

The Government of London and its relations

with the Crown 1400 - 1450

Caroline M. Barron

Thesis presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of London
January 1970

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

Abstract

The available sources have, to some extent, determined the form of this thesis, which was undertaken in the hope that a more detailed study of the relations between London and the Crown during the years 1400-1450 would place in perspective the crises with which it begins and ends. The most important source of material for this study has been the Journals of the Court of Aldermen and Common Council which survive from 1416 (the years 1429-1436 are missing). Historians with the help of a nineteenth century index have quarried in these Journals, but they have never been read through systematically. Journals nos. 3 and 6, having been wrongly bound up, could not be used until their pages had been sorted into the correct order from the internal evidence of their contents. The scribes who compiled the Journals were both careless and cautious which increases the difficulty in interpreting their crabbed notes. From studying the Journals dominant themes emerged which were then followed up at the Public Record Office and elsewhere.

The conclusions from this study fall into three main categories. The Journals provided a great deal of material from which it was possible to draw a much more detailed picture of the machinery and business of the government of medieval London. The Aldermen and civic officials emerge as conservative, but conscientious, men who might press hardly upon minority interests, but had constantly before their eyes the needs of the City as a whole.

Secondly it has been possible to tidy up the chronology of the crises themselves. At such times as Bolingbroke's usurpation and Cade's revolt the

civic scribes were least active and most cautious. But it seems clear that the London support for both these men has been exaggerated and that the fundamental conservatism of the City governors was not easily rocked, whether by royal scions or Kentish peasants.

But this study has proved most useful where the more mundane contact between the Crown and the citizens could be examined. In this way it has been possible to place the financial relations between the King and the City in perspective, and to realize that the King did not come as a beggar to the Londoners, since he had at his disposal all the chartered freedoms and privileges which were essential to the communal and economic life of the City. London, in spite of its great prestige and financial importance, still operated in the fifteenth century within a framework of royal privilege. While the memory of Richard II's action in 1392 was still green, the Londoners were in no position to demand redress of grievances before supply. In understanding the delicate balance of the relationship between the Crown and the Londoners it is easier to understand the survival of the Lancastrian dynasty.

'Considering that this cause is every Freeman's
cause, and the good and true keeping and defending
of the liberties of this famous City is the welfare
of every man that is inhabitant therein'

(Sheriffs' petition to Common Council,
2 September 1440, L.B.K., pp. 242-43).

Acknowledgments

This research project was begun seven years ago and, inevitably perhaps, it comes to an end heavily in debt. Such debts as these are never repaid but it is my hope that, like all generous benefactors, its patrons may be satisfied with the author's grateful acknowledgment of their help.

I am indebted to three institutions for their support. Somerville College which nursed me to a B.A. and encouraged me with the M.V. Clarke postgraduate award, Westfield College which gave me a postgraduate scholarship and Bedford College which, by giving me successively a tutorial studentship and fellowship, provided me with the incentive to venture into new fields from which this thesis has greatly benefited. Moreover throughout these years the Institute of Historical Research, with its kind and efficient staff, has always provided a haven where books, tea and good companionship could be enjoyed together. I learnt much at the seminars held there by Professor Wormald, Professor Du Boulay and Professor Reddaway, not only of the tools of the historian's craft, but also of the means of discussing problems in common.

Without devoted and learned archivists a work such as this would have been impossible. In this respect my greatest debt is to the archivists at Guildhall: Mr. Philip Jones and his assistants Mr. Michael Chandler and Miss Betty Masters in the Record Office, and Dr. Albert Hollaender in the Library. They have all helped me to find material which I might otherwise have missed and to interpret passages which were obscure. To work in their repositories has been one of the greatest pleasures of my researching years, and I value their friendship as highly as their archives.

Elsewhere I have also been well served, but my demands have been less wearing and continuous than at Guildhall. I acknowledge with gratitude the help given to me by Mr. W. O'Sullivan in the Library of Trinity College Dublin, Mr. MacMichael of the Westminster Abbey Muniment Room, Dr. N.R. Ker at Magdalen College, Oxford and the efficient staffs of the Public Records Office, The Bodleian Library and the Manuscript and Reading Rooms of the British Museum. I am grateful also to the Masters and Wardens of the Worshipful Companies of Mercers, Merchant Taylors, Goldsmiths and Ironmongers, for allowing me to consult the records kept at their company halls.

There are many people whose help has been invaluable to me. Foremost amongst these is my supervisor, Professor May McKisack, who kindly agreed to take me under her wing, diverted me from an unsuitable research topic to this most interesting one, and has borne her extended supervision with great patience and understanding. This thesis owes much to her good judgment and acumen. I wish that it might also have reflected her great gifts of synthesis and brevity. When Professor McKisack was in America Professor Reddaway agreed to shoulder the burden of supervising me. I am grateful to him for inciting me to read the records themselves and for his gently cynical view of young female academics which provided a necessary spur to action. I only wish that he might have lived to see the results of his timely goading. Professor F.R.H. Du Boulay, Dr. Edmund Fryde, Miss Barbara Harvey, Miss Jean Inray, Mr. David Johnson, Mr. William Kellaway, Dr. C.H. Lawrence and Dr. Elspeth Veale have all, at different times, answered my queries, provided me with useful information and sacrificed their own time on my behalf. I thank them all. But my greatest debt is to my husband. Only those who are

married to women-with-theses can fully appreciate the discomforts involved. But for his forbearance, excellent judgment, goading, encouragement and, above all, sustained enthusiasm, this thesis would not now exist.

January 1970

Caroline M. Barron

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

Chapter I	London and the Accession of Henry IV	1
Chapter II	The Machinery of Civic Government	39
Chapter III	The Business of Civic Government	145
	(i) The Financing of Civic Government	146
	(ii) Peace-keeping in the City	154
	(iii) The Administration of Justice	165
	(iv) The Administration of City Property	172
	(v) The Upkeep of London Bridge	182
	(vi) The City and the City Companies	192
	(vii) The Freedom of the City of London	199
	(viii) Apprenticeship in London	209
	(ix) The care of orphans in London	212
	(x) The control of Brokers and Usurers	220
	(xi) The Administration of Civic Markets	225
	(xii) The control of Weights and Measures	231
	(xiii) The sale of food in the City	239
	(xiv) Public Health in London	257
Chapter IV	An Opposition Party in the City 1438-1444	278
Chapter V	London and Parliament 1400-1450	323
Chapter VI	London and the Crown 1400-1450: the City as Suitor	356
Chapter VII	The Financial Relations between London and the Crown 1400-1450: the Crown as Suitor	418
Chapter VIII	London and the Crown 1400-1450: a marriage of convenience	455
Chapter IX	London and the Revolt of Jack Cade in 1450	479
Appendices		
IA	Attendance of Members at Court of Aldermen 1416-1462	541
I	Ward Officers	544
II	Wardens of Ludgate	556

III	Wardens of Newgate	557
IV	Undersheriffs	558
V	Recorders	559
VI	Chamberlains	560
VII	Clerks/Controllers to the Chamberlain	561
VIII	Common Clerks	562
IX	Common Serjeants at Law or Common Pleaders	563
X	Common Serjeants at Arms or Common Criers	564
XI	Waterballiffs	565
XII	Swordbearers or Esquires to the Mayor	566
XIII	Common Huntsmen	567
XIV	Serjeants of the Channel	568
XV	Permanent Serjeants at Mace attending the Mayor	569
XVI	The Assize of Bread in the Fifteenth Century	570
XVII	Fifteenth Century Prosecutions of Bakers	571
XVIII	Prices of Wine in the City per Gallon	572
XIX	Searchers of Wine	573
XX	Reports of Wine Searchers	577
XXI	Fish Prices in the City	578
XXII	Keepers of the Common Seal/Common Chest	579
XXIII	Keepers of the Great Beam	581
XXIV	Bailiffs of Queenhythe and Billingsgate	582
XXV	Saltmeters at Queenhythe and Billingsgate	583
XXVI	Cornmeters at Queenhythe and Billingsgate	584
XXVII	Coalmeters at Queenhythe and Billingsgate	585

XXVIII	Assayers of Oysters at Queenhythe and Billingsgate	586
XXIX	Oystermeters at Queenhythe and Billingsgate	587
XXX	Keepers of Blackwell Hall	588
XXXI	Collectors of Bridge Rents	589
XXXII	Collectors of Bridge Quit-rents and fees at the Stocks	590
XXXIII	Bailiffs of London Bridge	591
XXXIV	Janitors and Keepers of the Gate of Bridge House	592
XXXV	Clerks of the Works at London Bridge	593
XXXVI	Auditors of the Bridgewardens Accounts	594
XXXVII	Bridgewardens	600
XXXVIII	Costs of Building the new City Conduit	602
XXXIX	Numbers of Electors present at London Elections 1407-1455	603
XL	Numbers of Common Councilmen present at Elections	604
XLI	Voting Frequency of Non-Aldermen at Parliamentary Elections 1407-1455	605
XLII	Non-Aldermen London M.Ps. 1400-1450	606
XLIII	Incidence of Aldermen M.Ps. attending meetings of the Court of Aldermen during sessions of Parliament	608
XLIV	List of Indentured returns of London M.Ps. between 1406 and 1460, surviving in the P.R.O.	609
XLV	All London Loans to the Crown 1400-1460	610
XLVI	Corporate London Loans to the Crown 1400-1460	613

Bibliography

I	Manuscript Sources
---	--------------------

II	Printed Sources	
	(i) Records of the City of London	v
	(ii) Records of Royal Government	v
	(iii) Miscellaneous Records	vi
	(iv) Chronicles	
	(a) London Group	ix
	(b) Other Chronicles	xi
III	Secondary Works	xiii
IV	Catalogues and Works of Reference	xxi

List of Abbreviations used in the footnotes

(fuller details of these works will be found in the bibliography)

<u>Ammundesham</u>	<u>Annales Monasterii Sancti Albani a Johanne Ammundesham Monacho.</u>
<u>Annales</u>	<u>Chronica et Annales Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blanford.</u>
<u>Arnold's Chronicle</u>	<u>The Customs of London otherwise known as Arnold's Chronicle.</u>
<u>Bale</u>	Robert Bale's Chronicle, ed. R. Flenley.
B.H.R.	Bridge House Rental.
<u>Brie</u>	<u>The Brut, or the Chronicles of England</u> , ed. F.W. Brie.
<u>Charters</u>	<u>The Historical Charters...of the City of London</u> , ed.W. de G. Birch.
<u>Chron.du Religieux</u>	<u>Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denys.</u>
<u>Cleopatra C IV</u>	ed. C.L. Kingsford in <u>Chronicles of London.</u>
<u>Cont. Eulogium</u>	<u>Eulogium Historiarum.</u>
<u>Creton</u>	'A French Metrical History of the Reign of Richard II', by Jean Creton.
Devon, <u>Issues</u>	<u>Issues of the Exchequer</u> , ed. F. Devon.
<u>D.N.B.</u>	<u>Dictionary of National Biography.</u>
<u>Econ.H.R.</u>	<u>Economic History Review.</u>
E.E.T.S.	Early English Text Society.
<u>E.H.L.</u>	<u>English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century</u> , by C.L. Kingsford.
<u>E.H.R.</u>	<u>English Historical Review.</u>

<u>Emden, Biographical Register</u>	<u>A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500, by A.B. Emden.</u>
<u>English Chronicle</u>	<u>An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II Henry IV, Henry V & Henry VI.</u>
<u>Fabyan</u>	Robert Fabyan, <u>The New Chronicles of England and France.</u>
<u>Foedera</u>	<u>Foedera</u> , comp. Thomas Rymer.
<u>Froissart</u>	<u>Chroniques de Froissart</u> , vol.XVI.
<u>Giles' Chronicle</u>	<u>Chronicon Angliae Temporibus Richardi II, Henrici IV, Henrici V et Henrici VI.</u>
<u>Great Chron.</u>	<u>The Great Chronicle of London.</u>
<u>Gregory</u>	Gregory's Chronicle (Egerton 1995).
<u>Gough London 10</u>	ed. R. Flenley in <u>Six Town Chronicles of England.</u>
G.R.O.	Guildhall Record Office.
Harben, <u>Dictionary of London</u>	Harben, H.A., <u>A Dictionary of London</u> (London, 1918).
<u>Harley 565</u>	<u>A Chronicle of London 1089-1483.</u>
<u>H.M.C.</u>	<u>Historical Manuscripts Commission.</u>
Jacob, <u>Fifteenth Century</u>	E.F. Jacob, <u>The Fifteenth Century</u> (Oxford 1961).
Johnson, <u>Drapers' Accounts</u>	<u>The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London</u> , vol.I.
<u>Julius B I</u>	<u>A Chronicle of London 1089-1483.</u>
<u>Julius B II</u>	ed. C.L. Kingsford in <u>Chronicles of London.</u>
Kingdon, <u>Grocers' Accounts</u>	<u>Facsimile of the First Volume of the Ms. Archives of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London 1345-1463.</u>
<u>Lambeth 306</u>	ed. J. Gairdner in <u>Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles.</u>
<u>Lambeth 448</u>	ed. J. Gairdner in <u>Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles.</u>

<u>Liber Albus</u>	<u>Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber Albus, Liber Custumarum et Liber Horn.</u>
<u>Liber Custumarum</u>	<u>Ibid.</u>
<u>Longleat Ms.</u>	ed. R. Flenley in <u>Six Town Chronicles of England.</u>
<u>Memorials</u>	<u>Memorials of London and London Life in XIII, XIV and XV centuries.</u>
<u>Palgrave, Antient Kalendars</u>	<u>The Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of His Majesty's Exchequer.</u>
<u>Paston Letters</u>	<u>The Paston Letters</u> , ed. J. Gairdner.
<u>P.P.C.</u>	<u>Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England.</u>
<u>P.R.O.</u>	Public Record Office.
<u>Rawlinson B 355</u>	ed. R. Flenley in <u>Six Town Chronicles of England.</u>
<u>R.P.</u>	<u>Rolls of Parliament.</u>
<u>Strecche</u>	The Chronicle of John Strecche for the reign of Henry V (1414-1422).
<u>Stow, Annales</u>	<u>Annales or a General Chronicle of England</u> , by John Stow.
<u>Stow, Survey</u>	<u>A Survey of London</u> , by John Stow.
<u>T.C.D.</u>	Trinity College Dublin.
<u>Thrupp, Merchant Class</u>	Thrupp, S., <u>The Merchant Class of Medieval London.</u>
<u>Traison</u>	<u>Chronique de la Traison et Mort de Richard Deux Roy d'Engleterre.</u>
<u>T.R.H.S.</u>	<u>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.</u>
<u>Usk</u>	<u>Chronicon Adae de Usk 1377-1421.</u>
<u>Vitellius A XVI</u>	ed. C.L. Kingsford in <u>Chronicles of London.</u>
<u>Vitellius F XII</u>	<u>Grey Friars Chronicle.</u>

Walsingham vol.II

Thomas Walsingham, Historia Anglicana, vol.II.

Wedgwood, Biographies

J.C. Wedgwood, History of Parliament 1439-1509,
vol.II.

West.Chron.

Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, vol.IX.

William of Worcester

Annales Rerum Anglicanum by William of Worcester.

CHAPTER I

LONDON AND THE ACCESSION OF HENRY IV

Freissart wrote of London in 1398 as 'la ville ... où le conte d'Erby estoit cent fois meulx aime que le roi Richard'.¹ Without the consent of the City it is very unlikely that Richard could have been deposed and the Duke of Lancaster crowned as Henry IV with such apparent facility. It was, Professor McKisack has suggested, a 'vex populi' composed mainly of Londoners which provided the popular acclaim necessary to endorse Henry's seizure of the Crown on 30 September 1399 at a meeting of the Estates at Westminster.² It is reasonable to ask why Richard II was so unpopular with the Londoners and whether the City swung over to support Bolingbroke as easily and as rapidly as Freissart suggested. Although Richard II had made enemies in London he also had friends there, and it was not until some weeks after Henry's landing at Ravenspur that the Londoners openly declared for the usurper. Historical hindsight makes Richard's deposition appear to have been inevitable; in fact the outcome was much more evenly balanced.

1. Freissart, p.138.

2. M. McKisack, 'London and the succession to the Crown during the Middle Ages', in Studies in Medieval History presented to F.M. Powicke, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, R.W. Southern (Oxford 1948), p.84.

2

That Richard was unpopular throughout England after 1396 there can be no doubt, but unpopularity does not necessarily lead to deposition.¹ As with the country at large, so with London. Richard gave the Londoners many reasons for disliking him but only the arrival of Henry Bolingbroke, the capture of Richard II at Flint and the usurper's march southwards towards the City, would have brought the Londoners out in open revolt. There may have been 'radical' elements among the London mob, but the voice which spoke for the City was that of the Aldermen; loyal, conservative and cautious. A voice which would accept nothing less certain than the inevitable. But by swinging over to Henry Bolingbroke when they did, the citizens of London avoided blood-shed and facilitated the 'constitutional' deposition of Richard II. They demanded their price and received their reward. The loyalty of the City of London involved not romantic sentiment but plain business sense.

The deterioration of the relationship between Richard II and the City of London began in 1392 when the King seized the liberties of the City and appointed Sir Edward Dalyngrigge as Warden. The Mayor of the year 1389-90, William Venour, and the Aldermen were imprisoned and fined 3000 marks. The City as a whole was fined £100,000.²

-
1. See C.M. Barrow, 'The Tyranny of Richard II', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XLI (1968), pp.1-18.
 2. See Ruth Bird, The Turbulent London of Richard II (1949), Chap.VII. The causes of this dispute are obscure but I am hoping to examine them more thoroughly in a forthcoming article.

In the end the Londoners were able to make their peace: the King and Queen enjoyed a triumphal procession in London and were presented with expensive gifts.¹ On 19 September 1392 the King issued three letters patent of pardon from Woodstock. The first of these pardoned the Mayor and Aldermen their individual fine of 3000 marks and released them from prison.² The second letter pardoned the City its fine of £100,000.³ In both these letters the King promised pardon not only on his own behalf but also on behalf of his heirs and successors, and his ministers both for the present and in time to come. These two pardons were permanent and absolute. But the third letter repays close study of the original. In it the King restored their liberties to the citizens of London as they had enjoyed them before they were seized into the King's hand. But the final clause of this letter makes it clear that, unlike the other two pardons, this one was not permanent but was only to be effective until the King should ordain otherwise.⁴ In the Parliament which met at Winchester in January and February 1393 the Mayor and Aldermen petitioned the

-
1. Latin poem of Richard of Maidstone printed in Political Poems and Songs, ed. T. Wright (Rolls Series 1859), vol. I, pp. 282-300; Helen Suggett, 'A Letter describing Richard II's reconciliation with the City of London in 1392', E.H.R., vol. LXII (1947), pp. 209-13; West.Chron., pp. 274-76.
 2. C.P.R. 1391-96, p. 171; P.R.O. C/66/336 m. 32; G.R.O. Charter 47.
 3. C.P.R. 1391-96, p. 130; P.R.O. C/66/335 m. 20; no copy at Guildhall.
 4. C.P.R. 1391-96, p. 173; P.R.O. C/66/336 m. 31; no copy at Guildhall. The letter ends with the words 'quousque aliter ordinandum que eisdem in cuius etc'.

King for a 'plein et perpetual restitution' of their liberties, but without success.¹

In spite of the pardons of September 1392 the Londoners paid £10,000 to Richard.² The collection of such a large sum caused some difficulty in the City. The Bridge House Estates contributed £60,³ and the City Companies were also called upon.⁴ It is clear also that the unusual demand for money led the Mayor and Aldermen to impose unaccustomed financial burdens on the citizens. Two groups of citizens, the widows and the clergy, petitioned in the Winchester parliament to be exempted from these novel obligations.⁵ In retaliation the Mayor and Aldermen petitioned that these groups should not be exempted from contributing to the fine which the Londoners were paying to the King for the return of the royal courts to London from York.⁶ This petition, at least, reveals the royal

-
1. R.P. III, p.324; P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.6041.
 2. C.P.R. 1391-96, p.226; see Walsingham, vol.II, pp.210-11.
 3. G.R.O. Bridge Master's Accounts 1390-1405, Roll 11, m.lv., money paid for 'divers affairs touching the City'. The income from the London Bridge Estates was sometimes used by the City as a source of ready cash in times of crisis. This payment put the accounts into arrears of £53.
 4. Mercers' Hall, Warden's Accounts 1347-1464, f.13v., paid to John Haddale, Mayor of London (1393-4) £10 for certain business touching the franchise of the City.
 5. R.P. III, p.325; P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.1052.
 6. R.P. III, p.325; P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.6036.

pretext. When Richard received the money or how he spent it remain obscure.¹

From September 1392, therefore, the Londoners held their liberties not in perpetuity but only during good behaviour. Their position was weak. On 6 June 1397 the Mayor of London, Adam Banne, died. Two days later Richard took the unprecedented step of appointing a Mayor for the City. His choice fell upon Richard Whittington.² Twice in Edward III's reign the Mayor had been deposed by the King but the successor had been chosen by the citizens. The right of the citizens to choose their own Mayor had been established in 1215.³ The King had appointed Wardens before but never a Mayor. The unusual nature of this action by Richard II can be barely ascertained from the contemporary evidence, but Arnold in his chronicle has preserved a unique reference 'This yere, in Junii, decessid the Mayre, and for him chosen Richard Whittington, who ye lords wold not admytt till on the morowe was admitted be ye king and occupied tyl Saint Edward's day'.⁴ It would seem, therefore, that although the King chose Whittington, the Barons of the Exchequer, before whom a new Mayor was normally sworn, refused to swear him and so the King himself performed the task. Two pieces of evidence substantiate this supposition.

1. A loan of £6333 6s.8d. advanced by the Mayor, Citizens and Commonalty of London was recorded as received at the Exchequer, 5 December 1394, P.R.O. Receipt Roll E 401/596. Arrangements were made for the repayment of this sum 1 March, 3 April 1395, P.R.O. Issue Roll E 403/549, so it is unlikely that it was the gift of 1392. For a suggestion as to how Richard II spent this money see C.M. Barron, *Richard Whittington*, in *Essays in London History*, ed. W. Kellaway and A. Hollander (1969), p.200.

2. *L.B.H.*, p.436; *Memorials*, p.544.

3. *Charters*, p.19.

4. *Arnold's Chronicle*, p. xxx.

In the Lord Treasurer's Remembrance and Memoranda Rolls where the swearing of the Mayors of London is normally recorded, there is no record of Whittington being sworn in June 1397 although he duly appears in October when he was re-elected by the citizens.¹ Secondly there is recorded on the Close Roll for this year a full copy of the oath of the Mayor of London. The entry is undated but the oath in no way differs from the Mayor's usual oath, and was probably enrolled there for the King's own reference.² This episode throws an interesting light on the attitude of the judiciary to Richard II and suggests that the Barons of the Exchequer, at least, were prepared to make a stand in defence of legality and the liberties of London.

There are many reasons for believing that Whittington was a close friend of Richard II.³ In 1397 he served his sovereign well and in so doing served also the interests of the City. As Mayor he negotiated the 'loan' of £6666 13s.4d. whereby the Londoners bought a full and perpetual confirmation of their liberties from Richard II, and Whittington also managed to keep London peaceful during the contentious autumn parliament of 1397.

The London 'loan' of £6666 13s.4d. was one of the number of such loans, totalling in all over £20,000, which Richard raised from his subjects in the summer of 1397. It was not repaid.⁴ But in return Richard on 12 June 1397, four days after Whittington's appointment

1. P.R.O. E 368/169 and 170.
 2. C.C.R. 1396-99, p.135; P.R.O. C/54/239 m.1v.
 3. C.M. Barran, 'Richard Whittington', op.cit., pp.205, 229-30.
 4. C.M. Barran, 'Tyranny of Richard II', op.cit., pp.1-6.

as Mayor, granted a full charter of liberties to the Londoners in which their rights were confirmed in perpetuum.¹ The problem of raising so large a sum in the City was again acute. The Bridge Estates contributed £50² and there is evidence that the City Companies were further called upon.³ Finally individuals paid contributions to the Chamber at Guildhall and received receipts for their money under the Chamber seal. John Woodcock, a Mercer and associate of Richard Whittington, contributed £50 which he was fortunate enough to have repaid by Henry IV.⁴ William Venour, a Grocer, contributed £100.⁵ In just over two months Whittington appears to have collected the necessary amount and on 22 August 1397 the Exchequer acknowledged

-
1. C.P.R. 1396-99, p.136; P.R.O. C/66/345; G.R.O. Charter no.49. Miss Bird suggested that the cause of this large 'loan' was Richard's attack upon the privileges and franchises of the City Courts, Turbulent London, op.cit., p.106. The cases which she cites appear, however, to be normal writs of certiorari issued by the King's Justices in cases which had come to them on appeal from City Courts. See Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, pp.242, 249, 251-53; C.C.R. 1396-99, pp.103, 105, 395. The explanation that the 10,000 marks was to pay for a full charter seems more likely.
 2. G.R.O. Bridge Master's Accounts 1390-1405, Roll 15, n.lv. Paid £50 to the Chamber (of London) by order of Richard Whittington Mayor and Aldermen.
 3. Grocers' Accounts, p.78, paid £13 6s.8d. to Mayor Richard Whittington and to the Aldermen by the assent of the mistery on 23 July 1397 'pur le franchises de Londres'.
 4. 7 April 1400, Woodcock was paid by assignment a total sum of £1300 6s.6½d. This was mainly to cover money owed to him by Richard II and Isabella for purchases of mercery. These debts amounted to £1250 6s.6½d. which left £50. The entry states that this sum was Woodcock's contribution to the loan of 10,000 marks lately made by the Mayor and Citizens of London to King Richard, P.R.O. Issue Roll E 403/565.
 5. Venour appears to have been repaid during Richard's reign, 4 November 1397, P.R.O. Issue Roll E 403/556.

that it had received 10,000 marks from the Londoners.¹ The King wrote to thank the citizens of London for their 'pecuniary assistance' and referred to the need for good government in the City during the forthcoming meeting of Parliament.² Richard II's attention was shifting now from the collection of money to the attack upon his enemies, the Duke of Gloucester and the Earls of Arundel and Warwick.

On 10 July 1397 Richard had arrested Warwick and Arundel by treacherous means.³ On the same night Richard dined at the house of his half-brother, John, Earl of Huntingdon, which was called Cold Harbour in the London parish of All Hallows the Less. From here he set out for Pleshy to arrest Gloucester.⁴ One chronicler records that before setting out Richard took the precaution of commending the secure custody of the City to the Mayor and Sheriffs.⁵ It seems likely that Whittington was privy to Richard's plan, and it may be that a group of Londoners accompanied Richard to Pleshy, together with the Earls of Rutland, Kent, Huntingdon and Nottingham.⁶ Subsequent

-
1. P.R.O. Receipt Roll E 401/606.
 2. 21 August 1397, L.B.H., p.438.
 3. M. McKisack, Fourteenth Century (Oxford 1959), p.478.
 4. Traison, p.127. See C.L. Kingsford, 'Historical Notes on Medieval London Houses', London Topographical Record, vol.X (1916), pp.94-100.
 5. Kirkstall, p.129.
 6. Annales, p.203.

events during the Parliament would suggest that Richard could rely upon some support in the City.

Gloucester was arrested and shipped to Calais, while Warwick and Arundel were imprisoned in the Tower. Froissart wrote that the citizens of London were surprised and annoyed by the arrests but comforted themselves with the thought that the Duke of York would do something to put matters right.¹ In anticipation of the adverse public opinion Richard issued a series of writs. The Sheriffs were notified of the arrests and instructed to prevent the holding of meetings unless by the King's authority.² Further writs followed from the safe distance of Windsor. The Londoners were informed that Gloucester, Arundel and Warwick had been arrested, not for the old crimes of 1387/8 but for new ones committed since then. Members of their households and families were not to be molested. Yet another writ instructs the Mayor and Sheriffs to arrest any servants of the three lords whom they found armed within the City.³ A third writ ordered the Mayor and Sheriffs to arrest and imprison until further order, any adherents of the three lords whom they found going from place to place within the City or its suburbs, sowing evil words and inciting people against the King.⁴ The maintenance of peace in the City, together with the collection of money for the

1. Froissart, pp.72-74.

2. 13 July 1397, C.C.R. 1396-99, p.197; L.B.H., p.437.

3. 15 July 1397, C.C.R. 1396-99, pp.137, 208; L.B.H., pp.437-38.

4. 15 July 1397, C.P.R. 1396-99, p.241.

'loan', must have presented Whittington with a formidable task; but he appears to have carried it out successfully.

Parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster on September 14th.¹ The King instructed those who wore his livery and received his pay to assemble at Kingston-on-Thames on that day and ride with him to Westminster.² In August it was necessary to take steps to ensure that there would be enough food in the City for all those who were coming to Parliament.³ These precautionary measures were well-justified. Not only did the King bring all his own retainers, but he allowed those lords whom he trusted to bring their retainers also. A chronicler wrote 'and thus in their array comen all the worthy men of this land unto our king; and all his people come to London on one day (presumably 14 September 1397), in so much that every street and lane in London and in the suburbs were full of them lodged, and ten or twelve miles about London every way'.⁴ Groups of men at arms were stationed by the Mayor and Aldermen at the main City gates to prevent disorders.⁵

-
1. 18 July 1397 writ to Londoners to elect four M.Ps. Andrew Newport and Dru Barentyn, Aldermen, and William Chichele and Robert Ascombe Commoners were chosen, L.B.H., pp.437-37. There is no evidence of royal interference in the election. For a discussion of this question see M. McKisack, Fourteenth Century (Oxford 1959), pp.486-87.
 2. 20 July 1397, L.B.H., p.438. 3. 27 August 1397, L.B.H., p.438.
 4. Continuation C of Brut, Bris, p.353.
 5. Ibid., p.354. A servant of Henry, Earl of Derby named William de Laken was murdered in Fleet Street during the September Parliament, C.P.R. 1396-99, p.427, Coroner's Inquest P.R.O. Chancery Miscellanea C47/68/12 no.337. The author of the Harley Chronicle records that in 1399 there was a fight between the men of Chester and the Londoners, Harley 565, p.83. The animosity between the two groups probably dates from the 1397 Parliament.

It is not easy to gauge the popularity of Gloucester, Arundel and Warwick in the City, or the indignation which their fates aroused. It seems clear however that Richard (and Arundel himself) expected the Londoners to make some active show of sympathy for the Earl as he was led to his execution on Tower Hill. Six of the lords who had condemned Arundel were sent to escort him to his execution for fear that he would be rescued by the Londoners.¹ According to one chronicler Arundel chose especially to be led along Cheapside in the hope that this might happen.² But in the event a large crowd turned out to mourn his fate, followed 'illum plangente', and sympathetically watched his execution.³ They did not rise up to save him. Arundel's son Thomas was helped in his escape from the household of John Holland, Duke of Exeter (presumably that same house at Cold Harbour where Richard had dined on 12 July) by a London Mercer William Scot. Dressed in the clothing of a groom he was able to get away to join his uncle Thomas, lately Archbishop of Canterbury, in France.⁴

The vengeful events of the Parliament were quickly accomplished and on September 30th it was adjourned to meet again at Shrewsbury

1. English Chronicle, p.10.
 2. Unprinted section of Giles' Chronicle, B.M. Royal Ms. 13 c 1 f.109v. I am grateful to Miss Mary Taylor for this reference.
 3. Evesham, p.138; Froissart, p.79.
 4. Great Chron., p.50. William Scot is an obscure figure. He made his second and third livery payments to the Mercers' Company in 1391 and 1392. 20 January 1399 he made a gift of lands in Northumberland and of goods and chattels to two other London Mercers, C.C.R. 1396-99, pp.431, 432. This may have been done to avoid some Lancastrian retribution.

on January 28th. The author of the Traison states that Richard decided upon the adjournment to Shrewsbury 'to punish the Londoners'.¹ It is true that the loss of trade would be a form of punishment for the Londoners, but the motive behind the adjournment is more likely to have been the inflammable situation in London which would make it difficult to hold a further session of Parliament at Westminster. Arundel had not been rescued by the citizens, but they had demonstrated their sympathy for him in the face of the Cheshire guard. It seems likely that Richard did not again visit London until he came thither in the company of Henry Bolingbroke; and in 1398 he travelled around the Midlands, never too far away from Chester and Wales where lay the sources of his military strength.

In October 1397 Whittington was re-elected as Mayor of London in perfectly normal conditions.² The Londoners had no reason to dislike Whittington and since he seemed able to work with the enigmatic Richard, the choice was a judicious one. On January 28th 1398 Parliament reassembled at Shrewsbury. Amongst other things the acts of the Merciless Parliament were annulled, the 1387 questions to the judges were upheld and a committee was appointed to deal with the Hereford/Norfolk dispute and with other outstanding petitions

-
1. Traison, p.140. This author also records the somewhat improbable story that after the September Parliament Richard ordered a muster of the men of London so that he might see their strength. The King reviewed the Londoners accompanied by the Duke of Lancaster and two other horsemen.
 2. L.B.H., p.440.

which had been presented to Parliament. The Grocers' Company paid Robert Chichele, the brother of William Chichele one of the City's M.Ps. £6 13s.4d. 'by common assent for the parliament at Shrewesbury'.¹ The exact purpose of this payment remains obscure.

Richard took steps to publicize the acts of this Parliament in London. A copy of the statutes dealing with the conviction of the Appellants and the overthrow of all their acts, which was, presumably, sent to the Mayor and Sheriffs, was copied into the City's letter book.² The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London and the other bishops were instructed to promulgate sentences of excommunication against those who violated the various statutes.³ Richard also sent to the Pope for confirmation of the acts of these two meetings of Parliament and in Easter week 1398 the Papal confirmation was read out in London at Paul's Cross and at the Church of St. Mary Spital.⁴ It is clear that Richard was particularly anxious that the Londoners should know of the overthrow of the Appellants and their acts.

In 1398 London, together with the sixteen adjacent countries, was singled out for special treatment by Richard II. This was the area from which the Appellants had derived their main support. Accordingly Richard demanded that proctors, acting on behalf of the

1. Grocers' Accounts, p.81.

2. L.B.H., pp.443-44; Statutes of the Realm, vol.II (1816), pp.94-110.

3. Édouard Penoy, L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme d'occident (Paris, 1933) pp. 345-6.

4. Great Chron., p.48; Harley 565, pp.83-84.

people living in London and the surrounding counties, should seal obligations in which they acknowledged their guilt, their need for the King's grace and their desire to submit to him in all things. The proctors were further empowered to act on behalf of the citizens in swearing to uphold the acts of the Westminster and Shrewsbury Parliaments.¹ For the City of London Roger Waldesyn, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Braybrooke the Bishop of London, Richard Whittington the Mayor and the two Sheriffs John Askham and John Woodcock acted as proctors. The sealing of this proctors' letter from London can probably be dated to July/August 1397.² There is some evidence, but it is not conclusive, that these proctors' letters or blank charters were accompanied by some sort of fine.³

The dispute between the Dukes of Hereford and Norfolk formed a sinister thread in the perplexing events of 1398. The Parliamentary committee which met at Bristol on March 19 failed to resolve the matter. Before the case was again considered six weeks later, the Constable of Windsor Castle had been instructed to deliver the Duke of Norfolk to Richard Whittington who was to escort his prisoner to the King's Wardrobe in the City.⁴ Norfolk's presence in the City

-
1. C.M. Barron, 'Tyranny of Richard II', op.cit., pp.11-14.
3 April 1398 Richard Whittington and twenty-seven others were summoned to appear before the Council 'to declare what shall there be laid before them', C.C.R., 1396-99, p.277.
 2. C.M. Barron, 'Tyranny of Richard II', op.cit., p.12 n.2.
 3. Ibid., p.12, n.7.
 4. 15 April 1398, C.C.R., 1396-99, p.258.

appears to have caused some disquiet and it was necessary for the Mayor and Sheriffs to keep watch around the Wardrobe where Norfolk was imprisoned.¹ Froissart recorded that the Londoners favoured Hereford to such an extent that Richard's counsellors advised the King not to side openly with Norfolk for fear that the Londoners would unite with the great Lancaster connections to overthrow Richard.² On 16 September 1398 Norfolk and Hereford met for armed combat but Richard prevented this trial by battle and instead Norfolk was banished for life and Hereford for ten years. Froissart again describes how the citizens of London turned out to sympathize with Bolingbroke as he passed through the City and how the Mayor and leading citizens accompanied Henry to Deptford.³ It seems unlikely, however, that Whittington would have been so reckless as to ride openly with a man whom the King had chosen to disgrace. On 13 October 1398 Dru Barentyn, who had been an M.P. for the City in the last Parliament, was elected as Mayor in place of Whittington.⁴ On behalf of the citizens of London he had to swear a new oath which included the promise not only to uphold the acts of the Westminster and Shrewsbury Parliaments, but also the judgments and banishments recently made at Coventry.⁵

-
1. 23 April 1398, C.C.R. 1396-99, p.259. A further writ to the Mayor and Sheriffs instructed them to hand Norfolk over to Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, who would bring him to the King in person, ibid., p.263.
 2. Froissart, pp.96, 99, 102-03. 3. Ibid., pp.111-12.
 4. L.B.H., p.444.
 5. P.R.O. Ancient Correspondence S.C.1/43/no.20; for similar oaths sworn by ecclesiastics, see C.M. Barron, 'Tyranny of Richard II', op.cit., pp.14-16.

The Duke of Lancaster died in February 1399, but far from allowing Henry to enter upon his inheritance, Richard, on March 18th, revoked his letters of attorney and banished Henry for life.¹ The bulk of the Lancastrian lands were confiscated. It was at this critical moment that Richard decided to set out for Ireland to punish the rebellious Art McMurrough. Eleven Londoners are recorded as accompanying Richard on this expedition. At least five of these men were Goldsmiths or Jewellers.² The presence of these London merchants and artisans in Richard's Irish entourage may lend colour to the suggestion to be found in some chronicles, that Richard took all the Crown Jewels with him to Ireland and intended to live there and govern England from a safe distance.³ Such a group may also indicate that Richard II had a party of supporters within the City, apart from Richard Whittington himself. The King was, after all, a considerable patron of Drapers, Skinners, Mercers, Coppersmiths, Latteners and Goldsmiths. There are many entries on the Issue Rolls

-
1. Froissart, p.138, states that the Londoners thought that Richard should recall Henry.
 2. The eleven men were: Andrew Preston, Vintner, Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, p.261; Saer Parkesgate, ibid., p.262; Robert Yorke, Cordwainer, C.P.R. 1396-99, p.522; Thomas Litlyngham, Painter, ibid., p.573; Christopher Tyldesley, Goldsmith, ibid., p.566; Henry Horne, Goldsmith, ibid., p.519; Henry Camelle, Goldsmith, ibid., p.546; John Lyverpull, Jeweller, ibid., p.523; John Bishop, senior, Goldbeater, ibid., p.550; John Pope, Skinner, ibid., p.550; Hugh Sprot, Merchant, P.R.O. C81/1084/1.
 3. Annales, pp.239-40; Cont.Eulogium, p.380; Eng.Chron. p.14; also mentioned in the Deposition Articles, R.P.III, p.420.

recording payments to various London craftsmen for beautiful objects,¹ and a man like Christopher Tyldealegh who had been appointed to the office of King's Goldsmith was likely to be numbered amongst Richard's supporters in the City.² Although many of his subjects suffered as a result of Richard II's love of luxury, pomp and beauty, yet there were those, especially a group of London merchants and craftsmen, who profited by this trait in their King.

In preparation for the expedition to Ireland the yeomen of the King's livery assembled in London in Easter week.³ The Harley chronicle records that "the men from Chester made a great fray in Friday Street, on a night in their inns, the which were well beaten and hurt with arrows and brought them to the Counter".⁴ Before embarking for Ireland Richard wished to visit the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury, but he feared to make the journey because of the hostility of the men of London and Kent. It was only Archbishop Waldern's guarantee of his safety and the presence of his Cheshire

-
1. E.g. 24 May 1397 payments to William Fitzhugh, Goldsmith, for various golden objects including a circlet crown for Queen Isabella costing £46 10s.0d. P.R.O. E 403/555; 5 March 1399 payment of £100 to the London Coppersmiths, Richard (Nicholas ?) Broker and Geoffrey Prest, for the tomb effigies of Richard and Queen Anne, P.R.O. E 403/561; 14 April 1399 they were paid a further £100, P.R.O. E 403/562; 14 July 1397 Henry Yevele and Stephen Lote, Latoners or Masons of London, were paid £100 for a marble tomb for Queen Anne, P.R.O. E 403/555. These latter works were commissioned in 1394, see Palgrave, Ancient Kalendars, vol.II, p.56.
 2. 25 March 1398 Tyldealegh appointed Goldsmith to the King and Queen, C.P.R. 1396-99, p.319; the appointment was repeated a month later with the traditional grant of 12d. a day from the Keeper of the Great Wardrobe, and a suit of the King's livery every year of esquire's rank, ibid., p.333.
 3. C.C.R. 1396-99, p.489.
 4. Harley 565, p.83.

guard paid at the rate of 6d. a day, that overcame Richard's fears.¹
 In a belated bid to gain greater popularity amongst the citizens, Richard granted to the London Fishmongers a more complete control over the sale of fish in the City than they had hitherto enjoyed.²

It would seem that Richard's departure from England led to a general outbreak of disorder in the country. The Bishop of St. David's, Guy Mone, writing to the King in Ireland mentioned an insurrection in Oxfordshire and an affray in London.³ It is possible that this lawlessness led the Londoners, as Froissart says, to send messengers to Henry Bolingbroke in France.⁴ But it

-
1. Eng.Chron., p.14.
 2. 9 May 1399, L.B.H., pp.447-48; C.P.R. 1396-99, p.575. The Fishmongers' right to hold their own Halimot court twice a year was also restored by these letters patent. The Fishmongers' monopoly was quashed in the first Parliament of Henry's reign although the right of holding a court remained, R.P. III, p.445; see R. Bird, 'Turbulent London', op.cit., pp.112-13. ...
 3. Letters from Guy Mone printed by M. Dominica Legge, Anglo Norman Letters and Petitions (Anglo-Norman Text Society, Oxford 1941), pp.271-73, 278-79.
 4. Froissart, pp.156-65. Froissart's account of events during these years is highly coloured and partisan, and must be treated with circumspection. The problem of his sources for the years 1395-1400 has not yet been fully studied, but see M. Galway, 'Froissart in England', Birmingham Historical Journal, vol.VII (1959-60) pp.18-35; A.H. Diverres, Introduction to Froissart Voyage en Bearn (Manchester 1953); A. Artonne, 'Un exemple de la methode de travail de Froissart', Revue du Nord, vol.XXXIII (1951), pp.253-4
 Froissart stated that the Londoners sent the Archbishop of Canterbury as their emissary. Waldern would certainly not have consented to go on such an errand. This may be a confusion with Thomas Arundel, the ex-Archbishop of Canterbury, who accompanied Bolingbroke back to England.

appears that Bolingbroke's plans were well-laid in advance, and that there were many who expected him when he landed at Ravenspur on 4 July 1399.¹

When Bolingbroke reached his castle of Pontefract he despatched letters to several bishops, magnates and communities in England. The French sources for this period preserve what purports to be the text of Henry's letter to the Commons of London. The letter warns them that Richard, with foreign help, intended to keep the City in subjection, to arrest the chief magistrates and to put them to death at a great festival to be held after the King's return from Ireland. This was to be followed by the imposition of tallages and subsidies at the King's whim. The letter concluded with an assurance of Henry's desire to help and protect his friends in London.² Whether the French chronicler has preserved the exact text of such a letter seems, perhaps, doubtful although English chroniclers also mention that Henry sent letters to the Londoners calling himself Duke of Lancaster and Steward of England, and promising to reform what was amiss.³ A carefully drafted propaganda letter from Henry Bolingbroke to the Londoners could well have included an appeal to the Londoners known dislike of foreigners, royal interference in their choice of officials and arbitrary taxation.

1. Kenilworth Castle was garrisoned from 2 June 1399, see M. McKisack, Fourteenth Century (Oxford 1959), p.492 n.1.

2. Traison, pp.180-82; the same chronicler records that when the letter was received in London all the citizens agreed that Henry should be King in Richard's place. Chron. du Religieux, p.709; the text of a further letter from Henry to the Londoners is recorded, Traison, p.187.

3. Eng.Chron.; p.15; Cont.Eulogium, p.381.

The agitated debates which must have taken place in the Court of Aldermen and the Court of Common Council in June 1399 have left no record. While Henry from the security of the Lancastrian strongholds set about winning support for his cause, his uncle the Duke of York, who had been left as guardian of the realm in Richard's absence, exerted himself ineffectively to maintain the royal position. The uncertain loyalty of the City of London led York to move the government to St. Albans by July 12th 1399.¹ Writs were sent out to summon the King's lieges to come armed to join him.² The author of the Traison states that three hundred Londoners rode out to St. Albans to join the Duke but returned three days later.³ Whether the Londoners joined York or not it is clear that he was able to assemble some archers at St. Albans and from there his army moved to Wallingford (July 20th). Meanwhile on 15th July Archbishop Waldern had instructed the Bishop of London, Robert Braybrook, to pray publicly in the City for the peace of the realm and the success of the King in Ireland.⁴ Both of these were forlorn hopes. From Oxford on July 18th the Duke of York instructed the Mayor and Sheriffs to prevent Armourers in London from selling arms to anyone but true lieges of the King.⁵ In another

-
1. M. McKisack, Fourteenth Century (Oxford 1959), p.492.
 2. See petition to Henry's first Parliament, R.P. III, p.470.
 3. Traison, p.184.
 4. Guildhall Library Ms.9531/3 Register of Braybrook 1381-1404, f.252v. See similar writ from Arundel as Archbishop to Braybrook to pray for Henry, dated 16 October 1399.
 5. C.C.R. 1396-99, p.509.

writ they were warned to imprison all the felons who had assembled in Kent, Surrey and Middlesex to rob and kill merchants travelling to London.¹ In this writ the Duke of York may have been trying to induce the Londoners to support Richard II by displaying to them the threat to their peaceful trading ventures which lay in the wake of armed rebellion. This writ hinted at the general breakdown of law and order which followed Richard's departure for Ireland and has been noted earlier. But the fear of lawlessness led the Londoners, ultimately, to support not Richard, as York had hoped, but Henry Bolingbroke.

Although Froissart wrote that the Londoners offered Henry their whole-hearted support as soon as he set foot in England, the evidence does not bear this out, and Froissart's account is, in general, too inaccurate to inspire much confidence.² It seems clear that the City maintained an equivocal attitude towards Henry and his cause for about six weeks; until after Richard had fallen into Henry's hands. The London mob may have been vocal in its support for Bolingbroke and so drove York away to St. Albans, but there is no sign of any official London expression of support for Henry during these weeks. There is, for example, no evidence that the Londoners provided Henry with any financial support at this time although the City of York lent him 500 marks before his accession.³

1. C.P.R. 1396-99, p.597.

2. Froissart, pp.171-75. Froissart states that Henry landed at Plymouth and marched directly to London. It is certain that both these statements are wrong. Henry did not visit London until after his meeting with Richard.

3. Foedera, vol.III, part IV, p.187, grant of repayment to the Mayor and citizens of York dated 18 July 1400.

By 29 July 1399 Richard had returned to England, the Duke of York had capitulated to Henry at Berkeley Castle and Richard's two friends, Sir John Bushey and Sir Henry Green had been executed at Bristol. But for bad management, treachery and ill-luck, Richard might yet have mustered an army and repaired his fortunes. But on 14 August the King was induced to leave the stronghold of Conway, and it was as a virtual prisoner that he met Henry the next day at Flint Castle.¹

It was the news of Richard's capture by Bolingbroke which jolted the City of London out of its neutral position. The news seems firstly to have provoked some mob violence in the City, precipitated partly by the misconception that Richard had already been brought to Westminster. Failing to find the King, the mob instead arrested some of the Westminster monks, Sir Ralph Selby and Sir John Slake the dean of the Chapel Royal. Sir Thomas Bagot who had been captured in Cheshire was imprisoned at Newgate and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Roger Waldern, may also have been taken into custody by the Londoners at this time.² In the second place since Richard's cause now seemed hopeless there was no reason for Dru Barentyn and the Court of Aldermen to hold back from open support for Henry. They had no desire either to put the City into a state of

-
1. For the chronology of Richard's movements at this time and for his treatment at Conway see M.V. Clarke and V.H. Galbraith, 'The Deposition of Richard II', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol.XIV (1930), pp.125-81.
 2. Julius B II, p.19; Continuation C Brut Brie, p.358; Usk, p.28. Sir John Slake was imprisoned at Ludgate.

siege or to have it plundered by the Lancastrian army, in Richard's dying cause. Moreover on 20 August Richard and the Duke of Lancaster jointly sent a writ to the Londoners from Chester assuring them that abuses would be reformed and that those who took advantage of the present upheavals to break the law would be severely punished.¹

Accordingly the Londoners sent a deputation to Henry. Adam of Usk states that three of the City's twenty-four Aldermen, together with fifty of the citizens, came to meet Henry while he was still at Chester and, having recommended the City to him, under their common seal renounced their fealty to King Richard.² It seems reasonable to trust Usk's account since he was a member of Henry's retinue at this time. The author of the Traison says that the London deputation came to Coventry; Creton says Lichfield. Both these accounts have a hysterical air and mention that the Londoners demanded Richard's instant execution which is most unlikely. Moreover the author of the Traison was dependent upon Creton for the story and Creton frankly admits that he was not present on this occasion.³ On the other hand an entry in the accounts of the Merchant Taylors' Company suggests that the meeting place may have been Leicester.⁴ Wherever the meeting took place it was extremely important for by their action the Londoners were sanctioning Henry's seizure of the Crown before Richard had been officially deposed.

1. C.P.R. 1396-99, p.593.

2. Usk, p.28.

3. Traison, pp.212-13; Creton, p.376.

4. Merchant Taylors' Hall, Ms.A 4 Accounts 1397-1445, total expenses for riding to Leicester with the Mayor in 1398-9, including an allowance for four horses and payments to John Creek, Dreper, for the journey 617d 1.2.

By 31 August Richard and Henry had reached St. Albans and it may be that it was out of some compassion for his cousin that Henry took steps to ensure that Richard should not be led through the streets of London as a public spectacle.¹ It may be, as was later recorded, that a group of Londoners hoped to waylay and kill Richard and that some of them felt cheated when Richard was not led through the streets to be openly mocked.² But it was important to Henry that Richard should remain alive so that he could play the necessary part in his own deposition. Accordingly therefore he appointed Sir Thomas Rempston, one of the faithful Lancastrian supporters, as Constable of the Tower,³ and then entrusted Richard to Dru Barentyn the Mayor of London.⁴ Thus while Henry received a tumultuous welcome from the Londoners when he entered the City on 1 September, Richard was taken quietly to Westminster and then transferred to the Tower the next day by water.⁵

-
1. Annales, p.251 records that Richard asked that the Londoners should not see his dejection since they would rejoice so greatly.
 2. Fabyan, p.546; Froissart, p.190; the author of the Traison wrote that Richard was led through the streets of London followed by a small boy pointing him out sarcastically as 'King Richard who has done so much good', p.215.
 3. 31 August 1399, C.P.R. 1396-99, p.593; further grant 1 October 1399, C.P.R. 1399-1401, p.264.
 4. Traison, p.214; Creton, p.377; Stow Annales, p.323; Chron. du Religieux, p.717 states that Henry handed Richard over to the sons of the Earls of Arundel and Gloucester to revenge their fathers' deaths, and that it was they who took Richard to the Tower.
 5. Evesham, p.156; Traison, pp.214-15; Creton, p.377.

On 30 September 1399 the Estates were summoned to assemble at Westminster. Henry had spent the weeks since his arrival in London drawing up the articles of deposition, and drafting the form of the claim by which he would take the Crown. The Mayor of London must have been frequently consulted. He was in a good position to provide information for the deposition articles and in return there were reforms which the Londoners wished to see carried out by the new King. Because the support of London was crucial to Henry's success, later chroniclers tended to exaggerate the City's enthusiasm for the new King. In truth the attitude of the City was calculating and restrained, but having renounced their allegiance to King Richard they had to ensure that Henry succeeded and that their own interests were considered. Accordingly on 30 September it was not only the Estates of the realm but also the populace of London who consented to Henry's becoming King. Mr. Steel has suggested that Henry used the Londoners to quash Archbishop Arundel's idea that he should have a parliamentary title.¹ Certainly, as Professor McKisack has pointed out, the Londoners must have formed a preponderant element in the 'populus' to whom the Archbishop of York read the articles of deposition in Westminster Hall.² Moreover according to one chronicler this populace did not merely accept Henry's accession, but rather chose his name from a list of candidates presented to them by the Archbishop.³ The crucial part

1. A. Steel, Richard II (Cambridge 1941), p.280.

2. M. McKisack, 'London and the Succession', op.cit., p.84.

3. Chron. du Religieux, pp.725-27.

which the Londoners had played in Richard's deposition was well-known. Some years later, during the northern rising, Philip Fitz-Eustace, the prior of St. Botolph's, claimed that the northerners had risen against Henry because he had only been elected King by the 'villanos civitatis' of London.¹

The ceremonies surrounding Henry's coronation were divided into two parts. On Sunday 8 October, Henry created several new knights at the Tower of London and then proceeded through the City with them together with the Mayor and leading London citizens who were splendidly arrayed in scarlet gowns with the hoods bordered in miniver.² Then on St. Edward's day, 13 October, Henry was crowned at Westminster Abbey. The Mayor, Recorder and Aldermen took their accustomed places at the coronation feast and the City Companies provided minstrels for the occasion.³

Parliament which had been summoned to meet on 6 October, but was adjourned until the day after the coronation, duly met on Tuesday 14 October. The M.Ps. for London were John Shadworth and William Bampton, both veteran Aldermen and two younger men, William Sonnyngwell

-
1. Traison Appendix A, p.268; see J.H. Wylie, Henry IV (London 1884), vol.I, p.420.
 2. Julius B II, p.48; Bodley 2376 printed Archaeologia, vol.IX (1824), p.275; Traison, pp.224-26; Froissart, p.205. The Grocers' Company paid a Draper £23 3s.4d. for white cloth 'when we rode with our Lord King Henry from the Tower as far as Westminster', Grocers' Accounts, p.83.
 3. Traison, p.225; Julius B II, p.48; Bodley 2376, op.cit., p.276; Grocers' Company paid 48/4 for minstrels, Grocers' Accounts, p.83. The Merchant Taylors paid 33/4 for minstrels and 6/9 for drink, Accounts 1397-1445, f.7.

and Richard Merlawe. The events of this Parliament are important, for in certain of the petitions and in Henry's response to them it is possible to detect some of the bargaining of September. In return for helping Henry to his Crown the Londoners achieved some important concessions.

First there were some statutes which, while they did not concern the Londoners alone, were definitely in their interests. A new Liveries Act limited the wearing of liveries to the King's retainers, and then only in special conditions, in an attempt to prevent the lawlessness such as that which disturbed London during the autumn parliament of 1397.¹ Henry granted a common petition asking for a confirmation of an earlier statute and stronger measures to deal with those who impeded navigation on rivers by weirs and other fishing devices.² This cause was particularly dear to the hearts of the Londoners.³ A further statute released the Merchants of the Calais Staple from paying gold to the King's mint at the Tower before exporting their wool. Moreover the obligations which the exporters had sealed since the passing of the statute of 1397 were to be annulled.⁴ Henry also agreed that all cloths of which the value of a dozen was less than 13/4d. should not be liable for sealing by the cocket or any other seal.⁵ Finally a general pardon was granted to everyone except those who had taken part in the murder of the Duke of Gloucester.⁶

1. R.P. III, p.428; April 1400, writ to the Mayor of London to carry out the provisions of this new act, C.C.R. 1399-1402, p.182; see also R.P. III, p.477.
2. R.P. III, pp.438, 475.
3. See Chapter VI, pp.357-365.
4. R.P. III, pp.340, 429.
5. R.P. III, pp.437, 498.
6. R.P. III, p.445.

All of these were general measures which, while they affected the Londoners, were aimed at securing a wide basis of support for the new regime. There were some measures which were instigated directly by the Londoners. In a petition to the King, the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of London asked for a confirmation of their liberties and customs which had been granted by the King's predecessors, and for the enjoyment of these liberties without infringement by any royal officials and notwithstanding any ordinances, judgments, charters, letters patent, writs or proclamations of the King's predecessors 'ou ascune seisine des libertees ou franchises susdites en mayns d'ascuns vos progenitours ou predecessours'.¹ In parliament Henry made a general confirmation of the charters of the various cities and boroughs of the realm.² Then on 25 May 1400 the Londoners received the particular confirmation of their own charter. The confirmation listed the City's previous charters including Richard II's letters patent of 19 September 1392 and 12 June 1397³. It was obviously of great importance to the Londoners that at Henry's accession not only the pardons of 1392 but also the letter patent of 1397 whereby they regained their liberties in perpetuity, should be confirmed by the new King. Henry's confirmation includes also a grant to the citizens of the right to keep all the City's gates and the appoint officers to collect toll, customs and tronage in the markets of Chepe, Billingsgate and Smithfield.

-
1. P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.6079. The petition is undated but on grounds of paleography and content it seems reasonable to ascribe it to Henry's first Parliament.
 2. R.P. III, p:429.
 3. Cal. Charter Roll 1341-1417, part III, p.399.

It was also of importance to the Londoners that the circumstances in which the King might seize the liberties of the City and the fines which he might exact, should be clearly defined. The statute of 1354 had laid down a procedure which Richard had only partially followed.¹ In parliament the Londoners petitioned that the statute might be repealed since it was contrary to the City charter in two respects: first because each civic official ought to be personally responsible for his own faults and not the City as a whole; and secondly because crimes committed in the City by citizens should be punished by the citizens themselves and not by outsiders.² Henry did not, however, assent to the repeal of the 1354 statute, but he agreed that if the City committed the crimes covered by the statute, the various penalties would not necessarily be exacted but the matter should rest with the judges assigned to hear the case.³ Henry was not prepared to yield this important control over the City, but by a partial concession he may have met the demands of the Londoners half-way. In fact no Lancastrian King seized the liberties of the City into his own hand.

There were other, less fundamental, concessions which the Londoners obtained in Henry's first parliament. They successfully

1. Statutes of the Realm, vol.I (1810), pp.346-47; Bird, Turbulent London, op.cit., p.103.

2. R.P. III, pp.442-43; see Chapter III, pp. 165-168.

3. Statutes of the Realm, vol.II (1816), pp.117-18; Miss Bird pointed out that it had already been enacted in 1393/4 that the statute of 1354 was not necessarily to apply to erroneous judgments in the City Courts, since there existed a means of appeal to the Justices in error sitting at St. Martin's, ibid., p.91 and Bird, Turbulent London, op.cit., p.111 and n.2.

petitioned for the repeal of Richard's recent letters patent which had limited the right to sell fish in the City to members of the Fishmongers' Company.¹ The merchants of London petitioned against Richard II's introduction of the office of royal packer who charged 1d. for packing each cloth. Henry granted their petition, acquitted the merchants of 'pakoure' and declared any letters patent to the contrary to be null and void.² In this parliament also the Mayor, Aldermen and commoners of London complained about the delays in holding various assizes in London because of the absence of the deputy Coroner who was a royal official. The King made a considerable concession in allowing the Sheriffs to proceed with the assize in the absence of the deputy Coroner, provided that he had been first called and had failed to appear.³ Moreover Henry did not give his assent to a Commons' petition which would have diminished the income of the London Sheriffs, by limiting the toll which the bailiff of Smithfield could take on sales carried out in the market.⁴

The London merchants were not, however, successful in a petition which they presented against various statutes - the most recent being

-
1. R.P. III, p.444; Statutes of the Realm, vol.II (1816), p.118.
 2. R.P. III, pp.443-44; Statutes of the Realm, vol.II (1816), p.118;
see Chapter ~~XXI~~^{VI}, p.386-381
 3. R.P. III, p.429; P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.6075; see Chapter III,
p. W. Kellaway, 'The Coroners in Medieval London' in Studies in London
History (London, 1964) pp.75-91.
 4. Henry procrastinated by sending to the London Sheriffs for information, and he did this again when the petition reappeared in the next Parliament, R.P. III, pp.439, 474.

of the eleventh year of Richard's reign - which had enlarged the privileges of foreign merchants buying and selling in London.¹

Although Henry did not assent to this petition, yet when he confirmed the charter of the Hanse merchants, he made it more stringent in its demands for reciprocal privileges for English merchants abroad. The new charter was enrolled in chancery, exemplified at the request of the English merchants and entered in the Letter Book of the City of London.² Even if the Londoners did not extract as many concessions as they would have liked from Henry IV it is clear that those which they did achieve were sufficient to make a change of King worthwhile.

There were private rewards as well as communal ones. Dru Barentyn received thirteen messuages which had belonged to a royal debtor.³ Thomas Knolles who had succeeded Barentyn as Mayor in October 1399 also received tenements which were in the King's hands in January 1401.⁴ William Hyde who was a Sheriff 1399-1400 was granted an exemption from serving on assizes or as collector of subsidies.⁵ Richard Whittington was granted repayment of some of Richard II's household debts to

1. P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.6080; cf. L.B.H., pp.53, 222.

2. C.P.R. 1399-1401, pp.57, 140; 6 December 1399, L.B.I., pp.5-6. Later, in 1406, Henry did enlarge the privileges of foreign merchants, L.B.I., pp.54, 69. See Chapter III, pp.365-372.

3. P.R.O. E 368/172 f.73. 1 July 1400 Dru Barentyn was paid £400 in lieu of the manor of Walkerle in Hertfordshire which he had restored to Robert, Lord Morley, E 404/15/462.

4. C.P.R. 1399-1401, pp.407-08.

5. Ibid., p.392.

him.¹ John Shadworth who had been an M.P. in Henry's first parliament was granted the tronage of wool and he received an exemption from tiresome duties such as Hyde had obtained.² Three Londoners - Whittington, together with Shadworth and Bampton the Alderman M.Ps. of 1399 - were appointed as members of the King's Council at a fee of 50 marks p.a.³ These appointments ensured for the Londoners an unusual voice in the conduct of policy during Henry's first year as King.

The loyalty of the Londoners to their new King was to be quickly tested. At Christmas 1399, after the dissolution of Henry's first parliament, the recently demoted Earls of Kent, Rutland, Huntingdon and Salisbury, together with William Merk the Bishop of Carlisle, plotted to restore Richard.⁴ The rebels met together at the house of William Colchester the Abbot of Westminster, in St. Paul's Church and in other places in the City.⁵ Their plan was to kill the King and his supporters under cover of a mumming to take place at Twelfth

-
1. C.M. Barron, Richard Whittington, op.cit., p.201 and n.1. Thomas Duc, a London Skinner, was also paid for furs supplied to Richard II, P.R.O. E 403/567. William Donardeston, a London Draper, was to receive payment for a debt which Richard II had owed to him, C.P.R. 1399-1401, p.231.
 2. C.P.R. 1399-1401, pp.152, 482; C.P.R. 1401-5, p.103; C.C.R. 1399-1402, pp.536-37.
 3. C.M. Barron, Richard Whittington, op.cit., p.216 and n.2.
 4. Traison, p.227 et seq. This is the most circumstantial account of the rising.
 5. L.B.I., pp.1-2; John Holland, Earl of Huntingdon, whose goods were forfeited to the Crown, borrowed nearly £2000 in London in September and October 1399, P.R.O. E 159/176 f.35-35; C.P.R. 1399-1402, p.180. He may have been raising money for the expenses of the rising.

Night at Windsor. Rutland, however, treacherously betrayed the plot, first to his father and then to Henry himself.

Thus forewarned on 5 January Henry left Windsor with his sons and took the road for London. It is interesting that at this critical juncture he turned, not northwards to his own duchy, but eastwards to London. Thomas Knolles, the Mayor of London, also got wind of the plot from certain Londoners¹ and riding towards Windsor to warn the King, encountered Henry on the road.² Only twelve hours after Henry had left Windsor, the rebels arrived to find that the bird had flown. Henry himself reached London in the evening of 5 January and set about providing himself with an army. Those who enlisted under his banner were to be paid at the high rate of 18d. per day for lancers and 9d. per day for archers. On 6 January Henry set off with part of the army which he had thus assembled leaving his sons to keep the Tower of London together with the Mayor.³ Henry seems particularly to have feared that the Flemings would support the rebels and also especially commanded the Mayor to allow noone to go overseas to carry the news.

The rising was rapidly dealt with. Although Kent fought a delaying action at Maidenhead and managed to escape to join Salisbury at Cirencester, Rutland deserted to Henry. By 8 January both Kent

1. Giles' Chron., p.7; Eng.Chron., p.20.

2, Stow Annales, pp.324-25.

3. Annales, p.329; Thomas Knolles was repaid his expenses at this time for providing 10 armed men and 20 archers to defend the Tower, 4 February 1400, P.R.O. E 403/564, E 401/604.

and Salisbury had been beheaded. Lord Despenser was similarly dealt with at Bristol and on 15 January Huntingdon was beheaded at Fleshy. Other minor rebels were tried before Henry himself at Oxford and suffered grisly deaths; these included Sir Thomas Blount, Sir Benedict Cely, Thomas Wyntersell and Sir Ralph Lumley.¹ Henry returned to London on 15 January and ordered that the traitors' heads should be placed on London Bridge as a timely warning to those who might be inclined to follow their example.

Roger Waldern the late Archbishop of Canterbury and William Mark the Bishop of Carlisle who were implicated in the rising, were committed to the Tower with other prisoners to await their trial. This began on Tuesday 28 January and was held before certain commissioners among whom were Thomas Knolles the Mayor and Matthew Southworth the Recorder of London. An incomplete account of the proceedings is preserved in the Letter Book of the City.² Waldern and Mark tried, unsuccessfully, to claim benefit of clergy and then both men accepted, under protest, a trial by a jury of twenty-four Londoners. Other conspirators included Gilbert Purveys of Scotland, who acknowledged his guilt and was condemned to a traitor's death, and a man named Gilbert Lollebrok who spoke in his own defence, but his fate is not recorded since the entry breaks off at this point. From chronicle

1. There is some confusion among the chroniclers as to the fates of the lesser figures in the rising. Julius B II, p.62 states that Wyntersell was beheaded at Fleshy with Huntingdon.

2. L.B.I., pp.1-4.

sources it is known that Sir Bernard Brocas was executed, and that Sir Thomas Shelley¹ and two priests, William Maydelayn and William Feriby² were hanged and beheaded at Tyburn.³ Waldern was later set at liberty and Thomas Merk was pardoned.⁴ Amongst the names of those who received pardons for their part in the conspiracy there were only two who were described as 'of London'.⁵ Although the conspirators may have hoped for support in London, as Froissart suggested, they entirely failed to achieve it.⁶ The Londoners not only warned Henry of the rising, guarded the City, provided men for his army, but also searched out and condemned the conspirators as traitors. Henry had judged that the Londoners would support him in this crisis and he had been proved right. They had nothing to gain and much to lose by a restoration of Richard II.

-
1. Shelley was described as 'late' in a grant of his goods made 6 February 1400, C.P.R. 1399-1401, p.193.
 2. John Bathe, Rector of Stapleford Salisbury, was granted absolution for his offence in having revealed the hiding place of William Feriby, priest, to some officers of the City of London. Bathe claimed that he was unaware that Feriby would be in danger of death, 14 July 1401, Cal.Papal Registers 1396-1404, p.396.
 3. Traison, pp.231-60; Great Chron., pp.83-84; Julius B II, pp.62-63; Gregory, p.102; Fabyan, p.568; Annales, pp.329-30. The fates of Richard Cliderowa and Thomas Lollebrok, who are mentioned in the indictment, are not known, L.B.I., p.2.
 4. C.P.R. 1399-1401, p.385.
 5. Ibid., p.228. The two Londoners were John Horne and William Burnell, both of whom were sufficiently obscure to escape any notice in the civic records.
 6. Froissart, pp.226-27.

It was inevitable that the failure of this rising should also bring to a close the life of Richard II.¹ After his deposition Richard had been moved from the Tower, first to Leedy's Castle and then to Pontefract. Although the exact manner of Richard's death is uncertain it seems clear that the French King knew of his death by 29 January.² On the advice of the council Henry decided that the body of the late King should be brought south very slowly, with the face uncovered, so that as many people as possible would see for themselves that the King was dead.³ After lying in Pontefract Minster the body travelled to London where it arrived on 10 March,⁴ In the City the body received the honours due to a King; four black horses drew the draped litter which was escorted by two esquires and four knights. After resting for two hours in Cheapside the cavalcade moved on to St. Paul's where King Richard lay in state surrounded by flickering candles and there his interment was holden with all the solemnity of service that might be done.⁵ The Londoners provided thirty men dressed in white

-
1. Traison, p.223 states that in the judgment against Richard it was asserted that he would be the first to suffer if a rebellion broke out on his behalf.
 2. E.F. Jacob, The Fifteenth Century (1961), p.27. 20 March 1400, payment to two esquires, one for bringing news from Pontefract 'comodum ad regis concernentibus' and the other for a journey to Pontefract for the protection and custody of the body of Richard II, Devon, Issues, p.276. The first messenger was Sir Thomas Swynford who had been given custody of Richard at Pontefract, Jacob, op.cit., p.23. It is likely that his journey south was to announce the death of Richard II.
 3. P.P.C. I, pp.111-12.
 4. Fabyan, p.568; Continuation C of Brut, Bria, p.360; Lambeth 306, p.52.
 5. Great Chron., p.83; Froissart, p.233.

and bearing torches to attend the funeral.¹ If Henry himself felt no compunction about carrying his cousin's pall it is doubtful if the Londoners felt any remorse over the part they had played in Richard's downfall. From St. Paul's the coffin was carried on to Westminster whence, after further religious ceremonies, it moved off to its burial place at Kings Langley in Hertfordshire. This was not to be its final resting place for Henry V had the body transferred again to Westminster Abbey so that Richard might finally lie with Queen Anne in the tomb which he had had made.²

It may be useful to conclude this chapter with a brief analysis of the financial dealings of the City of London with Richard II in the years immediately preceding his deposition and with Henry IV in the years immediately following his accession. The City of London in its corporate capacity provided Richard II with the 'loan' of £6666 13s.4d. in August 1397 and a further £2000 a year later.³ Apart from Richard Whittington no individual Londoner lent money to Richard II after November 1396. Henry IV received a gift of £666 13s.4d. in July 1400, a loan of £1333 6s.8d. in the same month, a loan of ~~£2666 13s.4d.~~ ^{£1333 6s. 8d.} in May 1402 and a further loan of £2000 in October 1403.⁴ But the most striking contrast is to be found in the

1. Continuation K of Brut, Brie, p.591.

2. Fabyan, p.567; see p.17, n.1 above.

3. 31 August 1398, Loan of £2000 received at Exchequer, P.R.O. E 401/609; payment by assignment 9 July 1399, P.R.O. E 403/562; tallies cashed 9 July 1399, P.R.O. E 401/614.

4. See Appendix 46, p.614. Loans nos.1, 2, 3, 4.

far greater number of individual loans made by Londoners to Henry IV in the early years of his reign. In 1400-01 seven Londoners lent him £3753 7s.8d., in 1401-02 twelve Londoners lent him £9905 19s.0d. and in 1402-03 eight Londoners lent him £5503 6s.8d. This financial picture suggests the difference between the two Kings. Richard who was canny, but suspicious and personally unreliable, extorted large sums from the Londoners by the manipulation of royal prerogatives. He was a patron of the arts and a considerable spender and in this way Richard built up a small group of supporters in the City like Richard Whittington and Christopher Tyldesley. But Richard III's power in London was narrowly based. Henry, on the other hand, inspired confidence among a much wider group of Londoners, but he was to spend on the arts of war what Richard had squandered among the painters, merchants and jewellers of the City. Soon the Londoners were to discover that in his financial dealings, their new King was not better than his predecessor but only different.

CHAPTER IITHE MACHINERY OF CIVIC GOVERNMENT

The government of London in the fifteenth century appears to have been loosely organized but comparatively efficient. There was no clear-cut distinction between the judiciary and the legislature, although there was an increasingly efficient executive comprising paid and permanent officials who carried out the will of the organs concerned with justice and legislation, and also the will of the honorary, impermanent officials, namely the Mayor and the two Sheriffs.

The basic unit of civic government was the ward where, in the wardmote, members were elected to attend the Common Council and the ward alderman was chosen. The Court of Aldermen met almost daily and was the nerve centre of civic government. The Court of Common Council met less frequently, but for it were reserved the really important decisions. Apart from the wardmote, the Court of Aldermen and the Court of Common Council, there was also the ancient Court of Hustings, which all freemen could attend. But its legislative functions by the fifteenth century had almost disappeared. It had become primarily a judicial court and a court of record. Civil cases between citizens might go to the Hustings, or else to the Mayor's or Sheriff's courts. The wardmotes, Court of Common Council and Court of Aldermen could also act as disciplinary tribunals to deal with citizens who offended against civic regulations.

In the early fifteenth century wardmotes were held at least once a year and more often if so commanded by the Mayor.¹ Many mayoral precepts to the Alderman instructing them to hold wardmotes survive recorded in the Letter Books; almost annually from 1404-1437 and then a single precept in 1461.² From these precepts it is possible to learn of the business of the wardmote: ward officers were to be elected, precautions taken against fire and rioting, the streets were to be lit, Common Councilmen chosen and the streets cleansed and guarded. Occasionally the Aldermen were instructed to make arrangements about levying money in their wardmotes.³ All male householders and hired servants were expected to attend the wardmote whether they were free of the City or not.⁴ In order to simplify the procedure it was decided in 1447 that by virtue of an annual precept from the Mayor an Alderman could hold as many wardmotes as seemed to him to be necessary during the year. Moreover juries were to stand for one year and if a member died then the Alderman could choose another man to fill the vacancy.⁵

-
1. On the scope of wardmotes see A.H. Thomas, Cal.P. and M. 1413-37 pp.xxiv-xxx, p.115 n.2; Liber Albus, pp.36-39.
 2. L.B.I., pp.37,44,53,62,70-71,83,90,98,110,121,131,145,175, 191,206,264, Precepts for 1419 and 1420 missing; L.B.K., pp.5,19, 36,48,59,65,87,105,117,128-29,160,194,215, Precepts for 1433, 1434, 1436 missing; L.B.L., p.10.
 3. 3 December 1429, Aldermen instructed to levy money in their wards for Guildhall, L.B.K., p.105.
 4. Liber Albus, p.37.
 5. 26 May 1447, Jour.4 f.180.

At the wardmote, apart from the activities mentioned above, civic legislation was read out and, after a jury had been empanelled, articles were submitted to them and they could present wrong-doers in the wards; those who were immoral or night walkers, those who kept houses of ill fame, those who threw dung or rubbish into the streets, those who blocked public highways or who broke the assizes of Bread and Ale.¹ Unfortunately there survive wardmote presentments only for 1422, 1423 and a few from Portsoken ward for the reign of Edward IV.² But from these it is clear that the inquests ranged over a wide variety of topics and that not a great deal was done about the offences which they presented. It was the task of the Alderman to correct the defaults or the defaulters presented in the wardmote or, if he could not do so, to bring them to the attention of the Mayor, Chamberlain or Sheriffs. The presentment was made in the form of an indenture, half being kept in the ward and the other half being kept by the Alderman until he presented it to the Mayor at the next sitting of the Mayor's General Court which was held each year on the Monday after the feast of the Epiphany.³

-
1. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.115, n.2; Liber Albus, pp.337-38.
 2. Recorded in Plea and Memoranda Rolls of Mayor's Court, Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.115-41, 150-59; Portsoken presentments in Guildhall Record Office for years 5,6,7,11,12,14,15,16,19, 20,21,22 Edward IV, 23 Henry VII and two unidentifiable years.
 3. Liber Albus, pp.37-38; Carpenter's statement that two copies of the presentment were made by indenture is confirmed by the Portsoken presentments of the reign of Edward IV, some of which have serrated tops.

The Beadle kept a list of those who were expected to attend the wardmote and at the meeting he would read out the list. Those who were absent were fined 4d.¹ These fines were paid into the City Chamber although on occasion the Court of Aldermen might decide that they could be used for other purposes. In 1434 half the income from these fines was to remain in the wards, partly as a reward for the Constables and Beadles who collected the money and partly for the provision of fire-fighting equipment. The other half was to be used for building the new Guildhall chapel.² In 1440 it was decided that the whole income from these fines was to be used to provide fire-fighting equipment in the wards.³

Although the Alderman had an overall responsibility for his ward, the main administrative work was done by ward officers chosen in the wardmote and subsequently sworn before the Mayor and Aldermen.⁴ These officers were the Beadle, Constables, Scavengers, Aleconners, and a Baker. Those who failed to turn up to be sworn were fined 2/-.⁵

Every ward had a Beadle; and the ward of Cripplegate, which was divided into Cripplegate Within and Cripplegate Without for many

1. Liber Albus, p.37; Memorials, pp.589-591.

2. 23 October 1434, L.B.K., p.181.

3. 1 and 2 September 1440, Jour.3 f.55v.56; in 1422 and again in 1423 the men of Walbrook and Bridge wards had presented the lack of a ladder, hook, grappling hook and ropes with which to prevent fire in their wards, Cal.P. and L. 1413-37, pp.135, 139, 152, 158.

4. For lists of these officers see the Appendix, pp.544-555

5. Plea and Memoranda Roll A 50 f.3-4v.

administrative purposes, had two.¹ It was the Beadle who kept the roll containing the names of those who were expected to attend the wardmote and, according to his oath, he was responsible for ensuring that there was no immorality in the ward, no peace-breaking and no sale of goods contrary to mayoral precepts.² Beadles might be given additional duties. In 1417 the Beadles were enjoined to keep the roads clean in their wards, in 1418 they were to report any illegal gatherings to their Aldermen, and in 1431 they were to carry out an inquiry into the origins of suspect persons who came to live in the wards.³ Their importance can be seen from the fact that it was decided in 1438 that all their names should be entered in 'huius libri', i.e. in Journal no,3.⁴ There are very few recorded cases of Beadles abusing their positions or failing to carry out their duties. In 1439 Richard Clerk, the Beadle of Cornhill was sent to prison for disobeying the Mayor and for failing to come when summoned.⁵ William Mayle, the Beadle of Billingsgate was more enterprising; with five others he discovered a case of adultery but instead of bringing the offenders to court he

-
1. A list of wards with most of the Beadles entered in against the name of the ward is to be found 4 December 1428 Jour.2 f.126v. In 1422 Bread Street ward and Coleman Street were without Beadles, Plea and Memoranda Roll A 50 f.3, f.4v.
 2. Liber Albus, pp.37, 313-14.
 3. 4 December 1417 Jour.1 f.39; 9 January 1418 Jour.1 f.38; 13 December 1431 L.B.K., p.132. On 9 December 1439 it was decided that noone in future should move from one ward to another unless he brought a sealed testimony bearing his name and the words 'Receive John X of ward of X as a man of good fame', Jour.III f.32.
 4. 18 February 1438 Jour.III f.180v. The list does not survive.
 5. 15 July 1439 Jour.III f.18.

accepted 16/8d. from the man in the case. The money was divided at 2/6d. each and the remaining 1/8d. was used to buy meat and drink. Mayle was sent to prison.¹ But that there were only two recorded cases of offending Beadles in sixty years augurs well for the general standard of these men.

The ward Constables were the servants of the Beadles. They pursued offenders and brought them to court, raised the hue and cry and arrayed panels of juries.² The number of Constables in each ward varied. In 1422 Bassishaw had only two while Farringdon Without had twenty-one.³ In 1440 their power to make forcible entries into houses in their wards was restricted but in 1442 it was agreed in Common Council that they should be guaranteed any expenses incurred in the execution of their duties.⁴ The work of the Constables in carrying out vigils with the Alderman of his ward could be extremely onerous and extensive.⁵ Moreover because of the strenuous nature of his duties, a Constable had to be strong in wind and limb. Thomas Derlington who had been chosen as one of the Constables for Langbourne ward was rejected at the General Court held on 12 January 1451 on the grounds

1. 2 May 1461 Jour.VI f.53v.

2. Liber Albi, . . .37, 312-13.

3. Cal.P. and K. 1413-37, p.116.

4. 20 April 1440, Constables were only to make such entries in the presence of an Alderman, Jour.III f.41v; 2 May 1442, M.B.K., p.269.

5. e.c. 18 July 1440, Jour.III f.47v.

that his malformed hand rendered him unsuitable for the office.¹ Indeed the duties could be dangerous. In 1444 the Constables of Bridge ward were wounded while trying to break up an affray started by the son of Lord Audeley, and ten years later Nicholas Cambridge, the Constable of Dowgate, had to complain to the Mayor and Alderman about the resistance which he received at the hands of William Symond, the hosteller at the sign of the Swan.² Considering that there were probably about 200 Constables operating in the city at any given moment, the paucity of cases brought against them is remarkable. John Botiller, a Constable of Bread Street was dismissed from his office for negligence; in 1458 John Scribayn, a Constable of Langbourne, had to provide security to keep the peace; John West, a Constable of Billingsgate, with four others, was sent to Newgate for causing a riot against the city Chamberlain; and in 1461 Robert Hardy, a Constable of Tower ward was also sent to prison.³ Whether these cases represent but the exposed tip of an iceberg of bribery, violence and corruption it is difficult to tell.⁴

-
1. 12 January 1451 Jour.V f.52v.
 2. 18 July 1444 Jour.IV f.132v.; 6 May 1454 Jour.V f.163.
 3. 19 February 1450 Jour.V f.31; 17 November 1458 Jour.VI f.222v.; 16 February 1459 Jour.VI f.149v.; 2 May 1461 Jour.VI f.53v.
 4. The activities of the Beadles and Constables about which there is most evidence is their search for, and arrest of, fornicators and adulterers. A schedule of such arrests - 70 between 1400 and 1439 - is appended at the end of Letter Book I, pp.273-87. A further 28 such prosecutions are recorded in the Journals between 1421 and 1460. (See Jour.I f.91; Jour.II f.14v., 38, 23, 83v., 88v., 94, 44v., 87v., 84v., 129v., 131, 137v., 138v., 132; Jour.III f.16, 18, 51, 77v., 174v.; Jour.IV f.141v., 44v.; Jour.V f.161, 173, 54, 266v.; Jour.VI f.217v.) Whether Beadles and Constables were informed about the activities of certain couples or whether they made routine inspections is not clear.

The Scavengers, whose numbers, like those of the constables, might vary from ward to ward, were particularly responsible for the repair of pavements, precautions against fire and the cleaning of the streets.¹ The office of Raker appears to have been an offshoot of the Scavengers office. His particular task was to clear away refuse and hence to ensure that water could flow down channels in the streets. These officers were paid out of sums levied in the wards, although the men of Coleman Street ward maintained that their Raker should be paid 26/8d. annually by the Chamberlain so that he should clean out the grates at London Wall and Lothbury.² Rakers had early devised the art of throwing their rubbish into the next ward or placing it in such a position that it was carried by force of water beyond the bounds of their responsibility.³ The first wardmote precept which enjoins the men of the ward to elect a Raker is in the year 1414 but such officers are not listed with Beadles, Constables and ~~Rakers~~ ^{Scavengers} in 1421.⁴ The wardmote precept which was drafted and copied into the Letter Book in 1437 lists Rakers with the other ward officers and the ward presentments for Portsoken in the reign of Edward IV always record the name of the Raker along with the Beadles, Constables and Scavengers.⁵

-
1. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.116, Farringdon Within had 13 Scavengers and Bassishaw had two. Scavengers oath Liber Albus, p.313.
 2. Cal.P. and M. 1304-81, pp.85, 150; Liber Albus, p.335; L.B.H., p.360; Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.117, 158.
 3. Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, p.71; in 1378 Common Council considered the problem of the disposal of rubbish, L.B.H., p.108.
 4. November 1414, L.B.I., p.131; the precept 12 December 1422, includes the injunction to elect a Raker, L.B.K., pp.5-6.
 5. L.B.K., p.215.

When ale was brewed in the ward, the brewer had to send for the ward Ale-conners who would ensure that the ale was of the right quality, sold in the correct measures and priced according to civic ordinance. Half of the forfeitures and fines for transgressing the ordinances went to the Ale-conners who operated in pairs within the wards and were chosen by the men of the ward.¹ A list of ward Ale-conners was made in 1377 but although the wardmote precept of 1390 includes the injunction to elect Ale-conners, such a practice was not repeated until 1417.² Perhaps the custom of electing Ale-conners in the wardmotes and then presenting them to be sworn before the Mayor and Aldermen had fallen into abeyance for at the Common Council held on 2 September 1440 it was ordained that this should happen 'as hitherto accustomed'.³ The names of the Ale-conners, however, appear only once on the Portsoken presentments of Edward IV's reign. It is difficult to tell from the limited evidence how long these officers remained in their positions but the Portsoken lists of officers for the reign of Edward IV suggest that whereas the Beadles and Rakers were permanent officials, the turnover in Constables and Scavengers was fairly rapid.

1. Liber Albus, pp.316, 358-ol; L.B.H., p.157.

2. L.B.H., pp.71, 361; M.B.I., p.191; Cal.P. and M. 1364-81, p.256.

3. L.B.K., p.243.

The Liber Albus mentions that the Alderman's clerk should also be present at the wardmote, no doubt to draw up the indentured presentments. It seems unlikely that he was a permanent ward official but rather a clerk employed for the occasion or, perhaps, a permanent member of the Alderman's household.¹

The Hustings Court was not only the oldest court of Law in the City, it was also the ancient assembly at which all the citizens might gather to express their opinion on matters of common interest. But by the fifteenth century the Hustings as a citizen assembly had been largely superseded by the better organized and more regulated Common Council. Whether the Hustings ever met in the fifteenth century as a legislative or consultative body seems doubtful. The election of the city's M.Ps., which was supposed to take place at a meeting of the Hustings, in fact took place at meetings of the Common Council, which serves to emphasize the eclipse of the Hustings as the prime citizen assembly.²

As a court of law, however, the Hustings continued, although in this period it was probably less important than either the Mayor's or the Sheriff's court. Unlike the Mayor's court its actions were initiated by royal writs and were largely confined by this date to cases involving

1. Liber Albus, p.37; Richard Taillor may have been such a clerk to the Alderman, see Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.140.

2. On the election of the City's M.Ps., see Chapter V.

lands (Pleas of Land) or rents (Common Pleas). The sessions of the court were held on Mondays or Tuesdays and judgments were given by the mouth of the Recorder in the presence of six Aldermen.¹ A man who was summoned to the Hustings five times and failed to appear could be declared an outlaw.² Assizes of Fresh Force and Novel Disseisin were usually begun by a plaint of intrusion made in the Hustings and the record of such assizes could be brought into the Hustings for permanent record or as the result of a writ of error.³ The records of the court are copious in the fifteenth century and include the rolls of Deeds and Wills, Hustings Books and the rolls of the Pleas of Land and of the Common Pleas almost all of which are written in Latin.⁴

The Court of Hustings was served by at least one clerk, registered and sworn attorneys and the inquest and juries which were necessary were summoned by the ward Beadles.⁵

-
1. For the history of the Hustings Court see A.H. Thomas, Cal. Early Mayor's Court Rolls (1924), pp.xiii-xx; P.E. Jones, The Court of Hustings, The Law Journal, vol.XCIII, pp.285-86; Liber Albus, pp. 162-64.
 2. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.51-52. In the fourteenth century outlawries declared in the Hustings were recorded in the Rolls of Pleas of Land or Common Pleas. In the fifteenth century special rolls of outlawries were compiled of which one has survived for the years 1415-17, see G.R.O. Misc. Roll K.K.
 3. Cal.P. and M. 1438-58, p.3, n.1; London Possessory Assizes, p.xiii, n.3, xvii-xviii, 56; deeds which were enrolled in the Hustings had the same effect as a fine at Common Law, ibid., p.114.
 4. The rolls of Deeds and Wills, Pleas of Land, Common Pleas, are extant for almost every year during this period. The Hustings books begin in 1448 and include brief notes of cases heard each week. From 1439 to 1448 similar brief notes are to be found recorded in the Journals. When it became necessary in 1448 to begin a new Journal (no.5) it must have been decided to start a separate Hustings Book.
 5. The recording of Hustings business in the Journals suggests

(continued at foot of next page)

In the fifteenth century there is little development in the scope or procedure of the Hustings except that some attempt was made to regulate its sessions in accordance with the absence from London of the King's court and legal counsel. In 1408 it was decided that out of law terms sessions of the Hustings should not be held in the city.¹ In 1444 this ordinance was modified to deal with urgent cases which needed to be tried during the absence of the court, and in January 1446 it was decided that sessions of the Hustings should be held during law vacations. In the following November this decision was confirmed with the proviso that the Mayor and Aldermen were empowered not to hold sessions if this should seem, for some reason, to be advisable.²

The Common Council became, during the fourteenth century, an essential element in civic government. Its origins and early membership

-
1. 20 February 1408 L.B.I., p.64.
 2. 17 July 1444, 24 January 1446, 22 November 1446 Jour.IV f.34v, 113, 150v.
-

(Footnote 5 continued from previous page)
 that by c.1440 the records were kept by the same group of clerks which was responsible for the Mayor's Court Rolls, Letter Books and Journals, perhaps under the general supervision of the Common Clerk. In 1380 Henry Perot was clerk to the Hustings Court, London Possessory Assizes, p.56.

are obscure and have been the subject of considerable debate.¹ In 1320 a meeting which appears to be a Common Council was summoned, through election by misteries, after the murder of Bishop Stapledon.² The traditional date, however, of the first Common Council of the City which was elected by wards, is 1347.³ During the rest of the fourteenth century the two methods of election, by misteries and by wards, were both used. Election by misteries was preferred in 1351 and 1352, and again from 1376-1384.⁴ But in 1384 it was decided that Common Councilmen should be elected by the wards, six, four or two men in accordance with their size.⁵ This regulation was confirmed in the following year and again in 1389.⁶ By the time John Carpenter

-
1. Dr. A.H. Thomas argued that the origin of the Court of Common Council was to be found in the Hustings Court, see Cal.P. and M. 1364-81, pp.xiv-xv. See also Tait, 'The origin of Town-Councils in England', E.F.R., vol.XLIV (1929), pp.177-202 and 399; A.H. Thomas, 'Some recent contributions to the Early History of London', History, vol.IX (1924), pp.92-102.
 2. Cal.P. and M. 1323-64, p.15.
 3. L.B.F., p.162; Memorials, pp.liiii-lv.
 4. L.B.F., p.237; L.B.G., p.3; Cal.P. and M. 1364-81, p.256; Cal.P. and M. 1381-1413, pp.29-31; L.B.H., pp.36, 41, 60, 64, 155, 156, 199.
 5. 29 January 1384 L.B.H., p.227; liber Albus, pp.461-63.
 6. 31 July 1384 L.B.H., pp.237-40; 13 December 1385 ibid., p.277; 25 March 1386 ibid., pp.279-81; 12 January 1389 ibid., p.347. Precepts to the aldermen to cause Common Councilmen to be elected in wardmotes, 1387, 1388, ibid., pp.300, 322.

came to write the Liber Albus in 1419 the custom of electing Common Councilmen from the wards was firmly established and no change in this procedure was made during the first half of the fifteenth century.

The election of Common Councilmen took place in meetings of the wardmote and it would appear that the same men continued to serve in the office for a number of years. The four men who served as Common Councilmen for Portsoken ward in 1460 served continuously until 1466. On the other hand none of these four men had been serving in this office in 1458.¹ A man could continue to serve as a Common Councilman as long as he was able and the ward was willing. There seems to have been no rule which enforced a complete turnover in Common Councilmen every year. A third of the 191 Common Councilmen who appeared on the list for 1458/9 were still serving in 1460/1.²

In the period 1384-86 the number of Common Councilmen was fixed at 96,³ although a complete attendance was seldom recorded and at a meeting held in June 1384 there were only 60 Common Councilmen present.⁴

-
1. L.B.D. f.lxxv; Portsoken Ward Presentments 5-22 Edward IV, G.R.O. Ms.242a m.1,2; one of the Portsoken Common Councilmen, William Stallon, continued to serve in this capacity until 1483.
 2. L.B.D. f.lxxv-lxxvi. The actual figures are 65 out of 191 were found still to be serving as Common Councilmen two years later.
 3. L.B.F. p.227; Cal.P. and M. 1381-1413, pp.122-24, 132-33. The old Common Council elected by misteries had been a larger body. There were 153 men present on 9 August 1376, L.B.H. pp.41-44.
 4. Cal.P. and M. 1381-1413, pp.53-54; in October 1384 attendance rose to 94, ibid., p.84, and in March 1385 dropped again to 70, ibid., pp.54-55. There coexisted with the Common Council a larger and more amorphous body called the Great Commonalty. In July 1384 there were 267 persons present, L.B.H., pp.237-40; July 1385, 140 persons present, ibid., pp.269-71; March 1386, 174 persons present, ibid., pp.279-81; August 1388, 210 persons present, ibid., pp.332-34.

It would seem that in 1422 the official size of the Common Council was still 90.¹ The next occasion for which there survives a list of Common Councilmen is 25 October 1441 when they assembled to vote about the office of Common Weigher. There were 93 Common Councilmen present on this occasion. It is possible that the full complement was still only 90, but it is more likely that the Council was already enlarged.² Certainly by 21 March 1454 the decision must have been taken to enlarge ~~the enlarge~~ the size of the Common Council for on this date there were 104 Common Councilmen present.³ By 1458/9 the official number of Common Councilmen appears to have been 188.⁴

Apart from the usual demand that a Common Councilman should be 'sufficient' there seems, at the beginning of this period, to have been no restriction placed upon the wardmote's choice of men to serve in this capacity.⁵ But on 20 February 1427 membership of the Common

-
1. There survives an incomplete list of Common Councilmen chosen by the wards in January 1422. The names of the Common Councilmen for Aldersgate, Lime Street and Portsoken wards are recorded and the numbers of 4, 2 and 3 respectively are the same as they were in 1384, Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.116. The Liber Albus, however, suggests that the Serjeants of the Chamber should summon to the Common Council 16, 12, 8 or 4 men, according to the size of the ward, which would have produced a larger body than the 6, 4 or 2 to be chosen in 1384, Liber Albus, p.40.
 2. Jour.III f.99v.
 3. Jour.V f.155.
 4. The list of wards with their allotted number of Common Councilmen at this date is to be found L.B.D. f.lxxv; the list of Common Councilmen for 1458/9 ibid., f.lxxv-lxxiv^v; the list of Common Councilmen for 1460/1 ibid., f.lxxv-lxxvi^v.
 5. 10 December 1410 Precept to elect 'prescribed number of sufficient men' L.B.I., pp.89-90.

Council was confined to those who were free of the City by birth, apprenticeship or ~~service~~ ^{office}.¹ On 3 March 1446 this restriction upon membership was reiterated.²

On being admitted to the Common Council a member had to take an oath in which he swore to be true to the King, to come when summoned unless he had a reasonable excuse, to give good and true counsel, to maintain no man's cause contrary to the good of the City, to keep the Council's secrets and to stay at the meeting until the Mayor had left.³ Absent members were noted by the clerk of the Chamber and they could be fined.⁴ It was a Serjeant of the Chamber who would summon members to meetings giving them a day's notice. Moreover, although the clothing of the Common Council in a common livery seems to have been a rare occurrence compared with the frequent communal liveries chosen by the Aldermen, it was an occasional burden which the Common Councilmen had to shoulder. For the reception of Margaret of Anjou in 1445 they chose a livery of plain red without devices and for the Coronation of Edward IV

-
1. 20 February 1427 Jour.II f.90.
 2. 3 March 1446, neither aliens nor Englishmen, who were free of the City by redemption, were to be admitted to the Common Council, Jour.IV f.119v.
 3. Fifteenth century English version of oath L.B.D., p.192; French version of oath c.1384 Cal.P. and M. 1381-1413, pp.92, 124; Latin version of oath c.1419 Liber albus, p.41.
 4. M.B.E., pp.237-40; Liber Albus, pp.40-42. The original fine of 40d. in 1384 appears to have been reduced to 2/- by 1419. On 17 August 1453 it was decided by the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council that any Common Councilman who was absent from the next meeting of the Common Council (summoned to deal with a royal request for money) should be fined 6/8d., Jour.V f.117v.

in 1461 the Common Council, after inspecting two samples of green cloth and learning that the men of Coventry were to be clothed in green, chose 'le lyghter grene one'.¹ Moreover service as a Common Councilman could involve work in the ward as a tax assessor or collector.² The most onerous duty, however, falling upon a Common Councilman would be the membership of the committees which were constantly appointed by Common Council to deal with the whole range of civic business. But as well as the obligations there were also some advantages in serving as a Common Councilman. During his term of office he was excused from serving on inquests except in those pleas of land where his presence was essential, and also from acting as a tallage collector and from serving on City watches unless he chose to do so.³ This privilege was reiterated in 1423, 1426 and 1440.⁴

In the fourteenth century the only evidence for meetings of the Court of Aldermen and the Court of Common Council is provided by the Letter Books. But in 1416 the series of records known as the Journals begins and with them a more detailed record of the proceedings of both courts. The first certain reference to a meeting of the Common Council

-
1. 20 November 1444 Jour.IV f.52; June 1461 Jour.VI f.54.
 2. 2 September 1457, a list of the Common Councilmen chosen to assess and collect the tax voted for the King, Jour.VI f.175v.; 13 February 1461, a similar list Jour.VI f.40v.
 3. L.B.H., p.241.
 4. 27 September 1423, a member of Common Council was not to serve on inquests unless it was a matter which involved the King, or unless it were an inquest at St. Martins or lewgate, Jour.II f.8v.; 21 January 1420 when the exception was cases involving more than 40 marks, Jour.II f.62; 17 December 1440 when the exceptions were cases involving the King, or pleas of land, Jour.III f.69v.

to be found in the Journals is on 20 April 1417.¹ The references to meetings of the Common Council become increasingly frequent as the century progresses, although the record of their business is usually more attenuated than that of the Court of Aldermen. In 1495 the inconvenience of recording the proceedings of both courts in one book led to the creation of a new series of records, the Repertories, in which are recorded the proceedings of the Court of Aldermen whereas the proceedings of the Court of Common Council continued to be recorded in the Journals. In 1384 it had been decided that the Common Council should meet together with the aldermen at least once a quarter² and such records as survive of meetings held from 1416 onwards suggest that until 1438 the council did meet on average four times a year. But in the years 1439-1450 the recorded average of meetings held jumps to fourteen a year, and in 1451-1462 the average rose again to seventeen meetings a year. The Lancastrian need for ready money, the artisan troubles and the uncertain political situation help to explain this increasing need to achieve a broader basis of popular consent. But it is clear that the Court of Common Council met upon the summons of

1. Jour.I f.18v.

2. 31 July 1384 L.B.H., p.241.

the Court of Aldermen; whether it had the constitutional right also to assemble itself seems doubtful.¹

John Carpenter in the Liber Albus gave a detailed description of the procedure at the meetings of the Court of Common Council which were held at Guildhall. No-one was to attend without a summons and those who were summoned were to have their names called over by the Serjeant of the Chamber. Business was not to be delayed for latecomers. In cases of difficulty when the sense of the meeting could not be obtained by consensus each member was to be separately questioned upon oath.² There were few changes in procedure during this period. In 1427 and 1428 the secrecy of the proceedings of the Court was reaffirmed and it was decided that anyone who revealed the secrets of the Common Council, to the damage of the commonalty, was to lose his freedom and pay a fine of £20.³ As the pressure of business on the Common Council increased it appears that the business of initiating civic ordinances and of drafting such legislation, was deputed to a group of twenty Common Councilmen. In July 1442 it was affirmed that such ordinances were to be observed as firmly as if they had been initiated by the whole Common Council.⁴

-
1. 4 April 1420, Court of Aldermen decided that there would be a meeting of the Court of Common Council on the following Saturday (April 6), Jour.I f.74v.; 24 September 1448, Court of Aldermen decided that there would be a meeting of the Common Council on the following Friday (27 September), Jour.IV f.225v.; for similar instances see 21 January 1426, Jour.II f.62; 22 February 1440, Jour.III f.37; 3 October 1443, Jour.IV f.8v.; 18 June 1455, Jour.V f.246v.
 2. Liber Albus, pp.40-42.
 3. 24 May 1427, something which had been said at a meeting of the Common Council had been revealed to the Duke of Gloucester, to the detriment of the commonalty, Jour.II f.93v.; 26 May 1428, Jour.II f.109v.
 4. 24 July 1442, a fine of £20 was to be imposed upon those who failed to accept such ordinances, Jour.III, .1,2v.

In the scope of its business the Common Council was omniscient; in matters of finance it was supreme and no unusual tax or loan was agreed to without its consent, although the Court of Aldermen might first prepare the way for such consent.¹ Difficult matters which involved dealings with the King and the royal government were frequently referred to it. The election of the City's M.Ps. took place at its meetings,² and the great civic projects of this period were often referred to it for important decisions; the building of Guildhall, the purchase of Billingsgate, the protection of the Thames, the repair of London Bridge and the prosecution of the tithe dispute with the City clergy were all matters which occupied the attention of the Common Council. Disputes between different companies in the city were also matters for its deliberation. The final compromise between the Girdlers and Cordwainers about the assay of leather was reached in a meeting of the Common Council in July 1424.³ In 1445 the final division of labour between the fusters and saddlers was proclaimed in one of its meetings.⁴ The rivalry between the Latoners and Plumbers was so acute that members of the two Companies refused to finish off the work which

1. See Chapter VII.

2. See Chapter V.

3. Dispute in evidence 12 March 1424, Jour.II f.13; compromise 17 July 1424, Jour.II f.20v.; compromise reiterated 13 March 1430, L.B.K., pp.114-15.

4. Dispute arises 10 November 1424, Jour.II f.27, L.B.K., p.37; agreement 26 June 1425, and 6 July 1425, Jour.II f.45, 45v.

had been begun by a member of the other Company. It was the Common Council which decided in September 1445 that those foreign plumbers and latoners who had to be called in to do such work should be held as free of the City, unless the Plumbers and Latoners reformed themselves and were prepared to finish off each other's work.¹

By a civic ordinance of September 1378 it had been decided that strangers were not to be admitted to the freedom of the City without the consent of Common Council, although it should be noted that this ordinance was made during a period when the Common Council itself was elected by the misteries.² In the fifteenth century there were a number of occasions when men were admitted to the freedom by the Court of Aldermen acting alone, but there were also a considerable number of admissions to the freedom which did receive the assent of the Common Council.³ General regulations about the freedom were usually made in Common Council.⁴ Similarly the custody of the keys of the Common Chest and of the Common Seal were usually made public in meetings of Common Council⁵ and it would seem that the use of the Common Seal had to receive its authorization.⁶

-
1. 17 September 1445, Jour.IV f.95.
 2. 15 September 1378, L.B.H., p.109.
 3. 23 October 1439, Jour.III f.25v.; 9 March 1441, Jour.III f.79.;
6 May 1444, Jour.IV f.24; 6 November 1454, Jour.V f.204;
2 December 1454, Jour.V f.210v.
 4. 20 February 1427, Jour.II f.90; 26 March 1428, Jour.II f.109v.;
24 January 1449, Jour.V f.4v.; 5 July 1451, Jour.V f.58;
9 August 1454, Jour.V f.184; see Chapter III pp. 199-209.
 5. 6 May 1444, Jour.IV f.24; 17 October 1452, Jour.V f.90v.;
26 January 1461, Jour.VI f.288v.
 6. 10 October 1452, use of the Common Seal authorized in tithe dispute case, Jour.V f.89v.

During this period the Common Council appears to have acted largely in accordance with the wishes and, no doubt, the directives of the Court of Aldermen. There is little to suggest a clash of wills; which is not surprising since their interests were, on the whole, identical. Differences between the two bodies appear to have been easily resolved. The procedure for choosing a new Rector of St. Peter's upon Cornhill was drawn up by the Common Council in 1445.¹ The Court of Aldermen was to present four candidates to Common Council for its final selection. In fact the Court of Aldermen would themselves choose from the four candidates, hence reducing the role of Common Council to that of a mere rubber stamp in the business. In this way Thomas Gascoigne was chosen as Rector in November 1445,² and John Cote in February 1446.³ Then on 27 July 1447 of the four candidates the

-
1. In 1429 the Mayor, Aldermen and commonalty claimed the advowson of St. Peter's upon Cornhill. In August they tried to reject the candidate Thomas Larchaunt chosen by the bishop, and to choose instead a candidate of their own, Thomas Lewcock, a doctor of Theology, Jour.II f.138. The City failed in this attempt and Larchaunt was duly installed as rector. Larchaunt was succeeded by John Conesby in 1436 and, when he died in 1445, the Court of Common Council drew up the procedure whereby the rectors of St. Peter's were to be chosen in the City. The Mayor and Aldermen were to choose four reputable clerks 'approved in moral character and knowledge' and these men were to act as a nominating committee. The committee would select four persons whom they deemed fit for the office, doctors or batchelors of Theology, seculars, unbeneficed and willing to live in the church. These men were to be presented to the Common Council for its final choice. The chosen man would then be presented to the Bishop for canonical institution, L.B.K., p.310-11.
 2. 12 November 1445; meeting of Common Council 13 November 1445, Jour.IV f.10o.
 3. 28 February 1446, four men presented when the Court of Aldermen chose John Cote and decided to hold a Common Council to ratify their choice, Jour.IV f.119; 3 March 1446, Common Council approve of Cote, Jour.IV f.119v.

Court of Aldermen chose Dr. Hugh Darlet. But when Common Council met on the following day they selected Dr. William Millington.¹ Negotiations must have ensued and on 12 August 1447 in a meeting of the Common Council the four candidates were again presented and Dr. Hugh Darlet was chosen as Rector by the Mayor and Aldermen with the assent of the Commonalty.² As Darlet continued as Rector for nearly thirty years a similar situation did not occur again during this period.

In the matter, also, of choosing civil officials there seems to have been a large measure of agreement and consultation between the two bodies. By custom the choice of certain officers did lie with one Court rather than the other, but this did not prevent consultation. The choice of a new Recorder lay with the Court of Aldermen but the election of Thomas Billing in September 1450 was ratified by a meeting of the Common Council although it was noted in the margin of the Journal, 'nota quod Recordator electus est per Laiorem at Aldermannos'.³ On the other hand the choice of Common Weigher lay with the Common Council,⁴ as did the choice of the Common Serjeant at Law or Common Pleader and there is no indication of any interference by the Court of

-
1. 27, 28 July 1447, Jour.IV f.186v., 187.
 2. 12 August 1447, Jour.IV f.187v.
 3. 21 September 1450, Jour.V f.46v.
 4. 25 October 1441, decided in Common Council that the office of Common weigher should be placed in commission, Jour.III f.99v.-100; on this occasion all the members of Common Council who were present were listed and against their names was written 'p' for 'placet' or 'n p' for non placet.

1

aldermen in the choice after 1437.¹ So too the final choice of the Common Huntsman lay with Common Council and when the Court of Aldermen decided to ask John Green, gentleman, whether he would accept the office their decision to do so on 1 April 1457 was made with the proviso 'quantum in ipsis est'. Three days later Common Council ratified this appointment.² The Common Council was also responsible for the choice of a Common Clerk but the Court of Aldermen was unlikely to stand aside from such an important appointment. When Richard Barnet was chosen as Common Clerk by the Common Council in October 1438 the Court of Aldermen was clearly not too happy with the appointment. In the end they only agreed to his holding office for one year although in fact he remained in the office until 1446.³ It was in a meeting of the Common Council held on 5 August 1461 that Barnet's successor, Roger Tonge (alias Spicer) was dismissed for his many offences against Edward IV and it was agreed that the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty should not proceed to a new election without mature deliberation. A royal letter on behalf of Richard Osborn for the office was read out

-
1. Although John Wilton was chosen by the Aldermen, 11 November 1437, Jour.III f.188, Robert Danvers was elected by Common Council, 11 October 1441, Jour.III f.97; Richard Layle elected by Common Council, 24 July 1442, Jour.III f.142v.; 13 September 1443 the Court of Aldermen decided that Common Council should meet on the following Thursday (19 September) in order to elect a Common Serjeant, Jour.IV f.4; all succeeding Common serjeants in this period were elected in meetings of the Common Council, see below pp.133-134 and Betty R. Masters, 'The Common Serjeant', The Guildhall Miscellany, vol.II, no.9 (1967), pp.379-89.
 2. 28 March, 1 April, 4 April 1457, Jour.VI f.116v., 118, 118v. John Tyler was chosen in Common Council, 5 April 1448, Jour.IV f.214v.; William Sudbury was chosen similarly, 5 December 1459 Jour.VI f.223; see below pp.
 3. 4 October 1438, Jour.III f.164, 164v.

in a meeting of Common Council and the final election of William Dunthorne also took place there in the following October.¹ This prevailing harmony is well exemplified in 1441 when the Court of Aldermen decided not only that Undersheriffs should not, in future, be annually removable, but also chose Thomas Burgoyne and John Walton to fill the two offices. At a meeting of Common Council held some days later the new ordinance and the two new officers were simply approved.² The Common Council had neither the time nor the inclination to wage war with the Court of Aldermen.

There is no doubt that important as were the Wardmotes, Eustings and Court of Common Council which represented in their different ways ancient traditions of equality, it was the Court of Aldermen which really governed the City. It was the nerve centre of City politics and its functions were legislative, executive and, in a sense, judicial, for the court had merely to resolve itself into the Mayor's Court to deal with judicial cases. Moreover certain Aldermen, after 1444, became Justices of the Peace and the Court of Aldermen itself had disciplinary powers. Since the business of the Court of Aldermen, was, in effect, the whole business of the City this will require a chapter to itself. Here will be discussed the qualifications for being an Alderman, the means whereby they were elected and their duties and rewards.

1. 5 August, 25 September, October 1461, Jour.VI f.46, 22v., 7v.

2. 9, 20 July 1441, Jour.III f.88v., 89.

The ordinance of 1397 had laid down that candidates for vacant aldermanries should be reputable and discreet and fit both in morals and worldly goods to be judges and Aldermen of the city.¹ In 1413 Aldermen were further required to have been born in England of English parents.² Although we know that some men were anxious to achieve the rank of Alderman, John Carpenter in the Liber Albus envisages that there may be those who will refuse the charge after being chosen. Such recusants were to stand in danger of losing their freedom.³ John Pattlesley who was chosen as the Alderman for Farringdon Within in February 1428 had failed to come to take his oath a month later and the court decided that if he did not do so he would be imprisoned and his house sequestered. He was soon sworn.⁴

In this period the men who became Aldermen were drawn almost exclusively from the Companies of Grocers, Mercers, Fishmongers, Drapers, Goldsmiths, Skinners, Vintners and Ironmongers.⁵ Moreover according to his oath the Alderman undertook not to sell food (bread, ale, wine, fish, flesh) by retail either personally or through his apprentices or servants, which effectively limited membership of the court to the greater companies. In 1437 Thomas Bernewell a fishmonger who had been chosen as Alderman of Queenhythe in 1433 petitioned the court to

-
1. 1 August 1397, L.B.H., p.436.
 2. 16 October 1413, L.B.I., p.117.
 3. Liber Albus, p.35.
 4. February - March 1428, Jour.II f.107v., 109v.
 5. Beaven, vol.I, p.329.

discharge him from his aldermanry since he was unable to live without selling fish retail. His petition was granted.¹ There were only eight Companies from which nearly all Aldermen were chosen; and even these Companies were by no means equally represented. The Grocers, Drapers and Mercers Companies tended to monopolize the membership of the Court and in 1441 the Court discussed whether the number of men serving from any one Company should be limited. They came to no conclusion, but in 1446 they decided that the number from any company should be limited to six unless there were no suitable candidate from another Company.²

There were two stages in the election of an Alderman: the choice of a man, or several candidates, by the ward; and the acceptance of such a man, or the selection of a candidate, by the Court of Aldermen. In 1402, and again in 1420, it was decided that the freemen of the ward, assembled in the wardmote, should choose four honest and sufficient citizens whom they would present to the Court of Aldermen for their choice of the one most fit to support the honour and charge of the City.³ Curiously, however, this process whereby the freemen of the ward chose candidates whom they presented to the Court of Aldermen

1. 7 and 9 October 1437, Jour.III f.190; Simon Seman, a vintner, who was an Alderman from 1422-1433 appears to have petitioned unsuccessfully to be allowed to sell goods retail, 28 September 1426, Jour.II f.84v.

2. 31 May 1441, Jour.III f.80v.; 25 February 1446, Jour.IV f.118.

3. 20 September 1402, L.B.I., p.18; 10 October 1420, L.B.I., p.241. An act of 1397 had enjoined that two candidates were to be presented, L.B.H., p.43o.

is not the process of election described by John Carpenter in the Liber Albus although he must have known of the acts of 1402 and 1420. Carpenter describes a process whereby the wardmote chose one man whom the Court of Aldermen might accept or reject as they deemed fit.¹ The explanation of this may lie in the failure to observe these acts during the early part of the period. Whether it can be assumed that where no list of candidates has been recorded only one man was presented by the ward, seems doubtful. But in 1420 when John Botiller was chosen as Alderman of Farringdon Within only three men were nominated by the ward. In 1426 only two men were nominated when Thomas Wandesford was chosen for Vintry; two men only when Robert Otele was chosen for Tower. In 1429 Stephen Brown was chosen as Alderman for Aldgate ward from only two candidates but in the same year the men of Castle Baynard presented four men from whom the Aldermen chose Thomas Walsingham.² When, after a gap of seven years, the Journals are again extant, we find the Court of Aldermen summoning the men of the ward of Langbourne before them and enjoining them to present four suitable candidates 'sub poena'.³ After this date, 1436, whenever the names of the candidates are preserved there are always four of them.

The Court of Aldermen claimed, and exercised, the right to reject all four candidates who were presented to them. There were several

1. Liber Albus, p.35.

2. 1 June 1420, Jour.I f.78v.; 10 May 1426, Jour.II f.67v., 68; 22 June 1426, Jour.II f.78; 4 May 1429, Jour.II f.133; 25 February 1429, Jour.II f.131v.

3. 12 December 1436, Jour.III f.126.

grounds for such rejections. In the case of Brid e ward in 1444, Cornhill in 1456, Castle Baynard in 1457, Bread Street in 1458 and Billingsgate in 1460 none of the candidates was deemed sufficient.¹ The four men presented by the ward of Lime Street in 1448 were rejected since not all of the candidates were of sufficient standing with the (intended?) result that the choice of the Court was thereby restricted.² The men of Farrington Without in 1458 presented two Aldermen among their four candidates and the Court rejected all four men on the grounds that it was customary to present only one Alderman among the four.³ If more than one were presented this made the task of the court very invidious. It can be seen that the Court kept a firm control of its membership and resisted, by its use of the veto, any attempt on the part of the wards to force its hand. There is only one case of royal interference in an election recorded during this period, that of Philip Malpas in 1448, and the implications of this have been discussed elsewhere.⁴

When candidates were presented to the Court of Aldermen the choice of the new Alderman seems usually to have been arrived at by common

-
1. 24 July 1444, L.B.K., pp.295-96; 29 November 1456, Jour.VI f.87v.; 22 November 1457, Jour.VI f.185v.; 12 February 1458, Jour.VI f.192v.; 17, 26 November 1460, Jour.VI f.268.
 2. 1 April 1448, Jour.IV f.213v.
 3. March 1458, Jour.VI f.194v.; in fact the same ward had presented two Aldermen among their four candidates in 1451 and the Court had not objected on this occasion, Jour.V f.62.
 4. See chapter IX.

agreement and the Journal records the choice 'nem.con.'. But on eight occasions during this period it would appear that the Court had to resort to voting and when the votes were, on one occasion in 1458 equally divided between Thomas Oulegrave and Richard Flemynge, the Mayor exercised a casting vote in favour of Oulegrave.¹

There were few perquisites attached to the office of Alderman. The financial burden was heavy and the rewards, such as they were, were not of a financial kind.² It was a dignity, often forced upon a man, by virtue of his known wealth. There were a few advantages. Aldermen escaped from serving on juries and inquests, and they did not have to pay for the enrolment of deeds and charters in the Fustings which related to themselves.³ A man who became an Alderman was more likely to be knighted than a man who was an ordinary citizen.⁴ Moreover an Alderman could move fairly easily to another ward and this practice became so common as the fifteenth century progressed that it

-
1. The names of the Aldermen who were present at meetings were always recorded and the clerk registered their votes by the simple method of writing the initial letter of the name of the candidate of their choice above the Alderman's own name on the list. The eight occasions when voting is recorded are 29 August 1438, Jour.III f.166; 26 April 1446, Jour.IV f.125v.; 16 July 1451, Jour.V f.60; 19 July 1452, Jour.V f.78v.; 24 October 1454, Jour.V f.202; December 1457, Jour.VI f.186-7; 9 March 1458, Jour.VI f.194v.; 3 April 1458, Jour.VI f.195.
 2. It was always the Aldermen who had to dip into their pockets to provide money in an emergency, e.g. for the Granary in 1437, Jour.III f.194.
 3. Liber Albus, p.35.
 4. Beaven, vol.I, p.255; the only two knights in this period appear to have been William Estfeld knighted in c.1439 (L.B.K., p.231 and n.3) and William Cantelowe knighted at the coronation of Edward IV.

had to be limited in 1479.¹ When Nicholas Yoo, the Alderman of Farringdon Within, asked the court if he could have the vacant aldermanry of Candlewick Street, this was granted to him without any reference, apparently, to the men of the ward.² More usually, however, an Alderman would be presented among the four candidates chosen by the ward and if he agreed to move the Court would give its assent to the transfer.³

An examination of some of the duties and burdens which an Alderman was expected to shoulder, makes it easier to understand why it was not always a coveted honour. Apart from his obligation to join the Mayor at the head of any subscription list in the City, the Alderman had to pay for expensive liveries. It would appear that an Alderman might have to buy new liveries as often as three times a year, at Pentecost, at the Mayor's riding to Westminster in October, and at Christmas.⁴ The

-
1. Beaven, vol.II, p.240.
 2. 8 August 1438, Jour.III f.167v. 16 March 1446 William Whetenale, the Alderman of Farringdon Without was chosen by the Mayor and Aldermen to be the new Alderman for the vacant ward of Walbrook, according to City custom, Jour.IV f.121. Clearly the ward of Walbrook had no say in the matter and protested. 17 men of the ward appeared in Court 7 April 1446 and one of them, John Washawe, affirmed that as greatly as the men of Farringdon Without rejoiced in Whetenale's departure, so greatly would the men of Walbrook grieve over his coming. 11 of the men undertook to obey Whetenale and the protest as ineffectiue, Jour.IV f.124v.
 3. August 1451 Farringdon Without ward presented William Hulyn and William Deer, both of whom were Aldermen, and Richard Alley and Thomas Davey who were not. Hulyn and Deer were asked by the court if they would like to be Aldermen of this ward and when they declined Richard Alley was chosen, Jour.V f.62. In October and November 1458 Ralph Josselyn was offered both Coleman Street and Langbourne but chose to remain at Cornhill, Jour.VI f.233v., 221v.
 4. Liber Albus, p.35 where only the Pentecost and October liveries are mentioned, but the Christmas liveries are mentioned in the Journals. 14 October 1441 Aldermen to have new scarlet liveries

(continued at foot of next page)

liveries were expensive and could cost as much as 50/- per person.¹

In these circumstances it is understandable that the Court should have spent quite a lot of time deciding what colour these liveries should be although they occasionally deputed the task of choosing to two Aldermen, and, on one occasion the future Mayor was allowed to choose the liveries for his own riding to Westminster.² These liveries had to be carefully preserved as they might be used on other occasions during the year when the Mayor and Aldermen appeared together in public.³

In addition to these financial burdens the Alderman had a great many time-absorbing duties. He was expected to preside at wardmotes and to collect taxes and levies of various kinds within his ward, although the general maintenance of law and order within the ward was left to the Constables and Beadles. In 1440, however, the court decided that no Constable, or anyone else, was to make a forcible entry into a house for any cause unless in the presence of the Alderman of the

-
1. 7 February 1421, Jour.I f.88; 5 May 1441 it was decided that Chamber, out of profits of brokerage, should pay each Alderman 100/- for his livery, Jour.III f.85, 88v.
 2. 13 March, 14 October 1437, Jour.III f.119v., 190v.
 3. 20 September 1440 the Court of Aldermen decided that for the election of Sheriffs the Aldermen were to wear the last livery but one and the last livery for the Mayor's election, Jour.III f.59, Liber Albus, p.35.

(footnote 4 continued from previous page)

for Christmas, Jour.III f.98; 10 November 1444, 21 November 1446, the Christmas liveries were to be blood red, Jour.IV f.50v., 149v.; 6 November 1452 Christmas liveries to be violet, Jour.V f.92v.; 28 November 1459 Aldermen chose brown/blue for Christmas liveries, Jour.VI f.141.

ward.¹ The Aldermen were expected to attend assizes of nuisance, to act as arbitrators and to use their seal to authenticate deeds.² They had to attend the Eustings Court and the Court of Aldermen to which, in times of crisis they could be specially summoned from the country.³ Moreover an Alderman's duties in maintaining law and order in the city at large could be very onerous since he was often expected to carry out nightly patrols for a period of weeks in times of disturbance and such patrols during the Midsummer and Christmas holidays were an annual task.⁴

Attendance at the Court of Aldermen, which could be almost daily, formed one of an Alderman's main duties. This could involve him in acting as an arbitrator, as a judge when the Court sat as the Mayor's Court, and in a host of business concerning both the private affairs of citizens and the public life of the City. In 1454 the Court of Aldermen held an emergency meeting in the barge taking them from the City of Westminster for the swearing of the Sheriffs, but it usually met in Guildhall.⁵ On 4 November 1455 the Mayor and Aldermen agreed

-
1. Cal. P. and L. 1413-37, pp.xxviii-xxx; 20 April 1440, Jour.III f.41v.; for precepts to Aldermen to levy money in their wards see Chapter III; when the City was raising money for the new conduit each Alderman was instructed to bring the money to Guildhall together with the names of those who had refused to pay, 3 February 1441, Jour.III f.74.
 2. Cal.P. and L. 1437-57, p.viii n.3; as arbitrators, ibid., pp.10, 17; Cal.P. and L. 1458-83, pp.1, 43, 49, 63, 65; for use of seal, ibid., pp.159, 161, 163, 175; Cal.P. and L. 1437-57, pp.159, 160, 165, 175, 184, 185.
 3. 12 August 1415, L.B.I., p.183; 23 June 1440, L.B.K., p.239; Chapter IX, pp.309-310; for a table of the Aldermen's attendances at the Court see appendix no. IA pp. 541-543.
 4. E.g. 18 July 1440, Jour.III f.47v.
 5. 30 September 1454, Jour.V f.195.

that they should spend the whole week on the common business of the City and that nothing should be allowed to interrupt them.¹ This pressure of business, and the conflict between private and public business in the Court is again reflected in the decision in October 1461 that the Court should spend every Monday in attending to the City's affairs and that the consideration of private matters should be postponed until later.²

It seems to have been allowed to an Alderman to appoint a deputy to carry out his duties while he was away on business, or ill or in some other way unable to perform them himself. In 1425 Robert Tatersall asked the Court if Thomas Ayer and then John Whatele could act as his deputies while he was away from London.³ In June 1428 Thomas Duffhous carried out the nightly vigils as deputy for John Mitchell and in 1429 Simon Seman chose Ralph Stokes to act as his deputy.⁴ It was the Alderman, or his deputy, who was instructed to hold a wardmote to discuss finance in January 1439.⁵ Clearly the appointment of such deputies had become a regular part of the exercise of an Alderman's duties.

Just as it was difficult for a wealthy man to avoid being chosen as an Alderman, so it was difficult for an Alderman to obtain a discharge once he had undertaken the task. John Carpenter wrote in the Liber Albus

-
1. 4 November 1455, Jour.V f.270.
 2. 28 October 1461, L.B.M., p.8.
 3. 13 June, 28 July 1425, Jour.II f.44v., 48v.
 4. 18 June 1428, Jour.II f.115v.; April 1429, Jour.II f.132; Thomas Duffhous was Sheriff 1428-29.
 5. 19 January 1438, Jour.III f.183v.

that an alderman was not removable except for a reasonable cause, and the Court tended to scrutinize pleas to be excused with care.¹ Twenty-one Aldermen were exonerated by the Court during this period; nine of these pleaded old age, or deafness or ill-health and two of these were excused because of the length of their service. Stephen Brown had served for thirty-one years and Nicholas Wotton for more than forty.² Two men, Stephen Foster and Thomas Bernewell were excused on the grounds of their poverty.³ Philip Malpas, Thomas Canynge and, probably, Ralph Holland, were discharged in unusual circumstances for reasons that were partly political. A further two, John Derby and William Deer appear to have been discharged in order that they could more freely pursue litigation in which they were involved.⁴ No reasons are given for the discharge of the other five Aldermen.

-
1. Liber Albus, p.36.
 2. Stephen Brown exonerated from Billingsgate, 14 February 1460, Jour.VI f.198, dead by 3 February 1466; Nicholas Wotton exonerated from Dowgate 5 April 1446 Jour.IV f.123v., dead by 15 September 1446.
 3. Stephen Brown exonerated from Bread Street, 3 February 1458, Jour.VI f.191; Thomas Bernewell exonerated from Queenhythe, 13 October 1437, Jour.III f.190.
 4. John Derby asked to be exonerated 9 August 1454 but his request was refused, Jour.V f.183v., he then presented his reasons in greater detail to the Court on 21 September 1454 which were: i) that Richard Quartermayn was prosecuting him at common law contrary to the liberties of the City, ii) William Marowe had affirmed an original bill against him in the Mayor's Court, iii) his case against the Chamberlain, John Sturgeon, had been taken into the Mayor's Court where he could not obtain justice. His petition was finally granted, Jour.V f.192, 200, L.B.K., p.362. Derby was discharged in an amicable atmosphere and when he visited the Court in future he was to come as a brother and not as a stranger because of his services to the City. William Deer was exonerated from Dowgate 7 February 1456, Jour.VI f.28v.; he was involved in a complicated law-suit against Alexander Broke which began at least as early as 5 July 1455. Deer was finally found to be guilty of usury 23 March 1456, Jour.VI f.6v.; see also 4 April 1457, Jour.VI f.118v. and Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, pp.134-35.

Although in 1425 the Court had decided that anyone who had served as Mayor should not only be eligible for discharge from his aldermanry if he should so wish but also that a man so discharged should be entitled to have an annual livery, this ruling does not appear to have been strictly observed.¹ But it is true that a man who had not served a term as Mayor might find it more difficult to be granted a discharge. Thomas Walsingham had to agree to glaze the east window of the new Guildhall in order to obtain his release, and John Derby paid a £50 fine.² Ralph Skinnard who served only three months as Alderman of Castle Baynard had to pay a fine which appears to have gone to his successor in the aldermanry, Robert Large.³ Thomas Canynge, who was, admittedly, finally discharged for contumacy and disobedience, was ordered to pay a fine of £40 to the Chamber.⁴ An ex-Mayor who resigned was automatically entitled to wear the Alderman's livery but this favour might occasionally be granted by the Court to a retiring Alderman who had not served as Mayor. John Derby was allowed to wear the livery to keep him warm and Robert Whitingham on his discharge was granted one gown each year of the Alderman's livery.⁵

-
1. 15 October 1425, Jour.II f.54v.; Thomas Canynge who had served as Mayor 1456-7 was refused a discharge, 5 December 1460, Jour.VI f.279v.
 2. Walsingham exonerated 22 April 1429, Jour.II f.132v., L.B.K., p.109; Derby exonerated 19 October 1454, L.B.K., p.362.
 3. July 1429, Jour.II f.137.
 4. 15 January 1461, Jour.VI f.286.
 5. 2 May 1438, Jour.III f.174v.

On three occasions during this period the Court refused an Alderman's petition to be discharged. Richard Gosselyn's reasons were considered insufficient in 1426 and he was told that if he applied to the King to be exonerated he would stand in danger of losing his freedom.¹ John Bithewater had to petition during the mayoralties of John Coventry (1425-6) and John Reynwell (1426-7) before he was finally excused in 1428.² At the same meeting of the Court which granted a discharge to Geoffrey Feldyng and John Atherly, Thomas Canynges was refused his release on the grounds that his reasons were insufficient. He was ordered to continue to carry out his duties but was finally discharged in disgrace a month later.³

The secrecy of the deliberations of the Court of Aldermen and the dignity of the office were closely guarded.⁴ A man who insulted an Alderman was tried, not in the wardmote, but in the Mayor's Court, and the punishment for striking an Alderman was the loss of a hand.⁵ In the fifteenth century such a punishment was never executed but Geoffrey Lovey was imprisoned in Newgate in 1413 for cursing and slandering Thomas Fauconer, and Thomas Mayneld was also imprisoned

-
1. 18 October 1426, Jour.II f.86; Gosselyn continued as Alderman until October 1428; he died c.1429.
 2. January 1428, Jour.II f.105v.
 3. 5 December 1460, Jour.VI f.279v.; 15 January 1461, Jour.VI f.28b.
 4. 24 May 1427. Certain words which Robert Whitingham had spoken in the Court of Aldermen in a matter which concerned the Duke of Gloucester had been revealed to the Duke to the considerable harm of Whitingham and to the discredit of the Court. All the Aldermen who were present swore on the Gospels that anything which was spoken in Court should not be revealed outside, Jour.II f.93v.
 5. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.xxviii-xxx; as late as 1387 this punishment would have been put into execution but for the intercession of the Alderman concerned, Lemorials, pp.490-94.

there two years later for insolently threatening William Sevenoke, the alderman of Tower ward, with the fate of Nicholas Brembre.¹ Several men who lived in Bridge Street ward were sent to prison in 1420 for rebelling against their Alderman, Robert Wydington.² Seven years later Clement Bisshop, who called Nicholas James a 'false extortioner' in front of a great many people was condemned to the pillory for this offence.³ In 1461 Thomas Bailly was sent to prison for having spoken shameful words about John Young, the alderman of Farringdon Without.⁴

Important as were these deliberative organs of government it was the civic officials who gave impetus and effective meaning to their wishes. Apart from the Aldermen whose duties have already been described, civic officials may be divided into two categories; the unpaid annual officers such as the Mayor and Sheriffs, and the permanent salaried officers such as the Recorder, Chamberlain and Town Clerk, and a group of lesser officers who may conveniently be called the civic serjeantry. The discussion of the duties of the Mayor and Sheriffs will deal also with the courts over which they presided.

-
1. 19 May 1413, L.B.I., p.114; Memorials, pp.592-93; 21 March 1415, L.B.I., p.132; Layneld was released at Sevenoke's request and gave a £20 bond for good behaviour.
 2. L.B.I., p.245.
 3. 18 September 1427, Bishop was pardoned the pillory at the intercession of William Weston but had to provide a £10 bond to keep the peace in London and Southwark, Jour.II f.100.
 4. 28 March 1461, Jour.VI f.25v.

To be eligible for the Mayoralty a Londoner had not only to be an alderman but also to have served already as Sheriff 'au fin quil peot estre assaye en sa governance et bountee, avant quil attei ne a tiel estat de Mairalte'.¹ When John Carpenter wrote the Liber albus it had become established that a man should not be compelled to serve a second year in the office of Mayor unless he agreed to do so of his own free will.² The financial burden of the office was considerable and in 1424 the Court of Aldermen decided firstly, that no-one who had served twice as Mayor should be elected again and, secondly, that no-one was to serve a second term as Mayor until seven years had elapsed. The Common Council seems to have accepted only the second of these two ordinances and it was not until 1435 that the Common Council agreed that a man should not be called upon to serve as Mayor a third time.³ John Reynwell who had served as Mayor in 1426-7 was excused from serving a second time in 1444 and in the following year he was excused altogether from serving again.⁴

During this period some modifications took place in the process of electing the Mayor. In 1404 the principle was reasserted that only those

1. Liber albus, p.464.

2. Ibid., p.22; in 1389 an ordinance was agreed whereby no-one was to be Mayor for more than a year at a time, but could be re-elected after an interval of five years, M.F., p.347.

3. 8 October 1424, Jour.II f.23; Richard Whittington had served a third term as Mayor in 1419-20; 13 October 1424, L.B.K., pp.33-4 n.1; 8 April 1435, M.B.K., p.191.

4. 9 October 1444, Jour.IV f.43v.; 17 September 1445, Jour.IV f.95.

who were summoned should attend the Mayor's election and when the artisans tried to get Ralph Holland elected as Mayor it was necessary, in 1442, to proclaim a royal writ confirming this limitation of the franchise.¹ In 1444 not only was the election confined to those who were summoned but also, as a further precaution, the door of Guildhall was to be shut.² The custom of celebrating Mass before proceeding to the Mayor's election had been introduced in 1406 but it is not clear how long the innovation survived.³ In the Liber Albus John Carpenter carefully records the process whereby the commoners present in Guildhall chose two aldermen whom they presented to the Court of Aldermen for their final selection of the next Mayor. The Letter Books disclose that Dru Barentyn was the rejected candidate in 1406 when Richard Whittington was chosen, but after this date they record only the name of the successful candidate. In 1439, however, the Journals record the names of both the aldermen who were presented, and do so again in 1440 and 1441.⁴ The Journals are silent again until 1457 when both names are recorded, as they are in 1458, 1459 and 1460. Although in 1439-41 Ralph Holland was rejected three times, there appears to be emerging in the later period the custom that one year's rejected candidate is the next year's

1. 23 September 1404, L.B.I., p.34; L.B.K., pp.274-75, 288; Jour.III f.152v.; see chapter IV below.

2. 9 October 1444, Jour.IV f.43v.

3. L.B.I., pp.52-53, 60, 69, 226.

4. Memorials, pp.565-66; Jour.III f.24v., 62v., 97v.

Mayor.¹ It was customary for all the Aldermen who were able to do so, to attend the Mayor's election on October 13th. The attendance on these occasions is notably higher than on any other occasion during the year and even the Prior of Holy Trinity, the ex-officio Alderman of Portsoken ward, was usually present. In 1445 it was noted that William Estfeld, Nicholas Wotton, John Gedney, Thomas Catworth and William Combe were absent from the Mayor's election contrary to the custom of the City.²

Once the Mayor was elected on October 13th, he had fifteen days to wait before taking his oath at Guildhall on October 28th. On the following day he would ride to Westminster to be sworn before the Barons of the Exchequer.³ This latter occasion was one of great magnificence and considerable ceremony when the City displayed to the Crown and to the royal officials its wealth and pomp. All the City Companies rode with the Mayor and the procession would be accompanied by bands of minstrels.⁴ But in 1447 a change took place in this time-honoured equestrian procession. In that year, when John Gedney was chosen as Mayor, it was agreed that he should go to Westminster to take his oath by barge down the Thames.⁵ This may have been done as an

-
1. 1457 Cook and Boleyn presented; Boleyn chosen, Jour.VI f.180v.
1458 Scot and Hulyng presented; Scot chosen, Jour.VI f.234v.
1459 Cantelowe and Hulyng presented; Hulyng chosen, Jour.VI f.163.
1460 Cantelowe and Lee presented; Lee chosen, Jour.VI f.271v.
 2. 27 October 1445, Jour.IV f.102v.
 3. Liber Albus, pp.20-27.
 4. E.g. L.B.I., p.78.
 5. 13 October 1447, Jour.IV f.195v.; John Carpenter noted that in the past Mayors 'vel pedestres per terram vel per aquam Thamisiae in batello adierunt Westmonasterium vel Turrim, et fuerant onerati et accepti' Liber Albus, pp.21-22.

experiment but in 1453, at the petition of the commonalty and at the wish of the Common Council it was agreed that in future the Mayor should go by barge to take his oath. There is no indication of the reasons which prompted this decision. Ten days after this had been decided, the Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Somerset sent Thomas Belgrave, a royal serjeant at arms, to ask the Mayor and Aldermen to persuade the commonalty to return to the old custom of riding to Westminster. But the commonalty would not go back on its decision and the new Mayor, John Norman, went to Westminster by barge.¹

It appears that the King was normally present with the Barons of the Exchequer to receive the Mayor's oath, although in 1459 he was prevented by virtual civil war from being there.² On the same day on which he took his oath the Mayor would appoint attorneys for the City, one to act in the Exchequer Court, one in the Court of Common Pleas and two in the King's Bench. The Journal records the names of some of these men in 1454, 1456 and 1460.³

There is every indication that to hold the office of Mayor was an expensive task. There was no salary and only incidental sums would

-
1. 8, 18 October 1453, Jour.V f.124v., 126; although the Chroniclers attribute this change to John Norman personally, the evidence of the Journals suggests that it was a popular decision, Great Chron., pp.186-87; Rawlinson, p.103 and n.2; Bale, p.140.
 2. Liber Albus, p.25; L.E.K., p.396.
 3. 26 February 1454, John Windeslade to be the City's attorney in the Court of Common Pleas; 28 October 1456, Mildenhall to be the Mayor's attorney receiving the usual fee, Jour.VI f.109v.; 24 October 1460, Richard Simson to be the Mayor's attorney in the Exchequer Court for the next year, Jour.VI f.273v.

fall to the Mayor.¹ Not only was the Mayor's time no longer his own but he had to pay the wages of two serjeants and his sword-bearer as well as numerous other expenses; the Mayor was always expected, then as now, to read the list of those contributing to funds of various kinds.² There were some compensations. The Mayor appears to have had a pre-emptory right to move to any Aldermanry which fell vacant during his Mayoralty. In 1451 when the ward of Cornhill became vacant because Simon Eyre had moved to Langbourne, Nicholas Wyfold the Mayor 'per unanimum assensum et voluntatem aldermanorum prædictorum ... iuxta consuetum curiæ in huiusmodi casu usitatum, officium aldermani wardæ de Cornhill super se assumpsit'.³ There was, moreover, considerable patronage at the disposal of the Mayor. Originally he enjoyed the right to make six men free of the City, with the alternative of two casks of wine at the City's expense, but because the King objected to men who were not residents in the City being made freemen and so escaping royal prises and dues, in 1434 the Mayor's privilege of making freemen was annulled, but he was to receive instead four casks of the best red wine of Gascony.⁴ It appears also that the retiring Mayor could request offices or favours for those who had served him well or to whom he was indebted in some way. In 1453 Geoffrey Feldyng requested that John Hynton might have the next vacancy which occurred in the

1. E.g. 14 October 1463, amercements in the Mayor's Court were to be divided between the Mayor and Chamber, L.B.L., p.38.

2. Liber Albus, p.49.

3. 16 July 1451, Jour.V f.60; in 1446 Simon Eyre, the Mayor, chose to have the vacant ward of Broad Street, 7 February 1446, Jour.IV f.114v.

4. L.B.I., p.64; L.B.K., pp.34-35, 180.

office of valet of the Chamber and that his butler John Erly might be admitted to the freedom.¹ When Richard Lee left office in 1461 he asked that Richard Green might have the serjeantry of the channel after John Horncastle or another office of similar value. The Court of Aldermen agreed to this.²

The Mayor's entourage included at least four valets,³ several serjeants of whom three, after 1436, served in a permanent capacity, the sword-bearer, the serjeant of the channel, the Common Huntsman, the Water-bailiff and a butler.

In the charge of the sword-bearer was the Mayor's seal. The new Mayor received this in a purse after he had taken his oath at Guildhall on October 28th.⁴ The sword-bearer was entitled to a fee when the Mayor's seal was used but in 1440 it was decided that letters which were sealed with the Mayor's seal were to be written by the Town Clerk and were to be enrolled.⁵ The seal would be used on mayoral precepts such as those instructing Aldermen to hold wardmotes, but it appears to have been mainly used to authenticate private documents for better

-
1. 28 October 1453, Jour.V f.127. A valet of the Chamber appears to be the same officer as a valet of the Mayor. The request for Hynton probably succeeded since he was among those deputed to ride to the King at Fertford, 26 September 1455, Jour.V f.264v.
 2. 27 October 1401, Jour.VI f.81; Richard Green was sworn as an attorney in April 1462, Jour.VI f.11.
 3. 18 December 1419 it was decided that each year the Mayor was to select the four valets who had been most diligent and they were to receive two marks each, Jour.I f.66v.
 4. Liber Albus, p.24. The Mayor's seal was made in 1381 and continued in use until 1910, Memorials, pp.447-48.
 5. 27, 28 October 1440, Jour.III f.64v., 65.

vid'nce and security'. The only recorded use of the Mayor's seal for civic purposes was in 1453 when letters to the Archbishop of Cologne and the citizens of Cologne pleading for the release of the City's envoys to Rome, were sent under the Mayor's seal.¹

It was the duty of the Mayor to preserve peace in the City, to exercise a general oversight of all civic officials, to ensure that trade in the City was carried out in accordance with civic ordinances, to act as arbitrator and judge and to play the leading role in the numerous civic and religious functions.² The Mayor's oath, however, laid greater emphasis upon the Mayor's obligations to guard the rights and franchises of the King, than upon his civic duties. In his capacity as judge and escheator the Mayor of London acted as a royal servant. To carry out his duties as escheator which had been granted to him in 1327 the Mayor was allowed the services of a clerk for whom he had to answer to the King at the end of his term of office, as well as for the profits and issues.³ On 28th October 1456 John Byron was chosen to act as the Mayor's deputy in the office of escheator for the coming year and in 1468 it was decided that the Mayor and Aldermen should

-
1. 8 October 1453, Jour.V f.124v.; for the private use of the Mayor's seal, see Cal. P. and M. 1381-1412, p.235; Cal. P. and M. 1413-36, pp.190, 258, 301; Cal. P. and M. 1437-58, pp.1, 50.
 2. Liber Albus, pp.27-30; Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.129, 136.
 3. Liber Albus, p.25; see H.L. Chew, 'The office of Escheator in the City of London during the Middle Ages', E.F.R., vol.LVIII (1943) pp.319-30; L.B.K., p.396.

elect a sub-escheator annually whom the Mayor could not then remove.¹ The entertainment of foreign dignitaries did not play a large part in the Mayor's duties in the fifteenth century although in 1438 it was agreed that he should invite the ambassadors from Folland to dinner if 'procedant ad bonam finem'². If the Mayor were ill or unable to carry out his duties he could appoint a locumtenens. Robert Large who was Mayor in 1439-40 and who was described on 14th July 1440 as 'iam infirmus' chose William Estfeld to carry out his duties for him.³ Thomas Charlton who was Mayor in 1449-50 did not attend the Court after 8th July 1450 and Thomas Catworth acted as his deputy during the aftermath of Cade's revolt. It is clear that the Mayor was expected to pay the costs and expenses incurred by his locumtenens and a committee of eight aldermen was appointed to negotiate with Charlton about this in August 1450.⁴

One of the Mayor's most important functions was to act as judge in the Mayor's Court and many of the entries in the Journals are records of these proceedings and judgments, some of which were subsequently enrolled in the Mayor's Court rolls, but many were not. All cases in the Mayor's Court were begun by bills of complaint delivered to the

-
1. In 1454 John Byron was a clerk in the Sheriff's court so that his appointment as Mayor's deputy in the office of Escheator in 1456 may simply mean that he was chosen as the Mayor's clerk in this office, but perhaps with extended powers, 12 July 1454, Jour.V f.177; 28 October 1456, Jour.VI f.109v.; 22 November 1468, L.B.L., p.81.
 2. 13 May 1438, Jour.III f.173v.
 3. 14, 18 July 1440, Jour.III f.46, 47v.; Robert Large died 24 April 1441.
 4. 12 August 1450, Jour.V f.43v.; Thomas Charlton last appeared in the Court of Aldermen on 15 March 1452 and must have been dead by 7 August 1452 when Richard Lee was elected as his successor as Alderman of Bishopgate, Jour.V f.80.

attorneys of the Court. Some of these original bills survive in the Guildhall Record Office. The scope of the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court and its procedure have been fully described elsewhere and it only remains to describe certain trends and developments during this period.¹ The business of the Court was divided between sessions held in the Inner Chamber of Guildhall and those held in the Outer Chamber. When the Mayor and Aldermen sat as the Court of Aldermen to deal with the administrative civic business they sat in the Inner Chamber and it was here also that they dealt with cases involving the complicated Law Merchant. The ordinary business of the Mayor's Court took place in the Outer Chamber of Guildhall. In 1409 there was an attempt to limit the sessions of the Mayor's Court which took place in the Inner Chamber, no doubt because they were not public as other sessions.² Moreover the evidence from the Journals suggests that, for the sake of convenience, the Mayor and Aldermen did not always move from the Inner to the Outer Chamber when they transformed themselves from the Court of Aldermen to the Mayor's Court. Because, perhaps, of the new work at Guildhall, sessions of the Mayor's Court in 1419 were held at St. Dunstan's in the East.³ The personnel of the

1. See A.F. Thomas, Cal. Early Mayor's Court Rolls, pp.ix-xlv. Cal. P. and M. 1381-1412, pp.vii-xli; P.E. Jones, Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, pp.vii-ix; The Law Journal, vol.XCIII (1943) pp.301-02.

2. 4 November 1409, L.B.I., p.80 and n.2; see also a case in 1436 when the Mayor, in a return to a royal writ, defined the extent of the claims of the Mayor's Court to deal with cases of Law Merchant, L.B.K., pp.208-09.

3. 27, 29 May 1419, Jour.I f.56, 57.

Mayor's Court included the attorneys who were sworn to practise there and the clerks who kept the records. In 1462 these clerks were put under the direct control of the Common Clerk.¹ Moreover whereas it had previously been the task of the Mayor's Court clerks to make extracts of amercements ordered by the Court which would be delivered into the Chamber as a record, in 1463 this task also fell to the Common Clerk.² Amercements levied in the Mayor's Court were originally destined for the Sheriffs, but in 1461 it was decided that they should be equally divided between the Sheriffs and the Chamber. In 1463 it was further decided that they should be divided between the Mayor and Chamber.³

Dr. Thomas believed that the justice to be found in the Mayor's Court was fair and equitable. Like all medieval jurisdiction it was subject to exhausting procrastination and delays although some attempt to speed up justice was made in 1463.⁴ The only complaint against its jurisdiction to be found during this period is that of William Hubbard, an armourer, who was committed to prison for having scandalously told one of the clerks that the Mayor's court was not a court of Record but a court of favour.⁵

-
1. 5 February 1462, L.B.L., p.15.
 2. 12 January 1454, Jour.V f.141; 14 October 1463, L.B.L., p.38.
 3. Liber Albus, p.390; 9 November 1461, L.B.L., p.12; 14 October 1463, ibid., p.38.
 4. 15 October 1463, L.B.L., pp.38-39.
 5. 9 April 1459, Jour.VI f.154v.; 14 April 1459 Hubbard found recognitors for his good behaviour and was released, Jour.VI f.155v.

But perhaps the most marked feature of this period is the increasing dignity which came to surround both the person of the Mayor and the office itself. In 1414 for the first time a petition to the Mayor was addressed 'To our worshipfull Lord Mair of the Citee of London. Like unto youre soverain discrecioun...'¹ In 1415 the Mayor was accorded precedence in the City over the Archbishops, Bishops and the King's brothers.² In 1425 and 1427 when the Duke of Gloucester and other lords visited the City, the Mayor and his Sword-bearer took precedence over the Duke and his Sword-bearer.³ Similarly in 1441 it was the Mayor's Sword-bearer who led the Duke of Gloucester and other lords into Guildhall for a special judicial session at which both the Duke and the Mayor sat on demi-thrones.⁴ The care with which these occasions are described by the clerk who wrote the Journals, and the growth in importance of the Mayor's Sword-bearer, bear witness to the increasing civic pride and self-consciousness which surrounded the Mayor's office. In the same way offences which appeared to insult the dignity of the Mayor were severely punished. In 1442 Thomas Twychard who had gone to the Mayor's private house and had there disrespectfully and arrogantly accused him of having acted unjustly 'to the dishonour of the Mayor and his office' was committed to the custody of the Sheriffs so that

-
1. Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, p.17 and n.1; the Mayor was also described as 'Lord Mayor' in 1440, L.B.K., p.246 and in 1457, 1461, 1462, Cal. P. and M. 1457-82, pp.2, 17, 28; for an astringent comment on the use of the title 'Lord Mayor' see Beaven, vol.II, pp.xxviii-xxxi.
 2. 10 March 1415, L.B.I., p.135.
 3. 5 June 1425, 20 May 1427, Jour.II f.44, 93.
 4. 4 March 1441, Jour.III f.78. C.f. account of reception of Count of Vendôme in London, July 1445, J. Stevenson ed. Letters & Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France (RMs Series 1961-4) vol. I pp.101-2, 156-7.

others should not follow his bad example.¹ A tailor, Thomas Mason, was sent to prison for saying to one Basset 'I will better believe such a simple person as ye be than the Mayor and all the Aldermen'.² The Court took very seriously the case of T. Brewer who, in 1440, set himself up as a Mayor, attended by an Alderman, a goaler, a serjeant and a sheriff and thus surrounded visited the houses of citizens and Lombards to search for prostitutes. Since the Mayor was well known in the City such antics cannot have got very far, but the dignity of the Mayor's office was seen to have been attacked.³

The office of Sheriff did not carry the prestige of that of Mayor but it was, nevertheless, extremely important in civic government. The citizens of London enjoyed the right of electing their own Sheriffs instead of accepting a royal appointment. One Sheriff was chosen by the Mayor and the other was chosen by the commonalty, at a meeting held each year on September 21st.⁴ On September 26th the two newly-chosen Sheriffs would come to Guildhall to take their oath. On this occasion the retiring Sheriffs were expected to bring in all the records

1. Cal. P. and L. 1437-57, p.46.
 2. 11 December 1452, Jour.V f.97; on 12 December 1452 Mason found recognitors who were bound for him in £20 that he would behave and so he was released, Jour.V f.98.
 3. 15 April 1440, Jour.III f.41v.
 4. It was usually, but not always, the case that the Mayor would choose an Alderman and the commonalty a Commoner; see Beaven, II, p.xxxvii. On 23 September 1404 it was decided to limit the number of those who might attend the Sheriffs' election to those who were of the more sufficient men of the City or members of Common Council, L.B.L., p.34.

of their term of office.¹ In fact, since the Sheriff was personally responsible for his actions during his shrievalty he appears to have held onto his records and, if they were delivered up at all, it was usually after a considerable lapse of time.² On September 29th the Sheriffs were presented to the Barons of the Exchequer, accompanied on their journey by the masters and liverymen of the different Companies.³ Unlike the Mayor at the beginning of this period, the Sheriffs travelled to Westminster by barge and in 1439 the Court of Aldermen decided that in future the Sheriffs should pay for their own barges to Westminster, the implication being that the expense had previously been borne by the Chamber.⁴ The only noteworthy event concerning the Sheriffs' elections during this period was the death of John Bryan after twelve days in office in 1418. The Mayor and Recorder had to defend the City's right to elect a Sheriff in place of Bryan, but in the end they did this successfully and the citizens were able to choose John Perneys.⁵

The duties of the London Sheriffs were similar to those of other Sheriffs in England but they operated as royal agents within the

-
1. Liber Albus, pp.43-46; Sheriff's oath, ibid., pp.306-07.
 2. The records of the shrievalty of Simon Winchcombe who was Sheriff 1383-84 were not brought into court until 1428, L.B.K., p.76. None of the shrievalty records survive for the fifteenth century in the G.R.O. except some Sheriff's court rolls 1406-08 (see below) and a Sheriff's Register for 1458-59 (see below).
 3. Payments for expenses involved in the 'Sheriff's riding' appear in almost all the contemporary Company accounts.
 4. 15 October 1439, Jour.III f.25.
 5. L.B.I., pp.205-06; for the best account of Bryan's death see Farley 5775, printed by Kingsford, E.F.L., p.295; on 28 October 1418 John Bryan's sons, William and Robert, were placed in the custody of the Master of the Riote, Jour.I f.52.

framework of civic privilege and custom. Each of them was answerable to the King for half of the City's farm of £300. As royal servants they might be instructed as in 1401 to execute William Sawtre, or in 1417 to burn Sir John Oldcastle;¹ they were expected to erect bars and scaffolds for the various trials by battle which took place in Smithfield and they were the promulgators of innumerable royal writs of an administrative and judicial kind.² From the money which the Sheriffs collected on the King's behalf, they might be instructed to make direct payments, particularly annuities to individuals³ and the fees to local justices.⁴ The London Sheriffs would be called to account to the Barons of the Exchequer and the settling of the account might take some years.⁵ An unusual insight into the administration of the

-
1. R.P. III p.459a; P.R.O. Enrolled Foreign accounts 6 Henry V E 364/52
 2. P.R.O. E364/6374, 79, 97, enrolled Sheriff's accounts for erecting scaffold for the duel between Upton and Donne 1429/30; same for a duel between Peta de Vasques of Spain and Richard Wydeville in 1440/41; same for erecting a scaffold for an unspecified occasion in West Smithfield 1444/45; the same for a duel between John Halton and Robert Norreys 1452/53, for this duel see also P.P.C. VI, p.133, c.Lay 1453.
 3. Bundles of these accounts for the reign of Henry VI are extant and they include the receipts sealed by individuals, the royal writs and the notifications of payments made, P.R.O. E101/573 parts 1 and 2.
 4. Some of the indentures between the London Sheriffs and the justices survive covering the periods 1430-33, 1436-38, 1440 and ?1448, P.R.O. E101/571/41 (four indentures).
 5. William Cantelowe and William Marowe who were Sheriffs 1448-49 were still trying to settle their account in January 1451 when an inquisition of Londoners was summoned to give evidence about certain desperate debts totalling, in all, £221 12s. 7½d.; the documents relating to this account are to be found P.R.O. E199/27/28. General Sheriff's accounts during this period are to be found P.R.O. E199/Bundles 26 and 27,

London Sheriffs is provided by a Sheriffs' Register for the years 1458-59. It contains copies of the royal writs received by the Sheriffs, a note of the name of the bearer and, in the case of judicial writs, a brief note of the action taken. In the case of the longer, and fewer, administrative writs the account of the Sheriff's action is given in greater detail. There appears to have been some delay in executing royal writs since those issued in July were not dealt with until the new Sheriffs had been elected in the following October.¹

The position of a Sheriff of London was somewhat ambivalent, since he was the servant both of the King and of the City - two masters who were not always in harmony. According to his oath the London Sheriff was not to return royal writs concerning the state and franchise of the City until such writs had been shown to the Mayor and City Counsel.² In 1454 the Sheriffs' clerks were instructed not to return any writ touching the state of the City, or for delivery from Newgate prison, or any writ whereby the City might be 'burdened'.³ The City's quarrel with the King over the privileges of St. Martin's is a good illustration of the anomalous position in which the London Sheriffs might be placed. As servants of the City they had taken the prisoners away from the

1. G.R.O. Ms. 205 C; the Register also lists those sessions of the Hustings Court when the names of fugitives from justice were called out prior to their being declared outlaws. That this was not the only record kept by the Sheriffs' clerks can be seen from entries such as that on f. 40v. where it is recorded 'returnum istius brevis patet in libro causarum'.

2. Liber Albus, p. 307.

3. 28 September 1454, Jour. V f. 194v.; the Sheriff was to guard the interests of the City at his own cost.

sanctuary, and as servants of the King they were instructed to restore them. When such a conflict of duty arose the Sheriffs would seek from the Common Council an assurance that they would be indemnified and their expenses paid if they pursued the City's case.¹

In spite of his onerous duties there is no indication that the Sheriff received any salary either from the King or the City. There was little advantage to be gained from serving as Sheriff except that it was a necessary stepping-stone on the way to the Mayoralty. The fines and amercements which the Sheriff collected went towards the payment of the royal farm although anything in excess of the required £300 might go to the Sheriffs personally.² Apart from fines and amercements in their own courts and a share in those levied in the Mayor's Court, the Sheriffs collected revenue from other sources; they received 2 marks p.a. from the Fishmongers who enjoyed the privilege of holding their own court; Thomas Bmond and Richard Norton, who were Sheriffs in 1442-43, were granted the profits on the weighing of wool in ships to the value of £8 ls.0d. and under the will of John Reynwell

-
1. See, for example, the case of Ralph Josselyn and Richard Nedeham, Sheriffs 1458-59, who, on 19 November 1459 had still not returned a royal writ because it had stated that St. Martin's Lane lay within the liberty of the Church but which, the City contested, was a common lane. The Sheriffs were indemnified since they could not have returned the writ without injury to the City's liberties, Jour.VI f.169. In 1457 the Sheriffs were carefully advised by Common Council how to respond to a writ for levying soldiers in the City, Jour.VI f.124, 181v., 182v.
 2. If the Sheriffs took more than the stipulated fines from the Bakers, Brewers, etc. they were to pay 12d. for each penny which they had taken in excess, Liber Albus, p.46; for a list of the amercements and fees which could be levied by Sheriffs from pleas moved in the Mayor's Court see ibid., pp.390-91; 9 November 1461 it was decided that such amercements were to be equally divided between the Sheriffs and the Chamber, J.B.L., p.12.

certain bequests were to be paid annually to the Sheriffs.¹ But out of the money coming to them from these various sources the Sheriffs had to discharge not only the royal farm, but they had also to pay their servants, the expenses of their ceremonial journey to Westminster, the costs of keeping the City bars in good order and also the fees and expenses involved in the commissions of Goal Delivery at Newgate.² This considerable financial pressure upon the Sheriffs could lead them to be extortionate, not directly but by selling the offices at their disposal (serjeants and valets in their households, clerkships at the Counters, wardens at Newgate and Ludgate and porters in the Counters) and not enquiring too closely into the way in which those offices were executed.³

The Sheriffs played a major role in the keeping of law and order in the City and in this their functions were omniscient. They were, however, to be subject to the Mayor and were to execute his orders and judgments. In the words of John Carpenter they were to be 'majoris oculi'.⁴ The County of Middlesex also fell under the administration of the London Sheriffs; however they were not allowed to farm the

-
1. Liber Albus, p.383; 20 April 1450 Common Council decided that the Sheriffs were to receive the fines arising from judgments in the trial of the servants of Lord Scales and Thomas(?) Daniel who had caused an affray in the City, Jour.V f.34; 29 January 1445 and 27 April 1445 Bemoed and Norton granted profits of wool weighing, Jour.IV f.61, 76v.; for Reynwell's will see Hustings Wills II, pp.576-77, 576 n.2, also 4 October 1452, Jour.V f.89.
 2. 5 November 1450 it was decided, of old custom, that the Sheriffs should pay the fees for the Commission of Goal Delivery at Newgate out of their own money, Jour.V f.51; reiterated 14 December 1471, L.B.I., p.101.
 3. c.1421 the Sheriffs were forbidden to sell these offices, L.B.I., p.262; see also Cal. P. and L. 1412-37, p.151.
 4. Liber Albus, p.42.

91

county but only to appoint a deputy.¹ In 1454 as a result of the efforts of the Mayor and Thomas Lute, the clerk of the Peace in Middlesex, prisoners taken in Middlesex were to appear at the Newgate sessions of goal delivery, which lessened considerably the time and expense involved both for the Sheriffs and the prisoners.² The London Sheriffs also, together with the Coroner, sat on inquests for felony and held assizes of Novel Disseisin and Freshforce.³ According to his oath it was also the duty of the Sheriffs of London to see that the Assizes of Bread and Ale were duly kept in the City.⁴ In the early 1440s they were further instructed, clearly against their will, to construct and maintain certain bars, or barriers, at points on the City's boundary; in particular the bars between Smithfield and the Priory of St. John, the bars dividing the franchise of London from that of Middlesex, and the bars outside Aldersgate.⁵ Finally each Sheriff presided over one of the City's courts.

The Sheriffs' Court was the oldest judicial court in the City.⁶ By the fifteenth century, however, it had become very much subject to

-
1. Ibid., p.46; 25 October 1454 Robert Beaufitz was sworn as Undersheriff of Middlesex and Robert Broker was sworn as bailiff of Middlesex, Jour.V f.202v.; 10 November 1457 Thomas Segden was described as 'lately Sheriff (Undersheriff?) of Middlesex', Jour.VI f.184.
 2. 3 October, 12 October 1454, the Mayor received a pipe of wine for his labours and Thomas Lute was to have a yearly robe, a fee for delivering the Middlesex prisoners to Newgate and he was to be free of the City without payment, Jour.V f.196, 199.
 3. Cal. P. and M. 1412-37, pp.33, 52-53, 54-55, 114; Lond.Poss.Assizes, pp.xiv-xviii.
 4. Liber Albus, p.307.
 5. 16 August 1440, 31 March 1441, 23 June 1442, Jour.III f.52v., 8lv.,139.
 6. On the early history of the Sheriffs' Court see R.R. Sharpe, Cal.Early Mayor's Court Rolls 1298-1307, pp.xiv-xv; Cal. P. and M. 1381-1412 pp.xii-xiv, xx; P.E. Jones, 'The City Courts of Law; Mayor's and Sheriffs' Courts', Law Journal, vol.XCIII (1943), pp.301-02.

the Mayor's Court. Appeals could be made from the Sheriffs' Court to the Mayor's Court and, according to the Liber Albus, the Mayor could remove a case which was being tried before the Sheriffs into his own court even before judgment.¹ In 1454 a serjeant and clerk of the Sheriff were committed to prison because they had ignored the Mayor's precept to transfer a case from the Sheriff's court to that of the Mayor.² The records of the proceedings in the Sheriffs' Courts appear to have been considered as the personal property of the Sheriff and it could be many years before they were brought into Guildhall. In 1461 the City tried to ensure that plaints in the Sheriff's Court should be enrolled either in the Counters - where by this date the meetings of the Sheriff's Court were usually held - or in Guildhall, but not

1. Liber Albus, p.219.

2. 8, 12 July 1454, Jour.V f.175, 177.

elsewhere.¹ The types of cases with which the Sheriff's court dealt included account, covenant, debt, detinue, fabrication of deeds, foreign attachment, forcible entry, trespass, breaking in, stealing goods, and

-
1. L.B.K., p.76; 13 November 1461, L.B.L., p.12. The place of the Sheriff's Court was not firmly fixed; John Hadle (Sheriff 1375-76) held an Assize of Freshforce at his own house, Lond.Poss. ssizes, p.52; of the 45 cases covered by the Sheriff's Rolls 1406-08 only two are specified as having been heard at the Counters, the other meetings of the court were presumably held at Guildhall at this early date. The only Sheriff's Court rolls which survive in the Guildhall Record Office before 1554 cover the years 1406-08. These are not, in fact, rolls but scraps of paper with records of different cases on each. The cases are some of those brought before Geoffrey Brook and Nicholas Wotton, Sheriffs 1406-07 and Henry Halton and Henry Pountfreit, Sheriffs 1407-08, numbering 45 in all. They cover cases of debt, detinue and trespass. The pledges for prosecuting the cases are always fictitious, e.g. John Bishop and John Cate. On five of the cases a record of the pleading is included and to three of these is sewn a record of the names of those summoned to the inquest. Most of the records are endorsed although this is not always legible. The endorsement gives a date, usually a few days after the date on which the case was heard, and a name. The names are Marchaunt, Pychard, Otto Brys, Jardeville, Est, Partrich and Otes. Apart from the last two these men can be identified. Thomas Marchaunt was Common Clerk 1402-17, Otto Brys was a Mayor's Serjeant 1407-15, Richard Jardeville was a Mayor's Serjeant 1402-9, William Est was a Mayor's Serjeant 1402-09, and John Pychard was a Mayor's Serjeant and Common Serjeant at Arms 1407-c.1417. The exact meaning of these endorsements is obscure; perhaps these Mayor's Serjeants were moving the prisoners or bringing the record into Guildhall, or these may have been cases which went on appeal, or by pre-emption, to the Mayor's Court. But if this is so, not one of them is referred to in the Mayor's Court rolls. 10 December 1438 the Court of Aldermen decided that defaults in the Sheriff's Court should be recorded on rolls rather than in letters as was customary. Clerks who inscribed false defaults were to be removed from office and not reinstated without the permission of the Mayor and Aldermen. It may be, therefore, that the change from the scraps of paper of 1406-08 to the rolls of 1554 may be dated to 1438, Jour.III f.3.

cases involving foreigners. During this period it would seem that increasingly, the actual work in the Sheriff's Court was carried out by the Undersheriffs. When the Court of Aldermen issued an ordinance to prevent attorneys who were not sworn from appearing in the Sheriff's Court, it was the Undersheriffs, rather than the Sheriffs, who were instructed to see that this ordinance was observed 'corame eis'.¹

Probably the most onerous of all the Sheriff's duties was his overall responsibility for prisoners in the City, in the gaols of Newgate and Ludgate, and in the Sheriffs' own prisons called the Counters. The new Sheriffs would receive the prisoners of Newgate from their predecessors, by indenture, together with the keys of the prison. It was the duty of the Sheriff to appoint a good custodian and not to let the gaol to farm.² The Sheriff was also responsible for the building itself, which was important to the citizens not only as a gaol but also as one of the City's main gates. In 1406 a separate stone tower was built so that women might be more conveniently housed and as a result of the benefaction of Richard Whittington the whole gate and gaol was pulled down and rebuilt between 1423 and 1431.³ By 1448, however, the buildings were again in a state of disrepair due to the negligence of the gaoler.⁴ During Cade's rebellion the prison and

-
1. 3 September 1460, Jour.VI f.262v.; for the names of some of these attorneys operating in the Sheriff's Court see Jour.II f.28v., Jour.V f.177, Jour.VI f.268v., L.R.K., pp.350, 369-70.
 2. Liber Ihus, pp.47, 121-22. For the early history of Newgate prison see L. Basset, 'Newgate Prison in the Middle Ages', Speculum, vol.XVIII (1943), pp.233-46; R.B. Pugh, Imprisonment in Medieval England (Cambridge 1968), pp.103-09.
 3. 13 August 1406, L.P.I., pp.49-50; L.R.K., pp.19, 39, 49, 119. While the prison was being rebuilt the prisoners were housed in the

(continued at foot of next page)

gate were damaged and in 1455 a further committee was appointed to examine the defects of Newgate and report to the Court of Aldermen.¹ The prison was found to be so defective, owing to the negligence of the Sheriffs, that by the following year it was necessary to house the prisoners elsewhere, and in 1462 contributions were solicited for the repair of Newgate.² But at least during this period of bad management some provision was made to ensure that the prisoners received a supply of fresh water.³

The Sheriff's choice of men to fill the office of 'custos' of Newgate appears to have been unfortunate during this period. A complete list of these officers cannot be compiled but of the nine men who are known to have acted in this capacity, three at least were negligent and extortionate.⁴ In order to try to prevent abuses detailed ordinances were passed by Common Council in 1431, 1434 and again in 1463 to regulate the activities of the gaolers. These ordinances tried to prevent the gaolers from taking alms intended for the prisoners, organizing a

-
1. 2 October 1450, 10 September 1455 committees appointed to investigate, Jour.V f.47v., 260v.; 2 December 1450 Alexander Manning, the late keeper, undertook to repair the gaol at his own expense, Jour.V f.51v.
 2. 29 November 1456, April 1462, Jour.VI f.87v., 62v.
 3. 26 August 1435, L.B.K., p.189; 2 April 1459 a committee appointed to supervise the water system for Newgate, Jour.VI f.153v.; the necessary grants by the Prior of St. Bartholomew's dated 20 June 1436 and 19 May 1442 recorded L.B.L., p.4.
 4. See Appendix no. 3 p. 557.

(Footnotes continued from previous page)

3. Sheriff's Counters. A somewhat rudimentary picture of Newgate in 1445 is to be found in Jour.IV f.79v.
4. 14 December 1448, two Aldermen were appointed to investigate the state of Newgate, Jour.V f.3v.

monopoly for the sale of essential goods to inmates, charging undue sums for the hire of a bed and demanding extortionate fees for delivering the prisoners.¹ Moreover the wardens were proposed, by the ordinances of 1431, to be elected annually and to provide sureties not only to the Sheriffs that they would safely guard the prisoners, but also sureties to the Chamberlain that they would observe the ordinances. It was also intended that the Warden of Newgate should be sworn annually like other members of the Sheriff's entourage although there is no clear record that this was in fact done.² But in spite of these precautions the wardens do not appear to have been attractive men. William Arnold grossly violated one of his female prisoners; Alexander Manning left the corpse of a prisoner in the road and allowed the gate and prison to fall into disrepair;³ John Kyngescote 'by malice' had eighteen freemen prisoners led manacled to the Sheriff's Counters as though they were felons and thieves.⁴

The administration of Ludgate prison seems in this period to have been rather better than that of Newgate. Since early in the reign of Richard II freemen debtors and those convicted of minor offences had been imprisoned there.⁵ Like Newgate it came under the control of the

1. L.B.K., pp.124-27, 183; L.B.L., pp.41-43.

2. Alexander Boner was sworn to office 9 November 1416, Jour.I f.1v. There is no record of any other keeper being sworn during this period. The oath of the Warden of Newgate, to keep well and truly the gate of Newgate and the prisoners, is to be found in Jour.IV f.166v.

3. 10 October 1449, Jour.V f.16; for the crimes of Alexander Manning see 15 March 1447, Jour.IV f.172, 7 October 1450, 5 November 1450, Jour.V f.48, 51.

4. Cont.F.Brut, Brie, p.456.

5. L.B.H., p.97 and n.2. In the reign of Henry IV the Ludgate prisoners petitioned the Prince of Wales for 5 years freedom in which to earn money to pay off their debts, M. D. Legge ed. Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions (Oxford, 1944) pp 31-32.

1

Sheriffs who could send prisoners there, although the choice of keeper lay originally with the citizens and not with the Sheriffs. By 1414 the keeper was chosen by the Sheriff and in 1440 it was decided that the Sheriffs should provide the keepers, at their own expense, for Ludgate as well as Newgate gaol.¹ By 1419 it was found that many people had taken to living in Ludgate gaol 'upon the ease and licence that there is within' and then, from this retreat, planning false indictments against worthy citizens. For this reason the decision was taken on 1 June 1419 to close the prison.² But within fifteen days of the Ludgate prisoners being moved to Newgate, over sixty of them had died, so it was decided on 2 December to reopen the Ludgate prison, 'seeing that every person is sovereignly bound to support, and be tender of, the lives of men'.³

In 1431 Ludgate prison was closed from March until Midsummer. The author of the F. Continuation of the Brut states that the prison was reopened on 16 June 1431, and that on that day Henry Dene, a tailor, was made keeper of Ludgate by the Mayor and Commonalty.⁴ The various

1. 1 October 1409, L.B.I., p.76; 16 February 1414, L.B.I., p.123; 2 September 1440, L.B.K., p.243, Jour.III f.55v.; for a list of keepers see Appendix, no.2, p.556.
2. L.B.I., p.215; Memorials, pp.674-74; Jour.I f.57v. The ring-leader in the malpractices which led to the closing of the prison was a man named Roger Oliver, aided by one Roger Launsell. The author of the Continuation E of Brut blames 'one Olyver and three false harlots' Brie, p.444.
3. L.B.I., p.227; Memorials, p.677; Jour.I f.65v.; Stow, I, p.37; Cont. E Brut Brie, p.444.
4. Cont. F Brut Brie, p.456. Cf. Great Chron. p.155 and Cleopatra C IV p.133.

ordinances promulgated in 1431 and 1434 to reform the abuses of Newgate gaol, applied also to Ludgate.¹ After the re-opening of the prison fresh water was brought to the prisoners through the efforts of Thomas Knolles, and the gaoler, Henry Dene, improved the gaol privy at his own expense.² Early in 1454, however, there appears to have been a fire at, or near, Ludgate and it may have been this which prompted Stephen Foster, the Mayor, to set about enlarging the prison.³ Foster died in December 1458 but his widow Agnes continued this work of piety, possibly in response to injunctions in Foster's will.⁴ The prison was considerably enlarged and the land taken for this purpose had been leased to the Hospital of St. Bartholomew, so their rent was reduced accordingly.⁵ When the work was completed in 1463, new ordinances 'at the request, prayer and desire of the well-disposed, blessed and devoted woman Dame Agnes Foster, for the ease, comfort and relief of all the poor prisoners' were promulgated. These ordinances stipulated the appointment of an annual committee of two curates and two commoners to hear complaints from prisoners.⁶

-
1. 23 February 1431, 13 October 1434, L.B.K., pp.124-27, 183.
 2. Two indentures dealing with the provision of a water supply for Ludgate, 20 June 1436, 19 May 1442, L.B.M., p.4; Stow I p.108, and p.17 where he states that water was brought to the prison in 1432. 4 April 1441, L.B.K., pp.254-55, Jour.III f.82v.
 3. 13 March 1454, William Herbert, citizen and bladesmith was exonerated from assizes and vigils for two years because his tenements were burnt in the fire at Ludgate, Jour.V f.153; Rawlinson R 355, p.108; Stow, II, p.175 attributed the work to Foster. *9 March 1454, a house burnt outside Ludgate, Bodleian library, Ms Rawlinson library f. 3 f 2.*
 4. Foster's will drawn up 4 December 1458 and proved 27 December 1458, P.C.C. 15 Stokton; L.R.L., p.41.
 5. The rent was reduced from 22d. p.a. to 12d. p.a. 28 September 1460, Jour.VI f.269.
 6. 30 December 1463, L.L., pp.40-43.

The only other development of note during these years at the two prisons of Newgate and Ludgate was the separation of the office of keeper of the prison from that of keeper of the gate. When John Seint Germain was confirmed in office in 1414 it was as keeper both of the gate and prison of Ludgate, and in 1425 it was decided that it was the responsibility of the keeper of Ludgate gaol to see to the paving under the gate.¹ But in 1440 the Sheriffs were made responsible for choosing men to open and shut the gates of Newgate and Ludgate.² Hence, although Penry Dene was keeper of Ludgate prison from 1431 at least until 1460, a man named John Porter was keeper of the gate in 1454.³ In the same way while John Arnold was keeper of Newgate gaol c.1450-c.1456, in 1454 Robert Cook was described as 'custos' of the gate of Newgate and John Laye as 'custos velett' at Newgate.⁴

The Sheriffs were also responsible for their own prisons called the Counters; one of which was on the north side of Poultry and the other on the south side of West Cheap opposite the Standard.⁵ The Counters served not only as prisons where prisoners were held while

1. 16 February 1414, L.B.I., p.123; 13 January 1425, Jour.II f.31.

2. 1, 7 September 1440, Jour.III f.55v., 57.

3. 18 May 1454, Jour.V f.208.

4. 18 May 1454, Jour.V f.208.

5. L.B.I., p.109; Cal. P. and W., 1413-37, p.151. For a general account of the Counters, see R.B. Fugh, o.cit., p.109-11.

a sitting trial or for short periods of imprisonment for civic offences, but also as a meeting place for the Sheriff's Court and the administrative office for the business of the Sheriffs.¹ The prison was run by porters who were appointed by the Sheriffs and were sworn like other City officers. The Sheriffs were not allowed to farm out the control of the Counter prisons, for fear that such men would then behave extortionately towards the prisoners in their control, but the Sheriffs were themselves expected to see to the administration of the Counter prisons and to draw up the accounts.² But, as with the other prisons in the City, the Court of Aldermen and the Common Council exercised a general supervision.³

The onerous and extensive nature of the tasks borne by the Sheriffs is reflected in the number of their servants. The most important of these was the Undersheriff who ranked as first clerk at the Counters. At the beginning of this period it would seem that the Undersheriffs

-
1. Cal.P. and L. 1457-22, pp.20, 23; 18 December 1419 the Court of Aldermen decided that prisoners could not remain in the Counters after their trial and condemnation for even a night or a day, Jour.I f.66v.
 2. Liber albus, pp.522-23; L.B.I., p.262; not many of the names of the Porters of the Counters during this period are known:

4 November 1419 Robert (Wayn?) sworn as Porter	Jour.I f.63
29 November 1424 Robert Wayn " "	Jour.II f.29
13 October 1434 Thomas Elys and John Goos, Keepers of Counters	
	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.183
21 July 1455 (John) Power 'janitor' of Counter prison	Jour.V f.251
21 December 1422 a Porter at the Counter was indicted for extortion,	
	<u>Cal.P. and L. 1413-37</u> , p.151.
 3. 23 February 1431, 13 October 1434, ordinances made by Mayor, Aldermen, Sheriffs and Commonalty in Common Council assembled, L.B.K., pp.124-27, 183; 14 December 1448 two Aldermen were appointed to investigate the state of the Counters, Newgate and Ludgate, and the defective custody there, and to report to the Mayor and Aldermen, Jour.V f.3v.

were chosen annually, each Sheriff choosing one man for the office. A useful and efficient Undersheriff might, however, be kept on by a different Sheriff the following year.¹ Like the other members of the Sheriff's entourage they were sworn to office. In 1441, however, the Court of Aldermen decided that it would be more expedient if the Undersheriffs were not chosen annually by the Sheriffs but were chosen by the Common Council and remained in office during good behaviour.² After this date all recorded elections of Undersheriffs took place in meetings of Common Council, and in 1450 a meeting of the Common Council was especially summoned for this purpose.³ At this meeting it was decided that the Undersheriffs should, after all, be elected annually by the Common Council sometime between 21st and 29th September;⁴ what this meant in fact was that the Common Council, as in the case of the Chamberlain, annually approved the two Undersheriffs. Certainly they did not change each year.

-
1. John Fray and William Aston were both kept in office in 1416 and 1417. For a list of the Undersheriffs, see Appendix, no 4 p. 558.
 2. 9 July 1441, decision of Court of Aldermen, Jour.III f.88v.; 20 July 1441, ordinance of Common Council to this effect, Jour.III f.89; L.B.K., p.257. 13 September 1445 this ordinance was extended to include all City officers, including the Undersheriff of Middlesex, who were not annually elected on St. Matthew's day, i.e. all officers except the Chamberlain, Sheriffs, Bridgemasters and auditors, Jour.III f.lv., Jour.IV f.94. Two of the Undersheriffs of Middlesex appear to have been sworn in the Court of Aldermen:- 15 November 1453, Walter Brigger, Jour.V f.131v.; 25 October 1454, Robert Beaufitz, Jour.V f.202v.; Beaufitz later became deputy coroner.
 3. When Thomas Billing was elected Recorder, the Court of Aldermen decided to summon a Common Council to elect a new Undersheriff, 1 October 1450, Jour.V f.47v.
 4. 2 October 1450, Jour.V f.47v.

The Liber Albus says little about the duties of Undersheriffs, apart from their oath, and makes no mention of any salary. There are no recorded perquisites attached to the office and, presumably, an Undersheriff made what he could from the enrolling of pleas in the Sheriff's Court - over which he presided - and from a percentage of the various dues, amercements, fines etc. which it fell to his lot to collect. Thomas Burgoyne, in 1457, received 10 marks as a reward for his services on a deputation to the King.¹ But this is the only recorded example of such a payment.

According to his oath the Undersheriff was expected to serve the Sheriff, to administer equal law, to summon impartial juries, to enrol pleas for reasonable payments, to be obedient to the Mayor and the judges, to give no judgments contrary to civic ordinances, to amerce fairly and to account to the Chamberlain for any fines which he collected, to levy only established customs and not to return any royal writs without first consulting the Mayor and Common Council.² In these tasks he was acting as the deputy of the Sheriff and there is little separate record of the Undersheriffs' activities. In addition the Undersheriffs were responsible for having the records of the Assizes of Fresh Force drawn up and for seeing to their deposit in the Court of Husting.³ In the same way, at least by 1461, the Undersheriffs appear to have been responsible for making records of other cases heard

1. 28 March 1457, Jour.VI f.117; see L.B.K., pp.377-78.

2. Liber Albus, pp.317-18.

3. Lond.Poss.Assizes, p.xiii.

before the Sheriffs.¹ By 1460, if not earlier, the Undersheriffs virtually controlled the Sheriff's Court.² To help him with this considerable amount of paper work each Undersheriff had at least one clerk.³

But, as with many civic officials, the duties of the Undersheriffs extended beyond the Sheriff's court and beyond the terms of his oath. He might attend the Court of Aldermen and be used on civic deputations.⁴ Thomas Burgoyne, who was an Undersheriff from 1441 at least until 1463, may have enhanced the importance of the office by virtue of his personal experience. In 1448 together with certain Aldermen, he was sent to the King at Windsor, in 1449 he served on a further deputation to the King, in 1450 he was a member of the committee appointed to examine the title deeds to Billingsgate;⁵ in 1454, and again in 1456-61 he was chosen to act with the seneschal appointed by the Prior of St. Bartholomew to keep the Court at the August fair,⁶ in 1455 he served on the committee to audit the title account and rode to the King at Hertford when the City clashed with the Dean of St. Martin's and he served on further deputations to the King in 1459 and 1460.⁷ Burgoyne, moreover, was

1. See Cal. P. and M. 1457-82, pp.20, 23, 48.

2. See note 1, p.97 above.

3. Lond.Poss.Assizes, p.xiii; L.B.K., p.345.

4. Undersheriffs attended the Court of Aldermen, 27 July 1452, 20 November 1453, 29 October 1456, 13 May 1457, Jour.V f.79, 132v., Jour.VI f.85, 121v.

5. 16 March 1448, Jour.IV f.213; 17 June 1449, Jour.V f.12; 13 and 27 February 1450, Jour.V f.30v., 31v.

6. 15 March 1453, 9 August 1454, Jour.V f.106v., 183v.; 17 August 1456, 12 August 1457, 5 August 1458, 17 August 1459, 13 August 1460, 14 August 1461, Jour.VI f.101v., 131v., 249, 136, 260v., 23v.

7. 4 August 1455, 26 September 1455, Jour.V f.253, 264v.; 10 October 1459, 25 January 1460, Jour.VI f.144v., 227. Guy Fairfax was on the view of Southwark, 20 October 1459, Jour.VI f.164.

chosen as one of the City's M.Ps. in 1445 and, like other civic officials, he frequently acted as an arbiter.¹

When the office of Undersheriff depended upon annual appointment by individual Sheriffs it was not an especially attractive proposition. Hence, Alexander Anne moved from being an Undersheriff in 1423 to the more permanent office of Common Serjeant. When, however, in 1441 the office of Undersheriff became permanent during good behaviour, it was considerably more sought after. So much so that John Wilton, who had been an Undersheriff in 1431-32 and had subsequently become Common Serjeant in 1437, left his new office to return to being an Undersheriff in July 1441. Thomas Billing in 1449, Guy Fairfax in 1459 and Thomas Rigby in 1460 all left the office of Common Serjeant for that of Undersheriff. Billing moved on again in 1450 to become Recorder and he ultimately became a royal justice, as did John Fray, John Markham and John Fortescue.² By the end of this period the hierarchy of legal service in the City had become established as Common Serjeant, Undersheriff, Recorder and then, perhaps, royal justice.

The other members of the Sheriff's entourage were considerably less important. They may be divided into three categories; serjeants, valets or grooms and clerks. In 1404 it was decided to limit the number of serjeants to eight for each Sheriff. But in 1416 21 serjeants, 13 valets and 11 clerks were sworn, and in 1417, 22 serjeants, 18 valets and 11 clerks. In 1424 18 serjeants were sworn and in 1446 9 serjeants and

1. e.g. 19 October 1445, Jour.IV f.101; 24 October 1454, Jour.V f.202; July 1456, 21 February 1457, Jour.VI f.98, 93v.

2. Lond.Poss. sizes, p.xiii, n.2.

9 valets are listed although they probably represent the servants of only one of the Sheriffs.¹ In 1452 the Commonalty petitioned the Common Council that the Sheriffs should have only 12 serjeants each at most, and only four clerks (the Secondary, the Clerk of the Papers and two others), apart from the Undersheriff's staff. The Commonalty, moreover, wanted the serjeants to be men of substance since, when there are too many of them they 'coude nar con not alle gte their lyvyng but if they do extorc'ion and oppression to the comen people'.² Although the Common Council accepted this petition it appears to have had little effect, for in October 1453 the two Sheriffs were each allowed to have two serjeants and one clerk more than was allowed by the ordinance.³ Further in 1460 the Sheriffs were allowed to have as many serjeants as they wished providing that all the men who were chose for the job were freemen of the City.⁴ This dispensation was repeated in 1462, but in 1464 it was decided that the limiting ordinance of 1452 should be strictly observed and it was to be read out publicly each year to ensure that the retiring Sheriffs had observed it.⁵

The non-salaried position of the Sheriff's servants tended to offer a job which was open to abuse. The serjeants were entitled to

-
1. Jour.I f.iv., 39v.; Jour.II f.28v., Jour.IV f.156; .B.I., pp.32-33.
 2. 8 July 1452, Jour.V f.77v., L.B.K., pp.345-47.
 3. 3 October 1453, Jour.V f.122v.; 23 serjeants were sworn 12 November 1453, Jour.V f.130.
 4. 22 September 1460, Jour.VI f.267.
 5. Jour.VI f.22v., M.B.M., pp.13, 56.

certain specified sums for summoning people to Court and for assembling men for inquests. In 1458 it was agreed in Common Council that the rewards to these serjeants could be increased.¹ Apart from these agreed payments there might be additional chance sums which came to the serjeants and clerks.² The serjeants were not only servants of the Sheriff's Court but they were also expected to help the Sheriffs in all their duties, including the patrol of the City's streets at night in times of trouble.³ The particular task of the Sheriff's valets was to requisition horses and carts for civic purposes and 'que touz autrez voz faitz et ditz come boun et loial home vous porterez'.⁴ There is little to be said about the clerical servants of the Sheriffs. They received payments in the same way as the serjeants and valets and there was an established hierarchy. The Undersheriffs ranked as the first clerks and the two Secondaries derived their name from their position as second clerks. Although an act in 1356 had ordained that the Secondaries were to be annually elected, there is no indication in the fifteenth century of such a yearly change.⁵ It is possible that

-
1. Liber Albus, pp.520-21; 11 October 1458, Jour.VI f.234.
 2. e.g. 14 August 1367, an assize of novel disseisin in which the jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff and awarded him 100/- damages of which 20/- was to be given to the Sheriff's clerks and half a mark to the serjeants, Lond.Poss.Assizes, p.42.
 3. 18 July 1440, Jour.III f.47v.
 4. The valets were instructed not to take horses and carts belonging to people bringing goods to London to sell, but only horses and carts which were plying for hire, Liber Albus, p.319; L.B.I., p.115.
 5. 28 September 1356, L.B.G., p.72; Richard Tewelee is to be found serving as Secondary in 1416, 1417, 1424, see B.R. Masters, 'The Secondary', Guildhall Miscellany, vol.II, no.10 (1968), pp.425-33.

it was the task of the Secondary to compile the Sheriff's register of royal writs. Finally there were two Clerks of the Papers each of whom had at least two other clerks to help him.

It is not surprising that the Sheriff's servants made what they could out of their offices. In their persons they combined the duties of policemen, income-tax collectors and rent-collectors and were, accordingly, unpopular. Their job could be dangerous. When Richard Parys, one of the Sheriff's serjeants came to collect an amercement from Thomas Parker he was told that if he entered the house Parker would sheath his dagger in his bosom, and William Eustas, another serjeant, was hit over the head when he tried to move a prisoner from the bar of the court.¹ During this period seven of the Sheriff's servants were dismissed² and eight were sent to prison.³ Their offences

-
1. 28 July 1453, Jour.V f.116; 14 June 1448, Jour.IV f.220v.
 2. John Andrew dismissed for arresting someone contrary to civic ordinances, 5 December 1418, Jour.I f.52v.; John Horold, serjeant, dismissed for maltreating two prisoners, 1425, Jour.II f.48v.; John Frenssh dismissed for attacking someone so that his life was despaired of and the men of Bread St. ward brought a bill against him, 6, 8 July 1452, Jour.V f.77, 77v.; Richard Lovell, a clerk, dismissed for fornication, 2 July 1445, Jour.IV f.82; Henry Whitfeld dismissed for having arrested someone before he had been sworn to office, 6 November 1442, Jour.III f.179; John Westercote dismissed for an unspecified offence, 23 September 1439, Jour.III f.22v.; 2 April 1460 Penry Kesten, a clerk, dismissed for packing a jury, Jour.VI f.208.
 3. John Knyveton for saying that William Redebede had been placed in the stocks unjustly because of the prejudice of the Recorder, 14, 17, 27, 28 February 1417, Jour.I f.11, 11v., 12.; Thomas Stevenson and John Byron, clerks, for ignoring a Mayoral precept, 12 July 1454, Jour.V f.177; Robert Broker for attacking Alexander Manning in prison, 17 June 1452, Jour.V f.76; Richard Cote and John Rede, Sheriff's clerks for releasing two prisoners from the Counter without authority, 28 July 1455, Jour.V f.252; Alexander Brewster and John Cole, valet, for unspecified causes, 11 September 1449, 29 March 1452, Jour.V f.14v., 73. Richard Clare was criticized in 1395, Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, p.229; John Huntele, valet, escaped with a warning when brought before the Court of Aldermen for vagrancy, 1 March 1425,

(continued at foot of next page)

included arrest contrary to civic ordinances, assault, acting before sworn to office, disparaging the Recorder, ignoring a Mayoral precept, attacking a prisoner, packing of jury and releasing prisoners without due authority. But at least two Sheriff's officers received special rewards. Nicholas Ivory, a Sheriff's groom, was granted 13/4d. when he was languishing at the point of death 'for his good services and many costs in his office for the honour of the City', and in 1459 John Squyer, one of the Counter clerks, received a reward of 20/- for telling the King of the capture of Sir William Oldhall.¹ Moreover at least ten of the Sheriff's servants carried out their duties well enough to be promoted to offices elsewhere. Two became Esquires to the Mayor,² one became a Royal Serjeant at Arms,³ two became water bailiffs⁴ and one obtained the office of warden of Newgate gaol.⁵ A further servant was promoted to be a keeper of the Counter prison,⁶ one was the deputy coroner of the City⁷ and another became bailiff of Middlesex.⁸ To be a

-
1. 5 May 1458, Jour.VI f.242; 25 October 1459, Jour.VI f.164v.
 2. John Credy sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1416, 1417, Mayor's Esquire 1394-1419; John Hastings sworn as Sheriff's clerk 1416, 1417, Mayor's Esquire 1421-26.
 3. Belgrave sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1416, 1417, 1424, Royal Serjeant at Arms 1450, 1453, Jour.V f.30, 126.
 4. John Houghton sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1416, water bailiff 1431-45; John Goode sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1453, water bailiff 1457.
 5. Kingescote sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1417, warden of Newgate 1431.
 6. Thomas Ely sworn as valet 1416, 1417, Keeper of the Counter prison 1434, L.B.K., p.183.
 7. Richard Alfeld sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1416, 1417, Deputy Coroner intermittently between 1406 and 1422.
 8. Robert Broker sworn as Sheriff's serjeant 1446, Bailiff of Middlesex 1454, Jour.V f.202v.

(footnote 3 continued from previous page) Jour.II f.38. Thomas Holgrave a Sheriff's serjeant admitted packing a jury, 11, 28 October 1427, Jour.II f.102v., 98v.; he later became a permanent serjeant at mace of the Mayor.

member of the Sheriff's entourage was not attractive in itself and the positions could be easily abused, but to men of determination it could offer the means of promotion to offices of greater status and more legitimate reward.

Apart from the annually elected Mayor and Sheriffs the City was served by three permanent and important officers: the Recorder, the Chamberlain and the Common or Town Clerk. Each of these officers would be served by a secretariat of clerks of serjeants. The Chamberlain's office was probably the oldest and the duties and titles of the Recorder and Common Clerk had become defined in the reign of Edward I. In the late thirteenth century the Common Serjeant at Law, as the general supervisor of the City's legal system, was as important an officer as the Chamberlain and Common Clerk, and was probably more important than the Recorder, whose title first appears in 1304.¹ But by the fifteenth century the Recorder, who was concerned with the external legal position of the City, was probably more important than the Common Serjeant. This is suggested not only by the nature of his duties but also by the transfer of John Fray, Alexander Anne, Robert Danvers, Thomas Billing and Thomas Urswyk from the office of Common Serjeant to that of Recorder in the period under review.² For this reason the office of Common Serjeant

-
1. For the early history of these civic officers, see G. Williams, Medieval London (London 1963), pp.93-96.
 2. For lists of Recorders and Common Serjeants see Appendices, pp. nos 5 & 9 pp. 559 & 563.

at Law will be described in the section at the end of this chapter on the City's serjeantry.

This growth in importance of the office of Recorder may well be dated to the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries when the royal pressure on the City was severe.¹ Certainly the calibre of the men who occupied this office in the fifteenth century was high. John Bowys, Thomas Billing and Thomas Urswyk were all chosen to represent the City in Parliament² and Billing and Urswyk, together with John Fray, John Prestone and Robert Danvers were subsequently appointed as royal justices.³

The Recorder was chosen by the Court of Aldermen who would vote between candidates if they could not come to a unanimous decision. In 1426 John Symond received 13 votes while his opponent, Rackford, received only three, and there were two abstentions.⁴ In 1438 the Court of Aldermen was unanimous in its decision to offer the office to a man named Asshe, but he must have refused for Thomas Cokyn was subsequently elected with 'P' for placet written over the name of every Alderman present except one.⁵ On one occasion the King tried to influence the

-
1. See Chapter VI.
 2. Thomas Billing was an M.P. in 1449; Thomas Urswyk in 1463, 1467, 1470; John Bowys in 1442, Beaven, I, p.272.
 3. John Prestone a Justice of Common Pleas 1415-22; John Fray a Baron of the Exchequer 1425 and Chief Baron 1436-48; Robert Danvers a Justice of Common Pleas 1450-67; Thomas Billing a Justice of King's Bench 1464 and Chief Justice of King's Bench 1469-81; Thomas Urswyk Chief Baron of the Exchequer 1471-79.
 4. Jour.II f.86.
 5. 21, 23, 27 October 1438, Jour.III f.163v. Thomas Billing was elected Recorder 21 September 1450 at a meeting of the Commonalty summoned to choose the Sheriffs. The clerk of the Journals is careful to note, however, that the Recorder was elected by the Mayor and Aldermen alone, Jour.V f.46v.

Court in its choice of Recorder but whether this attempt was successful is not clear.¹ Once elected the Recorder received a fee of 100 marks p.a., a livery such as the Mayor and Aldermen wore and a clerk who received the same livery as the serjeants of the Chamber.² What is, perhaps, more surprising is that retired Recorders occasionally received some sort of pension. John Barton was awarded £10 a quarter and John Bowys who was old and infirm was allowed 20 marks p.a.³ But the Recorder's salary was not always promptly paid. Robert Danvers in March 1452 was still owed 100 marks for his service during the years 1447-50 and some provision had to be made by the Court of Aldermen for paying this sum.⁴

The duties of the Recorder as listed in the Liber Albus and according to the terms of his oath, required that he should be skilled in law, that he should sit with the Mayor when he heard pleas and delivered judgments, that he should act as spokesman for the City and report processes verbally to the judges in error sitting at St. Martin's, that he should record and enrol pleas, and that he should administer the same law to rich and poor, caring for orphans and keeping secret

-
1. 6 July 1440, Court of Aldermen received a royal letter for the Recorder, but the royal candidate is not named. 13 July 1440, John Bowys sworn, Jour.III f.45v., 46.
 2. Liber Albus, pp.42-43.
 3. 17 November 1422, Jour.II f.1; 14 July 1442, Jour.III f.41. Thomas Billing, after he had ceased to be the City's Recorder was retained at a fee to be of the City's Counsel, 2 December 1454, Jour.V f.210v.
 4. 23 March 1452, Danvers was to receive 50 marks at Michaelmas and 50 marks during the next year, Jour.V f.72v.

the City's counsels.¹ From the Journals it is clear that the Recorders were assiduous in their attendance at the Court of Aldermen and Mayor's Court.² In 1440 the Recorder had to defend the City's right to report verbally to the judges at St. Martin's and it may have been in connection with this business that John Bowys rode to Parliament in that year.³ The Recorder's name is frequently to be found among those serving on deputations to be sent to the King.⁴ But it is in two capacities not mentioned in the Liber Albus that the Recorder is to be found acting most often: as an arbiter and as a witness.⁵ Another duty which fell to the Recorder was that of acting as Returning Officer at the Mayor's election. When, on 13 October 1426, the City was without a Recorder, it was decided that the Prior of Christ Church should examine the votes cast and should faithfully report who had been chosen by the most.⁶

-
1. Liber Albus, pp.42-43, oath pp.308-09.
 2. ~~See Appendix no. —, p.~~
 3. 13 January, 15 April 1440, Jour.III f.34, 41v., Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, 11 July 1440, p.38.
 4. E.g. Robert Danvers, Recorder, a member of the deputation sent to the Chancellor at Chiswick to report the response of the Mayor and Aldermen to the King's request for a loan, 17 July 1444, Jour.IV f.34v.
 5. Acting as arbiter, e.g. Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.2, 39, 177, Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, p.48; 17 March 1424 the Recorder acted as an arbiter in a plea of Fresh Force, Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.172-73, Lond.Poss.Assizes, p.xxi; acting as a witness, e.g. Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, pp.118, 126, 137; the Recorder was also one of the judges in the usury cases of 1421, Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.100-06.
 6. Jour.II f.85v.; the role of the Recorder in the Mayor's election is also mentioned in Liber Albus, p.21.

It is difficult to determine how faithfully the Recorder exercised his duties. In February 1417 John Barton was accused of treating William Redehead unjustly because he came from the town of Barnet, and Barton was Seneschall of the lands of St. Alban's Abbey which was at loggerheads with Barnet town.¹ In 1455 Thomas Shelley, a Mercer, accused the Recorder of being 'chief counsel' with Shelley's opponent Simon Dawdeley.² What worried the Court of Aldermen more than these stray accusations of partiality was the Recorder's propensity to become involved in legal suits and business other than that of the City. It appears that Alexander Anne was dismissed for this reason and his successor was appointed on condition that he reject all other fees except that of the City.³ When Thomas Billing became a Serjeant at Law and found that he could be profitably employed at Westminster, and on Assizes elsewhere, he resigned his office as Recorder.⁴ The Londoners paid their Recorder a very handsome salary and in return they required his undivided attention.

The Chamberlain, despite the antiquity of his office and the heavy nature of his responsibilities, was not as highly paid as the Recorder, but received, like the Common Clerk, only £10 p.a.⁵ During this period,

-
1. 27 February 1417, Jour.I f.12v.
 2. 7 August 1455, Jour.V f.254.
 3. 15, 21 October 1438, Jour.III f.163, 163v.
 4. 3 October 1454, Jour.V f.196.
 5. Liber Albus, pp.47-48.

as earlier, the Chamberlains were not professionals but appear to have carried on with their trades while in office. Three of them were Mercers, two were Fishmongers, two were Drapers, one was a Grocer and one a Tailor. But these 'amateur' Chamberlains were served by a body of full-time, professional and experienced clerks and serjeants. Unlike the other City officers, the Chamberlain seems to have been entitled to few perquisites. He was not, in this period, provided either with a house or a livery. When, however, John Sturgeon ceased to be Chamberlain in September 1454 after four years in office, it was decided that he should receive a reward for his good and diligent service. This was to take the form of a robe each Christmas and a 'golden handshake' amounting in all to £22 16s.8d.¹

Since 1404 the Chamberlain had been elected each year by the Commonalty at the same meeting on September 21st when the Sheriffs, Bridgewardens and Auditors were chosen. An initial experiment to prevent the re-election of a Chamberlain who had served for two years was abandoned as impractical.² The Mayor and Aldermen did not, however,

1. 27, 28 September 1454, Jour.V f.194, 194v. The sum of £22 16s.8d. was arrived at thus:-

Reward for time as Bridgemaster	£7. 10s. 6d.
Reward for his first year as Chamberlain above his allotted £10	£3. 6s. 8d.
Breakfast for the Auditors above the 40/- allotted for this expense	£1. 6s. 8d.
Reimbursement of the £2 13s.4d. paid by him each year during his tenure of office to John Deye for collecting the Philpot rents	£10. 13s. 4d.

2. Liber Albus, p.48; 23 September 1404, L.B.I., pp.33, 35; the Chamberlain's election, after that of the Sheriffs, is not so recorded during the period 1408-1417, see L.B.I., pp.68-69, 189.

stand as aloof from the election of the Chamberlain as the procedure laid down in the 1404 ordinance would seem to suggest. In 1423 John Bederenden was re-elected as Chamberlain on the advice of the Mayor and Aldermen.¹ The attempts by the Commonalty to elect William Cottisbroke as Chamberlain during the artisan troubles of 1443 were firmly suppressed by the Aldermen who reinstated John Chichele and in the following year re-elected him to office without consulting the Commonalty.² Moreover, although John Middleton was officially elected as Chamberlain by an 'immense Commonalty' in 1449, in the Journal it is clear that the Mayor and Aldermen voted for Middleton who received fifteen of the eighteen votes cast.³

Towards the end of this period it became the practice, after the election of the Chamberlain, to require him to produce some security for his tenure of office. John Chichele was re-elected in 1448 on condition that he provided 'sufficient security'.⁴ The procedure was amplified in 1449 when John Middleton was elected; he himself and five others provided sureties to four Aldermen, the Recorder and the Common

-
1. 13 September 1423, Jour.II f.8v.
 2. See Chapter IV, pp.304-306.
 3. 21 September 1449, Jour.V f.15, L.B.K., pp.328-29. Two of the Aldermen voted for a man whose name began with S. and one voted for a man whose name began with C.
 4. 21 September 1448, Jour.IV f.228.

Serjeant at Law.¹ When Thomas Thornton was elected five years later, four fellow Drapers joined him in an obligation of £1000 to John Norman, the Mayor, and his successors.²

The Chamberlain's duties were listed in the Liber Albus and defined in his oath. His primary duty was to look after the City's cash and to maintain the lands, tenements and rents belonging to the Chamber 'which shall, according to reason, increase'. He received the fees for, and so virtually controlled, entries to the City franchise. Together with the Common Clerk, the Chamberlain was concerned with the keeping of the City's records and muniments which were to be carefully guarded and shown only to suitable persons. Finally the Chamberlain was to protect and administer the goods of orphans and keep secret the City's counsel.³ Although the finances of the City were, for several reasons, overstrained in this period there is no indication that the Chamberlains were considered to have failed in their duty of guarding the City's finances. Occasionally the Chamberlains were made personally responsible for loans borrowed for specific civic purposes,⁴ and sometimes the examination of Chamber receipts and expenditure went beyond the usual annual survey.⁵ In this period it fell to the Chamberlain's lot to act as 'estates bursar' not only for the City's lands but also for the lands given to endow the

-
1. 23 September 1449, Jour.V f.15v.; the four other mainpernors were Geoffrey Feldyng, John Harowe, Robert Baron and Thomas Muschamp.
 2. 30 September 1454, Jour.V f.195; Thornton's mainpernors were Philip Malpas, John Stokker, Stephen Grene, John Whitehede.
 3. Liber Albus, pp.48, 309-10.
 4. E.g. 26 January 1447, Jour.IV f.158v.
 5. E.g. 12 January 1437, Jour.III f.124; 13 September 1440, Jour.III f.58v.; 7 February 1447, Jour.IV f.162.

Guildhall chapel, providing the income from which the Chamberlain was to pay the salaries of the chaplains.¹ In obedience to his oath to increase the City's profits from its lands, the Chamberlain in 1425 put Moorfields to farm 'pro meliore quo poterit ad opus communitatis'.² Moreover on several occasions the Chamberlain was called upon to defend the Common Soil from encroachments as for example when the Rector and parishioners of St. Botolph's Billingsgate wanted to extend the east end of the church to enlarge the Vestry in 1455.³ There is no recorded case of the Chamberlain admitting anyone unlawfully to the Freedom, although the number of regulations governing this became more numerous in this period.⁴

The Chamberlain's duties in relation to the City's records became defined as the Common Clerk's responsibilities in this sphere increased. There are no surviving Chamberlain's accounts until the sixteenth century, but his concern with the City's cash inevitably came to include the control of such things as royal tallies, title deeds, bonds and obligations - all of which could be termed 'City assets'.⁵ In 1417 the Chamberlain was entrusted with a Letter of Privy Seal and an indenture between the Mayor and the Royal Treasurer concerning the Spanish sword given to the Londoners as security for a loan.⁶ John Chichele, when

1. 2 July 1417, Jour.I f.24.

2. 29 September 1425, Jour.II f.53.

3. 10 May 1455, Jour.V f.241v.; see also Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, p.ix.

4. See Chapter III, pp. 199-209.

5. None of the Chamberlain's own records survive from this period. The earliest surviving Chamberlain's accounts are for 1536-37, G.R.O. Ms.35B. The Sheriffs were expected to hand over their Court records on leaving office to the Mayor who would hand these records over to the Chamberlain 'pur sauvement garder', Liber Albus, p.45.

6. 2 October 1417, Jour.I f.35; see Cha. VII p.443

Chamberlain, was given at different times, a City charter and the Common Seal for safe-keeping,¹ and when he ceased to be Chamberlain he was instructed by the Mayor to hand over a chest containing books, evidence and tallies which he had accumulated during his term of office.² In 1453 the Court of Aldermen decided that the Rolls and Memoranda in the custody of the Chamberlain should not be shown to anyone unless that person had a particular interest. Moreover an enquirer might only have a copy or exemplification of a record with the consent either of the Chamberlain or his deputy, or of the Common Clerk or his deputy.³

The Chamberlain's administration of the goods of orphans is discussed elsewhere, but there is every indication that in this period these duties were well and conscientiously carried out.⁴ It is difficult to know whether the Chamberlain observed the injunction in his oath 'le conseil de la citee celerez'. With the other aldermen, however, who were in Court on 20 May 1427 he swore on the Gospels that he would not reveal to anyone the business transacted 'in curia et camera'.⁵

So much for the Chamberlain's duties as laid down in the Liber Albus and in his oath, but the Journals reveal that the Chamberlain's

-
1. 15 November 1447, Jour.IV f.201; 4 September 1448, Jour.IV f.225v.
 2. 8 October 1451, Jour.V f.63v.; John Littleton was also given royal tallies to look after, Jour.V f.18; 20 November 1450, Court of Aldermen decided that a royal tally was to remain in the Chamber, Jour.V f.47v.
 3. 1 December 1453, Jour.V f.135.
 4. See Chapter III, pp. 212-220.
 5. 24 May 1427, Jour.II f.93v.

activities were not confined to these tasks. He was often present at meetings of the Court of Aldermen.¹ John Hill when he was Chamberlain had to gather rush boats and clean the City streets.² John Bederenden was instructed to collect aulnage in the City.³ It fell to the Chamberlain's lot in 1453 to provide samples of cloth for the City's liveries and to see to its ordering and making up.⁴ The Chamberlain might be instructed to take part in the search of the Thames,⁵ or to levy a City subsidy,⁶ or to deal with complaints made by Cordwainers and Cobblers against each other.⁷ Like other City officers he was expected to serve on committees.⁸

To help him carry out these duties the Chamberlain had a deputy or clerk who was first called the Controller in 1454.⁹ Such men must have been very experienced for there were only three occupants of this

-
1. E.g. John Bederenden attended in March 1423, 27 March 1424, 20 April 1425, 24 July 1425, 21 January 1427, 31 January 1427, Jour.II f.4v., 16v., 41, 47v., 88v., 89; John Chichele present in Court 14, 17 December 1436, Jour.III f.125v., 125; Thomas Thornton present in Court 1 April 1457, Jour.VI f.118.
 2. 29 September 1419, Jour.I f.61. 3. 11 October 1425, Jour.II f.54.
 4. 17 May 1453, Jour.V f.110v. 5. 12 September 1453, Jour.V f.120v.
 6. 16 January 1429, Jour.II f.136. 7. 5 February 1455, Jour.V f.220v.
 8. E.g. John Middleton appointed to Billingsgate committee, 13 February 1450, Jour.V f.30v.; John Sturgeon appointed to Granary committee January 1452, 7 June 1453, Jour.V f.70, 111v.; Thomas Thornton appointed to Newgate committee 10 September 1455, Jour.V f.260v.; and to Cripplegate committee, 8 March 1460, Jour.VI f.205.
 9. This clerk was entitled to receive half of the 12d. fee taken for entering freedoms, and a further reward at the discretion of the annual auditors, Liber Albus, p.48.

office between 1400 and 1478.¹ Richard Osbarn, the first clerk during this period, was provided with a house for which he paid 40/- p.a. His salary is not specified but when he retired in 1437 the Court of Aldermen provided him with a house, an annual robe and a pension of £6 13s. 4d. p.a. His successor, William Chedworth, was assigned a salary of £5 p.a.² The clerk's duties were multifarious. Richard Osbarn acted frequently both as an executor and as an arbiter. Robert Langford was one of Carpenter's executors.³ The clerk helped to levy subsidies and to receive the money,⁴ he might be present in Court⁵ or act as clerk to various committees,⁶ he might see to the cleaning of the streets⁷ or be sent as a member of a deputation to the King.⁸

-
1. For list, see Appendix, p. 7, p. 561.
 2. 11 March 1400, L.B.I., pp.6-7, 10-11; granted £5 p.a. 21 September 1437, Jour.III f.191; amount increased to £6 13s.4d., 28 September 1437, Jour.III f.191v.; at a meeting of the Common Council his pension was agreed, 15 November 1437, Jour.III f.188v.; Osbarn was dead by 13 June 1438 and John Carpenter was a feoffee for him, Hustings Wills, vol.II, pp.484-85; Jour.III f.171, 8.
 3. For Osbarn as an executor see L.B.I. passim; as an arbiter see Jour.II f.33v., 92v., 104, 116v., 135; for Langford as Carpenter's executor, see Cal. P. and L. 1457-82, pp.ix, 128 n.1.
 4. Osbarn was a commissioner to raise a royal subsidy 28 August 1430, L.B.K., p.111; he received £100 from the revenues of London Bridge, 10 February 1417, Jour.I f.42v.; Chedworth was a receiver of money to be lent to the King, 23 March 1444, Jour.IV f.20v.; similarly for expenses in defending the City, 7 February 1445, Jour.IV f.63v.; he was to levy ameracements and sums due to the Chamber according to the City's charter, 28 April 1447, Jour.IV f.175v.; Langford received money for the Conduit 1449-50, Jour.V f.84 and administered loans 1460-61, Jour.VI f.55.
 5. E.g. Osbarn present in Court, 27 March 1424, Jour.II f.16v.
 6. E.g. Chedworth clerk to Aquaduct committee, 16 March 1439, Jour.III f.11
 7. Chedworth received repayment for his costs in cleaning the streets near the Tower, 2 October 1445, Jour.IV f.98v.
 8. Chedworth served on various deputations, 17 July 1444, 17 November 1447, 16 March 1448, Jour.IV f.34v., 201, 213; Langford was sent to the Bishop of London for a Papal Bull, 14 March 1454, Jour.V f.153.

For a time William Chedworth was made Controller of the City's Great Bear.¹ The office was growing in importance and this was acknowledged on 28 September 1454 when Robert Langford, who had been in the Chamberlain's office since 1437 and who had succeeded William Chedworth as clerk in 1450, was admitted and sworn as Controller and Clerk of the Chamber.² Apart from the Controller there were to be three serjeants to serve the Chamberlain in business touching the Chamber but, unfortunately, due to loose descriptions, it is impossible to distinguish these men from the serjeants serving the Mayor.³

Although the Chamberlains during this period ~~were~~ not professionals it seems clear that most of them had shown some interest in civic finance before being chosen as Chamberlain. John Bederenden had been present at a meeting on 15 September 1418 when it was decided how much should be paid to the merchants supplying goods to the King at Rouen, and he was elected an auditor in the year before his election as Chamberlain.⁴ John Middleton was a Master of his Company, the Mercers,

-
1. See Chapter III, pp. 235-236.
 2. Langford in Chamber office 1437, Jour.III f.195v.; Clerk, 24 September 1450, Jour.V f.47; Controller, 28 September 1454, Jour.V f.194v.
 3. Robert Blounte and Thomas Kirton appear as Chamber officials of some kind, although not as Serjeants of the Chamber. Blounte was described as 'one of the clerks of the Mayor's Court' 21 October 1454, Jour.V f.201 and Kirton is described as 'clerk of the Court' 13 March 1461, Jour.VI f.24. Both men were associated in tasks with Langford, Jour.V f.153, 173, Jour.VI f.147v., and both were concerned at different times with the receiving or dispensing of City cash, Jour.V f.154, 156v., 201. Blounte is often to be found acting as an attorney in the Chamber, Cal. P. and M. 1437-57 and Cal. P. and M. 1458-82 passim, Lond.Poss.Assizes, pp.127-28.
 4. 15 September 1418, Jour.I f.48; L.B.I., p.226.

four years before he was chosen as Chamberlain.¹ As early as 1436 John Sturgeon could be described as a master and good man of the Mercers' Company and in 1438 he was elected an auditor.² He was a Common Councilman by 1437 and served as receiver of sums levied in the City on several occasions, as well as on numerous committees.³ In 1445 he was an M.P. and acted as temporary Bridgemaster from January to September 1449.⁴ Although he became Chamberlain in the following year his ambition was perhaps too apparent for, in 1446, he was accused of having written on a wall three times 'John Sturgeon Alderman', and this ambition he never realized.⁵ Thomas Thornton was also a Common Councilman by April 1444 and he served on various committees before being elected as Chamberlain in 1454.⁶ The office of Chamberlain does not, however, appear to have been a stepping stone to promotion. John Middleton was the only occupant of the office during these years who succeeded in becoming first a Sheriff and then an Alderman in 1456. But Middleton had been an unsuccessful candidate as Alderman, twice in 1451 and once

-
1. 22 February 1445, Jour.IV f.65. 2. L.B.K., pp.201. 219.
 3. 15 November 1437, Jour.III f.188v.; a receiver, 30 March 1439, Jour.III f.13; on committees, 23 March 1442, 2 May 1442, 24 April 1444 (two), 15 July 1444, 18 June 1445, 14 July 1447, 9 May 1448, Jour.III f.114v., 115; Jour.IV f.23, 34, 81v., 184v., 217; Sturgeon was entrusted with a key of the Common Chest, 11 October 1447, Jour.IV f.195v.
 4. 21 January 1445, Jour.IV f.59v.; 24 January 1449, Jour.V f.4v.
 5. His accusers were Robert Osgood and Thomas Creek who also said that he had done much harm in Parliament, 3 March 1446, Jour.IV f.119v.
 6. 24 April 1444, Jour.IV f.23; on committees 20 April 1450, 2 October 1452, 15 February 1453, Jour.V f.34, 47v., 88v., 103v.

in 1456. John Chichele failed to be elected as an Alderman in 1437, as did Thomas Thornton in 1458, and in 1460 he was rejected by the Court of Aldermen on three separate occasions. The over-ambitious John Sturgeon was never even selected as a candidate for an Aldermanry. These rejections suggest that the Chamberlains during this period may have been more popular with the community at large than they were with the members of the Court of Aldermen who made the final selection. On the other hand it must be noted that it was the Aldermen who supported John Chichele in September 1443 when the Commons cried for him to be replaced by William Cottesbroke as Chamberlain.

It is not surprising that John Carpenter, who occupied the office of Common Clerk from 1417-1438, and who compiled the Liber Albus during that time, was more specific about the duties and rewards of the office which he held, than about any other. The Common Clerk was elected by the Common Council and received £10 p.a. for his services.¹ Carpenter notes, however, that he was also to receive 10d. for every deed or will which was enrolled in the Hustings, 2/- for every deed enrolled in the Mayor's rolls and 6d. for every writ for Assizes of Nuisance, for writs 'de intrusione' and for precepts to the Sheriffs for

1. Liber Albus, pp.47-48, 311-12. Carpenter states that the Common Clerk was elected by the Common Council of the City. All the Common Clerks whose elections are recorded during this period (see Appendix no 8 p.562) were elected by the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council. After Richard Barnet had been elected in this way, the Mayor and Aldermen decided that he should remain in office for a year, i.e. 1438-39. In fact he served the City until 1446, Jour.III f.164-164v.

cases in the Hustings.¹ The Common Clerk was also entitled to receive sustenance for his clerks although their number is not specified.² But apart from these remunerations listed by Carpenter, there were others. John Marchaunt had a house over the middle gate of Guildhall, Richard Barnet was made free of the City, and Roger Spicer received a civic livery at the time of Parliament in 1453 and in 1458 he was granted a reward of £29 17s. Od.³ Carpenter himself was granted a reward of 10 marks by the Court of Aldermen for his labours for the City, which could refer to his service as an M.P. or to the compiling of the Liber Albus.⁴

In addition to these official remunerations, the Common Clerk appears to have received payments in cash or kind from the City Companies who were always anxious to have a friend at Guildhall. Carpenter received cloth from the Taylors' Company in 1418 as well as a total of 10/- for helping the Master and Wardens draw up a supplication to be presented to the Mayor and Aldermen.⁵ The Grocers paid Carpenter and

1. Liber Albus, p.48. The Common Clerk was also to receive 6d. for each writ of scire facias and fieri facias which he drafted, except those done for Aldermen. See Lond.Poss.Assizes, p.xvii. During the period of John Carpenter's Common Clerkship an average of 72 deeds and wills were enrolled each year which would have brought about 60/- p.a. into the pocket of the Common Clerk.
2. John Carpenter was clerk to John Marchaunt, L.B.I., pp.179-80; Richard de la Felde was clerk to Richard Barnet, October 1439, Jour.III f.25; Robert Helsey was sworn as a clerk of the Court of Aldermen, 4 April 1441, Jour.III f.82v.; Robert Aston was one of the clerks serving Roger Spicer, December 1456, Jour.VI f.88.
3. L.B.I., pp.179-80; Barnet was made free of the City, 11 October 1438, Jour.III f.163; Spicer received livery, 8 March 1453, Jour.V f.105; Spicer granted special reward, which was to be paid to William Cantelowe to whom he owed the money, 11 October 1458, Jour.VI f.234.
4. 10 June 1440, Jour.III f.44.
5. Merchant Taylors' Hall, Ms. A 4 Accounts 1397-1445, f.103v., 105.

others 26/8d. for enrolling a deed in 1419 and in the following year Carpenter received a further 20/- from the Brewers¹ for counsel and for his various labours on their behalf.¹ Roger Spicer received 6/8d. from the Cutlers in 1451 and the same amount from the Pewterers in 1456 'for saying of the ordinances that the six men of the craft made'.² Spicer also wrote some letters for the Mercers' Company in 1457 for which he was paid 3/4d. and in the following year he, together with the Common Serjeant, Guy Fairfax, was entertained to breakfast at the King's Head by the Carpenters' Company at a total cost of 13/11d.³

According to John Carpenter it was the duty of the Common Clerk, together with the Chamberlain, to keep and control the City's records and to authorize the making of transcripts. It also fell to the Common Clerk to enrol pleas in the Hustings and for the Assise of Nuisance, with the assent of the Mayor and Recorder. He was to be obedient to the Mayor and City Counsel, secret and assiduous in the service of the City, and responsible for his own clerks.⁴

There is little evidence about the activities of the Common Clerks in any of these duties except that of keeping the records. But, like

-
1. Kingdon, Brocers' Accounts, vol. I, f.133; Guildhall Library, Ms.5440, Brewers' Account Book 1418-1440, f.25-26v.
 2. Guildhall Library Ms.7146 Cutlers' Rolls no.5, this judgment has not survived in the City's rolls; Guildhall Library, Ms.7086/1 Pewterers' Accounts, f.14.
 3. Mercers' Hall, Wardens Accounts 1347-1464, f.191; Bower Marsh, ed. Records of Worshipful Company of Carpenters (Oxford, 1914), vol. II, Wardens' Account Book 1438-1510, p.28.
 4. Liber Albus, pp.47-48, 311-12.

the Chamberlain, the Common Clerk was sworn to secrecy in 1427.¹ There is however, a considerable amount of evidence to show the increasingly important role which the Common Clerk came to play in the keeping of the City's records. As early as 1426 John Carpenter was in possession of certain financial obligations, and in February 1428 an obligation to the Sheriffs was placed in his safe-keeping.² Later in that year records from the shrievalty of Simon Winchcombe (1383-4) were brought into court and delivered to him.³ By 1443 the control of the Common Clerk over the records must have been nearly ~~absolute~~ ^{complete} since he alone was enjoined not to deliver any of the City's books to the Chamber clerks.⁴ In 1453, however, both the Chamberlain and the Common Clerk were instructed in the administration of the City's rolls and Memoranda.⁵ But when John Middleton, the late Chamberlain, in 1456 brought into Court certain evidences about lands and tenements which had been bequeathed to the City by John Reynwell, they were handed over, not to the Chamberlain but to the Common Clerk.⁶ Moreover when Willian Dunthorne was chosen as Common Clerk five years after this, it was decided that three Aldermen

1. 24 May 1427, Jour.II f.93v.
2. 5 March 1426, Jour.II f.64; February 1428, Jour.II f.107v.
3. 11 August 1428, L.B.K., p.76.
4. 16 October 1443, Jour.IV f.10v.; possibly this vigilance came as a result of the artisan trouble, i.e. the Aldermen did not want the artisans to have access to uncomfortable precedents, see Chapter IV.
5. 1 December 1453, Jour.V f.135.
6. August 1456, Jour.VI f.104.

should supervise the books and records which the Chamberlain was to deliver up to the Common Clerk by an indenture between them.¹ Finally in 1462 the Mayor and Aldermen decided that all the records in the Chamberlain's possession were to be delivered to the Common Clerk by indenture, and he was to be completely responsible for them.²

Apart from his duties in connection with the safe-keeping of the City's records, the Common Clerk also compiled them. John Carpenter and William Dunthorne both compiled books of civic custom and precedent which they appear to have done, not in the course of duty, but out of personal zeal.³ More officially, however, the Common Clerk was responsible for compiling the City Journals and the Letter Books. It is unlikely that he wrote the Journals himself, since there is no gap or noticeable difference during the period when Roger Spicer was away in Rome, but it seems clear that they fell under his general supervision. Journal III which covers the years 1436-1442 bears several signs of having been in the custody of Richard Barnet who became Common Clerk in October 1438. The list of Aldermen appears to have been written in at this time, possibly when Barnet succeeded Carpenter. Moreover

-
1. October 1461, Jour.VI f.7v.
 2. 7 May 1462, L.B.L., p.17; the working of this new arrangement can be seen as early as 21 May 1462 when a letter and acquittance arising out of a case in the Mayor's Court were to remain in the custody of the Common Clerk, in the Upper Chamber where the records were kept in a certain chest, Cal. P. and M. 1458-82, pp.27-28.
 3. G.R.O. Liber Albus and Liber Dunthorne (comp. c.1474).

there are three entries in the book which might be described as of a 'private' nature and concern obligations and debts in which Barnet was himself involved.¹ Journal IV which covers the years 1442 to 1447, and hence four years of Barnet's tenure of office, also has a couple of these 'private' entries on Barnet's behalf.² But this somewhat cavalier use of the City's books, paper and ink was not imitated by other Common Clerks.

The Common Clerk also performed other tasks which were not specified in the Liber Albus. Sometimes he attended meetings of the Court of Aldermen.³ He supervised the writing of letters sent under the Mayor's seal and of Mayoral precepts,⁴ and he served on committees.⁵ As the century progressed, and especially during Roger Spicer's tenure of the office from 1446-1461, the Common Clerk came to be used with increasing frequency as an envoy. Richard Barnet was among those sent to the Chancellor at Chiswick in July 1444,⁵ and Spicer was frequently absent from the City. In 1448 he rode to Windsor with the Aldermen⁶

-
1. 14 January 1441, Memorandum of debt of 11/- owed by R. Barnet to John Rowe, one of the Bridge collectors, Jour.III f.71; 4 October 1441, Robert Blome, one of the clerks of the works at London Bridge, acknowledges receipt of a roll of accounts from Richard Barnet, Jour.III f.96; there are several entries concerning the goods of Alice Kympton who was being sued for debt, and whose goods were in the custody of Richard Barnet, Jour.III f.132, see Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, p.38.
 2. 6 April 1444, John Dobyll, draper, acknowledges a debt of 100/- to Barnet payable at Easter 1445, Jour.IV f.22v.; rough draft of an obligation of Richard Barnet, secretary of the City, to J.W. gentleman, payable of the feast of All Saints ?1444, Jour.IV f.235v.
 3. 31 January 1427, Jour.II f.89; 1 April 1457, 2 May 1459, Jour.VI f.118, 157v.
 4. 27 October 1440? Jour.III f.64v.; 6 October 1449, Jour.V f.16; 3 September 1457, L.B.K., p.382.
 5. 17 July 1444, Jour.IV f.34v. 6. 16 March 1448, Jour.IV f.213.

and in 1452 he was sent to Rome to prosecute the City's case against the claims of the London clergy for increased tithes. En route to Rome he was arrested and detained in the prison of the Archbishop of Cologne where he remained at least until October 1453. Spicer was still absent from the City in July 1454 but he attended a meeting of the Court of Aldermen in the following November, after two years' absence from the City.¹ In 1455 Spicer served on a deputation dealing with St. Martin's and in 1459 he was appointed to a deputation to the King.² But in spite of all these good services for the City, he was dismissed in August 1461 for his Lancastrian sympathies, and cut off without a pension.³

The careers of the Common Clerks were circumscribed. Unlike the Recorders, they did not move on into the Royal service. On the other hand they were not amateurs like the Chamberlains but were trained as clerks. Certainly John Carpenter, and perhaps Roger Spicer, had worked in the office of the Common Clerk before themselves being promoted to the Common Clerkship itself. In the City they were widely respected and appear frequently as executors, arbiters, attorneys and recipients of the gifts of goods and chattels. John Carpenter was elected as an M.P. for the City in 1437 and 1439; but apart from this they appear primarily as hard-working and conscientious civil servants, although Richard Barnet did not escape the biting censure of Ralph Holland during the artisan troubles of 1443.⁴

1. See Chapter III, pp.

2. 6 October 1455, Jour.V f.266; 10 October 1459, Jour.VI f.144v.

3. 5 August, 23 October 1461, Jour.VI f.46, 82.

4. See Chapter IV, pp. 315.

The civil service responsible for the executive business of the City was provided by a corps of serjeants. Of these the two most important were the Common Serjeant at Law or Common Pleader, and the Common Serjeant at Arms or Common Crier. The first recorded appointment of a Common Serjeant at Law came in 1291 and since that date he had always been one of the most important civic officers.¹ His duties were chiefly legal and stemmed from his position as spokesman for the Common Council by whom he was elected,² though not without some prior consideration by the Court of Aldermen. He received an annual fee of £10 and some of the Common Serjeants during this period were also provided with houses.³ The Common Serjeant at Law was particularly concerned with the custody and protection of orphans,⁴ and he also drafted

-
1. L.B.A., p.123; for a discussion of the office of Common Serjeant at Law and a list of holders of the office, see Betty R. Masters, 'The Common Serjeant', Guildhall Miscellany, vol.II, no.9 (1967) pp.379-89.
 2. Liber Albus, p.47; a Common Council was especially summoned to elect the Common Serjeant on 19 September 1443, but the decision that no-one should be elected had already been taken by the Court of Aldermen, Jour.IV f.4, 4v., 9; in the same way on 11 November 1437 the Court of Aldermen chose John Wilton as Common Serjeant, and four days later he was duly elected by the Common Council, Jour.III f.188, 188v.
 3. Liber Albus, p.47; Alexander Anne was granted a house over Aldgate, Jour.II f.132.
 4. See oath of Common Serjeant, Liber Albus, p.310; Masters, op.cit., p.380; Chapter III, pp. 212-220.

indictments and prosecuted on behalf of the City, attended meetings of the Court of Aldermen, acted as an arbiter and served on committees.¹ The oath of the Common Serjeant at Law described the general nature of his work 'En attendant serrez sur les Mair, et Audermans, et Comunes, pur lez causes et busoignes de la citee, as toutz temps qe vous serres a ce requys et chargez'. Between 1390 and 1463 fifteen men served the City in this capacity; five of these men became Recorders and six of them were Undersheriffs.² In the fifteenth century the office, while clearly important and requiring considerable legal skill, was but a stepping-stone to higher things.

By comparison the office of Common Serjeant at Arms was a humble one requiring no particular skill but a loud voice. According to John Carpenter in the Liber Albus the Common Crier was to be in constant attendance upon the Mayor and execute his commands. When he made cries throughout the City at the request of the Sheriffs he was to be paid 12d. by them and to be provided with a horse 'pur honour de la

-
1. Mettele as arbiter, 8 December 1430, Jour.III f.127v.; Billing as arbiter, 19 October 1445, Jour.IV f.101; Fairfax as arbiter, 31 May 1458, Jour.VI f.243v.; Alexander Anne drafted the indictment against Leversegge and Spark, October 1424, Jour.II f.23v., L.B.K., p.39; John Fray prosecuted usurers on behalf of the City, 1421, Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.99-102; John Wilton took £1000 to Calais, 28 March 1438, Jour.III f.176v.; Billing was a receiver of money for the King, 23 March 1444, Jour.IV f.20; Nedeham on deputation about royal loans, 2, 23 October 1450, Jour.V f.47v., 49.
 2. John Fray, Alexander Anne, Robert Danvers, Thomas Billing, Thomas Ursewyk became Recorders; John Fray, Alexander Anne, John Wilton, Thomas Billing, Guy Fairfax and Thomas Rigby became Undersheriffs; for lists of Common Serjeants, Recorders and Undersheriffs see Appendixes pps. 4, 5, 9 pp. 558, 559, 563.

citee'. He was to proclaim wills and the result of cases in the Hustings for which he was to receive 6d. His annual fee was 60/- or more if his behaviour merited it, and he was also entitled to claim from a newly elected Alderman the robe which he had worn on the day of his swearing, or 6/8d. The Common Serjeant at Arms was elected by the Common Council and held office at their pleasure.¹ As described by John Carpenter the duties appear to be quite onerous and yet John Combe who held the office from 1417 to 1460 was also able to hold the offices of Bailiff of Southwark and Deputy Coroner at different times during the period.² But John Combe also carried out somewhat menial tasks such as summoning persons to attend the Court, retrieving escaped prisoners and carrying civic messages.³

There were four other civic officers whose work was closely associated with that of the Serjeants:- the offices of Waterbailiff, Mayor's Esquire or Swordbearer, Common Huntsman and Serjeant of the Channel.⁴ The Waterbailiff was responsible for searching the waters of the Thames and Medway within the City's jurisdiction, removing

-
1. Liber Albus, p.49. John Combe and his successor John Asshe were provided with a house over Cripplegate, Jour.II f.107, 132; Jour.IV f.97; Jour.VI f.219v.
 2. John Combe was Bailiff of Southwark c.1443-1460, see Chapter III pp 171-2 he was Deputy Coroner 1421-22, see Chapter VI, pp.
 3. E.g. 27 September 1453, Combe rode to the Lord Chancellor, Jour.V f.122; 1 February 1455, Combe brought Henry Bray back to prison, Jour.V f.219; 20 May 1455, Combe rode with two other Serjeants to the Duke of York, Jour.V f.243v.; 1450, the Grocers' Company paid Combe 3/4d. 'for doing his office divers times', Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, vol.II, f.305; see Masters, op.cit., p.380.
 4. For lists of the holders of these offices see Appendix pp 11, 12, 13, 14 pp. 565-568.

illegal weirs and nets, and for bringing the offenders into the Mayor's Court.¹ Although the elections to this office took place in the Common Council, at least three of the Waterbailiffs during this period held office at the instance either of the King or the Duke of Gloucester.² Why it should have been so sought after is not clear since the salary was only £5 p.a., together with certain perquisites, and the work seems to have been quite onerous.³ To help him, however, the Waterbailiff had the services of a valet who received a fee and clothing as did the other valets of the Chamber.⁴

-
1. Oath of the Waterbailiff, Jour.IV f.166v.
 2. 4 December 1413, William Talworth had been appointed by royal letters, L.B.I., pp.120-21; 14 December 1431, John Houghton was appointed at the instance of the Duke of Gloucester, L.B.K., p.133; 21 January 1445 William Veyse appointed at the instance of King, L.B.K., pp.302-03, Jour.IV f.59v.; 21 August 1452 royal letter asking that the office of Waterbailiff should be granted to John Houghton (the previous occupant?). Common Council decided that since the Recorder and Common Serjeant were absent William Veyse should continue in office for the time being, Jour.V f.82v.; see Chapter VIII, pp.46§.
 3. William Talworth retired on a pension of 4 marks p.a. and his successor John Houghton was to have a salary of £5 p.a., 14 December 1431, L.B.K., p.133. The Saltmeters paid 5/- to the Waterbailiff on entering office, Jour.III f.29v.; William Veyse was also appointed Weigher of Eels, Jour.IV f.59v., L.B.K., pp.302-03, Jour.V f.139; Veyse was made free of the City, 21 August 1446, Jour.IV f.144; John Houghton was given a house over Aldgate, Jour.VI f.92v., 124.
 4. 14 April 1424, John Haukeslowe valet to William Talworth, L.B.K., p.13, Jour.II f.17v.; 23 October 1434, agreed that Houghton should have a valet who would be paid 4 nobles p.a. as other valets of the Mayor, L.B.K., p.182; 4 October 1456, Ivo Machon, alias Yon Machon, alias John Yon, was appointed as valet to the Waterbailiff in succession to Thomas Bedford, L.B.K., pp.380-81. William Veyse was finally dismissed from office for neglect, 17 February, 10 March, 7 October, December 1457, Jour.VI f.92v., 114, 180, 188.

The office of Mayor's Esquire or Swordbearer seems to have become more important as the period progressed. John Creden and John Hastings were known as the Mayor's Esquires but John Penriche and Richard Power were given the title of Swordbearer.¹ According to John Carpenter the Mayor's Esquire was entitled to an annual salary of 40/- from the Chamber 'et nient plus'.² He also had in his charge the Mayor's seal and for its use he could charge a fee of 12d. although this sum shows signs of inflation.³ Moreover when John Penriche was appointed in 1426 it was decided that he should receive 53/4 p.a. and a reward of 6 marks. Although at the time it was stipulated that this should not serve as a precedent, Richard Powers was appointed to the office in 1442 on the same terms.⁴ In addition to this, all the Swordbearers were provided with houses,⁵ John Creden received a retirement

-
1. See T. Kingsley Collett, 'The Swordbearer', Transactions of the Guildhall Association, vol.III (1965), pp.39-45; for a list of Swordbearers, see Appendix, no.12 p. 566.
 2. Liber Albus, p.49.
 3. Richard Power was paid 2/- by the Mercers' Company for attaching the Mayor's seal to a letter to the Earl of Warwick c.1456/7, Mercers' Hall, Warden's Accounts 1347-1464, p.191.
 4. 9 July 1426, Jour.II f.78v.; 1 June 1442, Jour.III f.136v.
 5. John Creden had a house over Cripplegate, L.B.I., p.259; John Penriche had a house over the lower gate of Guildhall, L.B.K., pp.57-58, his widow Johanna was allowed to continue in occupation of the house for a year after his death, unless she married again, 29 May 1442, Jour.III f.136, Jour.IV f.21, 41; Richard Power was to have Penriche's house from 1 April 1448. It had been occupied by Thomas Holgrave meanwhile. Until this time Power appears to have been granted 20/- in lieu of a house, Jour.IV f.213v.; Cal. P. and M. 1458-82, p.47.

pension,¹ and Richard Power was allowed a 'suitable servant' at the Chamber's expense.² Moreover the Swordbearer could also collect fees from the City Companies for performing certain ceremonials at the Company feasts.³ Apart from his custody of the Mayor's speal the duties of the Swordbearer seem to have been primarily ceremonial, carrying the Mayor's sword before him and in all ways it was his duty 'sauver le honour de soun seignur et de la citee'.⁴ As the City became increasingly self-conscious in the matters of precedence and ceremonial - an example is the care with which the Journal's scribe specifies the positions of the Mayor's and the Duke's swords when Gloucester visited the City in 1425⁵ - so the office of Mayor's swordbearer grew in importance. Moreover the Swordbearer is not to be found carrying out a host of miscellaneous tasks as other civic officers appear to have done.

The office of Common Huntsman was held in the fifteenth century by a series of Esquires or Gentlemen, who were not Londoners. John

-
1. 21 September 1419, L.B.I., p.226; the pension consisted of 40/- p.a. and a livery as the other Serjeants had.
 2. 12 January 1447, L.B.K., p.320.
 3. Merchant Taylors' Hall, Ms. A 4/2 Warden's Accounts 1453-1470, 1462, f.231; John Hastings in 1422/3 received 5d. from the Brewers for his friendship, Guildhall Library, Ms.5440, Brewers' Account Book 1418-1440, f.100v.
 4. Liber Albus, p.49; for the Swordbearer's oath, L.B.D., pp.197-98. John Creden was sworn as a Sheriff's serjeant in 1416 and 1417 and was sent on an envoy to France in 1415, Jour.I f.lv., 39v., L.B.I., p.200.
 5. 5 June 1425, Jour.II f.44.

Courtney came from Aynesford, Kent and John Grene from Essex. The Court of Aldermen appears to have arranged who should occupy the office although the election was made by the Common Council or Commonalty.¹ In 1425 it was decided that the remuneration of the Common Huntsman should be at the discretion of the Mayor and Aldermen, and in 1448 John Tyler was allowed £10 p.a. and his clothing.² William Sudbury and John Stokker were appointed on the same terms in 1459 and 1463.³ The duties were gentlemanly rather than onerous and although John Grene was allowed to have a deputy, his successor William Sudbury had to exercise the office himself.⁴ The Common Huntsman looked after the City's dogs and horses and saw to their kennels and stables. He might or might not be reimbursed his expenses.⁵ One of the places where the Londoners hunted was on the lands of the Cistercian Abbey of Stratford Langthorne in Essex, and in 1460 the Common Huntsman, backed by the Mayor and some of the more stalwart Aldermen, rode off to assert the City's rights. This they did successfully.⁶

-
1. John Tyler was elected by an immense Commonalty, 5 April 1448, L.B.K., p.321; John Grene was selected by the Court of Aldermen but they took considerable trouble to ensure that this appointment should be kept secret until the Common Council had agreed, Jour.VI f.116v., 118, 118v. For a list of Common Huntsmen see Appendix, p. 13 p. 567.
 2. 24 April 1425, Jour.II f.41v.; 5 April 1448, L.B.K., p.321.
 3. 5 December 1459, Jour.VI f.223, 26 September 1463, L.B.L., p.36.
 4. Jour.VI f.118v., 223.
 5. Jour.VI f.198v.; 25 October 1457, John Tyler received 10 marks towards the cost of repairs to various buildings carried out while he was Common Huntsman, Jour.VI f.182.
 6. April/May 1460, Jour.VI f.210, 214, 215.

On 10 January 1418, Henry Waleys was admitted to office as Serjeant of the Channel; the first sanitary officer whom the City had appointed. His successor William Horn was sworn to office and the selection of men for this task appears to have lain with the Court of Aldermen. According to his oath the Serjeant of the Channel was expected to keep the streets and waterways in the City free from rubbish, to amerce offenders and to account to the Chamberlain for the sums so collected.¹ What remuneration the Serjeant received in this period is not specified, but in spite of the unattractive nature of the work, the job was sought after.² Both John Holden and John Horncastle were allowed the services of a valet, whose duty it became to hang up the awnings which protected the Mayor and Aldermen from the wind and weather during the special sermons at St. Paul's Cross and at St. Mary Spittall during Easter week.³ The valet's wages which were only 6/8d. p.a. in 1457 rose to £1 in 1461.⁴

-
1. Serjeant of the Channel's oath, L.B.D., p.201; in this period he was specifically instructed to cleanse the banks of the Thames, and the markets at Leadenhall and St. Nicholas Shambles, as well as the streets of the City, L.B.K., p.5, Jour.VI f.188, L.B.L., p.11.
 2. 27 October 1461, the Court of Aldermen decided that Richard Grene should have the office of Serjeant of the Channel after John Horncastle, or another office of similar value, Jour.VI f.81.
 3. 28 May 1457, Richard Brown valet to John Holden, Jour.VI f.123v.; 30 May, 19 October 1460, William Halle valet to John Horncastle, Jour.VI f.215v., 82. The Serjeant of the Channel's valet appears to have acquired the privilege of hanging the awning during the century. 2 September 1420, William Wilcok, a valet of the Common Serjeant at Arms performed this task, L.B.I., p.231, but 28 May 1457, October 1461 it was the valet of the Serjeant of the Channel, Jour.VI f.123v., 49.
 4. 28 May 1457 (6/8d.), 30 May 1460 (13/4d.), 19 October 1461 (£1), Jour.VI f.123v., 215v., 82.

The lesser serjeants who served the City may be conveniently divided into three categories:- the serjeants who served the Chamber, the serjeants serving the Mayor and those who served the Sheriffs and Undersheriffs. This last category of serjeants has been described above in the section dealing with the Sheriffs.¹ In 1436 a new class of serjeants was introduced by the creation of three permanent serjeants-at-mace attending upon the Mayor.² Until this time it would appear that whereas the serjeants of the Chamber were permanent officers, those who served the Mayor were not. On several occasions serjeants of the Mayor moved on to be serjeants of the Chamber.³ John Carpenter states that the Mayor was served by three serjeants (including his Esquire or swordbearer) at his own expense although the men were entitled to receive 40/- p.a. from the Chamber. The three serjeants, however, who served the Chamber were chosen by the Common Council and remained in office at its pleasure. These serjeants also received 40/- p.a. but they could have their salary docked for negligence.⁴ From the office either of serjeant to the Mayor or of Serjeant to the Chamber, a man might hope to move on to be Common Huntsman, Common

-
1. See pp. 107-112.
 2. 12 October 1436, L.B.K., p.203.
 3. William Caldebeck who was Mayor's serjeant in July 1444, became a serjeant of the Chamber in October 1444. Cal. P. and K. 1437-57, p.60, Jour.IV f.44, L.B.K., p.300; William Andrew who was a Mayor's serjeant in November 1446, became a serjeant of the Chamber in March 1447, Jour.IV f.149, L.B.K., p.318. John Goode sworn as Mayor's serjeant 12 November 1453, sworn as serjeant of Chamber 1 March 1455, Jour.V f.130, 225.
 4. Liber Albus, pp.49-50.

Serjeant at Arms, Waterbailiff, Serjeant of the Channel, or, after 1436, permanent Serjeant at Mace of the Mayor.¹

The Serjeants of the Chamber were entitled not only to their 40/- salary but to a new livery twice a year and a share in the profits from enrolling freedoms.² The new class of serjeants serving the Mayor created in 1436 were to be paid 40/- p.a. and were entitled to an annual livery.³ Apart from these standard remunerations these serjeants might receive the freedom of the City,⁴ or be allotted a

-
1. William Sudbury had been a Serjeant at Mace of the Mayor before becoming Common Huntsman. John Pychard who was a serjeant of the Chamber in April 1407 (U.B.I., p.54) was subsequently Common Serjeant at Arms. John Combe and John Asshe had both been serjeants of the Mayor before becoming Common Serjeants at Arms. John Goode was a Mayor's serjeant and serjeant of the Chamber (see n.3, p. ~~103~~) before becoming Waterbailiff. John Asshe, another serjeant of the Mayor, was nominated but not chosen on the same occasion. John Holden, a serjeant of the Chamber in March 1444 (Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, p.59) was subsequently Serjeant of the Channel. John Russel who was a serjeant of the Chamber in April 1442, February 1444 (Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, pp.47, 58), was appointed one of the permanent Serjeants at Mace to the Mayor in January 1446. Thomas Dounham who was a Mayor's serjeant in October 1453, (Jour.V f.122v.) was appointed one of the permanent Serjeants at Mace to the Mayor in February 1460.
 2. The three serjeants of the Chamber were to divide amongst themselves half of the 40d. fee payable on enrolling new entries to the freedom, Liber Albus, p.50.
 3. When the new class of serjeants was created in 1436 the exact remuneration was not stated, but when John Asshe succeeded Ralph Vernon as a permanent Serjeant at Mace attending the Mayor, he was to have 40/- p.a. and a livery as Vernon had had, Jour.IV f.112v.
 4. John Asshe as permanent Serjeant at Mace to the Mayor made free 21 October 1446, Jour.IV f.144; Thomas Dounham when Mayor's serjeant made free 'by virtue of his office', Jour.V f.88.

house,¹ or receive a special reward for some special service.² They were all entitled to a suitable servant.³ But over and above these official emoluments, the position gave ample opportunity for receiving bribes, although this was expressly forbidden under heavy penalties in 1419.⁴ Further in 1444 it was decided that no-one should be admitted as a serjeant unless he provided security for his good behaviour during his tenure of office.⁵ But from reading the Company accounts for this period it is clear that the 1419 regulation was widely ignored. The Brewers' Company retained Thomas Donnington, one of the Chamber serjeants, from 1420-24 at 6/8d. p.a. and in 1422, six of the Mayor's serjeants were paid sums ranging from 5d. to 10/- 'to be good friends to our craft'.⁶ The Carpenters' Company retained one of the Mayor's

-
1. William Caldebek, a serjeant of the Chamber given a house over Bishopsgate, 21 September 1461, Jour.VI f.21v.; Thomas Holgrave, a permanent Serjeant at Mace to the Mayor, given a house over the lower gate of Guildhall, 29 May 1442, Jour.III f.13o, L.B.K., p.270; Richard Vernon, a Mayor's serjeant, was granted a house near Aldersgate, but on this occasion the Common Council complained, and decided that in future, no civic official was to have a civic house without the consent of the Commonalty, 20 July, 22 December 1422, Jour.II f.7v., 12, L.B.K., p.12.
 2. 3 December 1453, decided that no serjeant or valet of the Mayor or Chamberlain should receive a reward except on the recommendation of the Mayor or Chamberlain, Jour.V f.158v.; John Percival, a permanent Serjeant at Mace of the Mayor granted a reward of 20/-, 8 May 1462 Jour.VI f.9.
 3. 15 January 1447, L.B.K., p.320. 4. 30 April 1419, Jour.I f.56.
 5. 13 October 1444, Jour.IV f.44.
 6. Guildhall Library, Ms.5440, Brewers' Account Book 1418-1440, f.60, 112, 100v. In the accounts the words 'for to be good friends to our craft' are crossed out in favour of the more proper 'for their labour and profit to the craft'.

serjeants at a fee of 6/8d. p.a. and the Taylors^e took the precaution of electing William (Thomas?) Holgrave, a Mayor's serjeant to be a member of the Livery.¹ When in 1450-51 the Cutlers^e Company was suing Henry Otway in the Mayor's Court the Common Clerk, and the clerks, valets and serjeants serving the Mayor all received gifts of cash or knives.²

The chief duties of these officers were the summoning of parties to appear before the Mayor, the serving of writs, the escort of prisoners, the empanelling of juries and the witnessing of deeds.³ It is clear that the City Companies might pay them for carrying out these specific tasks as well as the more general bribes to procure such men as good friends.⁴ All the officers who served the Mayor were expressly forbidden to act as a mainpernor for any prisoner on pain of loss of office.⁵ Perhaps because their offices were better paid than those of the Sheriff's entourage there are very few instances recorded of the serjeants of the Mayor or the Chamber abusing their positions, or having to be dismissed for violence or extortion.

-
1. Carpenters' accounts op.cit., p.32; Merchant Taylors' Hall, Ms. A 4/1, Warden's accounts, 1397-1445, 1422-3, f.133.
 2. Guildhall Library, Ms.7146 Cutlers' accounts, Roll no.5.
 3. Jour.V f.141.
 4. c.1420 the Mercers paid Ralph (Vernon) a serjeant of the Chamber 1/- for summoning parties to appear before the Mayor, Mercers' Hall, Warden's accounts 1347-1464, f.81; 1461-2 the Cutlers paid serjeants of the Chamber 8d. a time for summoning the Bladesmiths and the Pinners, Guildhall Library, Ms.7146, Cutlers' accounts, Roll no.11.
 5. 25, 28 September 1445, Jour.IV f.98, 98v.; repeated 5 May 1455, Jour.V f.240v.

CHAPTER III

THE BUSINESS OF CIVIC GOVERNMENT

Introduction

The business of civic government was in effect the business of the Court of Aldermen. While certain functions were carried out by other bodies such as the Court of Hustings, and the Court of Common Council exercised an omniscient residual power, yet it was the Court of Aldermen which bore the brunt of the everyday work of governing the City. The civic officers were usually competent men but when their work transcended the routine they consulted the Court of Aldermen.

It will not be possible within the confines of one chapter, even a large one, to deal with every aspect of civic government in the fifteenth century. There were, in particular, two causes celebres which occupied much of the time of the Court; the tithes dispute between the Londoners and their clergy which began intensively in 1448, and the rebuilding of Guildhall and Guildhall chapel between 1411 and 1455. These have been, or will be, treated elsewhere.¹ But two other civic projects of this period, the repair of London Bridge and the creation of a new water supply for the City, are included since they serve to indicate how the Londoners set about complex tasks of this kind. While the intermingling of communal effort and private charity remains peculiarly medieval, yet the machinery of money-raising, the appointment of committees and the auditing of accounts bears signs of remarkable sophistication.

1. See J.A.F. Thomson, 'Tithe disputes in Later Medieval London', E.H.R., LXXVIII (1963), pp.1-17; Caroline M. Barron, 'The Medieval Guildhall of London', Guildhall Miscellany, forthcoming.

Government did not then, any more than now, separate into self-contained compartments. However, if the work is to be discussed some division of function is necessary; but there is inevitably some overlap between the categories which have been selected.

(1) The Financing of Civic Government

The finances of the City may be divided into two categories; the normal income and expenditure and the abnormal income and expenditure. The normal income and expenditure was largely in the control of the City Chamberlain whose accounts were audited annually by a committee of two Aldermen and four Common Councilmen who were chosen each year on 21 September the day of the election of the Sheriffs.¹ Unfortunately there are no fifteenth century Chamberlain's accounts which have survived, hence the knowledge of ordinary civic income and expenditure must be arrived at by inference.

The Chamber's normal sources of income were diverse. They included fees for the enrolment of apprentices, freemen, deeds, charters and wills;² fees for the use of the Mayor's seal on letters; fines and amercements in the Mayor's Court; fines paid by Brewers and other food vendors who infringed the assizes, fines for failure to attend the wardmotes.³ The Chamber derived further income from the rents for City property, from special taxes such as scavage⁴ and seldage (a toll on market stalls), which in the

-
1. For a description of the Chamberlain's office, see Chapter II, pp. 116-126.
 2. June 1423 it was decided that no deed was to be enrolled until the fee was paid, Jour. II f. 7.
 3. This list is derived from the list of fees increased to pay for the work at Guildhall in 1411, Memorials, pp. 590-91.
 4. See Chapter VI. pp. 372-378.

early 1450s was farmed to a cordwainer, Henry Marchaunt, for £10 p.a. for ten years.¹ The merchants of the three towns of Amiens, Nesle and Corbie made an annual compounded payment of 50 marks in return for the freedom to trade in London.²

The normal recurring expenses of the City would include the payment of annual fees to Civic officers,³ the liveries provided annually for City servants, pensions to ex-Aldermen and retired officers, the purchase of pens, ink and parchment, the upkeep of City property, the payment of rents and quitrents, the provision of gifts, civic entertainments and dinners, the expenses of the City's M.Ps. and all that was needed to maintain the pomp and dignity of the City. There would also have been annual salaries

-
1. 19 February 1459, Jour.VI f.149v.; the annual fee was later reduced to 10 marks p.a., 4 March 1459, Jour.VI f.151.
 2. The merchants from these three towns had enjoyed this privilege since 1237, L.B.C., p.29n. During this period payments from the merchants are recorded in 1409, 1410, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1424, 1425, 1426(2), 1427, 1428(2), 1429(2), 1431, L.E.I., p.75, 89, 267; L.B.K., pp.31, 45, 50, 52, 60, 69, 76, 77, 99-100, 107, 121. In July 1423 the merchants complained to the King's Council that according to the terms of their agreement they should not be forced to pay the 50 marks for years when they could not live in London because of war. They had been compelled to pay £30 in 1415 when they could not live in London because of Agincourt. The Council upheld the merchants' claim, P.P.C., III, pp.113-15. In 1445 the Court of Aldermen agreed that the merchants should come and trade as before accustomed, and on the same terms, and they were excused the payments for past years. The acquittance is written in French. Since the last recorded payment was in 1431 the prevailing war conditions may have prevented trade for the next 14 years, Jour.IV f.85v., 87v.
 3. The known annual salary bill was at least £135 6s.8d. This figure is based on the salaries detailed in Chapter II but the bill was probably doubled by the inclusion of officers such as lesser serjeants whose salaries are not known, and the pensions paid out to retired officers.

paid to the priests serving the City church of St. Peter upon Cornhill, as well as to clergymen and others retained to be of the City's counsel. It is clear that at times during this period the City's cash ran very low. In 1440 it was necessary to double the fees for enrolling apprentices, freedoms by apprenticeship, deeds and wills in order to relieve the poverty of the Chamber.¹ In 1444 it was again decided to double these fees until the Chamber's debts were paid.² And the Chamber clearly continued to be hard-pressed in the latter part of this period. When the Court of Aldermen decided to pay Thomas Fyndern who had captained the City's troops at Calais, a £10 reward, it was necessary for one of the Aldermen to advance the money since there was nothing at the time in the Chamber.³

This poverty of the Chamber, overstrained perhaps by the building of the new Guildhall, may have helped to develop the system whereby special projects were separately financed and audited, and did not come within the purview of the Chamberlain. The rebuilding of Guildhall was the first civic project during this period which required abnormal income. It was decided that it should be financed by doubling the normal income of the Chamber and, therefore, in effect placing the Chamberlain in charge of the Guildhall building account. It would appear that this gravely disorganised the Chamber finances and may explain the emergence of a new procedure for keeping special accounts separate from normal ones. The Journal is missing

-
1. 8, 9 January 1440, Jour.III f.33v.
 2. 31 January 1444, Jour.IV f.16; 2 March 1444, Jour.IV f.18v.;
L.B.K., p.292.
 3. 24 September 1453, Jour.V f.121v.

for the years 1428-1436 but the first recorded instance of a special levy, separately collected and audited, is the raising of the half fifteenth for the repair of the Bridge in March 1439.¹ The tithe dispute, building of the new conduit and the purchase of Billingsgate were also financed in this way.

There were four ways in which the City could raise money for abnormal expenditure: by assessments on wards in the manner in which royal loans or Parliamentary taxes were raised; by special levies of gifts from leading citizens; by taxes, loans or gifts squeezed from the City Companies; by a loan from a wealthy citizen who would be repaid out of normal Chamber income over a period of time.

The ward assessment was the method most frequently used in this period. The procedure was exactly the same as that described elsewhere whereby royal loans were raised in the City.² A decision of the Common Council was followed by a precept to the ward Alderman, collection by assessors chosen in each ward, the money being brought to Guildhall by the Aldermen and received by special chosen Receivers, and the accounts audited by a further Committee of the Common Council. The procedure was sometimes modified. In 1440 it was decided that citizens should not be assessed in a variety of different wards where they had property but only in the place where they normally resided.³ Sometimes the Aldermen paid separately but for the levy for the conduit in 1440 it was decided that they should be taxed in their wards.⁴

- 1. 16 March 1439, 500 marks voted and a committee of five receivers appointed, assessment drawn up, Jour.III f.12; 24 March 1439, writ for collecting the money, Jour.III f.12v.; 26 March 1439, a committee of 8 Commoners and 4 Aldermen appointed as auditors, Jour.III f.12v.
- 2. See Chapter VII, pp.427-432.
- 3. 24 September 1453, Jour.V f.121v.
- 4. 23 November 1440, Jour.III f.67v. The idea behind this may have been that if Aldermen were taxed in their wards, rather than in the wards in which they lived, this would provide a more even distribution of Aldermannic wealth.

Foreigners were made to contribute and the fact that those men who lived in St. Martin's and other privileged places avoided these taxes was one of the chief grievances against them.¹ The civic authorities appear to have taken considerable trouble to ensure that the poor people in the City should not be overburdened by taxes. Although the basic assessment remained the same the poorer wards would be relieved of some of their assessed quota.² In April 1439 it was decided that since many poor people in Aldgate ward had been assessed to pay 2s. which they could not afford, they were to be repaid their money out of that provided by the Aldermen.³

The second method of raising abnormal sums, that is by special gift levies, was more sparingly used for obvious reasons. The circumstances had to be exceptional. A gift of 1000 marks was provided for the Duke of Bedford in 1425 in this way.⁴ Again in 1426 it was decided that each Alderman should convene the Common Councilmen and good men of his ward and ask each of them what they would contribute towards a gift of 1000 marks for the Duke of Gloucester. The names of the donors were to be conveyed to the Duke. When it was discovered that the subscribed sum fell short of 1000 marks by £100, it was then decided to display the names in the Mayor's Court. If it was thought that men had not subscribed according to their income, they were to be induced to do so.⁵ A similar procedure was employed in 1438 to see if

-
1. 13 May 1455, it was decided that foreigners who lived in St. Martin's Lane were to pay the subsidy as other foreigners did, Jour.V f.242.
 2. 5 August 1419 it was decided that the last levy of 2 fifteenths from citizens had caused considerable hardship in the wards of Tower, Cordwainer, Cheap, Dowgate and Walbrook and they were relieved of £30, £40, £30, £10, £10 respectively, Jour.I f.58v. The allowance for Cheap ward was removed 1 July 1429, Jour.II.f.135v.
 3. 21 April 1439, Jour.III f:15.
 4. 3 December 1425, Jour.II f.59v.
 5. 6, 20 April 1426, Jour.II f.65v., 66v.

'probi homines' could be persuaded to lend 6d. or 7d. a week.¹ When Rouen was threatened in 1449 the non-Aldermen provided £94 18s., and 20 out of the 24 Aldermen provided £97 17s.4d.; together a total of £192 15s.4d. In fact Rouen fell before the money was despatched and so it was returned to the donors. This is the only subscription list which includes non-Aldermen, to have survived from this period.² There are, however, several lists of loans or gifts provided by the Aldermen to tide the City over some difficult period.³

The third way of raising extraordinary sums of money in the City was to persuade the Companies either to lend or to give. When the City needed to raise 2000 marks in August 1444 for civic purposes and for a royal gift, the Common Council considered raising the money from the Companies, but later abandoned the idea in favour of the usual ward assessments.⁴ In February 1445, however, fourteen City Companies agreed to lend money until June to help the City in a particular financial crisis,⁵ and in 1447 the Companies made enforced gifts to complete Guildhall chapel.

Fourthly the City could raise a large loan from an individual, as it did from William Cantalowe in November 1454 when money was needed urgently to forward the City's case in the tithing dispute.⁶

-
1. 19 January 1438, Jour.III f.183v.
 2. Jour.V f.20-24. John Olney, Alderman, agreed to provide 4 archers for 6 weeks at 6d. a day i.e. £4 14s.0d. rather than the cash.
 3. E.g. list of loans advanced by Aldermen during the mayoralty of Thomas Chalton (1449-50), Jour.IV f.210v.
 4. 26 August, 13 October, 11 November 1444, Jour.IV f.39v., 44, 49v.
 5. 20 February 1445, Jour.IV f.64v-65v.
 6. 13 November 1454, Jour.V f.207. 22 August 1455 the Chamberlain acknowledged that he owed Cantalowe £840 which he agreed to pay at the rate of £50 p.a. (£25 at Christmas and £25 at Easter) Jour.V f.257. 1 September 1455 Cantalowe agreed not to pursue the executors and heirs of Thomas Thornton, the current Chamberlain, for any money which was owing to him, but rather whoever was currently the City's Chamberlain.V.257-58v

How willing were Londoners to pay these numerous abnormal exactions? It has been estimated that they were expected to put their hands in their pockets three times in two years to provide royal loans and Parliamentary taxes. When civic exactions are added to these it is more likely that the demands came twice a year. It is clear that the more affluent Londoners made some attempt to spread the burden evenly and fairly. There were, none the less, objections. In 1420 some Londoners were deprived of their freedom for failing to pay a Parliamentary assessment.¹ John Tys was sent to prison for urging in public that the citizens should pay a single rather than a double assessment for the fifteenth.² In January 1425 the constables of Langbourne ward reported that John Bonanntre had refused to pay the increased wardmote fine saying that those who levied it should be hanged and pickled at the Nativity.³ In the same year William Reygate was sent to prison for behaving rebelliously when John Bithewater was assessing the men of his ward for a gift for the Duke of Bedford.⁴ In 1440 Common Council decided that those who had complaints to make about the size of their assessment should take the matter to the Aldermen and good men of the ward, and not bring it up before the Court of Aldermen.⁵ The names of those who refused to pay their assessment were to be brought into court by the Aldermen.⁶ In 1445 Roger Mason was sent to prison for affirming that the assessors of Dowgate ward were perjurous.⁷ In August 1452 a group of men in the ward of

-
1. 4 May 1420, Jour.I f.76. William Squyer of the ward of Farrington Without told the Aldermen that he would rather die than pay his assessment, 7 May 1420, Jour.I f.76.
 2. May 1421, Jour.I f.91v.
 3. 17 January 1425, Bonanntre was mainpernored, Jour.II f.31v.
 4. 10 December 1425, Jour.II f.59v.
 5. 1 February 1440, Jour.III f.35v.
 6. 3 February 1441, Jour.III f.74.
 7. 18 August 1445, Jour.IV f.89v.

Farringdon Within led a protest against the levy for the purchase of Billingsgate. A salter named William Wells declared that they wanted no more Common Councils since they did nothing but burden the men of the City.¹ He, along with others, was sent to prison, but they all found a champion in John Neele who had been a Warden of the Whitetawyers Company. He told the Aldermen, 'Be soory for yorself ye wolle distroye all y lace [i.e. unless] you wite it shall not be suffred thus to send our neighbours to prisone'.² John Cole, a skinner, was equally outspoken in 1457 demanding that an account of the money collected should be made to Common Council 'for this money shall nat be mouldred by the mair and aldermen as our other money hath to before this'.³ It may have been partly in response to this continuing current of unrest that the Court of Aldermen appointed an auditor in each ward to deal with all the accounts and especially with those concerned with the raising of a thirteenth in the City in January 1458.⁴ Taken overall the amount of recorded protest in the City about the various taxes and assessments seems to have been remarkably small, and may indicate that the attempts by the Aldermen to spread the weight of exactions evenly and justly by applying a rough and ready means test, was largely successful.

In general in financial matters the City seems to have displayed a flexibility which is in marked contrast to the rigidity of the Lancastrian

-
1. 17, 18 August 1452, Jour.V f.81, 81v., 82v. John Smith, Brewer, was the leader of this protest movement which also affected Candlewick Street where John Chester and Thomas Gefferoy were sent to prison for their protest, 4 August 1452, Jour.V f.80.
 2. Neele had to enter into recognizances of £100 to the Chamber agreeing to obey the City officers in future, 21, 22 August 1452, Jour.V f.82v.,83.
 3. 18 October 1457, Jour.VI f.181. Cole was sent to prison but entered into a recognizance to behave well towards the City officers and so was released, 30 October 1457, Jour.VI f.181v..
 4. 14 January 1458, Jour.VI f.189.

Exchequer. In a period of unsuccessful war and shaky royal finance the City was able to raise considerable sums not only for national purposes but also for rebuilding Guildhall, buying Billingsgate, repairing the Bridge, constructing a new water supply and prosecuting a long and expensive case at Rome. The size of the levies and the comparative ease of their collection indicate that London was both wealthy and well governed.¹

(ii) Peace-keeping in the City

The problem of keeping the peace in the City was a perennial one and a constant source of anxiety for the Mayor and Sheriffs and Aldermen for if they failed to keep good order, the King would be provided with an excuse to intervene in the affairs of the City and even, as a last resort, to deprive the Mayor of his office and appoint, instead, a royal lieutenant as in 1392. If the City's charter were suspended its restoration was usually both perilous and expensive. This fear of royal intervention helps to explain the strictly orthodox behaviour of the civic authorities whenever Lollards and heretics were tried or executed in the City.² Because of this

-
1. There were 38 recorded assessments between March 1439 and March 1461: 7 for civic purposes, 16 for royal loans, 14 for Parliamentary taxes and 1 for an unknown purpose. These 38 assessments cost the citizens an average of £1235 13s.4d. p.a. during these years. This must represent a minimum figure since several assessments do not survive and there were other gifts which were raised in other ways. Some of the loans were, of course, repaid. The wealthiest wards seem to have been Bridge, Cheap, Cordwainer Street, Farringdon Within and Without and Cripplegate. The poorest wards were Lime Street, Aldgate and Portoken, i.e. the north-eastern wards in the City. Cf. R.S. Schofield, 'The Geographical Distribution of Wealth in England 1334-1649', Econ.H.R., 2nd series, XVIII (1965), pp.483-510, esp.pp.508-9.
 2. See J.A.F. Thomson, The Later Lollards (Oxford, 1965), Chapter 6.

fear the King had a useful lever in his negotiations with the City over loans and gifts and, in this respect, the City was at the mercy of the King. Until about 1450 the civic authorities managed fairly well to preserve good order in the City but after this date the City reflected the endemic disorder to be found throughout the country.¹

The attitude of the Mayor to disputes which came within his jurisdiction is well exemplified by a case at the beginning of this period. In 1404 the London friars appealed to the Pope against the authority of the Minister General and they asked the Mayor, William Askham, for assistance. His response was to enjoin the friars not to disturb the peace; the rights and wrongs of the case did not concern him.²

Sometimes the disputes which arose in the City were entirely the fault of the citizens. In 1409 the old dispute between the Cobblers and Cordwainers appeared to be erupting into armed rioting.³ In January the King wrote by Privy Seal to the Mayor, Recorder and Aldermen instructing them to settle the dispute and bring peace between the two parties, according to the custom of the City, otherwise the King himself would have to intervene.⁴ Three days later the King sent a further precept to the Mayor and Sheriffs about the ^{wearing} ~~warning~~ of swords and holding of unlawful assemblies in the City. The King had been informed that large numbers of his lieges were gathering armed in London.⁵ The dispute was settled in June but this arrangement

1. See R.L. Storey, The End of the House of Lancaster (1966), pp.1-28.

2. Cont.Eulogium, p.403.

3. See Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, p.267.

4. 21 January 1409, L.B.I., pp.73-74.

5. 30 January 1409, C.C.R. 1405-9, pp.485-86; L.B.I., p.72.

was found to be unsatisfactory and had to be revoked, but it had at least staved off royal interference in civic affairs.¹

But not all the affrays which arose in the City were the fault of the citizens. Henry IV's unruly sons Thomas and John caused a 'hurling' in East Cheap in 1410 which lasted until the Mayor, Sheriffs and citizens intervened.² In the following year Lord Thomas again caused trouble, this time in Bridge Street.³ In 1417 a vicious quarrel arose in the church of St. Dunstan's in the East between Lord Strange and Sir John Trussell 'on account of their wives'. In the brawl a London fishmonger, Thomas Petwardyn the keeper of Sprott's Kay, was killed while trying to separate the combatants. Lord Strange was held responsible for this outrage and was taken to the Counter prison. He was subsequently cursed by the church and had to do penance together with his wife, in the City.⁴

An even greater threat to the peace of the City was provided by the historic quarrel between Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort which arose in 1425 during the absence of the Duke of Bedford in France. While Gloucester himself was on the continent trying to recover the estates of his new wife, Jaqueline of Hainault, Beaufort sent Richard Wydevile and some men at arms, to garrison the Tower of London 'as if in state of war'.

-
1. 15 June 1409, Memorials, pp.571-74; L.B.I., p.74. For the details of this dispute see below pp. 47.
 2. Harley 565, p.93; Gregory, p.105; Lambeth 448, p.148.
 3. Harley 565, p.93; one chronicler states that there was an affray on 24 June 1411 in East Cheap between men of the retinue of Lord John, and because of this neither taverns, nor cook-houses were to open their doors after 9 p.m. Vitellius A XVI, p.268.
 4. Great Chronicle, p.95; Harley 565, p.105; Fabyan, p.581; Stow, Annales, p.352. Sir John Trussell and his wife were in London awaiting the outcome of a dispute about some property, see C.C.R. 1413-19, pp.319-20, 369.

These men remained there from February to October 1425.¹ During this uneasy time the Court of Aldermen instructed the ward constables to keep watch on the city boundaries and to prevent meetings.² There was talk of insurrection in the City: Andrew Strawson appeared in court for having asserted that Henry V had died before the war in France and that someone else of his blood should reign. John Perston and John Colchester claimed that they had planted a root which would flower and fruit in March.³ In June a cordwainer, John Exham, was sent to prison for having gathered groups of men against the peace of the kingdom.⁴ But by 5 June 1425 the Duke of Gloucester was back in England for on that day he came to the Court of Aldermen and 'certa negotia exposuit'.⁵ When the new Mayor, John Coventry, took his oath on 29 October he returned to the City to be instructed by the Duke of Gloucester, then at Baynard's Castle, to guard the City well. Cardinal Beaufort, with his followers, was lodged near St. Mary Overy in Southwark. On the next day all the shops in the City were shut and a battle on the Bridge was only prevented by the efforts of the Prince of Portugal, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other bishops. After eight journeys across the Bridge, peace was restored 'and thanks be to God, through the good governance of the Mayor and Aldermen, all people were

1. Great Chronicle, p.132.

2. 17 February 1425, John Warner, Cordwainer, appeared in Court for refusing to help keep the watch. He was mainpernored to keep the peace, stay away from meetings and inform the City's officers if he knew of any conventicles, Jour.II f.56v.

3. 3 March 1425, Jour.II f.38v. John Perston was willing to raise an insurrection since he had no wife, nor anything to lose.

4. 3, 4 June 1425, Jour.II f.43v.

5. 5 June 1425, Jour.II f.44.

saved and all went home again safely'.¹ The City continued, however, to be in a state of some unrest until the Duke of Bedford returned home in January 1426 and managed to bring about a more lasting peace between his uncle and brother.²

In the next ten years there was comparative peace in the City, but in the summer of 1437 there seems to have been a riot of apprentices. This is borne out by some evidence in the Journals and confirmed by a unique chronicle entry. The chronicle records that there was a rising of men's servants who met several times at the Great Conduit and fought and refused to obey either the constables or other civic officers.³ In the Journals there are several entries in July, August and September recording the names of masters who have gone bail for their apprentices.⁴ Some of the apprentices were present in court and others had run away. The Court obviously took the matter very seriously for the masters had to agree to produce their apprentices in court, and ensure that they kept the peace under penalty of £100. Probably as a result of these apprentice riots the King, early in September, issued a commission to the Mayor to make enquiry in the City with those who had caused riots and gathered in

-
1. Great Chronicle, p.136; Continuation D of Brut, Brie, p.432; Continuation H of Brut, Brie, p.567. .
 2. 17 November 1425, John Wokking and Thomas Reynwell arrested because the Court was informed that they intended to stir up a great commotion, Jour.II f.58v. There is no direct reference to the Gloucester/Beaufort dispute in the Journals which are very discreet. For the final settlement see Great Chronicle, p.136; Cont.D of Brut, Brie, p.432; Appendix E of Brut, Brie, p.453.
 3. Gough London 10, p.78n.
 4. 27 July 1437, 8 masters went bail for their apprentices, Jour.III f. 196-195; 30 July 1437, 2 masters, Jour.III f.195v.; August 1437, 1 master, Jour.III f.194; 5 September 1437, 2 masters, Jour.III f.192; 16 September 1437, 5 masters, Jour.III f.192v. Thus the total number of apprentices who were arrested was 18 and the chronicler estimated that

unlawful assemblies.¹ But this was as far as royal intervention went and the apprentices appear to have been brought under control.

The summer of 1440 was an extremely troubled one for the City's law-officers. On 17 June the veteran Lollard priest Richard Wyche was burnt as a heretic at West Smithfield. The real and bogus followers of the heretic caused considerable unrest in the City and it was not until the end of July that the Mayor and Aldermen had the situation under control.² Further on 1 July 1440 they had to declare their innocence and that of other City officers in the matter of the affray begun by the Duke of Norfolk. August saw several fires break out in the City, in Cheapside and in Bread Street.⁴ But the most serious threat to the peace of the City passed unnoticed by the chroniclers.

The dispute between the Butchers and the men of the Inns of Court seems to have broken out in August.⁵ The causes of the dispute are obscure. In court several butchers gave evidence that 300 men from the Inns had attacked and nearly killed them and their households and that one of them had been struck by an arrow while overhearing some malefactors declaring that they would kill anyone coming from London. The Undersheriffs had

1. 3 September 1437, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.145.
2. J.A.F. Thomson, The Later Lollards (Oxford, 1965), pp.148-51; Caroline M. Barron, Journal of the Society of Archivists III (1967), pp.258-59. 23 June 1440, the King sent a writ to the Mayor instructing him to take precautions to preserve the peace and to summon absent Aldermen to render assistance, L.B.K., p.239.
3. 1 July 1440, Jour.III f.45.
4. Harley 565, p.125; Vitellius F XII, p.17; Cont.F. of Brut, Brie, p.474.
5. 2 August 1440, John Johnson and --- Halifax, Butchers, were brought into Court on charges of riot and rebellion, Jour.III f.51v. 17 August 1440 6 Butchers appeared in Court and gave evidence against the men of the Inns of Court, Jour.III f.53-53v.

found 4 armed men in Davis Inn and 20 armed men in Barnard's Inn.¹ On 18 August the Mayor and Aldermen sent a deputation to the Lord Chancellor, in whose control the Inns of Court lay, complaining that the butchers could not go about their business in the City for fear of attacks from men of the Chancellor's Inns. On the following day the Master of the Rolls, men from the Butchers' Company and men from the Chancellor's four Inns came together to the Court of Aldermen and made an agreement.² The meeting arranged for the night of 20 July did not take place, but it was agreed that the matter should go to the arbitration of two Aldermen chosen by the Butchers and two others. If they failed to reach an agreement the dispute was to be taken to the Duke of Gloucester.³ The Butchers also asked that a meeting of the Common Council should be summoned to discuss their case and this was granted.⁴ Meanwhile the Mayor and Aldermen took the precaution of appointing nightly vigils to patrol the City.⁵ Although the Common Council on 7 September asked the Mayor and Aldermen to make peace between the butcher and the men of the Inns of Court, nothing further appears to have occurred this year.⁶

-
1. Sometimes called Thavies Inn; both were in Holborn. The Undersheriffs accused the son of Everard Flete and the son of Parker of Lemys Chirchawe of starting the brawl, both of whom had only recently been released from the Counter prison, Jour.III f.53.
 2. The Master of the Rolls entered into a £100 obligation that the men of the Inns of Court would keep the peace towards all London citizens until the following night, i.e. 20 August. The agreement was that the men of the 4 Inns would appear before 9 p.m. on that night, together with men from the Butchers' Company, to accept the arbitration of men chosen by themselves, 19 August 1440, Jour.III f.54v.
 3. At the appointed meeting only Wangford, the Master of Grey's Inn, turned up, although the Butchers and the Mayor and Aldermen were present, 18, 19 August 1440, Jour.III f.54-54v.
 4. 23 August 1440, Jour.III f.54v. Meeting of Common Council 29 August 1440, Jour.III f.55v....
 5. 29 August 1440, Jour.III f.55v. 6. 7 September 1440, Jour.III f.57.

John Paddesley was elected Mayor in October 1440 and he, like his predecessors and successors in these years, had to deal not only with eruptions of lawlessness in the City, but also with the underlying problems of artisan discontent which mark the years 1437-44.¹ In his mayoralty Paddesley had to cope not only with a revival of the Beaufort/Gloucester dispute but also with the resurgent butchers. In March 1441 Gloucester visited the City to answer a plaint of intrusion brought against him by his old enemy Cardinal Beaufort with others, touching a free tenement in the parish of All Hallows the Great.² While the Duke was in the City members of his household had come into conflict with the Londoners over the vexed problem of purveyance. A poor man who had tried to resist their attempts to purvey his horse had been wounded.³ The presence of so many armed and hostile retinues in the City made law-enforcement particularly difficult and measures were taken both by the King and Common Council to keep the peace.⁴ By the end of the month it had further become clear that members of Gloucester's household were trying to threaten and intimidate the jury which had been empanelled to decide on the Gloucester/Beaufort case.⁵

No sooner had this trouble died down than the Butchers again rioted. This time John Miller and other butchers had attacked the house of William

1. See Chapter IV.
2. Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, p.36. The case was heard on 4 March 1441 but no decision was reached, Jour.III f.78.
3. 3 March 1441, Jour.III f.78.
4. The King sent letters to keep the peace and Common Council decided that there should be a proclamation to this effect, 6, 9 March 1441 Jour.III f.78v., 79.
5. A member of Gloucester's household had told one of the jurymen that if he did not do well in his inquisition, he would die, 18, 20 March 1441, Jour.III f.80.

Wikeham, the keeper of Newgate. They had carried off arms from his house saying that they were for use against the men of the various Inns of Court in Holborn.¹ As a result of this trouble the Mayor ordered nightly vigils in the wards.² In August 1441 there was further trouble from the Inns of Court when several people were killed or wounded in a battle in Fleet Street between the Londoners and the men of the Inns of Court.³ The fighting continued until the Mayor, Sheriffs and other citizens arrived and parted the combatants. The chroniclers give the name of the leader of the lawyers as William Harebotell and a man of this name appeared before the Court of Aldermen on 8 September. He was described variously as 'of Furnivall's Inn' and 'of Clifford's Inn' and was accused of having made many 'turbations' in the City with his accomplices. He produced the alibi that at nine on the previous night when there had been a brawl in Fleet Street, he had been in Grey's Inn and had remained there until 10 p.m. Two Drapers, Richard Snell and Walter Mersh claimed that they feared bodily harm at Harebottel's hands. When Harebottel was further examined as to whether or not he had been exhorted by Mordon (possibly John Mordon, attorney), to keep the peace and not molest Richard Snell or anyone else, but live peaceably, Harebottel swore that he had not been so exhorted. Mordon then appeared in court and claimed that he had asked Harebottel to keep the peace with many discreet witnesses standing by.⁴ A nightly vigil was

-
1. 4 April 1441, Jour.III f.82. On the previous day a bill of complaint against the Butchers had been sent to the Mayor by the Commonalty. The Butchers claimed that this bill was completely false, Jour.III f.82. It may have been this which provoked the Butchers into the attack on Wikeham's house.
 2. 8 April 1441, Jour.III f.82v.
 3. Great Chronicle, p.176; Rawlinson B 355, p.102.
 4. 8 September 1441, Jour.III f.95.

imposed and a month later the men of the ward of Farrington Without put a bill of complaint up to the Mayor about the wrongs done to them by Harebottel and other men of the Chancellor's Inns.¹ There the matter ended for the time although the bad feeling between the Londoners and the lawyers continued throughout this period.

The final eruption of artisan discontent in 1443-4 and the arrival of Queen Margaret in 1445 posed problems of lawlessness in the City.² The summer months were always the most dangerous.³ In 1446 there were several threats to the peace while the King stayed at the Tower and great joustings were held there and at Smithfield. These may help to explain the assiduous vigils undertaken by the Mayor and Aldermen. The bastard son of Lord Scales was killed in a riot in Fleet Street and a chronicler noted that a great watch was kept in the City with men at arms but the citizens did not know why this was done.⁴

In July 1446 there arose the 'churls' case. A tumult broke out in Guildhall when John Harewell one of the serjeants tried to take John Beck, a cooper, prisoner. Beck was evading the attempts to put him behind bars, aided by his friends who obstructed the serjeant at every turn. In exasperation Harewell finally cried out 'I may nat have my prisonner for these churles'. A brawl ensued in which someone called the serjeant

1. 9 September 1441, 4 October 1441, Jour.III f.95v., 96v.
2. See Chapters IV and VIII.
3. In 1445 nightly vigils of Aldermen were appointed from May to July, Jour.IV f.78v., 80, 86.
4. Bale, p.120; Jour.IV f.127v., 129. An inquest into the death of Lord Scale's bastard son was taken at the Coroner's Court in Fleet Street. The Mayor and Aldermen ordered a new inquest and an inquiry into the felony, 20 May 1446, Jour.IV f.128v.

'murtherman' to which he replied 'Thow liest stynkyng churle in thyn hede'. This edifying evidence was examined in court with various witnesses saying whether they had heard Harewall calling people churles or not. One man said that he had heard the serjeant calling Beck a churle but did not hear him call the mob at large 'churles of London'. Beck and three of his associates were sent to Newgate for having caused an insurrection and the court decided that the use of the insult 'churl' was not a sufficient provocation for riot.¹ Yet the incident reveals an acute awareness of free status by lowly Londoners and a quick and hot-tempered response to any suggestion that they belonged to the villein class.

In October of the same year six men were imprisoned for causing a riot in Cheapside,² and at Christmas-time, always an occasion for excessive festivities in the City and a few broken heads, more elaborate precautions than usual were taken to preserve the peace. No arms were to be carried, lights were to be lit at night, hostellers were to inform the Mayor of all comings and goings and no boatmen were to carry passengers between six at night and six in the morning. There was, moreover, to be a nightly vigil of 400 armed men. One chronicler records that these precautions were taken on instructions from the King.³ Certainly these measures were successful since there was no recorded rioting during the Christmas season.

These were the last riots and troubles until the serious difficulties of the 1450s when Cade's revolt, the attack on Italian merchants and the

-
1. Evidence given on 30 July, 19 August 1446, Jour.IV f.134, 135v-136. After a month in prison Beck and the others were released 15 September 1446, Jour.IV f.142v-143.
 2. 11 October 1446, Jour.VI f.142v-143.
 3. 20, 21 December 1446, Jour.IV f.153v; Gregory, p.187.

dynastic rivalry produced considerable problems for the law-keepers of London. Although there is evidence of rioting in the City during the period 1400-1450, it is clear that it was usually brought quickly under control by the Mayor, Aldermen, Sheriffs and City officers. If they had constantly to be on the alert, this was the price the City had to pay for attracting great men and their retinues, as well as being the focus of the ambitions of so many classes of men. In a society of ruthless capitalism and free enterprise the cool minds of recession and the tight grip of monopolies provoked anger which had no other expression.

(iii) The Administration of Justice

The duties of the City officers in keeping the peace both in the City itself and in those parts of Southwark which lay within its jurisdiction, had to be carried out within the framework of royal justice. In the administration of justice, London occupied a unique place within the kingdom. By the charter of Henry I, Londoners enjoyed the right to choose their own Sheriffs and Justiciar to hear the pleas of the Crown. Moreover no citizen could be prosecuted for an offence committed within the City, except in the City's courts, nor could citizens sue each other in civil cases outside the City walls, except by special licence.¹ In course of time these privileges were amplified. The City courts took shape; the Hustings, Sheriffs' and Mayor's courts. Those actions which could not be finally determined by the Mayor or Sheriffs were tried by special justices

1. Charters, pp. 3-4.

of gaol-delivery sitting at Newgate. Appeals from judgments in City courts were tried on writs of error by special justices sitting at St. Martin's, one of whom, since 1327, was always the Mayor.¹ There were, however, other judicial privileges of the Londoners which rested more upon custom than charter and within this sphere the Crown was able to operate more freely. When the citizens were recalcitrant in some way, the Crown could question their judicial customs by miniature acts of quo warranto.

By a writ of certiorari the King could require the City to justify a judgment in a City court. The type of case could vary greatly. In 1413 the City justified the imprisonment of John Hertwelle who had removed a City orphan contrary to the will of the Mayor and Aldermen, by resort to City custom 'time out of mind'.² In the same way in 1421 the Londoners had to defend their right to try cases of usury but in this case they could refer not only to immemorial custom, but also to a confirmation by Parliament and a royal ordinance of 1364.³ In 1436 the City successfully

-
1. 6 March 1327, Charters, pp.53, 58, see L.B.K., p.159. On this question in general see A.H. Thomas, Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls 1298-1307, pp.ix-xi; G. Norton, Commentaries on the History, Constitution and Chartered Franchises of the City of London, 3rd edn. (1869) pp.361-63 where the author points out that a strict interpretation of the charter of Henry I whereby the Londoners had extensive jurisdiction in pleas of the Crown, was not wholly consistent with royal practice. The King's Coroner, Escheator and the King's judges of Gaol-delivery and on special eyres held at the Tower were, in fact, exercising jurisdiction in the City.
 2. 27 January 1413, L.B.I., p.111. For a fifteenth century statement of the City's judicial privileges, see L.B.K., p.257.
 3. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.97-98; Liber Albus, pp.368-71; L.B.G., p.162; See p.224 n. 1 below.

7.

claimed jurisdiction in a mercantile dispute when it was referred to the citizens by the King in accordance with the law merchant and the custom of the City.¹ Again it was only 'ancient custom' which the Sheriffs could plead to justify their seizure of the goods of Robert Cliderowe in 1438.² Similarly arrests of night walkers, adulterers and keepers of disorderly houses were justified by recourse to the immemorial custom of the City, and those detained in prison were to await whatever the law and custom of the City should require.³ In making these returns to royal writs, the City officers set out their case and justified their action, but their return usually concluded with an agreement to produce the prisoner in the King's court if so directed.

Occasionally the royal writs were concerned less with the cause of the arrest of goods or persons, and more with the legal process involved. It seems clear that the City was unwilling to let any of the records of the processes in civic courts pass outside the City and the Mayor, in 1411, refused to send a record of a case in the Sheriff's court but agreed to send a transcript of the process and this was accepted by the King.⁴ This anxiety about the City's records may explain why on two occasions in this

1. The case was between Elias Davy, a London Mercer, and John Burton of Norwich, L.B.K., pp.208-09; see Jour.III f.129, 129v. ⁴ December 1436 it was decided by the Court that Davy should not only pay Burton £30 but also a 20s. fine for contempt, Jour.III f.128.
2. L.B.K., p.217. The Sheriffs had seized Cliderowe's goods by way of withernam, i.e. in lieu of other goods which Cliderowe and Richard Cokke had taken from 3 London Mercers, cf. Liber Albus, pp.188-89.
3. L.B.K., pp.216-17; Cal.P. and M.1437-57, p.88.
4. Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, pp.305-6.

period, the Mayor claimed that the City had the privilege, when answering to a writ of error before the justices sitting at St. Martin's, of presenting the record and process orally by the mouth of the Recorder.¹ This privilege became a chartered right in 1444 when Henry VI granted the City an additional charter.²

Because the City vigorously defended its judicial privileges against royal encroachment this does not mean that the administration of justice in the City's courts was without blemish. On the other hand there are only sixteen cases recorded on the Patent and Close Rolls of writs of error involving processes in London courts, and four other cases in the Plea and Memoranda Rolls.³ Twenty cases in sixty years is not a large number. By and large the execution of justice in the City seems to have been conscientious. William Weternale, the Sheriff in 1441, declared that in a certain case before him he was not impartial and so the case was referred to a jury.⁴ But there were complaints such as that of Thomas York a Girdler, who was committed to Newgate for declaring shamefully that the execution of justice in the City was impeded by gifts and bribes to the judges.⁵ Men found

-
1. 1421, the Mayor also claimed that the City should have 40 days respite before answering to a writ of error, Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.111; 1440, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.38.
 2. G.R.O. Charter no.55, 26 October 1444.
 3. C.P.R. 1401-5, pp.66, 357; C.P.R. 1413-16, pp.37, 148, 414; C.P.R. 1416-22, p.419; C.P.R. 1422-29, pp.37, 122, 424, 548, 549; C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.437, 578; C.P.R. 1452-61, p.254; C.P.R. 1461-67, p.154; C.C.R. 1402-5, p.496; Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, pp.267-68, 294, 305; Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.42, 47, 111, 216, 223; Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.38.
 4. 19 May 1441, Jour.III f.85v.
 5. 30 March 1451; Jour.V f.55v. Robert Edolf was imprisoned for declaring that the judgment against him was false and for threatening the Mayor's life, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.82.

guilty of perjury in judicial cases were severely punished. In 1445 three men convicted of perjury were to be excluded from all acts of witness and credence in the City and their names were to be written on a tablet in full view of the public. They had also to pay fines.¹ A fruiterer named John Huwe four years later lost his freedom through perjury.² But it must be admitted that speed was not of the essence in civic jurisdiction any more than it was in royal jurisdiction elsewhere and when the Mayor and Aldermen were prodded by a royal writ to speed up their judgment in a case against John Abbot an ex-Sheriff, they replied that 'judgment had not been delivered owing to certain difficulties, but that it should be delivered as soon as possible after the Mayor and Aldermen were fully advised'.³

The City jealously guarded its monopoly of cases between citizens. Although licences were issued to individuals to prosecute cases outside the City, those who did not get such a licence ran the risk of losing their freedom.⁴ R. George and Peter Thorold lost their freedoms in this way in 1419 and their adversary, the Goldsmith John Corbyn or Corbet, lost his in the following year.⁵ The situation was made clear by an ordinance of the

1. Jour.IV f.95, 95v., 97, 99, 100v., 106v., 107.

2. 31 March 1449, Jour.V f.9.

3. 4 July 1433, L.B.K., p.169.

4. E.g. licence to Hugh Cavendish to prosecute John Knight and others, 30 August 1445, Jour.IV f.92. Similar licence to Martin Pockelington, 20 October 1418, L.B.I., p.202.

5. 10 January 1419, Jour.I f.68. John Corbyn lost his freedom 10 May 1420 but regained it a year later, Jour.I f.76v. A full account of Corbyn's expulsion from his company is to be found in Goldsmiths' Hall Ms.1518 B 39 Book A 1332-1442 f.124-5, 128.

Common Council promulgated on 9 August 1454. A freeman who prosecuted another freeman at law outside the City, was to be asked to abandon the suit. If he refused to do so then he was to be deprived of his freedom. He was also to pay a fine to the Chamber and the costs of the action.¹

Southwark did not come under the direct control of the City nor were its inhabitants liable to civic taxes. Thus it became the haunt of those who wished to escape the law or evade craft regulations and as such, it was the source of trouble and irritation to Londoners and their civic officers.² It was, therefore, a considerable advantage to the City to gain from the King in 1406 the right of arresting wrong-doers in Southwark and bringing them to Newgate prison.³ This produced a reaction from the men of Southwark who petitioned the King in the next Parliament to revoke the new Letters Patent, but the King merely commanded both parties to appear before the Council and there the matter rested.⁴

But the jurisdiction of the Mayor and the activities of the Bailiff appointed by the City to govern Southwark continued to be a grievance to the men of the borough. Richard Tyler and twelve of his neighbours obstructed

-
1. Jour.V f.184.
 2. Since 1327 the City had exercised jurisdiction in Southwark, but only over the small area near the Bridge foot known as the Guildable manor. In the rest of Southwark the law-breakers were subject to the more distant jurisdiction of the Sheriff of Surrey. For an example of the City's difficulties see Royal writ, 16 July 1405, C.C.R.1402-5, p.526. I am most grateful to Mr. David Johnson for help in elucidating certain points in relation to Southwark.
 3. 27 July 1406, C.P.R.1405-8, p.207. The City paid £10 p.a. for this privilege. In effect this put teeth into the charter of 1327 which had simply given the City the right to appoint a Bailiff and collect certain dues.
 4. R.P. III, pp.595-96.

the Mayor when he was carrying out his duties in 1421.¹ The anomalous position of the borough was also a grievance to the Londoners when men like the Saddler John Astall could evade the ordinance enjoining that the control of fust-making for saddlers should rest with the Fusters Company, by putting his apprentice to fust in Southwark.² By 1443 John Combe the Common Serjeant at Arms had been appointed Bailiff of Southwark and there were several complaints about the activities of his deputies and officials. These complaints were properly drafted and Combe and his serjeant put in a bill of excuse.³ In May 1444 the Court of Aldermen decided that Combe should not put the bailiwick to farm, nor appoint a deputy unless he were accepted by the court, that he should go personally to Southwark at least twice a week, and that he and any deputy of his should swear to observe the ancient customs of the borough.⁴ On 30 October 1444, however, the Londoners finally obtained from the King a new charter in which their rights in Southwark were considerably extended and formally confirmed; although these rights had, subsequently, to be defended.⁵

-
1. 18 June 1423, Jour.II f.7.
 2. Ordinance, 10 November 1424, L.B.K., p.37; 24 July 1425, Jour.II f.48.
 3. 15 October 1443, 16, 17 March 1444, Jour.IV f.9v., 20, 21. There were riots in Southwark in May 1443, P.P.C., V, pp.277-78.
 4. 30 May 1444, Jour.IV f.27. Copy of the oath of the Bailiff of Southwark 17 June 1444, Jour.IV f.30v.
 5. For negotiations leading up to the City's acquisition of the charter see 18 May, 7 September 1444, Jour.IV f.25v., 27v. and Chapter IV. G.R.O. Charter no.55; Cal.Charter Roll 1427-1516, pp.41-44. The charter granted the City the right to hold a view of frankpledge and a three day fair. 28 January 1445, Common Council voted a subsidy which was to be used in part to defend the City's liberties in Southwark, Jour.IV f.60v.

But in spite of this charter the borough of Southwark continued to be separate from the City in many ways. In 1455 it was decided that the inhabitants of the borough who did not pay scot and lot should not enjoy the freedom of the City unless they paid a compounded sum of 5s.¹ The Girdlers found that they had no jurisdiction over work made in Southwark;² the Mayor's assize of bread was resisted there in 1458;³ the Armourers admitted that they could not control the activities of members living in Southwark;⁴ and the inhabitants were reluctant to contribute towards the assessment of Bridge ward.⁵ But in 1460 the unpopular John Combe resigned his office and was succeeded as Bailiff of Southwark by John Gloucester, and in 1467 the City's rights in the borough were confirmed by Edward IV.⁶

(iv) The Administration of City Property

The administration and conservation of the property which the City held in common was one of the most onerous tasks which fell to the Court of Aldermen. The estates which had been allotted or bequeathed for the upkeep of London Bridge were administered separately from other City properties, and so they will be separately discussed.

By the later fourteenth century the ownership of the City streets, ditches, walls and gates, and adjacent land required for defence and perambulation was certainly considered by the Mayor and Commonalty to belong to them; likewise the water and banks of the Thames. 'An ownership based

-
1. 9, 19 September 1455, Jour.V f.260, 262.
 2. 21 October 1456, Jour.VI f.108v. 3. 26 January 1458, Jour.VI f.190.
 4. 9 October 1459, Jour.VI f.144v. 5. 21 August 1460, Jour.VI f.261.
 6. November 1467, C.C.R. 1461-68, p.452.

on physical control acquired partly by custom and usage and partly by specific grant from the Crown.¹ Henry IV in 1400 granted to the citizens of London the control of all the City gates and in 1444 Henry VI's charter confirmed long established practice by granting to the citizens 'all common sorts, purprestures, approvements in all wastes, common streets, ways and other places in the City and suburbs aforesaid and in the water of the Thames within the liberty of the same City forever'.²

To defend the common soil of the City from encroachment, maintain the City's walls and gates, to cleanse the City ditches, to light and pave and clear the City streets and to administer profitably such lands as had been granted to the Commonalty, were some of the most important tasks which fell to the Court of Aldermen.

One of the wardmote articles required juries to report purprestures on streets, walls, ditches and on the waters of the Thames or upon any common soil in the ward.³ The returns of 1421 and 1422 show the ward inquests to have been assiduous in presenting such encroachments.⁴ Alternatively the Mayor and Aldermen might order special inquests to examine encroachments in a particular area or ward.⁵ To build on the common soil of the City required a special licence such as that granted to the Rector and parishioners of St. Michael le Quern in 1430 to enlarge the church upon

1. P.E. Jones, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.xi.

2. G.R.O. Charter no.55.

3. Liber Albus, pp.337-38.

4. E.g. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.131, 134, 156, 157.

5. 5 September 1439 to be an enquiry into the extent of Common Soil at Paul's Wharf, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.20; 16 July 1439 to be inquisition in Baynard's Castle ward to see if there had been any purprestures on Common Soil in the ward, Jour.III f.18.

the common soil.¹ In 1458 the Court of Aldermen decided to deal with several encroachments on the common soil at the same time. There were four particularly glaring encroachments. John Adys, goldsmith, had built a stone house on the common soil in the parish of St. John Zachary. The Rector and parishioners of St. Mary Woolchurch had encroached on common soil near the Stocks. The Master of St. Augustin's Pappey had built out an abutting stone wall and William Melbourne had built a stone house in the parish of St. Benet Fynk.² Apart from the Master of St. Augustine's, the cases against the offenders were prosecuted with some vigour. It was decided that the new building put up by the Rector and parishioners of St. Mary's should be destroyed.³ John Adys was ordered to pay 5 marks to the Chamber for his contempt in building on the common soil and a quit rent of 6s.8d. p.a. for the building.⁴ William Melbourne who had been in trouble before for failing to repair one of his tenements in the parish of St. Bartholomew the Less, was ordered to answer for his building, but whether

-
1. 30 July 1429, Mayor and Aldermen agree to the church being built, half upon the common soil, Jour.II f.136v. Licence dated 22 March 1430, L.B.K., p.106.
 2. 11 August 1458, Jour.VI f.229.
 3. 13 September 1458, 4 Aldermen appointed to examine the nuisance built by the Stocks and report back to the Court, Jour.VI f.231; 19 September 1458 they report that it extends 4 feet into the common soil, Jour.VI f.231v.; 9 December 1458, decision to destroy the building before 1 March 1459, Jour.VI f.162.
 4. 9 December 1458, 6 March 1460 he agreed to abide by the decision of the Court, Jour.VI f.162, 204v. 10 March 1460 decided that Adys should pay the fine and rent, Jour.VI f.205v. 5 April 1460, Adys brings 5 marks to Court, Jour.VI f.209v. Jan./Feb. 1462 Adys is ordered to pay his arrears of quit rent, Jour.VI f.8v. Possibly because of his recalcitrance, Adys was six times rejected as an Alderman by the Court between 10 November 1458 and 12 November 1461.

he had to pay a rent, or destroy the building, is not recorded.¹ In the late 1450s and early 1460s there are indications that the Mayor and Aldermen made more stringent efforts to inspect common land, search for encroachments and prosecute offenders.²

The wall which surrounded the City was pierced at seven points by gates - Ludgate, Newgate, Aldersgate, Cripplegate, Moorgate, Bishopsgate and Aldgate. All the gates, except Moorgate, had houses over them which could be granted to City officers and those who received such lodgings were expected to maintain and repair the gates.³ Ludgate and Newgate also served as City prisons.⁴ In November 1454 some of the guardians or keepers of City gates together with wardens of the 'vallet' were sworn not to admit

-
1. 13 August 1455, Melbourne had threatened his Alderman, Christopher Water, and had said that if his building was destroyed, he would rebuild it and find a better Alderman. He was sent to Newgate, Jour.V f.255. 9 December 1458, Jour.VI f.162.
 2. 11 October 1458, Committee appointed to investigate all encroachments on common soil and decide whether they should be destroyed or made to pay rent, Jour.VI f.234. 29 May 1459, Discussion about various purprestures on common soil, Jour.VI f.111v. May 1461, Hugh Boner, who occupied a garden as a tenant of Christ Church Priory, was enjoined to pay no rent to the Priory in future since his garden was on common soil, Jour.VI f.73.
 3. The house over Aldgate was occupied by Alexander Anne, Common Serjeant in 1429 and by John Houghton, Water-bailiff in 1457, Jour.II f.132, Jour.VI f.92v. Bishopsgate was occupied by the Hanse merchants and was granted to William Caldebek, a Chamber serjeant in 1461, Jour.VI f.21v. and Chapter VI, pp.371-372. Cripplegate was granted to John Credeney, c.1408, to John Combe, Common Crier in 1428, to John Asshe, Common Crier in 1460 who was to supervise the repair of the gate, L.B.K., pp.65-6, Jour.II f.107, Jour.VI f.219v. Aldersgate was occupied by John Combe in 1428, William Wode a Chamber serjeant in 1444, Jour.II f.107, Jour.IV f.13. Ordinances about the repair of the gates 29 May 1442, 21 May 1445, L.B.K., p.270, Jour.IV f.78v.
 4. See Chapter II, pp. 97-102.

lepers or night-walkers into the City.¹ These men do not appear to be the same as those who occupied the houses over the gates. They may have occupied a room at ground level and were responsible for opening and closing the gates in accordance with civic regulations. The wall between Cripplegate and Bishopsgate was breached in 1415 during the Mayoralty of Thomas Fauconer and a new gate called Moorgate was built to lead out directly into Moorfields. It was decided to lay these fields out as gardens and to make some improvements in the way in which they were drained into Walbrook so that the whole area might be cleaner and healthier.²

The upkeep of the City walls and of the ditches which lay outside them was of vital importance to the citizens, not only for defence, but also for health. Much of the City's waste and sewage emptied into these ditches and when they became blocked, as frequently happened, the area could become insanitary and infectious. The ward inquests of 1421 and 1422 presented many broken walls and stopped up ditches.³ To prevent such nuisances was the task of rakers and scavengers in the wards and, at the civic level, of the serjeant of the channel. But the efforts of the Court of Aldermen in this

-
1. Those sworn (for the Keepers of Ludgate and Newgate see Appendix nos. 2 & 3) on 18 November 1454 were, Roger Ball 'custos' of the gate at London Bridge; John Stertant 'bedellus et janitor seu custos' of Bishopsgate; Richard Hardyng 'bedellus et custos' of Aldgate; Stephen of Croft 'custos' of the postern at the Tower; William Everard 'bedellus et custos' of Aldersgate; Roger/John Reynold 'custos velett' of Cripplegate; William Fox 'custos vellet' of Aldgate; John Scarlet 'custos velett' of Bishopsgate; Richard Laverok 'custos velett' of Aldersgate. William Hoggekyns 'custos velett' of Ludgate, John Hays 'custos velett' of Newgate.
 2. 2 July 1415, Memorials, pp.614-16; Stow, Survey, 1, pp.32-33; L.B.I., p.137.⁶ 12 January 1412 it had been found that the ditch between the City walls and Moorfields was blocked up and it was thought that this was due to the fields being used as gardens and refuse tips, L.B.I., p.101. 29 September 1425 it was decided that the Chamberlain should let the Moor to farm for as high a price as possible, Jour.II f.53.
 3. Xc.f. Haden 565 p.99
Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.127, 129-30, 152.

matter were lacking in regularity and persistence and appear to have been based upon the fallacious assumption that a cleared ditch remains clear.¹ Sums of money were allotted at intervals to clear ditches or to repair the walls; or the wards might be assessed for this purpose.² In the 1450s there is evidence of a more determined effort to clear the moats around the City walls. In 1457 Common Council appointed a committee of 2 Aldermen and 4 Common Councilmen to investigate what repairs needed to be done on the walls and ditches.³ A year later a further committee of 3 Aldermen and 5 Common Councilmen was appointed to deal with Thomas Bigge, carpenter, about the building of ditches and water-courses around the City walls.⁴ Again a year later another committee of four was to consider what improvements were necessary for the City's moats and to negotiate with the Master of St. Katherine's in order to buy land which was required to enlarge the moat around the Tower.⁵ In May 1461 there is finally some sign of success for the Common Council was informed that Lathers and Carpenters had gone round all the City ditches and had ensured that the water everywhere flowed smoothly⁶

1. E.g. L.B.I., p.101.

2. 14 October 1423, 20 marks allotted for the repair of the City walls, Jour.II f.103; 29 March 1432, letter from the Mayor to the citizens living outside the walls informing them that they have been assessed to provide £20 for the repair of the walls and the cleaning of the City ditches which 'ben in grete perill and ruine' L.B.K., pp.131-32. 15 December 1462 William Yorke, Fishmonger? was discharged from serving in any office on payment of 100 marks for the repair of the City ditches, L.B.L., pp.29-30.

3. 4 April 1457, Jour.VI f.118v.

4. 1 April 1458, Jour.VI f.195.

5. 6 April 1459, Jour.VI f.154v.

6. 22 May 1461, a committee composed of several Aldermen and 10 Commoners, of whom Thomas Bigge was one, was appointed to examine the ditches, Jour.VI f.74. 30 May 1461, Common Council received with pleasure the report of the committee's success, Jour.VI f.74v.

All the roads and streets within the City were not only the King's highways but were also considered as part of the common soil, and their status as such was confirmed by the charter of 1444. During their quarrel with St. Martin's the citizens affirmed that St. Martin's Lane was part of the King's highway and also part of the common soil.¹ This duality of control over City streets can be seen from the fact that the King sometimes sent writs to the Mayor and Aldermen instructing them to ensure that rubbish was not thrown into the streets leaving them obstructed.² The Mayor also issued proclamations to this effect and included injunctions to light the streets also.³ Owners and occupiers of tenements in the City were responsible for the upkeep of the road outside their houses, making sure that it was both level and paved.⁴ In 1439 and 1440 the Court of Aldermen and Common Council made some attempts to force householders to pave the streets outside their houses with wood in accordance with ordinances and ancient City customs.⁵ But both the inclination and the ability to force men to take action appears to have been lacking and the ward inquests tell their tale of ill-paved, ill-lit and obstructed roads in the City.

The common land of the City did not only include the waste lands, river banks and streets granted by the 1444 charter. It also included, by custom, sixteen feet lying on the City side of the City wall and also such lands and

1. 13 May 1455, Jour.V f.242; 19 November 1459, Jour.VI f.169; see P.E. Jones, Cal.P.and M.1437-57, pp.x-xiii.
2. 12 November 1409, L.B.I., p.82; 1 August 1444, L.B.K., p.297.
3. 7 November 1414, L.B.I., p.131; c.1461, L.B.L., p.11.
4. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, p.297; Cal.P.and M.1437-57, p.37.
5. February 1439, Jour.III f.9; 22 February 1440, Jour.III f.37; 28 February 1440, Jour.III f.37v.

tenements as were devised to the Commonalty by pious citizens or brought by the City and held in mortmain at this period, under royal licences.¹ During the mayoralty of Thomas Catworth (1443-4) the Commonalty bought certain tenements in the parish of St. Michael Le Quern from William Combes.² The City did not always buy a licence to hold in mortmain but might appoint feoffees to uses. Six Aldermen and four Commoners served in this capacity for certain tenements at the Fleshambbes in the parish of St. Nicholas Acon.³ Four Aldermen and eight commoners were assigned as feoffees for the lands in Calais bequeathed to the City by John Reynwell.⁴ The Commonalty not only acquired lands in the City but these had also to be administered. Botolph's wharf, for example, which had been in the possession of the City since 1297 was farmed to individuals at different times. In 1453 it was offered to Thomas Bernewell's widow for £40 p.a., but she must have turned down the offer, for a month later the court decided that the wharf should be farmed to anyone who would pay £36 13s.4d. p.a.⁵ During this period also the Commonalty undertook the rebuilding of the Great Cross at the west end of

-
1. L.B.K., p.189. On mortmain see Chapter VI, pp.40-42. Edward IV's charter of 28 June 1478 granted to the citizens the right to hold lands in mortmain to the value of 200 marks p.a. in return for cancelling his debt of £1923 9s.8d. which he owed to the City, Charters, pp.87-89.
 2. 6 April 1451, John Middleton brought certain evidences about these properties into court, Jour.V f.56.
 3. May 1458, these tenements were taken into the King's hands and appear to have been the subject of a dispute at the Exchequer, Jour.VI f.242v.
 4. 19 August 1457, Jour.VI f.132. Reynwell had died in 1445 but it took the City a long time to settle his estate with his executors, of whom William Combes, John Colston and John Newerk were three. There were many debtors' claims against the estate. It was decided that Reynwell's anniversary should be kept at the expense of the Chamber, 7 June 1454, Jour.V f.171. See also 2 April 1459, Jour.VI f.153v.
 5. L.B.E., p.243. 13 April, 28 May 1453, Jour.V f.108v., 111. 4 August 1453 Committee appointed to oversee a piece of land there, Jour.V f.253.

Cheapside which had originally been erected by Edward I in memory of Queen Eleanor. The new cross was put up in 1441 and Robert Marshall who was Sheriff in 1439-40 and left 100 marks for the work.¹ At this period there was no special City lands committee and the work of buying, administering and maintaining corporate property fell largely to the Court of Aldermen under the spasmodic surveillance of the Common Council.

In connection with its common property the City often used its Common Seal. London had had a Common Seal since 1216 which appears to have rested in the keeping of the Mayor for the first hundred years or so of its existence. On 22 March 1312, however, the good men of the Commonalty met together and petitioned the Mayor and Aldermen that, among other things, the Common Seal should in future remain in a chest under six keys, three of which should be kept by the Aldermen and three by good men of the Commonalty. Moreover the Common Seal was not to be used on letters which bound,^{or} burdened the Commonalty, without their first being assembled and giving their unanimous assent.² But in the charter which the citizens obtained from Edward II in 1319 it was laid down that the Common Seal was to be in the keeping of two Aldermen and two Commoners. No charge was to be made for its use and it was to be available for rich and poor.³ Where the names of fourteenth century keepers are recorded they usually include the Mayor, an Alderman and two commoners in accordance with the charter.⁴

-
1. Harben, Dictionary of London, p.271; Gregory, p.183; 22 August 1457 John Lamberd, Mercer, an executor of Robert Marshall, admitted in Court that Marshall had left 100 marks for the Cheap cross, Jour.VI f.132v. The cross was not completed until 1486.
 2. L.B.D., p.283; Liber Albus, p.366; Williams, Medieval London, p.272.
 3. Charters, p.48.
 4. L.B.G., p.334; L.B.H., pp.36, 62, 219.

In the fifteenth century the names of the keepers of the Common Seal are not recorded in the Letter Books as had occasionally been the practice in the previous century. But the keepers names are sometimes to be found in the Journals; and with some regularity after 1440. The Mayor appears to have been a keeper by virtue of his office, accompanied by two Aldermen and 3 commoners before 1452 and one Aldermen and 4 commoners after that date.¹ There seems to have been considerable continuity of personnel and an individual might, with the permission of the court, hand over his key to another person as Walter Chertesey handed over his key to the Common Seal to Robert Bertyn, a Draper like himself.² The Mayor would hand over his key to his successor without reference to the other five keepers.³ On one occasion the keys of the Common Seal were gathered up and placed in the custody of the Chamberlain for a brief period.⁴

The six keys of the Common Seal were, in fact, keys to two chests each with three locks and one was kept inside the other. Hence the keys were for the left, centre or right hand locks of the outer chest, and to the left, centre and right hand locks of the inner chest.⁵ The keepers of the Common Seal and the keepers of the Common Chest were the same people and might be called by either title. In the Common Chest the City kept other important documents.

-
1. For a list of the recorded keepers of the Common Seal, see Appendix no.22 pp. 579-580.
 2. 10 January 1444, Jour.IV f.13.
 3. Jour.VI f.229v.
 4. 4 September 1448 until 6 September 1448, Jour.IV f.225v., 226v.
 5. See October 1427, Jour.II f.102; 20 February 1455, Jour.V f.225v.

Although the keepers of the Common Seal were probably chosen on meetings of the Common Council, this is not always clear from the Journals. In fact on only two occasions are the keepers listed in accounts of meetings of the Common Council.¹ In 1312 the citizens had asked that the Common Seal should not be used for purposes which burdened the Commonalty without their consent. Certainly during the dispute with the clergymen of London when the Common Seal was used on letters this was done with the assent of the Common Council. Similarly on 10 October 1452 an obligation to Simon Eyre promising him repayment of £315 4s.4d. was sealed with the Common Seal in a meeting of Common Council.² But when the Common Seal was used in the presentation of Thomas Gascoigne to the living of St. Peter's Cornhill, this was done in the presence of the Mayor, six Aldermen and the Chamberlain.³ But it may have been thought that this action did not burden the Commonalty and so their assent, expressed through the Common Council, was not necessary.

(v) The Upkeep of London Bridge

The upkeep of London Bridge was one of the most pressing concerns of the government of London. Since the Bridge in use in the fifteenth century was that begun by Peter de Colechurch in 1176, it is not surprising that 250 years of continuous use had rendered the Bridge a constant anxiety.

-
1. 17 October 1452, Jour.V f.90v.; 26 January 1461, Jour.VI f.188v.
 2. 10 October 1452, Jour.V f.89v.
 3. 18 November 1445, Jour.IV f.107v. Similarly it was decided to attach the Common Seal to deeds for Katherine Carpenter, 2 September 1448, by the Mayor and Aldermen, Jour.IV f.225v.

Edward II's charter to the City had granted

that the keeping of the bridge of the said city, and the rents and profits belonging to that bridge, be committed to be kept to two honest and sufficient men of the city, other than the Aldermen, to be chosen by the commonalty, at the will of the said commonalty, and not to others; and who may be answer thereupon to the said commonalty.¹

In 1404 it was decided that the Bridgewardens should be elected annually with the Sheriffs on 21 September and that they should not serve for more than two consecutive years. But the Bridgewardens' duties were complex and such a rapid turnover of personnel was found to be impracticable and the ordinance was revoked two years later.² The main duties of the Bridgewardens were to keep the Bridge in good repair and to administer the lands and tenements which had been given by pious citizens who, as Mr. P.E. Jones wrote

were encouraged to feel that it was their duty to support what was not only a commercial asset but almost a sacred structure. Its maintenance was an obligation of citizenship as well as an act of faith and charity.³

To help them carry out their duties the Bridgewardens employed a Renter to collect the rent revenues; a bailiff who collected the tolls for crossing the Bridge⁴ and a Clerk of the Works who cared for the fabric. But the

-
1. Charters, p.49.
 2. 23 September 1404, 21 September 1406, L.B.I., pp.33, 35. For a list of Bridgewardens during this period see Appendix no. 37 pp.600-601.
 3. P.E. Jones, 'Some Bridge House Properties', Journal of the British Archaeological Association, 3rd series, XVI (1953), pp.59-73, esp. p.59. This is an excellent example of the kind of information which may be culled from the Bridge House records.
 4. For the fees which the Bailiff could collect see Liber Albus, pp.234-37.

overall responsibility lay with the Bridgewardens who had to account each year to six auditors chosen annually by the Commonalty.¹ The accounts and rentals were carefully kept and largely survive for this period.²

William Wetnale who was a Bridgewarden from 1434-1438 was the only man who held the office during this period who got into serious trouble over his accounting. The other Bridgewarden at this time was Thomas Badby, and their accounts were not audited until 1442. The original auditors thought that Wetnale owed money to the Bridge and further auditors were appointed. In December 1447 Wetnale was judged to have tended London Bridge negligently while he was a warden and he was condemned to forfeit his 100 mark reward. In response to this Wetnale decided to prosecute the Mayor and Commonalty in 1449 and the current Bridgewardens had to bear the expense of defending the case. In February 1451 a final arbitration was drawn up between Wetnale and the City which included the original arbitration of December 1447 together with additional clauses added by Common Council.³ Four months later

1. The auditors would be 2 Aldermen and 4 Common Councilmen, three of whom would usually be replaced each year so that there was some continuity. For a list of auditors see Appendix no.36, pp.594-99.
2. In G.R.O. there are Bridgewardens accounts in rolls from 1381 to 1406. These were superseded by separate rentals recording income from the Bridge properties, vol.I 1404-1421 and vol.II 1423-1460. At the same time separate books recording weekly payments by the Bridgewardens were kept, vol.I 1404-1412, vol.II 1412-1421, vol.III 1421-1430, vol.IV 1430-1445. The rentals and weekly accounts were subsequently combined in one volume 1460-1484. There are also many deeds of this period relating to the Bridge House estates and other properties, collected in 10 portfolios A-K, and 4 boxes of miscellaneous deeds.
3. Wetnale and Badby petitioned the Lord Chancellor to issue a writ against the Mayor and Aldermen, since they had spent of their own money £119 5s.6 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. 'for the grete spoyle and ruyn that the seid bridge thenne was inne' and could not get reimbursement from the City. London Topographical Record, vol.VI (1909), pp.65-66. 9 April, 11 May, 20 July, 25 October 1442, Jour.III f.116, 134, 142, 154v.; 24 April, 6 May, 19 July, 19,23 October, 17 December 1444, 23 November, 7 December 1445, 5 December 1446, 30 January, 26 April,

(continued at foot of next page)

Wetnale's place as Alderman of Walbrook ward was taken by Thomas Scot.¹

The auditors in July 1459 decided that Thomas Davy who had been a Bridgewarden for nearly ten years should bring into court the money which was owing from the time when he and Thomas Cook had been Bridgewardens (1449-1457).² Perhaps as a result of this the two new Bridgewardens who were chosen in September 1459 were required to provide security of £500 that they would well and faithfully render their accounts and satisfy the City of any arrears.³ In such circumstances it is difficult to understand why a man should wish to be elected as a Bridgewarden. He was paid an annual salary of £10, as well as a possible reward at the end of his service.⁴

1. 11 June 1451, Jour.V f.57. Wetnale had become an Alderman in 1438 on ceasing to be Bridgewarden.
2. 10 July 1459, Jour.VI f.160v. Sums of money were still outstanding from the account of Davy and Cook in 1460, see B.H.R., vol.III f.19(a)v.
3. 21 September 1459, Peter Calcote and Peter Alfold chosen as Bridgewardens L.B.K., p.399. 26 September 1459, required to produce security, Jour.VI f.138v. 13 January 1460, it was decided that the security should be £500, Jour.VI f.224v. 14 March 1460, Bridgewardens were asked whether they would agree to provide £400 security, Jour.VI f.207. 21 April 1460, William Haydock, Richard Rose, John Blaunche, John Pickering mainpernors for Peter Alfold and Peter Calcote in £500, Jour.VI f.210.
4. G.R.O. Bridgewardens Account Roll 15 m.1. Each Warden in 1396/7 was paid £10 and the Renter was also paid £10. When the next annual (as opposed to weekly) accounts are extant, in 1460, the Bridgewardens still receive £10 p.a. each. But they also receive £1 p.a. for clothing and a £10 reward. The Renter received £10 and a reward of 73s.4d. The salary roll had swollen to include a Clerk of the Works (salary £6 13s.4d. and reward 66s.8d.), a Collector of quit-rents and fees at the Stockmarket (salary £5 and reward 20s.), Bailiff or Collector of tolls on the Bridge (salary 66s.8d.), Jailer or Keeper of the gate (salary £6 10s.0d.), B.H.R., vol.III f.19v., 19(a)v.

(footnote 3 continued from previous page)

10, 14 July, 19 August, 12 October, 17 November, 4, 13, 15, 18 December 1447, Jour.IV f.22v.; 24, 32v., 41, 48, 55v., 108v., 110, 151v., 161, 175, 183v., 184v., 188, 196, 201, 202, 202v., 203v.; 21 February 1449, 8, 11, 20 May 1450, 5 February 1451, Jour.V f.6v., 35, 36, 53v.

Moreover as Bridgewarden he had access to large amounts of ready cash which, as long as he could account for it, he could employ as he liked meanwhile. The City itself might call upon the Bridge funds and, in some respects, the Bridge acted as a primitive bank for civic purposes. In 1397 the Bridgewardens provided £50 during the Mayoralty of Richard Whittington towards the sum to be paid to the King.¹ In 1417 Richard Osborn, the Chamberlain's clerk, was instructed to receive £100 from the Bridge revenues, probably for the new work at Guildhall, and in 1419 Nicholas James, who was then Bridgewarden, was asked to bring 50 marks into court.²

The defence of the lands and rights of the Bridge might take the wardens to court. In 1424 Nicholas and Robert Cock who lived in Bridge ward built a jetty or wharf out into the Thames at the north end of the Bridge. This jetty included an arch similar to the last arch of the Bridge itself. The Commonalty petitioned against this encroachment on common soil and William Trymnyell and John Colbrook, the Bridgewardens, were instructed to seize the jetty on behalf of the Commonalty. Although the matter was finally settled by the arbitration of Henry Frowyk in 1423, the Common Council had agreed to go to law over the matter if necessary.³

1. See Chapter I, p.7.

2. 10 February 1417, Jour.I f.42v. 16 November 1419, Jour.I f.63v. 27 October 1424, John Olney received 100s. in alms from the Bridgewardens on the instructions of the Court of Aldermen, Jour.II f.25v. Occasionally the Chamber assisted the Bridge, e.g. 18 April 1442, the Bridgewardens were to receive £20 from the Chamber with which to pay the Rector and parishioners of St. Mary Woolchurch for an area of land 15 feet wide lying between the Church and the Stock market, Jour.III f.90v. The Stock market was one of the oldest Bridge properties having been given to the Bridge by Henry le Waleys in 1282, L.B.K., p.130, n.1.

3. The men of Bridge ward indicted Robert Cock in 1421 for throwing filth in the Oisterdate of Thames St. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.140. For details of the case see 17 August, 13 October 1424, April, 23 May, 6, 25 July 1425, Jour.II f.21v., 24v., 40v., 43, 45v., 47, 47v.

The two main duties, however, of the Bridgewardens were the administration of the Bridge estates and the upkeep and repair of the Bridge which was to be paid for out of the income of these estates. Important decisions about buying and selling Bridge property might be referred by the wardens to the Court of Aldermen. In 1425 it was decided that Bridge lands in Kent should be sold or exchanged for better lands in London.¹ In 1442 the Chamber helped the Bridgewardens to buy lands from the Rector and parishioners of St. Mary Woolchurch to enlarge the Stock market.² In 1447 the Bridgewardens were authorized to rebuild a ruined house in the Shambles and the decision to buy a piece of land in Lewisham for the Bridge was made by the Court of Aldermen in 1459.³ The Court supported the Bridgewardens in their struggle with the Abbot of Stratford over four acres of land occupied by the abbey and claimed by the Bridge.⁴ In 1458 the Prior of St. Mary Spittel owed the Bridgewardens £4 in arrears of rent for a tenement called Copped Hall which the Court helped the wardens to collect.⁵ The Bridgewardens would turn to the Common Council or Court of Aldermen for confirmations of general policy in regard to rents, quit-rents, sub-letting, eviction, vacant rents and recalcitrant debtors.⁶

-
1. 19 November 1425, Richard Clifford had enfeoffed the Bridgewardens with these Kentish lands to the use of the Bridge, Jour.II f.57v.
 2. 18 April 1442, Jour.III f.90v.
 3. 10 May 1447, Jour.IV f.176v.; 12 October 1459, Jour.VI f.145v.
20 February 1460, feoffees were appointed for the lands lately acquired at Lewisham for the use of the Bridge, Jour.VI f.199v.
 4. 13, 21 August, 10 October 1460, Jour.VI f.260v., 261v., 263v., 271. On the last date the wardens were instructed to deliver to John Stamer, the mill at Saynes, held 'pro dampno' for a year by the Abbot of Stratford, see P.E. Jones, op.cit., pp.69-72.
 5. 22 April 1458, Jour.VI f.241v. For some notes on Copped Hall see C.L. Kingsford, 'Historical Notes on Medieval London Houses', London Topographical Record, X (1916), pp.100-01.
 6. 2 May 1442, petition of the Bridgewardens to the Common Council about sub-letting, L.B.K., pp.268-69; policy on eviction, 10 October 1442, (continued at foot of next page)

The Bridge was not incorporated and so its properties had to be held by feoffees who were often Aldermen and chosen by the Court of Aldermen or in Common Council.¹ All the Bridge House deeds and evidences appear to have been kept in a locked chest in the chapel on London Bridge. At intervals the Court of Aldermen appointed committees to examine the evidences of London Bridge.² The chest appears to have had three keys and the guardians of these keys were chosen by Common Council. The first reference to the keys of this chest of evidences is to be found in 1444.³ In 1458 it was decided that after

-
1. 9 April 1450, 8 feoffees of the lands of London Bridge were chosen at a meeting of Common Council, Jour.V f.33v. 18 April 1455, 10 Aldermen and 6 Commoners were enfeoffed of lands to be delivered to them by John Parker, attorney for Henry Frowyk, Jour.V f.238.
 2. 31 May 1448, 2 Aldermen, Recorder, Common Serjeant, Common Clerk appointed, Jour.IV f.219; 17 December 1453, 2 Aldermen to examine all the muniments and evidences of the Bridge, Jour.V f.138; 15 April 1455, 2 Aldermen, Common Serjeant, Chamberlain and 2 Commoners to supervise the opening of the chest with the deeds of London Bridge and see to their enrolment and the making of new deeds, Jour.V f.236v.; 12 January 1459, 6 Commoners appointed to examine the charters and evidences, Jour.VI f.147v.; 2 May 1461, 2 Aldermen and 2 Commoners appointed for this purpose, Jour.VI f.53v.
 3. 6 May 1444, 3 keys to Stephen Broun, Thomas Catworth, John Reynwell, Jour.IV f.24; 1 April 1446, 3 keys to the same men, Jour.IV f.122v.; 5 June 1454, the possession of the keys discussed and the Wardens said that they would report the next day on who had the keys, Jour.V f.170; 22 April 1458, 3 keys to Richard Alley (an auditor), John Walden (Alderman and auditor) and a Bridgewarden, Jour.VI f.241; 20 May 1460, Walden returned his key which was given to Hugh Wyche, Alderman, Jour.VI f.212v.; 2 May 1461, a key of the chest delivered to William Tailor, Alderman, who was one of the 4 men appointed to examine the Bridge deeds, Jour.VI f.53v.

(footnote 6 continued from previous page)

Jour.III f.152v.; 5 October 1440, payments to occupy Bridge properties, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.31; withholding of rents 23 July 1455, Jour.V f.251v.; 26 January, 15 March 1441, vacant Bridge House rents examined by the Court, Jour.III f.73, 76v.

the auditors and Common Serjeant had opened the chest and examined the deeds and evidences, the wardens were to make a register of the Bridge deeds in a book called Doomsday for a permanent record.¹

The chapel of St. Thomas on London Bridge was also the responsibility of the wardens who accounted for the offerings received from the faithful and also for the expenses of maintaining lights and candles, washing the linen and the salaries of the chaplains.² The Rector of St. Magnus at intervals tried to exercise some sort of jurisdiction or control over the chapel but this was resisted.³ The appointment of the four chaplains who served the chapel lay with the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty. These men received a salary of 10 marks p.a. together with surplices, the necessaries for the chapel, the use of a chamber in the Bridgehouse and fire-wood.⁴ Late in 1453 the Bishop of London dismissed two of the chaplains on London Bridge as well as a lawyer who was of the counsel of the Bridge. The Aldermen petitioned the Lord Chancellor about this but were then embarrassed to discover that an inhibition on the Bishop's action had been openly proclaimed at St. Paul's Cross at the suit of the Bridgewardens.⁵

-
1. 22 April 1458, Jour.VI f.241.
 2. E.g. B.H.R., vol.III, in 1460 the receipts from the alms of the faithful amounted to 31s.1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and the expenses were £36 6s.10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. There were separate sections in the accounts for the Chapel income and expenditure.
 3. 6 July 1425, Common Council decided that the Bridgewardens should not be subject to the Rector of St. Magnus in respect of the Chapel of St. Thomas, since it was free from all subjection, Jour.II f.45v. 26 January 1460, the Bridgewardens came into conflict with the Rector and Churchwardens of St. Magnus over the repair of a staircase in Stephen's Lane. The liability was disputed but the Wardens agreed to pay for the repairs until the ownership was settled, Jour.VI f.227v.
 4. L.B.K., pp.263, 290, 299.
 5. 29 November, 4, 8, 11 December 1453, Jour.V f.134v., 135v., 136, 136v. The Aldermen disclaimed all knowledge of the inhibition.

1

The prime concern of the Bridgewardens, however, was to maintain and repair the Bridge. This was no easy task. By 1425 the Bridge had become so weak that no carts shod with iron were to be driven over it on pain of imprisonment.¹ In 1426 during the Mayoralty of John Reynwell the Tower in the north side of the drawbridge was built and the Mayor laid the foundation stone.² In 1435 the Bridge was described as in a 'ruinous condition',³ and then in January 1437 the Tower at the Southwark end of the drawbridge, together with two of the Bridge arches to the south, collapsed and fell into the water.⁴ Curiously enough the first mention of this catastrophe which must have prevented any movement across the Bridge which can be found in the Journals is in June 1437 when it was decided that £100 which had been provided by the Londoners previously, should now be lent to the Bridgewardens for repairing the Bridge.⁵ Common Council in 1439 decided to raise 500 marks for the work of the Bridge and the responsibility for spending this money lay with the current Bridgewardens, Thomas Badby and

1. L.B.K., p.38. Gordon Horne, Old London Bridge (1931), p.115 states that in 1425 one of the arches was found to be seriously cracked, but he cites no evidence for this statement. William Chichele in his will drawn up 9 May 1426 left £10 'to sustentacion of the brigge of London and especiell for pyls to ben there dryve', E.F. Jacob, ed. The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury 1414-1443 (Oxford 1937-47), vol.II, p.340.
2. Stow, Survey, 1, pp.59-60; Gregory, p.161.
3. 27 July 1435, L.B.K., p.191. In this same year Common Council petitioned the King to protect their workmen from purveyance while they were needed for the repair of London Bridge, P.R.O. Ancient Petition 9386.
4. Stow, Survey, 1, pp.42,60; Cont.F of Brut, Cont.G of Brut, Brie, pp.470,505; in the Bridge House weekly payments vol.iii, there are several payments made during the week ending 12 January 1437 concerned with this disaster, which total in all £7 17s.8½d., e.g. 8d. paid to John Fisher of the household of Walsingham, for timber found in the Thames 'by the breaking of the Tower and the tamentments on the Bridge'. The compiler of the churchwardens' accounts of St. Peter Westcheap in 1436 noted, in a unique historical comment, that in this year a great part of London Bridge fell down, together with a tower called 'London', Guildhall Library Ms.645(i) f.25v.
5. 24 June 1437, 2 Aldermen and 2 Commoners appointed to supervise this. Jour. III f. 108.

Richard Lovelas.¹ By 7 September 1440 new Bridgewardens had been chosen and they were instructed to take the work in hand at once because of its urgency although they were not officially elected until Michaelmas.² The retiring wardens, who had largely been responsible for overseeing the repair of the Bridge and administering the money which had been granted for that purpose, had some difficulty in getting their accounts audited.³ On 21 September 1440, moreover, the Clerk of the Works at the Bridge was dismissed.⁴ The work of repair and reconstruction cannot have been completed for on 5 November Aldermen were deputed to supervise the new work on the Bridge, together with some commoners, skilled lathers and carpenters, and on 10 December two Aldermen were deputed to help the wardens to supervise the Bridge since new dangers had arisen.⁵

1. 16 March 1439, 5 Aldermen appointed to receive this money, Jour.III f.11. Assessment 22 March 1439, Jour.III f.12. 24 March 1439 precept to the Aldermen to collect the money, Jour.III f.12v. 26 March 1439, committee appointed to audit the account, Jour.III f.12v.
2. The new wardens were Thomas Cook and John Herst, 7 September 1440, Jour.III f.57.
3. 12 September 1440, Badby and Lovelas agreed to abide by the judgement of the Mayor and Aldermen, Jour.III f.58v.; 21 September 1440, they were considered to owe the Bridge £327 9s.10d., L.E.K., p.248; 1 October 1440, they agreed to accept the arbitration of 8 Aldermen, Jour.III f.60v.; 19 November 1440, witnesses were summoned to give evidence about certain erasures in the Bridge rent book, Jour.III f.67v.; the account of Badby and Lovelas continued to occupy the attention of the Court, 10,16 December 1440, 11,21 January, 9 February 1441, Jour.III f.68v.,69,70v.,72v.,75. 24 May 1440 their account was finally audited when it was decided that they should pay 200 marks to the Mayor and Commonalty and they were pardoned any further outstanding sums, Jour.III f.76v.,81.
4. 21 September 1440, Jour.III f.59v.
5. 18 November, 10 December 1440, Jour.III f.67, 68v.; 23 October 1440, it was declared to be the custom of the City that each cart coming laden across London Bridge should pay 2d. for the work of the Bridge, Jour.III f.64.

In spite of these repairs and the considerable sums spent on the Bridge it continued to cause anxiety. In April 1448 a petition was put to Common Council for mending the wooden foundations of the Bridge and a committee of five Aldermen and 12 Common Councilmen was appointed to study what repairs were necessary.¹ In March 1453 Robert Westerley a Lather and Thomas Sexton a Carpenter, together with others of their professions, reported to the Court of Aldermen that the part of the Bridge which was broken could be well repaired by an arch spanning 60 feet and they were ready and willing to undertake the work.² Three years later further repairs and more new work were necessary and a committee of two Aldermen and six Common Councilmen was appointed to look into the matter, estimate the costs and report to Common Council.³ Katherine Combes in 1460-61 made a gift of £10 for the new stonework on the Bridge and in 1462 a further committee to survey defects in the Bridge was found to be necessary.⁴

(vi) The City and the City Companies

In their general supervision of trade and mercantile affairs within the City, the Mayor and Aldermen came into contact, and sometimes collision, with the various City Companies, who had vested in their Masters or Wardens the more detailed supervision of their trade or craft. In the exercise of their scrutiny for defective work amongst men of their Company, the Masters or Wardens operated as the deputies of the Mayor with whom lay the overall

-
1. 5 April, 9 May 1448, Jour.IV f.214v., 217.
 2. 25 March 1453, Jour.V f.107v.
 3. 26 April 1456, Jour.VI f.66.
 4. B.H.R. vol.III, f.19v.; 14 April 1462, 2 Aldermen and 4 others appointed in a meeting of Common Council, Jour.VI f.62.

right of search in the City.¹ When, therefore, Masters of Companies were sworn before the Court of Aldermen, as they frequently were, this was a reminder that their authority was not absolute but came to them by delegation. Lists of Masters so sworn were recorded spasmodically in the Letter Books and Journals.

There were three other matters which might bring the Companies into contact with the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council. Ordinances drawn up by the Companies for their government were supposed to be shown to, and approved by, the Mayor and Aldermen. Some Company ordinances are recorded in the Letter Books.² Sometimes the Mayor and Aldermen had to ask that such ordinances should be submitted to them and sometimes they came spontaneously. In February 1455 the Wardens and men of the mystery of Painters came to court and asked the Mayor and Aldermen to examine their articles and ordinances which had received the seal of the Dean of Arches and had been confirmed by the Court Christian. The Painters feared that this confirmation might injure the jurisdiction of the Mayor and be contrary to the City's liberties, and so they asked that any objectionable clauses should be quashed.³ The statute of 1437 required all Company and guild ordinances and charters to be shown to the local justices of the peace or, in the case of London, to the Mayor. This led to the prolonged dispute between the Tailors and Drapers and to a closer scrutiny of Company books by the civic authorities⁴

-
1. For the implications of the Mayoral right of search see the dispute between the Tailors and Drapers described in Chapter IV.
 2. E.g. L.B.I., p.51 (Forcemakers), p.85 (Barbers), p.148 (Braziers), p.223 (Linenweavers); L.B.K., p.10 (Butchers), pp.22-24 (Shearers), pp.140-1 (Fletchers), pp.197-201 (Girdlers), pp.220-21 (Butchers), pp.258-9 (Whitebakers), pp.316-18 (Hostellers), pp.334-35 (Leather sellers), pp.337-38 (Tailors), pp.364-65 (Horners), pp.375-76 (Founden) 19 May 1439, Tallow-chandlers enjoined to work according to the tenor of ordinances written in the Chamber of Guildhall, Jour.III f.16v.
 3. 27 February 1455, Jour.V f.225. 4. See Chapter IV, pp.190.

In August 1437 four saddlers were mainpernored on pain of £20 to bring to court 'the book of the fraternity' and during the Mayoralty of Stephen Brown (1438-9) their 1424 charter, like that of the Tailors, was examined by the counsel of the City to see if it contravened any of the City's liberties. Similarly in 1459 it was decided that the wardens of the Carpenters should bring the books of their ordinances into court to see whether they should pay a fine to the City or not.² It is clear that the control exercised by the Court of Aldermen was real and not simply theoretical but it is notable that the Companies which were investigated and controlled never in this period included the great Companies to which the Aldermen themselves belonged.

Secondly the Companies might come into contact with the Court of Aldermen through internal troubles of various kinds. The Master or wardens might present a particularly heinous offender to the court for correction, for although they were empowered to fine offenders and destroy faulty work, the wardens could not send a man to prison. John Wilby a glazier was fined 10s. and condemned to Newgate by the Court of Aldermen, for having behaved rebelliously towards the wardens of his mystery.³ William Hyron, a haberdasher, who accused the wardens and other members of his mystery of falsely ruling the craft, and had said that he did not wish to obey their rules and ordinances, was sent to the Counter.⁴ Such cases of individual rebellion

-
1. August 1437, Jour.III f.194; Cal.P and M.1437-57, pp.33-34; 18 March 1449, Haberdashers brought their Royal Letters Patent into court, L.B.K., p.330.
 2. August 1459, Jour.VI f.137.
 3. 16 April 1455, Wilby threw himself on the mercy of the court and, at the petition of the wardens, was released from his prison sentence and his fine was reduced to 40d. Jour.V f.237.
 4. 26 September 1454, Jour.V f.193v.

occur frequently.¹ Less common are the massed rebellions of groups of men within companies. The Tailors Company called in the help of the Mayor and Aldermen to suppress the activities of servants and journeymen of the Company called Yeomen-tailors in 1415.² The Brewers had similar difficulty in subduing the 'outrageous' demands of their servants during the Mayoralty of John Gedney (1427-8) and the help of the Mayor and Aldermen was enlisted to tie down the servants' salaries to 4 marks p.a. (plus meat, drink, and clothing) and to prevent the servants from serving on a weekly or daily basis as they wished, rather than the customary yearly basis.³ In 1441 the wardens of the Bakers Company complained that their servants were organizing themselves with a fraternity with a livery, were refusing to work at night time, and were combining together to resist their masters and demand higher wages. The Court of Aldermen after hearing the evidence of the Bakers and their servants ordered the servants to submit to the rule of the wardens of the Bakers Company (rather than their own fraternity) and further enjoined them not to wear a livery or hold conventicles.⁴ The attitude displayed by

1. E.g. 29 January 1454, John Elakeneye, a rebellious pewterer, was presented to the court by the 2 wardens and 9 good men of his company and was sent to prison, Jour.V f.144v.; 25 October 1454, Thomas Hill, grocer, agreed to submit to the correction of the wardens of his Company Jour.V f.292v.
2. 19 April 1415, L.B.I., pp.136-37; 5 August 1417, the yeomen were forbidden to meet together except in the presence of the Masters of the Tailors Company, L.B.I., pp.187-88.
3. Brewers' Account Book f.38v.-39, 130, 188v. In the accounts for 9-10 Henry VI appears the following item 'in money given to John Gedney, Alderman, for divers constitutions that were rolled and entered for the servants of the Brewers' craft in the time that he was Mayor, and for to have good lordship of him, £6 13s.4d.'
4. October/November 1441, L.B.K., pp.263-66; in the evidence produced during November the servants' fraternity claimed that they had elected their own masters for 100 years, had a chaplain and candles in honour of St. Clement, met together in Cutlers' Hall and had Richard Broyn, pewterer, as their clerk, Jour.III f.102v.-105.

the Court of Aldermen in all these cases was rigidly suppressive and conservative. Their duty was to maintain the status quo and keep prices down and not to encourage radical notions such as the right of workmen to combine in order to achieve higher wages and better working conditions. Sometimes, however, the court's attitude was more conciliatory. When the Masters and wardens of the Cutlers quarrelled with the Commonalty of the Company about the way in which wardens were elected, the promulgation of new ordinances, the collection of Company fines and rents and the disciplinary powers of the wardens, the Mayor and Aldermen appointed two mercers to examine the affairs of the Company and ensure that new Masters and wardens were peacefully elected.¹

The most obvious intervention, however, by the Mayor and Aldermen in the affairs of the Companies came when disputes arose between them. There were several such disputes in these years and it will be necessary to select those most protracted or most interesting in themselves.² In 1417 a dispute arose between the Cappers and Hurers on the one hand and the Haberdashers on the other. The Cappers and Hurers wanted the fulling of caps to be done by hand, rather than by foot or at a mill which was cheaper. They had gained a mayoral ordinance in 1404 to forbid the fulling of caps except by hand.³ The Haberdashers in 1417 complained of this ordinance on the grounds

-
1. 15 June, 6 July 1420, Jour.I f.79, 81; L.B.I., pp.249-50.
 2. Other disputes were:- 1408 Cutlers and Bladesmiths, L.B.I., p.67; 1419 Tallow-chandlers and Salters, ibid., pp.222-23; 1422 Woollen weavers and Linen weavers, ibid., pp.271-72; 1424 Girdlers and Cord-wainers, Jour.II f.20v., L.B.K., pp.114-15; 1425 Pinners and Cardmakers, ibid., pp.42-43; 1429 Bowyers and Fletchers, ibid., pp.94-95; 1438 Skinners and Upholders, Jour.III f.173v., 172.
 3. 28 June 1404, L.B.I., p.29; Memorials, pp.558-59.

that, by keeping prices up it was contrary to the public interest. The court accepted their arguments, revoked the 1404 ordinance and gave the Haberdashers equal rights of search ^{wik} into the Cappers and Hurers.¹ But in 1437 it was decided that only fulling by hand or foot should be allowed and not fulling at mills.² Such a restriction on what was clearly a common and cheap practice was found to be impracticable and the Court of Aldermen decided in 1442 that caps could be fullled either at mills or by foot as long as they were well made and that no woollen cloths were fullled at the mills at the same time.³

The Cobblers and Cordwainers quarrelled over the amount of repair work which the Cobblers were allowed to carry out on a pair of shoes. By an ordinance of 1410 the Cobblers were allowed to apply a quarter of new leather to a shoe provided that the rest remained old leather.⁴ The Court of Aldermen and Common Council constantly upheld the 1410 ordinance in spite of the Cordwainers protests, but they also tied down the price of such a 'pieced' or repaired pair of shoes to 4d. for men's shoes and 2d. for women's, and the price of cobbling a pair of shoes was to be 3d.⁵ In this dispute the Court of Aldermen used its authority to prevent restrictive, and therefore expensive, practices.

-
1. L.B.I., pp.176-77; 18 March 1417, Jour.I f.16v. What is puzzling is that there were condemnations after 1417 for fulling caps at mills and it may be that this was still prohibited, although fulling by foot was now allowed, L.B.I., pp.208, 248; L.B.K., pp.40, 59.
 2. 20 November 1437, L.B.K., p.220.
 3. 14 May, 1 June 1442, Jour.III f.134, 136v. The Hurers and Haberdashers had quarrelled in January 1441, Jour.III f.73v.
 4. 10 December 1410, L.B.I., p.96. This was contrary to the ordinance of 15 June 1409, L.B.I., p.74; Memorials pp.571-74. A royal writ to enforce the ordinance was sent, 5 February 1417, L.B.I., p.187. 6 January 1418, Common Council decided that to observe the ordinance would be contrary to the public interest, L.B.I., p.194.
 5. 17 July, 2 October 1417, Jour.I f.26v., 35. 5 June, November 1428, 19 January 1429. Jour.II f.115. 125v.. 129-129v.

The Fusters who made the wooden blocks on which leather saddles were moulded and made, quarrelled with the Saddlers in 1424 over the scrutiny of these fusts. The Court of Aldermen decided that six men of the Fusters mistery, together with a Chamber serjeant, should scrutinize fusts made in the City independently of the Saddlers, who were forbidden to bring foreign fusters into the City to make their fusts.¹ The Saddlers, however, continued to try to control, indeed to take over, this smaller and dependent craft of fusting and the Court of Aldermen decided in June 1425 that because of the poverty of the Fusters' mistery, as no fuster was to practise saddlery so no saddler was to practise fusting under threat of a fine, imprisonment and the loss of his freedom.² Here the Court acted to prevent the poverty and unemployment which would be caused by the Saddlers' monopoly.

Although members of the Court of Aldermen were themselves members of Companies, their decisions appear to have been accepted as impartial and fair and it was in any case disputes concerning the lesser crafts which primarily occupied their attention. When the court failed to act impartially, as in the dispute between the Tailors and Drapers, this led to conventicles, violence and an attempt to overthrow the whole structure of civic government.³ That this is the only recorded case of a refusal to accept a decision of the Court of Aldermen is good evidence of the wisdom and impartiality with which the court acted. The Aldermen appear to have considered the general good

-
1. 10 November 1424, Jour.II f.27, L.B.K., p.37.
 2. 26 June 1425, the new ordinance was agreed by all the Aldermen except Nicholas James, Jour.II f.45; 6 July 1425, confirmed by Common Council, Jour.II f.45v.
 3. See Chapter IV.

of the citizens as a whole rather than the particular benefit of a group or Company, although their influence was always brought to bear upon the side of authority and law and order. This might bear hardly on a few but the City at large was probably best served in this way.

(vii) The Freedom of the City of London

The Freemen of the City of London may have comprised, in the fifteenth century, about a quarter of the total male adult population.¹ These Freemen formed a privileged group not only within the City where the Common Council was chosen from their number and ^{where} they could trade in favourable conditions, but also within the kingdom of England where, by a charter dating from the reign of Henry I, they were exempt from paying tolls.² The freedom of the City was, therefore, a sought-after privilege and in the thirteenth century the crafts fought the Aldermannic class for control of the freedom.³ By Edward II's charter in 1319 the control of entries to the freedom was vested in the Companies. 'No inhabitant of any mistery or trade, be admitted into the freedom of the City, unless by surety of six honest and sufficient men of the mistery or trade that he shall be of...and if they be not of some certain mistery, then they may not be admitted into the freedom without the assent of the commonalty'.⁴ The Court of Aldermen was entirely excluded from the business of making a man free of the City.

1. See A.H. Thomas, Cal.P. and M. 1364-81, pp.xxiv-xxvi, lxi-lxiv.
2. Charters, p.3.
3. Williams, Medieval London, pp.45-47, 191-93.
4. Charters, pp.46-47.

In the fifteenth century the Companies still maintained their control of entries to the freedom. Even if a prospective freeman were not always vouched for by men of his future Company, he could not enter the freedom without the assent of that Company whose craft he intended to practise.¹ Where a man became free of the City through patrimony or apprenticeship this control by the Companies worked quite smoothly.² It was over the question of freedom by payment, or redemption as it was called, that the assent of the Commonalty as laid down in the 1319 charter became necessary. In the fifteenth century this control was not exercised by the Commonalty in general but by the Common Council. The necessary assent of the Common Council before an alien could be admitted to the freedom of the City and the stipulation that he should only be admitted in full Hustings, were reiterated in 1433.³ There is no record of any control by the Hustings Court during this period, but the Common Council exercised more than a merely nominal control.⁴ On several occasions the decision to admit aliens to the freedom was taken in meetings of the Common Council.⁵ But the Court of Aldermen can also be found taking

-
1. See Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, pp. 33, 47, 50-51. 12 July 1421 the Court of Aldermen decided that William Louther was not to be admitted to the freedom without the assent of the mystery of Vintners, Jour.I f.93v. 17 December 1444, 6 men of the mystery of Broiderers presented William Owtchamp to the Mayor and Chamberlain to have him made free of the City in their mystery, Jour.IV f.55v.
 2. For a discussion of apprenticeship see below pp. 269-211.
 3. L.B.K., p.165.
 4. The entry of freemen is not recorded in the Hustings rolls nor in the Hustings books in the fifteenth century.
 5. E.g. 20 January 1439, James de Ferras, Jour.III f.6v.; 23 October 1439, James Leprynych, John Clampard, Smith, William Crosby, Arnold Fawkener, Jour.III f.25v.; 9 March 1441, Frederick Sward, Goldsmith, Jour.III f.79; 2 May 1442, Gerard Hamerbec, Jour.III f.133v.; 6 June 1458, William Rost of Swird(?) in Germany to be free in the Company of Armourers, to pay a fee to the Chamber and to be enjoined to take no apprentice who is not a subject by birth of the English King, Jour.VI f.244.

the decision to admit men to the freedom, but they may then have submitted such men to the Common Council for approval. On 21 September 1454 the Court of Aldermen decided that Master Roger Draper should be made free of the City on payment of a fine to the Chamber, but at a meeting of the Common Council held on 6 November, the Mayor and Aldermen agreed that Draper should by no means be admitted to the freedom without the consent of the Common Council.¹ Hence although the Hustings Court had the titular control of admissions to the freedom, the actual control was exercised by the Court of Aldermen together with the Common Council who practised, in effect, the right of veto.

A man was entitled to the freedom of the City if he was the son of a freeman, i.e. by patrimony, or if he had served an apprenticeship of at least seven years. The freedom could also be obtained by redemption.² The entry to the freedom through patrimony and apprenticeship caused little trouble in the fifteenth century, but about the purchase of the freedom there was considerable debate. In 1408 the commons complained to the Mayor and Aldermen that many aliens bought the freedom for a small sum and then enjoyed wide liberties in the City together with exemptions from toll, whereas those who became free by apprenticeship had worked long and hard for their freedom. The Mayor and Aldermen agreed that in future the freedom of the City should be obtained only by apprenticeship.³ But it is clear that the freedom continued to be sold. In 1410 Thomas Chaucer, the King's Butler, complained

-
1. Jour.V f.192, 204. There were several occasions when the Court of Aldermen took such decisions, and there is no further record of assent or protest in meetings of Common Council, e.g. 8 February 1444, John Maunche admitted to freedom, Jour.IV f.15; 6 March 1455, Roger Mersh admitted to freedom, Jour.V f.231.
 2. These three ways of acquiring the freedom are discussed by Dr. Thomas, *op.cit.*, pp.xxvii-lviii.
 3. L.B.I., p.63.

that the income from the King's prisage of wine, which freemen of London did not have to pay, was seriously diminished because of the numbers of men who had bought the freedom of London as well as of those who had received it as a gift from the Mayor.¹ The Mayor and Aldermen undertook to ensure that those who enjoyed the freedom were resident in the City, but they appear to have done this ineffectively and c.1424 there was a further petition requesting that those who bought the freedom or received it as a favour, should pay prisage.² This petition appears to have been unsuccessful. In 1427 the Common Council decided that no-one should be made free of the City unless he were of the allegiance of King Henry. Moreover a man who bought his freedom was not to be eligible for the Common Council.³

The purchase of the freedom of London was not only unpopular with other Englishmen who did not enjoy the same trading privileges, but also with many citizens who observed that absent freemen of the City did not shoulder the burdens of scot and lot, general levies and other irksome duties which came the way of resident freemen. In response, therefore, to a petition from Common Council in 1433, the Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs agreed that the freemen of the City were to reside in the City or, if absent on business, they were to make arrangements for the payment of their taxes. They agreed also that freemen were to use the craft under whose auspices they entered the freedom and that aliens who bought the freedom should provide

1. R.P., III, p.646.

2. L.B.K., pp.34-35; Thomas, op.cit., p.lv.

3. 20 February 1427, Jour.II f.90.

sureties before the Chamberlain that they would observe these conditions.¹ As a result of this decision there survive in the Guildhall Record Office a series of Recognizance rolls, the earliest dating from 1437, in which are recorded the recognizances of aliens who bought the freedom of the City. The alien himself was bound to the Chamberlain under pain of 100 marks to live in the City, pay scot and lot and use that mistery under whose auspices he entered the freedom. He had also to provide four men to act as sureties who were usually members of his future Company.² From these rolls it would appear that between 30 and 40 aliens bought the freedom each year.

-
1. L.B.K., pp.161-66. The Chamberlain himself was liable to a fine of 100 marks and the loss of his freedom and office if he disregarded these rules. The demand that a man should practise the trade in which he was enfranchised arose from a grievance about men who paid the smaller price to be enfranchised in an artisan mistery and then went on to trade in one of the greater Companies, Thomas, op.cit., pp.liv-lv. 17 August 1424, Common Council petitioned against the Lombard, Marcos Marcadelli, who had been made free of the City in the Fishmongers' Company which he did not use, but rather the business of Mercers, Grocers, and Drapers, Jour.II f.21v. To transfer from one Company to another required the assent of the Common Council and such transfers are recorded in the Letter Books, e.g. 4 February 1434, John Cok given permission to transfer from the Weavers to the Drapers, L.B.K., p.176.
 2. G.R.O. Recognizance Rolls nos.13-25. Rolls nos.13-23 are yearly rolls covering a Mayoralty between 1437 and 1454. Some rolls are missing. Roll no.24 covers the years 1454-1477 and roll no.25 covers the years 1463-1497. It would seem that in 1454 the practice of recording all such recognizances was discontinued and only certain ones were entered on the rolls which are no longer in chronological order. Roll no.24 for 1454-1477, records only 22 such recognizances. There may have been more complete recognizance books which have not survived. On roll no.13 for 1437-38 there are 31 recognizances. In only 7 cases on this roll are the sureties from Companies different from that in which the alien is entering the freedom. The recognizances were made with the Chamberlain, before the Mayor and Aldermen.

But even the stricter control of entries to the freedom initiated in 1433 does not seem to have been completely satisfactory. In 1448 there were still people enjoying the freedom of the City who lived away from London and so avoided civic obligations.¹ In 1449 Common Council approved a new bill to deal with those who bought the freedom and lived outside the City and the regulation of 1433 was reaffirmed.² In 1451 it was decided to prosecute non-resident freemen and three years later, as a result of the dispute with St. Martin's, it was decided that not only those freemen who lived outside the City, but also those who lived in privileged places within the City and so did not pay scot and lot, were to be made to shoulder civic burdens. Those who continued to live in privileged places were to lose their freedom.³ Then in 1455 it was decided to try a new method of coercion. Those freemen who lived in the suburbs immediately around the City walls, but who refused to pay scot and lot were, instead, each to pay a compounded sum of 5s. p.a. to the Chamber. Those who lived further away were not to enjoy rights as freemen at all.⁴ It seems clear from these continual injunctions and repeats

-
1. 11 September 1448, the auditors of the Chamberlain's account asked that these people should be prosecuted, Jour.IV f.227.
 2. 24 January 1449, Jour.V f.4v.
 3. 5 July 1451, 6 November 1454, Jour.V f.58, 204.
 4. 9 September 1455, the suburbs were described as the borough of Southward in the area of Bermondsey Street, the City of Westminster and thence to the bars of New Temple, the area from St. Giles in the Fields to Holborne Bars, the area called St. John's Street and the houses adjacent to the built-up area outside Cripplegate, the area from the bars at Bishopsgate to the church of Shoreditch, and the area from the bars at Aldgate to Whitechapel, Jour.V f.260. 19 September 1455, it was again agreed that all freemen who continually resided with their households outside the City were not to enjoy rights as citizens and the inhabitants of Southwark were to be informed of this, Jour.V f.262.

prohibitions that the City was not able, effectively to prevent the misuse of its privileged citizenship. A man who was not present in the City was not available to have his testimony of citizenship removed, and so the abuse continued.

But apart from the three main ways in which men obtained the freedom of London, by patrimony, apprenticeship and redemption, there were two other less usual means: one was by a grant of the freedom on the recommendation of some highly-placed person, and the other was a grant by virtue of office.

Freedom by recommendation existed in the early fourteenth century when 51 of the 646 persons who entered the freedom in the years 1309 to 1312 did so on the recommendation of the King, bishops, the Earl of Gloucester or similarly highly placed persons.¹ Sometimes such entrants paid as other redemptioners, sometimes they paid reduced fees or none at all. In 1433 the Commonalty complained that people had been obtaining the freedom by giving money to the Mayor or by 'je vous pries', i.e. recommendation.² In the following year the Mayor's right to appoint six men to the freedom was abolished, but 'je vous pries' continued unabated.³ Several, but probably not all, instances of this are to be found in the City Journals after 1437. Fifteen men received the freedom of the City at the King's instance between 1437 and 1460,⁴ one at the instance of the Earl of Suffolk;⁵ one at the

1. Thomas, op.cit., p.11.

2. L.B.K., p.161.

3. It was customary for the Mayor to make 6 men free of the City each year. The Mayor could surrender this privilege as William Staundon did in 1408, in lieu of 2 casks of wine, L.B.I., p.64. 23 October 1443, the privilege was abandoned altogether in favour of 4 casks of the best red wine of Gascony, L.B.K., p.180.

4. See Chapter VIII, pp.44-5 and n. . Further to the 10 instances there listed there are the cases of William Wynselowe, 13 September 1440, Jour.III f.58v.; Jacob Janyn, 29 May 1441, Jour.III f.86v.; Richard Jooskyn, 31 October 1441, Jour.III f.101; Thomas Burgeys in the Tailors' Company, 28 October 1447, Jour.IV f.199; Stephen Reygate, 21 November 1452, Jour.V f.94.

instance of the Queen,¹ one at the instance of the Duke of Exeter² and one at the instance of Mr. Thomas Manning, the King's secretary, in 1460.³ If these eleven cases were the only entries to the freedom by 'je vous pries' in the twenty year period, then the number was clearly not excessive. But such entries to the freedom may not have been systematically recorded in the Journals: the actual number may have been much greater.

Freedom by office appears to have been a fifteenth century phenomenon. It first appears in 1427 when it was decided by Common Council that no-one was to be admitted as a member of the Council unless he were free by birth, apprenticeship or office.⁴ The Commonalty petition of 1433 asked that no-one be admitted to the franchise in future 'but he be born, or made apprentice or officer withynne the Citee'.⁵ Whether the holding of certain offices entitled a man automatically to the freedom is not clear. The first instance of a grant of freedom by office to be found in the Journals is the conferment of the freedom on Richard Barnet the newly-elected Common Clerk in October 1438.⁶ Eight years later William Veysey the Waterbailiff,

-
1. 5 February 1444, John Kyng, Jour.IV f.16v.
 2. 28 October 1447, Mr. Hugh Payn, to be admitted on payment of a fine, Jour.IV f.199.
 3. 17 March 1460, Mr. William Gornay in the mistery of Bakers. He was to pay a deposit of £5 which would later be returned to him, Jour.VI f.206
 4. 20 February 1427, Jour.II f.90.
 5. L.B.K., p.162.
 6. 11 October 1438, Jour.III f.163.

-
5. 29 July 1440 *John Westercotes was restored to the freedom at Suffolk's instance, Jour III f. 51, 129v.*

John Asshe, one of the Mayor's serjeants-at-mace, and four clerks received the freedom by office.¹ In 1449 Thomas Nasshe, the City Butler, received the freedom in this way and in 1456 Robert Aston, a clerk in the Common Clerk's office was to receive the freedom 'as the Chamber clerks have it'.² In 1457 William Power a Chamber valet was to be free of the City by office without paying a fee, and when Richard Bromhale became a Mayor's serjeant he was also given the freedom.³ There are three further cases of grants of freedom 'by office' during this period although the nature of the office held by the recipient is not clear.⁴ It would appear that the freedom of the City by office did not involve the recipient in paying a fine.

The size of the fee payable for the freedom appears to have varied greatly. Men enfranchised in the artisan misteries would pay less than those entering the great trading Companies.⁵ When Common Council agreed to admit

-
1. 21 October 1446, the clerks were Roger Spicer, the future Common Clerk, Walter Shilley, John Clifton, Robert Godfrey, Jour.IV f.144.
 2. 6/13 December 1449, Jour.V f.27; 1 December 1456, Jour.VI f.88. By 5 September 1460, Aston was a clerk in the Mayor's Court and it was again stated that he was to be free of the City by office, Jour.VI f.261
 3. 27 May 1457, Jour.VI f.123v.; 27 February 1460, Jour.VI f.203.
 4. 20 February 1448, Thomas More, gentleman, Jour.IV f.207v. More performed several services for the City and was rewarded on 25 September 1455 with a gift of 5 marks, an annual livery at Christmas and a pension during good behaviour of 13s.4d. p.a., Jour.V f.264v., see also Jour.V f.142v., 188, 163v. By 1460 More was retained by the Bridge-wardens as their attorney in the Mayor's Court at a fee of 6s.8d. p.a. B.H.R., vol.III f.19v. 19 September 1449, John Peke was to be free of the City by office, Jour.V f.14v. 2 December 1454, Common Council decided that William Bataille should be admitted to the freedom 'ex officio' because his long fighting in the King's cause in Normandy had reduced him to poverty, in order that his wife might be able to keep a shop in the City, Jour.V f.210v.
 5. Thomas, op.cit., pp.li-liii.

James Falleran, a Lombard draper, to the freedom in 1452, the Mayor and Aldermen subsequently decided that he should pay at least £20 for the freedom and the Chamberlain was instructed to try to get an even larger sum.¹ The Rector of St. Mary Magdalen had only to pay 10 marks when he entered the freedom in the Mercers' Company.² Sometimes the payment of a fee was waived altogether,³ and when the freedom was conferred as a reward for services performed for the City, as in the case of Mr. Thomas Kent, clerk of the King's Council, or Mr. Thomas Manning, the King's secretary, or Thomas Croxton, clerk of the King's Bench, then no fee was demanded.⁴

Since the freedom was a desirable acquisition, so its loss could be used as a threat to produce good behaviour, or as a punishment for wrongdoers. It was clearly considered to be an extreme punishment for grave offences, particularly for infringements of the City's liberties. Perjury could be punished in this way,⁵ or the repeated failure to pay civic taxes,⁶ or breaking the peace,⁷ or prosecuting suits outside the civic courts without a licence,⁸ or for repeating things said in Common Council to the damage of

-
1. 14 October, 17 December 1452, Jour.V f.90, 93v.
 2. 6 March 1455, Jour.V f.231. John Maunche, a Lombard, who was admitted to the freedom on 8 February 1444, paid 20 marks, Jour.IV f.15.
 3. E.g. the case of Richard Botiller, Vintner, 3 April 1438, Jour.III f.17.
 4. 19 September 1458, 5 March 1459, Jour.VI f.231v., 151v.
 5. Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.54; John Huwe, Fruiterer, lost his freedom on this account, 31 March 1449, Jour.V f.9.
 6. 4 May 1420, the threat of the loss of their freedom was made against 3 men who failed to pay their assessment for 2 fifteenths, Jour.I f.76. John Kleyn, Vintner, was threatened with the loss of his freedom if he continued to sue for a Royal charter exempting him from scot and lot and inquest duties in the City, 10 December 1444, Jour.IV f.54v.
 7. 10 May 1420, John Corbet lost his freedom for breaking the peace and for attending conventicles, Jour.I f.76v.; see p.169n. 5 above.
 8. See p.169 above.

the Council or of any individual,¹ or for obtaining Royal Letters Patent which infringed the City liberties.² When Richard Gosselyn wished to be relieved of his Aldermanry in 1426 this was refused and he was told that if he sought a royal charter exonerating him from his duties he would stand in danger of losing his freedom.³

(viii) Apprenticeship in London

The courts of Aldermen and Common Council exercised a supervisory control over the conditions and practice of apprenticeship in the City. These conditions were the subject of extensive City custom, well established by 1400. The origin of apprenticeship and the control which the City, and the City Companies exercised over it have been thoroughly examined by Dr. Thomas.⁴ There was little change in civic practice in the first part of the fifteenth century. From the mid-thirteenth century the City had ordained that an apprentice must be enrolled, during the first year of his service, in the Chamberlain's register, at the cost of 6s.8d., in order that he might be entitled to enjoy the liberties of the City as a freeman. Moreover, in order to avoid disputes, the indenture in which the terms of the apprenticeship were laid down, was to be enrolled at the same time at the cost of a shilling.⁵ In the fifteenth century the Court of Aldermen reiterated the

1. 27 March 1428, Jour.II f.109v.

2. 20 February 1444, Jour.IV f.18; see Chapter ^{VI}IV, p.379.

3. 18 October 1426, Jour.II f.86.

4. A.H. Thomas, Cal.P. and M.1364-81, pp.xxx-xlvi.

5. In L.B.D., pp.35-179 are preserved some of the Chamberlain's records for 1309-1312. Most of the masters appear not to have enrolled their apprentices within the stipulated first year of their term, but waited until they had completed their service and then paid the fees both for entry and egress, together with a fine, at the same time. This was, presumably, to avoid paying an entry fee for an apprentice who might die before completing his term.

injunction that apprentices were to be enrolled within the first year of their term, and the motive behind this may well have been financial.¹ At intervals the fees for the enrolment for the beginning and end of the apprentice's term were increased or doubled for specific civic purposes.²

Apart from the financial motive the Court of Aldermen was also concerned about the enrolment of apprentices, since this was one of the means of obtaining the freedom of the City. In 1408 the Commonalty successfully petitioned the Mayor and Aldermen that the freedom of the City might only be obtained by apprenticeship and not by redemption, but it would seem, as Dr. Thomas wrote, 'that 'matters soon reverted to the old order'.³ Occasionally men like the whitetawyer, Thomas Prat, presented apprentices under false names who were thus fraudulently admitted to the freedom of the City.⁴

-
1. L.B.I., pp.34, 134. 24 January 1455, the Chamberlain was empowered to fine all those who failed to enroll their apprentices within the first year, Jour.V f.217v.
 2. Memorials, pp.589-91. 2 March 1444, the fees were doubled for 4 years to pay off Chamber debts, L.B.K., p.292. 1 April 1450, fees doubled for a year to meet the Parliamentary expenses of the citizens, L.B.K., p.331. Whether apprentice indentures were still enrolled by the Chamberlain seems doubtful. Carpenter mentions the necessity of the enrolment of the indenture itself, Liber Albus, p.272, but an original apprentice indenture of London dated Whitsun 1392 bears no record of having been enrolled. John Nogle, Haberdasher, placed his sister as an apprentice with Alice Wodeford, Silk-throwster, for 7 years, Guildhall Misc.ms.186-3. Aldermen did not have to pay to have their apprentices enrolled, Liber Albus, p.35, L.B.H., p.446, L.B.K., p.372. There is no mention of fees for enrolling the indenture in the list of increased fees for Guildhall, Memorials, pp.589-91.
 3. L.B.I., p.63; Thomas, op.cit., p.xxxviii. The petitioners did not, presumably, mean to exclude entries to the freedom by patrimony. Matters probably returned to the old order because redemptioners entry fines were worth quite a bit to the Chamber.
 4. 23 March 1439, Jour.III f.9v. Prat was sent to prison and the apprentice who had been party to the deception was fined 100s., with the alternative of being placed in the stocks; 27 October 1455, the Writers of Court Hand were instructed in Common Council on how to draw up apprentice indentures in order to avoid fraud, Jour.IV f.102v.

Most of the more detailed regulations about the number of apprentices a master could take and the type of man to be apprenticed, were drawn up by the Companies rather than by the City.¹ On one occasion Parliament laid down that those who apprenticed their children must be worth at least 20s. p.a.² This cut across the liberty claimed by all freemen of London to apprentice their children to other freemen in the City, no matter what their income. The Londoners, therefore, successfully petitioned to be exempted from the new statute.³

With the humanitarian aspects of apprenticeship the Courts of Aldermen and Common Council were not directly concerned. But apprentices who had not been enrolled, who were unduly chastised or neglected and untaught could sue their masters in the Mayor's Court. In these cases the apprentice might be exonerated by the Court from his apprenticeship and entrusted, with his consent, to a new master. But the Court did not act unless the master were sued.⁴ In one, somewhat unusual, case the Court of Aldermen does appear to have intervened. An apprentice of the Mercer, Thomas Muschamp, was taken prisoner at Eu in Normandy and the Court decided on 19 May 1455 that Muschamp should pay 25 marks, presumably to buy his apprentice out of captivity. The friends of the apprentice, however, agreed to repay Muschamp within six years.⁵

-
1. The Girdlers in 1435, and the Founders in 1456, restricted apprentices to 2 per master, L.B.K., pp.200, 275. The Cutlers in 1420 required that apprentices should be 'of free birth and condition, handsome in stature, having straight and proper limbs and of full age', L.B.I., p.250.
 2. 1405-6, Statutes of the Realm, vol.ii (1816), pp.157-58.
 3. Petition from the Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of London to the honourable Commons in Parliament, P.R.O. Ancient Petition n.4238; R.P.IV, p.354; L.B.K., pp.104-05. Statute repealed 1429, Statutes of the Realm, vol.ii (1816), p.248. See L.B.K., pp.87, 116; Thomas, op.cit., p.xli.
 4. Cases against masters are frequently to be found in Mayor's Court rolls, see Cal.P. and M.1413-37 and Cal.P. and M.1437-57, passim. See also the original bills in the Mayor's Court, G.R.O. M.C.1/File2A/nos.1-5, 10, 14, 46-53, 62-72. An example may be provided by the case of John Hill who brought a case against his master, John Doncaster, Salter, on
(contd. at foot of next page)

(ix) The care of orphans in London

According to the immemorial custom of the City, the Mayor, Aldermen, Chamberlain, citizens and commonalty of London, on the death of a freeman or freewoman of the City leaving heirs under age

had been ever accustomed to have the marriage and guardianship of such heir to their own use immediately after the decease of his ancestor, although his father or mother might still be living, as well as the lands etc. of the same, to hold in trust until the said heir should come to full age.¹

Moreover it was customary

to grant the guardianship of such persons and their property to their nearest friends or others, as they thought fit, on the said guardians finding suitable security for duly executing their duties.

In effect the City performed for its freemen those duties which the King performed for the orphaned children of his tenants-in-chief.

Although by the fifteenth century City custom governing the treatment of orphans and their property had become well-established, there was, as yet,

1. William Sevenokes claimed the guardianship of William, the orphan son of John Bryan, 1420, L.B.I., pp.220-22. William, and another son Robert, had originally been in the custody of the Master of La Riote, 28 November 1418, Jour.I f.52. On the Court of Orphans see P.E. Jones, The Law Journal, XCIII (1943), pp.357-58.

(footnote 4 continued from previous page)

10 October 1427. He complained that he had been badly treated and was not being taught his trade. Evidence was given in support of his case and Hill was exonerated from his apprenticeship with the consent and advice of the master of the Salters' Company. He was committed, instead to another Salter, Henry Mabell.

5. 19 May 1455, Jour.V f.243.

no clear cut Court of Orphans presided over by the Common Serjeant, as emerged late in the century.¹ Responsibility for the orphaned children of freemen was divided among several courts and civic officials. At root the custom sprang from a community spirit which acknowledged that all citizens had a responsibility to protect those too young to look after themselves. This communal responsibility is reflected in some of the wardmote inquests of 1422/3 when there were complaints of such offences as concealing orphans' goods and failures to appoint guardians for certain orphans.² Since orphans constituted a responsibility held by the freemen in common, so it became the custom that the Common Serjeant, who was the spokesman for the Common Council and for the Commonalty, should act also as the spokesman for the orphans. Since the middle of the fourteenth century it had been his duty to prosecute cases on behalf of orphans and to speak for them.³ He is to be found acting in this capacity in 1411, 1414, 1429 and 1430.⁴ The Chamberlain was also closely associated with the care of orphans for it was he who had charge of the orphans' goods during the child's minority. The executors would hand over to the Chamberlain such goods as were detailed for the testator's children and on coming of age the orphan would acknowledge satisfactory receipt of his goods from the Chamberlain.⁵ Moreover in 1428

-
1. Jones, op.cit., p.358. 8 July 1452, a bill was proposed in Common Council 'de orphanibus' but its contents are not known, Jour.V f.77v.
 2. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.132, 140, 158.
 3. Betty R. Masters, 'The Common Serjeant', Guildhall Miscellany, II (1968), p.380.
 4. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.15-16, 18-19, 246; L.B.K., p.84.
 5. These acknowledgments appear frequently in the Letter Books, In the case of an orphan girl who has married it is the husband who acknowledges receipt. There is no evidence that at this date the Chamberlain was expected to provide interest.

the ancient custom was reaffirmed that the Chamberlain was empowered to summon before him those who were in possession of orphan's goods, and that the Recorder, Common Serjeant, Common Serjeant-at-Arms and Common Clerk and all the Chamber officials should be there to deal with any problems which might arise. But in difficult or ambiguous cases neither was security to be taken nor goods handed over without the assent of a higher court.¹

The higher court to which this entry in the Journal refers was either the Mayor's Court which had cognizance of disputes between citizens in the matter of orphans and their goods, or the Court of Aldermen which exercised the practical supervisory control over orphans in the City. When in doubt executors would appeal to them for guidance.² Their control appears to have been omnipresent and careful, and to ensure that it should also be disinterested it was decided in 1455 that no alderman should act as a mainpinner or surety for those holding orphans' goods.³

This supervisory control exercised by the Court of Aldermen was four-fold: to administer and conserve the orphan's property, to select guardians for the child, to place him as an apprentice or choose another training for him, and to approve of a marriage partner. Since orphans continued in that state in a legal sense until the age of 21 the problem of marriage frequently arose.

The actual administration of an orphan's property lay under the control of the Chamberlain, and his possession of what could be, at any given moment,

-
1. 8 May 1428, Jour.II f.112v. This may have been the procedure which, in 1492, developed into an annual roll-call, held on the Monday after the Sunday in mid-Lent, for the purpose of calling-over the names of orphans' sureties, Jones, *op.cit.*, p.358.
 2. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.59, 242-43.
 3. 22 April 1455, Jour.V f.238v. This may also be the intention of a cryptic entry to be found 16 November 1419, Jour.I f.63v.

a considerable amount of wealth, led on occasion to its use as a convenient source of ready cash for civic purposes.¹ The protection of an orphan's interests and the sorting-out of a complicated account could be no easy matter, as was the case with the merchant and royal creditor Thomas Dyster who was singularly unfortunate in his choice of executors.² A difficult case might be settled by a debtor agreeing to pay into the Chamber for the use of the orphan a certain sum each year until the debt was paid.³ There are no cases recorded in this period of orphans subsequently suing the Chamber for loss or misuse of property. Between them the Court of Aldermen and the Chamberlain seem to have administered the orphans' goods satisfactorily.

The Court of Aldermen also chose the guardian who should look after the orphans until they came of age. Frequently the orphans were entrusted as wards to the man who subsequently married their widowed mother.⁴ The orphaned children of Aldermen were often committed to the care of other Aldermen.⁵ Sometimes the whole, or part, of the orphan's patrimony would be committed to the guardian with the orphan, perhaps to pay for the child's keep.⁶ When a guardian accepted a City orphan into his care, he had to enter

-
1. In 1391 the Mayor, Adam Banne, was empowered by Common Council to borrow £400 from the orphans' goods in the possession of the Chamberlain with which to buy corn, Cal.P. and M.1381-1412, pp.174-75.
 2. See Cal.P. and M.1413-37, pp.18-24; L.B.I., p.111.
 3. L.B.K., p.84; cf. Jour.II f.122, 130v., 134v.
 4. E.g. L.B.K., p.85.
 5. John, the son of John Woodcock, Mercer, was committed to the custody of John Gedney, 12 October 1428, Jour.II f.122; Henry, the son of John Perneys, Fishmonger, was committed to the custody of Simon Eyre, Draper, Jour.III f.201v.
 6. E.g. the guardianship of Margaret, daughter of Simon Herward, was entrusted to William Maltby, Mercer, together with £20 and a piece of plate worth 39s.4½d., L.B.I., p.261.

into a bond that he would not apprentice the orphan, nor give the child away in marriage nor bind or send away the orphan without the consent of the Court of Aldermen.¹

The consent, therefore, of the Court of Aldermen was required before an orphan could be apprenticed. For example, at a meeting of the Court held on 21 May 1420 John, the orphan son of John Stapleford who was 17 years old was apprenticed for 10 years to John Maldon a Grocer, and Richard, the orphan son of Nicholas Aughton, who was 16 $\frac{3}{4}$, was apprenticed to the Fishmonger and Alderman, John Mitchell, for an unspecified length of time.²

The apprenticeship of orphans appears to have been comparatively straightforward compared with their marriages. Margaret Beaumont, the orphan daughter of John Beaumont married John Everard without the permission of the Court and so was fined, while her sister Dionysia, was refused permission to marry the Mercer, and later Mayor, Hugh Wyche.³ But on the whole the Court appears not to have frowned upon conjugal bliss. Permission was given to Margaret Seint-Jermyn to marry an esquire of the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem in 1428 and her sister Thomazina was allowed to marry John Houghton of Lamport, Northamptonshire, a year later.⁴ Beatrice the daughter of William Lynne was allowed to marry Thomas Oxney in 1428 and Elizabeth, the daughter of Simon Seman was permitted to marry Robert Knolles in 1436.⁵ Whether these

-
1. E.g. Thomas Morestead entered into a bond of £300 or £400 on receiving Thomas Cosyn alias Colman, into his charge, 3 March 1421, Jour.I f.58v.; Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.90-91.
 2. Jour.I f.77v.
 3. June 1424, the fine of £100 and 20 marks, of which 40 marks was pardoned by the Court, Jour.II f.19v.; 23 August 1425, Jour.II f.51.
 4. 5 May 1428, June 1429, Jour.II f.112v., 135v.
 5. 16 October 1428, Jour.II f.123; L.B.K., p.27; 11 December 1436, Jour.III f.126.

were affairs of the heart or the results of cool calculations cannot be known but it seems clear that the Aldermen were primarily concerned with marriage as a means of transferring property. Such marriages were usually arranged. Henry, the orphan son of John Perneys was asked by the Court whether his master, John Selby, had arranged a marriage for him. He replied that his master had done nothing but that his master's wife had arranged for him to marry their daughter although he had not yet done so.¹ The orphan daughter of - Pigenel agreed in court to marry Richard George. The girl's mother, now married to William Irwill, had already been consulted by George and as she was agreeable to the match it seemed to the court to be a good idea to assent to the arrangement.² An Alderman was, of course, well-placed to know which orphans were both marriageable and wealthy, and one cannot but suspect that Thomas Scot, a Draper, Alderman and ex-Mayor was quick to see the advantages for his son John of a marriage with Katherine the orphan daughter of John Goodson who was to inherit £200 on coming of age or marrying.³ But often in cases of this kind where a prospective husband was to be considerably enriched by marrying an orphan, the Court of Aldermen tried to ensure that the money should be spent on property to be held jointly or on a settlement for the wife.⁴

1. 14 June 1437, Jour.III f.201v.

2. 9 November 1444, Jour.IV f.49.

3. 4 March 1450, L.B.K., p.329; April 1462, Jour.VI f.62v.

4. 14 May 1416, Robert Colbrook, Ironmonger, who had married Joan, the orphan daughter of the Salter Richard Woodcock, was to spend £100 on buying an estate for the benefit of himself and his wife, Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.47. 18 July 1427, a similar case when Robert Isham of Co. Northants. married Margaret, the orphan daughter of William Radewell, ibid., p.206.

One case may serve to illustrate the trouble which the Court of Aldermen took over the City's orphans. In the summer of 1452 William Combes, the Alderman of Castle Baynard ward died.¹ He left behind a widow Katherine and a son, George, who must have been nearly 21 but had not obtained his majority. He was also apprenticed to the Draper John Walshaw until he was 24 when he could inherit under his father's will. In November Katherine and the four other executors of the will of William Combes acknowledge in court that they would hand over to George the £400 cash and £20 worth of plate left to him by his father, when he was 24. Katherine had already made it clear that she did not want John Walshaw to have custody of the goods.² Nearly a year later John Walshaw came to court to explain that young George had entered into an obligation of 200 marks to 'a certain Richard Walshaw of Somerset'. The obligation had been enrolled in the royal chancery as had Walshaw claimed, the acquittance which Richard had sealed for George.³ It would seem that the court feared that George was being exploited by the Walshaws and entering into obligations which he did not fully understand, and so to protect his interests the court placed George in the care of John Derby an Alderman and Draper so that he should finish his apprenticeship term with him.⁴

But in the following summer George Combes again attracted the attention of the Court of Aldermen. This time he had been inveigled out of the City and away from the control of his master by a certain brother John FitzJames, gentleman, and William Cokkes. FitzJames agreed that George should be handed

-
1. Combes last appeared in the Court of Aldermen on 13 May 1452. The election of a new Alderman for his ward took place on 19 July 1452, Jour.V f.78v.
 2. 17 November 1452, Jour.V f.93v.
 3. 12 October 1453, Jour.V f.125.
 4. 1 December 1453, Jour.V f.135.

back to the control of the Mayor and the Court entrusted this troublesome charge to yet another Draper and Alderman, Stephen Foster.¹ But this was not all for the witless George had incurred debts not only to Brother John but also to tenants and others on the priory estates. The court, therefore, decided that George should have £100 of his money in advance with which to pay a debt of £29 0s. 10d. to Brother John and the other debts which he had incurred. Brother John agreed to send any obligations which George had entered into with the tenants and farmers, to London, and the Court of Aldermen agreed to see that they were paid.² Moreover as precautionary measures, John Walshaw was instructed not to get George involved in any bargains or obligations in the future and George himself entered into an obligation to the Chamberlain, on pain of losing £100, not to enter into any obligations, statutes merchant or statutes staple without the consent of the Court of Aldermen.³

As if the Court had not had enough trouble with George Combes he appeared a month later and said that he wished to marry Margaret, the daughter of the late Hugh Dene, a London citizen and Vintner. The Court, suspicious of the weak-willed and gullible George, asked him if he had been put up to this, but on receiving his assurance that he was proceeding '*ex voluntate sua propria absque excitatione matris suae aut alterius de avunculis suis*', the Court gave its assent to the marriage.⁴ Perhaps as a present for his future bride George appears to have bought some gold bracelets set with

-
1. 8 July 1454, Jour.V f.175.
 2. 12 July 1454, Jour.V f.176v. George acknowledged receipt of the £100 as part of the £400 due to him.
 3. 12 July 1454, Jour.V f.176v.
 4. 2 August 1454, Jour.V f.181v.

jewels about which the Court was informed a month later.¹ It must, therefore, have been a considerable relief to the Court of Aldermen when George Combes became twenty four, as he appears to have done by 26 March 1455, and the Court of Aldermen and the Chamber were exonerated from their responsibility.² Of the gullible George there is no further trace, without the guidance of the Court of Aldermen he seems to have been unable to make any mark in civic life.

(x) The control of Brokers and Usurers

The Court of Aldermen exercised a general supervision over financial dealings of a private kind between Londoners. It was particularly concerned with the activities of brokers and usurers. A broker who acted as a middle-man to negotiate bargains or sales was not, ipso facto, guilty of usury. But in practice the activities of brokers and usurers were often linked, as when the men of Broad Street ward in 1421 presented Adam Semy and Richard Kere as 'sustainers of foreign brokers and common usurers' and a common petition to the King in the Parliament of 1403-4 claimed that in London and elsewhere the sin of usury was practised under the name of chevaunce, by strangers called Brokers.³ The difficulty from both the national and the civic point of view was that the brokers and usurers were a necessary evil. While usury continued to be strictly condemned - and widely practised -

-
1. 13 September 1454, William Horn, Goldsmith, servant of Galiot Scot (a foreign merchant subsequently murdered, see L.B.K., p.385) acknowledged that he had delivered gold bracelets set with stones to George Combes, Jour.V f.190v.
 2. George Combes acknowledged receipt of £400 and the jewels worth £20 on 26 March 1455, Cal.P.and M.1437-57, p.146. The acquittance is again recorded 16 May 1455, Jour.V f.243; L.B.K., pp.349-50.
 3. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, p.131; R.P., III, p.541. In the petition the Commons ask that there should be no brokers, either denizens or aliens, and that there should be a yearly enquiry into usury. The King agreed that the matter should be dealt with according to the laws of the Church.

brokerage was permitted but was subjected to a series of stringent regulations.

These regulations were numerous in the City and were altered and amended quite frequently. The number of brokers who were allowed to operate in the City was limited ranging from 12 in 1424 to 30 in 1456.¹ Although in 1401, 1421 and 1452 it had been ordained that only Englishmen and London denizens were to act as brokers in the City, this was clearly found to be an impracticable restriction, and in 1429 and 1456 men who were obviously Italians were sworn as brokers, and were described as foreigners. Moreover in 1422 and 1429 inquests were held to enquire into the activities of aliens who were practising brokerage without being admitted and sworn before the Mayor and Aldermen.² Clearly the fact that they were aliens did not exclude them automatically. But whether denizen or alien every broker had to be accepted and sworn before the Mayor and Aldermen and this requirement appears in all the brokerage regulations of these years.³ The brokers were not only sworn but they had also to produce mainpernors to ensure that they would observe the various civic regulations.⁴

-
1. 1401, 15 brokers, L.B.I., p.12; 1419, 18 brokers (12 denizen, 6 aliens) Jour.I f.58; 1424, 12 brokers, L.B.I., p.33; 1429, 22 brokers (12 denizens, 10 aliens) Jour.II f.121; 1442, 24 brokers, L.B.K., p.269; 1452, 20 brokers, L.B.K., p.351; 1456, 30 brokers (12 denizens, 18 aliens) Jour.VI f.5, 65; 1479, 30 brokers, L.B.L., p.162.
 2. 20 August 1422, 4 April 1429, Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.145, 224-26. 14 October 1427, 6 Italians were enjoined not to practise brokerage under penalty of a year's imprisonment and a £20 fine. This may have been because they had not been duly admitted, Jour.II f.103.
 3. 1401, 1407, 1410, 1414, 1421, L.B.I., pp.12, 60, 85, 131, 264. 1424, 1442, 1452, L.B.K., pp.33, 269, 350-52; 1418, Jour.I f.48v. For brokers oath see Liber Albus pp.315-16. It was probably drawn up at the time of the ordinances made during the Mayoralty of Robert Chichele, 20 November 1421, L.B.I., p.264.
 4. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.113, 173-74; 1407, 1410, 1414, L.B.I., pp.60, 85, 131.

At the beginning of this period and at least until 1445 some of the brokers, if not all, appear to have been chosen by certain City Companies. In 1401 the Grocers, Mercers, Fishmongers, Ironmongers, Drapers, Vintners and Skinners chose fifteen brokers between them.¹ In 1445 fourteen brokers were chosen by the Mercers, Skinners and Grocers. The Tailors appear to have requested the right to choose brokers and to have been refused.² But in 1458 four Aldermen were appointed to choose those who should act as broker in the City so the Companies may have lost their right of presentation.³

Further regulations stipulated that brokers should ^{not} ~~eat~~ traffic in merchandise for their own benefit, should not transact bargains except in the presence of the vendor and purchaser and should do nothing which would tend to raise the price of the goods being sold.⁴ All these regulations were confirmed in 1452 together with certain additional restrictions which were promulgated in December, which established fixed rates of exchange for Italian money and instituted two surveyors to control the activities of the brokers.⁵ But since the new ordinance 'minus bene observatur et custodiatur', it was repealed by Common Council on 22 January 1454 and it was decided to return to the ancient ordinances of 1408 and 1421.⁶ The

-
1. L.B.I., p.12; see also 1407, L.B.I., p.60; 1442, L.B.K., p.269.
 2. Jour.IV f.165v.; 26 April 1445, Jour.IV f.75.
 3. 11 March 1458, Jour.VI f.201.
 4. 20 February 1408, L.B.I., pp.63-64; confirmed 20 November 1421, ibid., p.264.
 5. A committee had been appointed to draw up these new regulations. 31 August, 28 November, 11 December 1452, Jour.V f.84v., 94, 97v. Ordinances dated 15 December 1452, Jour.V f.99; L.B.K., pp.350-52. Thomas Muschamp and William Tailor were the first two surveyors appointed during good behaviour, 20 December 1452, Jour.V f.99v. Possibly Geoffrey Boleyn and Richard Lee were appointed 21 April 1456, Jour.VI f.64v.
 6. 22 January 1454, Jour.V f.143.

charges which a broker might make for his services were also laid down by the City at the rough rate of 2d. or 3d. for every 20s. worth of merchandise involved.¹ Fines for transgressing the various civic regulations were paid to the Chamber.²

None of these regulations was entirely successful. In 1422 and 1429 there were found to be unsworn brokers operating in the City and ad hoc commissions were appointed at intervals to try to stamp out malpractices.³ These commissions and inquisitions usually covered investigations into usurious practices also. It was probably because of the usurious nature of the bargains involved that, occasionally, attempts were made to prohibit the activities of brokers altogether. In November 1418 it was decided that there should be no brokerage in the City until the following Michaelmas and in 1463 it was ordained that no-one should act as broker within the City under penalty of 100s.⁴ But by 1479 there were again brokers in the City.⁵

Usury being the greater evil, although equally inevitable within a trading community, it was ruthlessly forbidden. There were proclamations against 'ungodly contracts and unclean bargains of usury' and undignified and expensive punishments were prescribed.⁶ From May to August 1421 there was a

-
1. L.B.I., p.264; L.B.K., p.352. William Wortley, a broker, successfully pursued John Gacyas, a Gascon merchant, in the Mayor's Court for 35s. worth of broker's fees, 27 March 1442, Cal.P.and M.1437-57, p.47.
 2. 5 May 1441, Jour.III f.85.
 3. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.145, 224-26; 28 September 1428, Jour.II f.119. The ordinance of 1442 laid down that there should be inquisitions four times each year, L.B.K., p.269; 29 April 1454, Jour.V f.162.
 4. Common Petition, R.P. III, p.541; 16 November 1418, Jour.I f.52; L.B.I., pp.211-12; 15 October 1463, L.B.L., p.40.
 5. 28 January 1479, L.B.L., p.162.
 6. Proclamations 9 July 1453, Jour.V f.114; 18 March 1454, Jour.V f.153v. 8 February 1456, L.B.K., p.374. A broker who took part in a usurious contract was to be led bare-headed through the City, without hose, ungirt, and bare-back on a horse, L.B.K., p.351. As early as 7 March 1364, the City had drawn up ordinances against usurious bargains, L.B.G., pp.160-61.

series of trials in the Mayor's Court for usurious practices whereby large fines were paid into the Chamber. Several respectable citizens such as John Higham and Philip Malpas, Drapers, William Burton, Grocer and William Bury, Mercer, were found guilty.¹ There are four further prosecutions for usury recorded in the Mayor's Court rolls. Two men were convicted and two were found not guilty.² Occasionally the Court of Aldermen appointed special commissions to enquire into the activities of usurers, those practising 'false chevisaunce', and they could also hear and determine the cases which came before them. They operated, in fact, as a judicial committee of the Court of Aldermen.³

Just as the regulations controlling brokers were half-hearted, difficult to enforce, often ignored and spasmodic, so too the City's attitude to usury was ambivalent. As Dr. Thomas wrote,

It is no easy task to discover exactly where medieval men, under the guidance of the Church, drew the line between legitimate enterprise and immoral gain accruing from the use of capital.⁴

When men of the standing of those successfully prosecuted in 1421, and when the Alderman William Dere was found guilty in 1456, then it can be seen how

-
1. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.95-110. See also rough notes of these cases Jour.I f.92v.-95v. On the fines, ibid., p.vii. In the course of these trials the City had to defend its right to deal with such cases, before the King's Council. Although on 3 July 1421 the Council only agreed to allow the Mayor and Aldermen to enquire into the activities of usurers and arrest them, until the Council should be better advised, it is clear from the Plea and Memoranda rolls that the Mayor's Court prosecuted, judged and fined usurers, P.P.C.II, p.289; Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.97-98. Only one chronicler refers to these trials, Cont.E of Brut, Brie, p.444.
 2. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.285-86; Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, pp.68, 134-35; Jour.V f.181v.; Cal.P. and M. 1458-82, pp.28-30.
 3. 19 March 1439, 2 Aldermen, 4 Commoners, Jour.III f.11v.; 6 February 1456, 4 Aldermen, 4 Commoners, Jour.VI f.28; 2 October 1460, 2 Aldermen, 4 Commoners, Jour.VI f.270v.
 4. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.vii.

widespread usury was in the mercantile community and how ineffective any control attempted by the Mayor and Aldermen in London must be.¹

(xi) The Administration of Civic Markets

The two markets of Queenhythe and Billingsgate were both ancient and they owed their prominence to their positions as havens on the Thames. Queenhythe was primarily a market for corn and was leased by the City from the crown for £50 p.a. Billingsgate lying below the Bridge was a more popular landing place and many commodities such as wine, fish and coal were landed and sold there, as well as corn.² By the fifteenth century the City had full control of both markets, issuing ordinances to regulate them and providing coal meters, saltmeters, corrmeters and oyster meters to operate in both places as well as a bailiff to have general supervisory control of each market.³ It would seem that these markets were concerned mainly with

-
1. William Dere's prosecution arose out of a dispute with Alexander Broke which began in July 1455, see Jour.V f.249v., Jour.VI f.5v., 28, 28v., 306. He was convicted on 20, 23 March 1456, Jour.VI f.6, 6v. The case dragged on until April 1457, Jour.VI f.2, 108v., 118v.
 2. Harben, Dictionary of London, pp.71, 492-93. Ordinances regulating the 2 markets in 1344, 1354, L.B.F., p.100; L.B.G., p.33. For the customs of Billingsgate and Queenhythe see Liber Albus, pp.238-41, 237-38. See also A.H. Thomas, Research Paper G.R.O. Box 2.32 and R.R. Sharpe, Research Paper, G.R.O., Ms.187.7.
 3. For lists of Bailiffs, Coalmeters, Saltmeters, Corrmeters and Oyster-meters in the fifteenth century see Appendices nos.24-29. The prices at which coal could be sold in the City were fixed 24 December 1405 at a quarter for 10d. and half a quarter for 5d. L.B.I., f.xlvii. There were nine recorded prosecutions between 1417 and 1455 for selling coal underweight and contrary to civic ordinances, Memorials, pp.669-70; L.B.I., pp.214-15; Jour.I f.13v.; L.B.K., pp.7, 95; Jour.III f.29v.; Jour.V f.173, 213, 246. 10 March 1429, John Twyer was condemned to have his defective sacks burnt on the pillory beneath him, L.B.K., p.95.

the wholesale transactions of goods. Whereas the citizens had leased the right to collect measuring fees, stall fees and the profits of toll collectors at Queenhythe from the crown since the reign of Henry III, they were granted these rights at Billingsgate by Henry IV's charter in 1400.¹ There were few developments in these markets in the first part of the fifteenth century. In 1449 it appears that the Commonalty decided to enlarge Billingsgate market by buying certain lands and tenements, near to the market, which had belonged to Sir Thomas Haseley for £1000, although the sum was not finally paid until 1452.² This extension of Billingsgate may have made it even more

-
1. 25 May 1400, Cal. Charter Rolls 1341-1417, p.403.
 2. October 1449, decision to communicate with the Lord Cardinal of York and other feoffees of the late Sir Thomas Haseley about Billingsgate, Jour.V f.17. 11 November 1449, Common Council agreed to buy Haseley's lands for 1000 marks, 500 marks to be raised by 1 August 1450 and 500 marks by 2 February 1451, Jour.V f.25. 12 November 1449 William Goodyng, lately clerk to Haseley, was made free of the City without charge, Jour.V f.25v. Various payments totalling c.£300 were made to Henry Waver, Haseley's chief executor, between November 1449 and March 1450, Jour.V f.26, 27. The price appears to have risen to £1000 by January 1450 when the executors acknowledge receipt of £466 13s.4d., a further £200 was to be paid to Waver by the eighth week after he had produced evidence of title, and the remaining £333 6s.8d. to be paid by 1 August 1450, Jour.V f.28, 28 January 1450 Waver produced evidence of title in court, Jour.V f.30. 21 February 1450, committee of Aldermen and legal experts appointed to examine these deeds, Jour.V f.31. 8 March 1450, 4 Aldermen (Combes, Feldyng, Cantelowe, Middleton) to be feoffees for Haseley's lands, Jour.V f.31v. 14 April 1450, City had to borrow money from the Companies to pay Waver, Mercers (£30), Grocers (£30), Drapers (£30), Vintners (£10), repayable 2 February 1451, Jour.V f.33v., 34. 13 May 1452, it was necessary to levy 1000 marks in the City for Billingsgate, Jour.V f.74v., 41. 4 August 1452, John Chester and Thomas Gefferoy objected to this levy and were sent to Newgate, Jour.V f.80. Stephen Broun must have been appointed as one of the feoffees for these lands for when he died he left them in perpetuity to the Mayor and Commonalty, 24 April, 2 May 1461, Jour.VI f.56v., 57v. 22 April 1461, 7 Aldermen and 12 Commoners chosen as feoffees of the lands lately belonging to Thomas Haseley at Billingsgate, Jour.VI f.56.

popular for in 1464 it was necessary to issue detailed regulations to ensure that an equal number of ships unloaded at Billingsgate and Queenhythe, and in the next few years certain improvements to the facilities at Queenhythe were carried out.¹

Smithfield market dated from at least the twelfth century when it was described by FitzStephen as a market for horses and livestock.² The field lay to the north-west of the City beyond the Priory and Hospital of St. Bartholomew. Some of the dues were payable to the King, the Sheriffs being responsible for their collection and some, (e.g. scavage), were payable to the City.³ In 1400, however, Henry IV's charter granted all the dues and customs to the citizens,⁴ but it would appear that the citizens had already been exercising considerable authority there in the fourteenth century.⁵ Whether the bailiff who controlled the market earlier was chosen by the Londoners or the King is not clear, but by 1424 the office was certainly a civic appointment.⁶

-
1. 10 February 1464, L.E.L., pp.45-48; 19 June 1471, Cal.P.and M.1457-82, pp.70-71.
 2. FitzStephen's description of London, written before 1183, is translated and printed by H.E. Butler in F.M. Stenton, Norman London (1934), pp.26-32, see esp. pp.28-29.
 3. Customs of Smithfield temp. Henry III, Liber Albus, pp.233-34.
 4. 25 May 1400, Cal.Charter Rolls, 1341-1417, p.403.
 5. Fourteenth century ordinances known as the statute of Smithfield, Liber Albus, pp.261-63. These were primarily concerned to ensure cash payments for cattle. Prosecutions for contravening these ordinances were pursued in the Mayor's Court, e.g. case of Peter Sharp, Cal.P.and M.1437-57, pp.25-26.
 6. In 1399 and 1400 the Commons petitioned against the excessive exaction of the Bailiff of Smithfield, R.P.III pp.439, 474. The only Bailiff whose name is recorded in this period is William Colyn who was sworn, 29 November 1424, Jour.II f.28v. He became Bailiff of Queenhythe in 1426, Jour.II f.91. 19 August 1444 it was decided that the Bailiff should not be entitled to exact pickage there, Jour.IV f.38v.

The field served not only as a market but also for royal jousts and tournaments and for public executions and hangings.¹ It may have been for these royal purposes that the citizens granted the King a piece of common land in West Smithfield in 1443 and a house there called the 'scacfold' in 1445.² St. Bartholomew's Fair was also held in Smithfield in August and the privilege of holding it had been confirmed to the Prior of St. Bartholomew's by Henry I.³ In this period a quarrellarose between the Prior and the City over the holding of this fair but in 1447 an agreement was reached whereby the supervision of the fair and the profits arising from it were equally divided between the citizens and the Prior. Moreover a representative of the City was to sit on the Pie Powder Court.⁴

-
1. Stow, Survey, ii, pp.29-33 states that in 6 Henry V a new building was erected in West Smithfield which was used for executing offenders.
 2. 6 October 1443, L.B.K., pp.297-98; 30 July 1445, Jour.IV f.88.
 3. Harben, Dictionary of London, p.50. In the time of Henry II there were two fairs, one belonging to the City and one to the Prior, but they were amalgamated and this led to trouble, Common Council Printed Minutes, 2 July 1840, pp.245-46.
 4. Henry Barton, who had been Mayor in 1428-29 was prosecuted by the Prior of St. Bartholomew's in the Exchequer in Michaelmas term 1430 for having prevented the Prior from enjoying the profits of the four day Smithfield Fair, M. Hemmant ed. Select Cases in the Exchequer Chamber before all the Justices of England 1377-1461 (Seldon Society, 1933), pp.48-52. 6 May 1444, first hint of trouble between the Prior and the City, to be found in civic records, Jour.IV f.24. 28 January 1445, Common Council voted money to resist the Prior's claims, Jour.IV f.60v. Further negotiations 5 March, 12 April, 18 June 1445, Jour.IV f.74v., 81,104. 20 August 1445, Common Council appointed 4 Commoners as 'custodes placitorum' of Smithfield fair with the help of an Apprentice-at-Law, Jour.IV f.91. 19,22 August 1446, temporary arrangement to regulate the fair agreed, Jour.IV f.135v.,136. August 1447, detailed regulations agreed, a representative of the City, and one of the Prior, to stand at the various parts of the market, the City representative wearing the City's Arms, and the Prior's representative wearing a badge of a crown. The total income from tolls was to be divided, and rewards for the toll collectors were agreed, Jour.IV f.188v. Negotiations in March 1453 led to a more permanent agreement on 28 October 1453, Jour.V f.106v.,107; L.B.K., pp.354-55. Appointments of City officials to be present at the fair recorded, 17 August 1456, 12 August 1457, 5 August 1458, 17 August 1459, 13 August 1460, 14 August 1461, Jour.VI f.101v.,131v.,249,136,260v.,23v.

At the end of the thirteenth century Henry le Waleys, then Mayor of London, obtained permission from the Crown to erect a building on a piece of land adjoining St. Mary Woolchurch, in order to help maintain London Bridge. Hence the Stock Market was built on the site of the Mansion House, where Butchers and Fishmongers had stalls for selling meat and fish.¹ In 1410 the Stock Market was rebuilt and in 1423 John Clerk, a Founder, was sworn as superintendant of the market to ensure that those selling fish stood in their appointed places.² As might be expected the men of Walbrook complained in 1422 that the Fishmongers and Butchers threw entrails and offal out of the market onto the King's highway to the 'horribility of the whole ward'.³ But the Court of Aldermen was not inclined to do anything drastic about the Stock Market since it was an important source of revenue for the Bridge bringing in a sum between £40 and £70 p.a.⁴ Although St. Mary Woolchurch was rebuilt in 1442, the City ensured that a space of at least 15 feet should remain between the Church and the market and in 1458 part of

-
1. Harben, Dictionary of London, p.554; Liber Custumarum, i, pp.275-76; G.R.O. Bridge House Deeds Portfolio F 73, 90, confirmations by Hamo de Chigwell of Henry le Waleys's grant, 18 February 1324.
 2. Stow, Survey, i, p.226; 7 May 1423, Jour.II f.5v.
 3. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, p.135.
 4. There were at least 71 stalls in the market, held by Fishmongers and Butchers according to the day, at a rent of 3d. or 4d. per week. Not all the stalls were always occupied. There were 27 other stalls outside the Stock Market proper, which were rented for 2d. per week. G.R.O. Bridge House Small Register f.83, 83v. In the period 1404-1421 the lowest yearly income from the Stock Market was £40 15s.2½d. in 1412/13, and the highest was £69 18s.11d. in 1416/17, B.H.R. I. By 1460 the Butchers paid a compounded annual sum of £40 and the Fishmongers a compounded sum of £27 14s.8d., B.H.R.III f.6v.

the new Church which extended onto the common soil was destroyed.¹ The decision of 1439 to build a granary there was abandoned and the only one to be built was at Leadenhall.²

There were also markets at Newgate, in the middle of the road, where poultry and grain were sold, and at Grace Church Street where corn was sold on the pavement outside St. Benet's Church.³ Both these markets were regulated by ordinances in the reign of Edward III and were under the supervision of bailiffs but no names of these men have survived for the fifteenth century.⁴ Cheapside was the main retail market in the City where all kinds of goods were sold. Poultry was sold between the Standard and the Stock Market. Eastcheap in Candlewick Street ward was primarily a market for the sale of meat.⁵ The Shambles, in the parish of St. Nicholas, together with the west end of Newgate was a further meat market dating back to the reign of Edward I. Although the Butchers bought some land there in 1355 'for the purposes of their trade' it seems that the City also acquired some tenements there in 1458 which were held by feoffees and were, presumably, used to enlarge the market.⁶

-
1. 18 April 1442, Jour.III f.90v.; 5 March, 19 April 1442, L.B.K., pp. 267-68, 272; Stow, Survey 1, p.226; 11 August, 19 September 1458, Jour.VI f.229, 231v.
 2. 18 July 1439, Jour.III f.18v.; see below pp.246-247.
 3. Liber Albus, p.433. John Serge appeared in court for forestalling grain at Newgate and Grace Church markets, Jour.I f.87.
 4. 20 November 1374, L.B.G., p.330; Liber Albus, p.247.
 5. Harben, Dictionary of London, pp.211-12; Stow, Survey 1, pp.216-17.
 6. May 1458, Jour.VI f.242v.; Harben, Dictionary of London, p.527.

In 1397 a messuage called Bakewell or Blackwell Hall together with a garden on the west side of Basinghall Street was conveyed, with royal licence, by three Mercers to the Mayor and Commonalty.¹ From this time onwards it served as the City's market for woollen cloth and the Commonalty appointed a warden who undertook, by his oath, to carry out the civic and national ordinances regulating the sale of cloth.² In 1405 the choice of a keeper of the cloth market was granted by the City to the Drapers Company although the man chosen by the Company had to be accepted and sworn before the Mayor and Aldermen and could be removed if they were displeased with him.³ In spite of handing over virtual control of the market to the Drapers, the Mayor and Aldermen did maintain their residual control. In 1437 seven Aldermen were appointed to investigate the market and in 1451 two men who had transacted a sale of 3 woollen cloths in the house of one of them instead of in the market, were brought before the Mayor.⁴ In 1451 brokers were forbidden to use the market for transacting business.⁵

(xii) The Control of Weights and Measures

The City was concerned with three aspects of the control of weights and measures. Firstly it was concerned to maintain the primacy of the City's

-
1. Hustings Roll 124(57).
 2. Civic regulations, 1399, L.B.H., p.449; Statutes of the Realm, vol.ii (1816), pp.88, 134, 154, 163-64, 168. See L.B.I., pp.30, 39, 41, 54. The oath of the Keeper, L.B.D., pp.200-01, L.B.I., p.41. Drapers' Ordinances of 1405 printed in Johnson, Drapers, i, pp.258-62.
 3. 9, 27 March 1405, L.B.I., pp.41, 42; Johnson, Drapers, i, pp.102-03, 258-59. The office in 1472 carried a salary of £16, ibid., p.103 n.3. For a list of Keepers see Appendix no.30 p.587.
 4. 12 January 1437, Jour.III f.124; 6 April 1451, the transaction was between a foreign Draper and Richard Phippes, Fishmonger, Jour.V. f.56.
 5. L.B.K., pp.342, 352.

weights and measures in relation to those throughout the country. This primacy had been granted to London in Magna Carta:

Let there be one measure of wine throughout our kingdom and one measure of ale and one measure of corn, namely the London quarter, and one width of cloth whether dyed, russet or halberjet, namely two ells within the selveges. Let it be the same with weights as with measures.¹

Secondly, it was concerned to maintain the accuracy and fair administration of the City's two measures: the Great Beam or Trone on which heavy goods (averia ponderis) were weighed and the Small Beam or Balance which was used for weighing silks and spices and lightweight goods. Thirdly, the City was responsible for ensuring that all measures, whether for ale, corn, beer or any other commodity, should be just and the incorrect ones destroyed and the owners punished.

Although the City claimed primacy for its own measures it also regarded them as the King's weights and measures which it administered for the Crown. Hence Henry III's charter to the City in 1268 granted that no merchants were to sell wares which ought to be weighed or troned 'unless by our beam or trone upon forfeiture of the wares'.² This led to the City's great balance or trone being known as the King's trone,³ the King's standard of London,⁴ the King's Beam or the King's Common Beam,⁵ i.e. the weights and measures of the City were the King's own weights and measures, hence of national and not merely civic importance.

-
1. Magna Carta clause 35, printed J.C. Holt, Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1965), p.327.
 2. Charters, p.41; Liber Albus, p.285.
 3. 25 May 1304, L.B.C., p.118.
 4. 3 August 1325, L.B.E., pp.203-04.
 5. 29 September 1300, Cal.Early Mayor's Court Rolls, 1298-1307, p.93. 21 October 1305, ibid., p.226; October 1458, L.B.K., p.394.

The City had always guarded jealously this primacy and the right to determine the weights and measures to be used throughout the realm.¹ In the fifteenth century the citizens believed that their primacy in establishing weights and measures was threatened by the Statutes of 1429 and 1438 which enacted among other things that every town should have its own common balance with sealed weights.² When Robert Ottley, after his election as Mayor in October 1434, was required by the Barons of the Exchequer to take an additional oath to maintain the recent statutes, he refused to do so. He claimed, on behalf of the City, that the standard weights and measures of London took precedence over those of the Exchequer. Ottley, and his successor in the Mayoralty, Henry Frowyk, both successfully refused to take the additional oath.³ Similarly in 1442 Thomas Knolles, who bought up tin in Cornwall and sold it in London, was enjoined by the Court that, notwithstanding the fact that he weighed his tin by the royal stater in Cornwall, in London it was to be weighed by the royal stater of the City.⁴

Heavy goods in the City were weighed at the Great Beam or Balance and lightweight goods, primarily silks, were weighed at the small beam or balance. Charges were made for weighing goods on both these beams.⁵ At the time

-
1. L.B.B., pp.213-14; L.B.C., pp.xiv-xv, 127-29; L.B.D., pp.xvi-xvii, 209-10; Cal.P.and M.1323-64, p.24; L.B.E., pp.203-04; L.B.F., p.107.
 2. Statutes of the Realm, vol.ii (1816), pp.174, 241-42, 282.
 3. P.R.O. K.R. Roll 1434/5 E 159/211, Recorda section f. 6 seq. Ottley continued to appear before the Barons of the Exchequer at intervals throughout his Mayoralty and afterwards, but the case ended with the entry 'Robertus Otteley mortus est'. He died in 1436. K.R. Roll 1435/6 E 159/212 Recorda section f 11 seq. Frowyk resisted the new oath on same grounds as Ottley. Later in the same roll, Recorda section Easter term f 9 19 May 1436, Frowyk and the Aldermen displayed a certain 'vas' vulgarly called the Kings standard of London, by which all bushells in the realm were measured. This was found to exceed the Kings standard in the Exchequer by a pint and a half and a fifth of a pint (water was used for the test). This discrepancy was displayed to the King's Council sitting in the starred chamber. K.R. Roll 1436/7 E 159/213 records nothing about the Mayor of London and weights and measures. Possibly the King's case against the City was dropped. The City's case is set out L.B.K., pp.xliv-xlv, 184-86, 192, 195.
 4. 14 July 1442, Jour.III f.41, cf. L.B.E., pp.203-04. Knolles and other Londoners who bought up tin in Cornwall and exercised a virtual monopoly of its sale in the City had been the cause of complaints by the Pewterers Company in the previous year, 30 April, 2, 4 May 1444, Jour.III f.84, 84v.
 5. Liber Albus, pp.226-27, 245-46, 285; L.B.H., p.22.

when these offices were filled by royal appointment the profits must have belonged to the King but by 1291 at least the City was in a position to grant the office of keeper of the small beam to someone of its own choice.¹ From 1310 the office was farmed for 50s. p.a.² The profits must, therefore, have been inconsiderable and it would appear that it fell under the control of the Mercers Company. Thomas de Depham in 1344 and Laurence Constable in 1353 were chosen by the Mercers Company and presented to the court for approval.³ Although the Mercers appear to have controlled the office the City continued to assert that all silk must be weighed on the common balance and not privately on a merchant's own scales.⁴ It would appear that this regulation applied to all silk-weighing and not simply to wholesale transactions. In the fifteenth century there are no references to the small beam to be found in the civic records and it would seem that the Mercers' control was complete, although ^{the} silk-weigher, once he was chosen by the Company (preference having been given to a 'decayed' member of the livery) he was, then, presented to the Chamberlain of the City. After this the balance-beam and the weights, which belonged to the 'fellowship of the Mercery' were delivered into his charge.⁵

-
1. 19 May 1291, William de Bettayne was granted the office, L.B.B., p.55.
 2. L.B.C., p.239; L.B.D., pp.227-28; L.B.E., p.236; L.B.F., p.192.
 3. 9 September 1344, L.B.F., pp.113-14; 7 January 1353, L.B.G., p.2.
 4. 2 December 1368, Cal.P. and M. 1364-81, pp.100-01, 105-06.
 5. Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company 1453-1527, ed. L. Lyell and F.D. Watney, (Cambridge, 1936), pp.47, 120. The small beam consisted of an iron beam, 2 latten basins, cords and hooks, and brass and lead weights. There are various entries in the Wardens' Accounts from 1405 referring to purchases, or repairs, of weights, Wardens' Accounts vol.i, f.45, 52, 55, 99, 183. See also Ms. Laws and Ancient Ordinances of the Company, f.19.

The control of the Great Beam was somewhat different. Edward II's charter of 1319 granted both the choice of the keeper and the profits of the office to the Commonalty of London.¹ By 1365 the Grocers, Apothecaries and Pepperers were choosing the keeper in the same way that the Mercers were choosing the keeper of the small beam.² But the Commonalty asserted its residual control more effectively than in the case of the small beam.³ In the fifteenth century the office continued to be held by a succession of Grocers, but these men were approved by the citizens. Richard Burtone in 1426 agreed to pay 40 marks p.a. for the office and Edmund Kerville paid £50 p.a. in 1458.⁴ But the exercise of the office by Simon Strete who had been appointed in 1438 was clearly unsatisfactory and so, in 1441, with the assent of Common Council it was decided to put the office in commission. William Chedworth, the Chamberlain's clerk was to act as controller of the office as the controllers of customs surveyed the work of the customs collectors.⁵ Strete was to continue in the active duties of weighing, and was to be paid £20 for his labour and 10 marks for the use of his house and weights. Chedworth was to receive 10 marks p.a. for his oversight. The office, in effect, was to cease to be farmed out, and was instead to become salaried. It was decided to enforce the statute of 1429 for the regulation

-
1. Charters, p.48; confirmed 25 May 1400, Cal.Charter Rolls 1341-1417, p.403
 2. 20 November 1365, L.B.G., p.204; cf. 18 February 1376, L.B.H., p.22.
 3. Articles were ordained for the Grocers in this matter by the Commonalty 1383/4, Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, i, p.22. The Grocers, however, drew up lists of charges and decided that the holder of the office should pay 40s. each year to the Common Box, ibid., pp.50, 66, 87. The Sheriffs of London controlled the weighing of lead in the City since they appointed William Goryngg as weigher of lead, 16 February 1391, Cal.P.and M.1381-1412, pp.175-76.
 4. For a list of holders of the Common Beam see Appendix no.23 p. 581.
 5. 16, 25 October 1441, Jour.III f.98v-100.

of the stater, 'viz. quod equaliter lingua stet in medium'; and when it was found that the old axis operated unsatisfactorily where the stater stood, further directions were given for the making of a new round axis of the same pattern as, and to be tested by, the Goldsmiths' scales.¹ Simon Strete was sworn to weigh well and truly according to royal statutes² and William Chedworth was sworn to control the said Simon well and truly.³ But the new system did not work satisfactorily. On 15 January 1442 Chedworth resigned from his position as controller and there were complaints about the charges which were made.⁴ In March it was decided that those who owed money for the weighing of their goods should pay or suffer distraint. Moreover in future merchandise was not to be taken from the City weigh-house before the tronage fee was paid.⁵

-
1. 31 October 1411, Jour.III f.101; 3 November 1441, Jour.III f.101v.
 2. A copy of Strete's oath is to be found, Jour.III f.126v. 'Ye shall swer that ye shall wel and trewly use and occupie the offus of comyn weyaer of Av' de poys of this cite of London be twix party and party after the good use and custume of this cite tyme owt of mynde usid acustumd and had and that ye shall take for the weyng of alle foreyns and fremen lik as hit hath be tyme owt of mynde usid accustumed and had so helpe yow god and holydom'.
 3. 3 November 1441, Jour.III f.101v.; 6 November 1441, various statutes about weights and weighing were declared in Court, Jour.III f.102; 18 November 1441, Masters of various Companies came to Court seeking the regulation of the great stater, Jour.III f.105.
 4. Jour.III f.108v.; 22 January 1442, John Atherley complained, Jour.III f.109.
 5. 2 March 1442, Jour.III f.112. 22 August 1442, a concession was made in that 'ferrum flex' could be weighed in merchants' houses but all other goods were to be brought to the weigh-house. If the Common Weigher did otherwise, he was to suffer imprisonment and loss of his office. On the same day Nicholas Yeo, Draper, and Nicholas Wyfold, Grocer, were appointed to scrutinize the balance, Jour.III f.149v.

In November 1442 the exercise of the office was still causing trouble. The clerk to the keeper threatened to resign and it was decided to farm the keepership once more to anyone who would offer £100 p.a. for it. Moreover the keeper was not to weigh any goods except in the presence of the clerk assigned to him by the Court of Aldermen and a record of the goods weighed was to be kept.¹ Strete then told the court indignantly that no freeman would offer £40 for the office.² As a result of this statement the Aldermen decided to consider the matter further, but no result is recorded. It would appear that Simon Strete probably continued in office until old age caused him to resign.³ On 4 July 1458 the wardens of various Companies presented four men from whom the Court of Aldermen chose Edmund Kerville, a Grocer, to be common weigher. Kerville was not to be salaried as Strete had been but was to pay a yearly farm of £50.⁴ About the time of this new appointment the City issued a proclamation forbidding merchant strangers to buy or sell any manner of avoir du pois which ought to be

-
1. 12 November 1442, Jour.III f.179.
 2. 14 November 1442, Jour.III f.91.
 3. Strete drew up his will 14 March 1456 and it was enrolled, 20 January 1460, Hustings Wills, ii, pp.540-41. In the Grocers' Accounts for 1453 there is recorded a list of the charges to be made for use of the Great Beam, by barrel, bale, case etc. which suggest wholesale transactions. Lead, cotton, rice, copper, flex are among the goods listed, apart from spices. The charge for goods not listed was to be 1d. for each 20lb. bale, see Baron Heath, Some Account of the Company of Grocers (3rd edn. 1869) Appendix no.10, p.421, and Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, p.323.
 4. 4 July 1458, Jour.VI f.246v. The £50 farm was reduced to £40 the following year when it was considered that Kerville's income would be considerably reduced by the restrictions imposed on the Genoese and other foreign merchants in the City, August 1458, 17 August 1459, Jour.VI f.249v., 136. 12 February 1462 Kerville was again remitted £10 of the £50 farm, although it was stated that this was not to form a precedent, Jour.VI f.15v.

weighed, unless it is weighed by the King's Common Beam according to the franchises and liberties of the City.¹ The history of the office of keeper of the Common Beam in the City in the first part of the fifteenth century would suggest that it was open to considerable abuse in this period.

Certain goods were not weighed at the City's two balances. Wool was weighed at the staple at Westminster although in 1463 Edward IV granted that the tronage, weighing and measuring of wool should be at Leadenhall and that all the profits were to go to the City.² Bakers' flour was weighed on special scales in the control of the Mayor.³

Finally the City exercised a general supervision over weights and measures used by London merchants, especially retailers. The wardmote inquests were expected to report false weights in use in the City and the Court of Aldermen tried to exercise a constant vigilance over this aspect of City marketing. In 1439 three men who had made and sold false measures to Brewers appeared before the court,⁴ and, earlier in the century Richard Whittington when Mayor had tried to ensure that ale and beer should be sold in standardized barrels marked with the cooper's sign.⁵ In 1442 some Lombard merchants complained to the Court of Aldermen about some false balances being used in the City. The Mayor inspected them and that same afternoon, having found them to be false, he ordered them to be destroyed and new balances

 1. c. October, ¹⁴⁵⁸ L.B.K., p.394.

2. Charters, p.85; cf. Stow, Survey, 1, pp.155-56.

3. See below pp. 240-242.

4. 18 November 1439, Gebon Parker, Richard Turner, John White, Jour.III f.29v.

5. L.B.I., pp.237-38.

made.¹ The City also appointed a common measurer of cloth, although the Hanse merchants were allowed to measure their own cloth, whether linen, canvas or whatever.²

Most of the City's measurers, of coal, corn, oysters and salt were stationed at particular City markets where those goods were sold. Together with the bailiff or 'custos' of the market they represented in tangible form the City's control over the sale of goods in London.

(xiii) The sale of food in the City

Another of the important tasks which fell largely under the control of the Court of Aldermen was the regulation of the sale of food in the City. The Court had the power to fix prices, authorize places and methods of sale, prevent monopolies, regulate standard sizes of containers, punish offenders and, through the Mayor's office, search the City for defective goods. The foods with which the Court was primarily concerned were bread, ale and beer, corn, salt, fish, meat, poultry and wine.

By the fifteenth century there were a number of regulations in force governing the price and weight of bread which were fixed each year by the Mayor at the Assize of Bread.³ In the Journals there are a great many entries:

-
1. 17 March 1442, Jour.III f.114.
 2. 15 December 1452, John Derham, Mercer, described as Common Measurer of cloth, Jour.V f.99.
 3. Liber Albus, pp.349-55. In G.R.O. there is also the Liber de Assisa Panis which was begun in 1293 and contains entries up to 1438. It includes regulations about the sale of bread made in different mayoralities and records prosecutions against different offenders. See S. Thrupp, A Short History of the Worshipful Company of Bakers of London (1933), esp. Chapter 2. See also Frieda Nicholas, 'The Assize of Bread in London during the Sixteenth Century', Economic History, vol.II (1930-33), pp.323-47.

recording regulations about the price of bread.¹ The traditional punishment for a baker who sold underweight bread was to be dragged through the City on a hurdle, but there were only a few occasions on which this was actually done in this period. Most Bakers escaped with a fine and/or imprisonment.² The Court of Aldermen was also concerned to preserve the distinction between Bakers of white bread and Bakers of brown bread (otherwise called turt bread or household bread)³ and to ensure that the flour used by the Bakers was pure and did not include barley or peas, or anything except wheat.⁴ In 1423 it was agreed that Bakers should not bake bread on Sundays except in dire necessity.⁵

In 1450 a quarrel arose between the Mayor and the City Bakers. Since the reign of Edward I the Mayor had provided weights and balances for weighing corn and flour. In return for this service he was to receive a halfpenny for weighing a quarter of corn and a farthing for half a quarter. This tax was known as pesage. But by 1450 it appears that the Bakers had compounded the sum for an annual payment of 50 marks. During the mayoralty of Thomas Chalton (1449-50) the Bakers refused to pay this sum and a long drawn out battle ensued.⁶ The regulations of the time of Edward I were

-
1. See Appendix no. 16. 22 October 1445, the City Bakers were allowed to raise the price of bread by 6d. for 2 or 3 weeks, Jour.IV f.101v.
 2. See Appendix no. 17 p. 571.
 3. 9 January 1440, Jour.III f.33v.; c.1441, L.B.K., p.258.
 4. 11 October 1432, commonalty petitioned against Bakers' practice of mixing barley with wheat before sending it out of the City to be milled, L.B.K., p.146; 27 July 1440, Bakers instructed not to put peas or vetches into bread, Jour.III f.50v.; 17 September 1440, decided to hold an inquisition into Bakers who used such ingredients in bread, Jour.III f.59, 60v.
 5. 8 May 1423, L.B.K., p.10.
 6. 15 October 1450; Jour.V f.48v.; Aldermen agreed that none of them, on becoming Mayor, would make an agreement with the Bakers until the 50 marks had been paid to Charlton, L.B.K., p.358; Thrupp, op.cit., p.4.

confirmed by Common Council on 16 January 1453 and again on 8 October 1453.¹ The Bakers maintained that they had been exonerated from the liability to pay pesage but this was not accepted by the City and in September 1453 various individual Bakers were prosecuted in the Mayor's Court.² The King sent a writ enquiring into the cause of the Bakers' imprisonment and ordering that they should be brought into Chancery.³ The City agreed to bear the costs of this action in the royal court where, on 1 November 1453, judgment was given in favour of the Mayor.⁴ Many Bakers came into court in December and agreed to abide by the ordinance and judgments of the Mayor and Aldermen in this matter.⁵ A small group of Bakers, however, led by John Mabewe were more obstinate and it was not until 16 September 1455 that Mabewe finally submitted to the Mayor and Aldermen, promised to pay his debts of pesage and agreed not to hold conventicles in the future.⁶ It appears that Geoffrey Feldyng who was Mayor in 1452-3 provided the necessary weights and balances

1. Jour.V f.100v., 124v.
2. 27 July 1453, Jour.V f.116; L.B.K., p.359.
3. 4 October 1453, Bakers accepted the arbitration of Wyfold, Billing and Ursewyk, Jour.V f.123v. 16 October 1453, Royal writ, L.B.K., p.359.
4. 28 October 1453, Jour.V f.127; L.B.K., pp.359-60. 5 November 1453, Bakers appeared before the Mayor and were informed of the decision of the King's justice, namely that they should pay pesage according to ancient City custom, Jour.V f.128v.
5. 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18 December 1453, Jour.V f.136-138v.; L.B.K., p.360. 18 December 1453, Common Council reaffirmed the dues to be paid by the Bakers, and the Bakers also agreed to pay £10 of the Mayor's costs in the case, Jour.V f.138v. See also 12 January, 6 February 1454, Jour.V f.141, 147.
6. 16 September 1455, Jour.V f.261v.; L.B.K., pp.368-69. Mabewe had appeared before the Court on 6 February, 10 July 1454, Jour.V f.147, 176.

at his own expense, and that these were kept by John Russell, one of the Mayor's permanent Serjeants at Mace.¹ In 1454 it was decided that the Chamberlain should buy these scales from Feldying and that they should then remain in the City to be used for weighing the Bakers' grain and flour.²

Just as the price of bread in the City was fixed by annual assizes, so was the price of beer. At the time when the Liber Albus was written a gallon of best ale was to cost 1½d. and a gallon of ordinary quality ale 1d.³ A further distinction was drawn between beer sold inside the Brewers' house and outside his house where it was a halfpenny cheaper.⁴ This vigorous tying-down of the price of beer led the Brewers to have a considerable quarrel with Richard Whittington, and throughout this period they made several attempts to be allowed to sell beer at a higher price.⁵ The Brewers' justification in demanding to be allowed to increase the price of beer, was the high price of malt which, they claimed in October 1422, cost as much as 8s.2d. or 8s.4d. a quarter which led many Brewers to abandon their craft.⁶ It was for this reason that the Brewers petitioned the King and Commons in parliament that they might have eight bushels of clean malt to the quarter, but after twelve years of effort they had still not achieved this objective.⁷

-
1. 7 December 1452, Jour.V f.96v.
 2. 28 September 1454, Jour.V f.194v.
 3. Liber Albus, pp.358-61. During the Mayoralty of Richard Whittington 1419-20, best beer was to cost 2d. a gallon inside and 1½d. a gallon outside, L.B.I., pp.233, 235-57.
 4. Cf. modern distinction between the public and the saloon bars.
 5. L.B.I., pp.233, 235-37. 18 November 1419, all Brewers ordinances to be observed, Jour.I f.64; 27, 31 August 1420, Jour.I f.84. Brewers' Account Book, f.32-34, 69v.-70.
 6. Brewers' Account Book, f.71.
 7. Brewers' Account Book f.77v.-78, 204.

In 1437-9 the price of malt was so high that the Brewers petitioned the Court of Aldermen that the Company might, on these grounds, be released from paying the usual fines and amercements. The Court agreed on condition that the Brewers kept the assize and did not raise their prices for this reason.¹ The ward ale-conners reported on those who broke the assize and the Company also kept a record of such offenders, but as in all matters of this kind the Mayor and Aldermen exercised a general supervision and could have offenders brought before the Court and there fine them or make them swear to observe the assize.²

The Mayor and Aldermen were not only concerned about the price of beer; they also took steps to regulate the sizes of containers in which it was sold. In 1408 it was decided that beer barrels should be marked at Guildhall to ensure the correct capacity and in 1420 it was further decided that Coopers should be punished for making barrels of an incorrect size and Brewers also should be punished for using such barrels.³ In 1411 it was decided that the pewter tankards in which beer was retailed, gallons, pottles and quarts, should also be sealed by the Chamberlain.⁴ In November 1439 two men appeared before the Court of Aldermen for having manufactured false pottles and quarts as well as false weights, and the ward inquests of 1421/2 present many faulty

-
1. Brewers' Account Book f.236v.; 26 September 1439, Jour.III f.23.
 2. Brewers' Account Book f.34. 14 December 1436, 9 Brewers in Court swear to observe the regulated prices, Jour.III f.125v. November 1436, Marianna Bradshawe promised not to sell ale at prices higher than those ordained by the Mayor, Jour.III f.129.
 3. 20 February 1408, L.B.I., pp.63, 232; 18 January 1420, L.B.I., pp. 235-37. In 1422/3 the Brewers paid 12d. to one of John Carpenter's clerks at Guildhall to have a copy of the London Coopers' marks, Brewers' Account Book f.100v. The list is probably the same as that recorded in L.B.I., pp.237-38; see also Jour.I f.69v., 72v. A further list of Coopers' marks is to be found c.1432, L.B.K., p.134.
 4. 25 November 1411, L.B.I., pp.97-98.

measures used in the retail sale of ale and beer.¹ The Court of Aldermen tried also to ensure not only that the customer received the right amount of beer for his money, but also that what he drank was reasonably wholesome. In January 1445 the wardens were enjoined to ensure that the Thames water used for brewing was taken not from stagnant pools but from places where the river ebbed and flowed, and in September 1455 a Fishmonger and his apprentice were convicted of having carried putrid water to John Richard a Brewer living in Coleman Street, and to other Brewers also.² Any water from the Thames at this period was probably unwholesome, but some less so than other, presumably.

The Brewers themselves drew up regulations to govern the ordering of their craft but the Commonalty of the City might ask for heavier penalties to be exacted for breaking these ordinances.³ Such fines were divided between the Chamber and the Brewers' Company.⁴ In 1458 a Serjeant of the Chamber was appointed to collect fines from Brewers who broke the assize and in 1461 a special collector of such fines, Richard Bowherst, was appointed to be responsible to the Chamberlain.⁵ Like all other crafts the Brewers were anxious to exclude foreigners, i.e. non-citizens, from taking part in any of the City trade, and they relied upon the help of the Mayor, Aldermen and City

-
1. 18 November 1439, Jour.III f.29v., 30; the men were Gebon Parker and Richard Turner; Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.119, 139-40, 159.
 2. 27 January 1445, Jour.IV f.60v.; 10 September 1455, Jour.V f.261v.
 3. Ordinances temp. Richard Whittington (1419-20), L.B.I., pp.233, 235-57; Ordinances temp. John Gedney (1427-28), Brewers' Account Book f.38v.-39; Ordinances temp. Nicholas Wotton (1430-31) and John Walls (1431-32), L.B.K., p.132, Brewers' Account Book f.34. Petitions about the enforcement of these ordinances, 13 December 1431, 11 October 1432, L.B.K., pp.142, 146.
 4. Brewers' Account Book f.34; 1 February 1421, Jour.I f.88.
 5. 31 May 1458, Jour.VI f.243v.; 25 September 1461, L.B.L., p.13. This would seem to infringe the duties of ward aleconners (see Chapter II, p. 47) and may help to explain their eclipse.

serjeants to enforce this monopoly. Nicholas Munde, a Southwark Brewer, was prevented from selling his ale direct to two inns in Fleet Street but was required to bring it to those places in the City where foreign victuals were normally sold.¹ In 1458 in response to a petition from the Brewers, the Mayor and Aldermen agreed that foreigners were not to buy or sell beer in the City except for their own personal use, that is, they were to be excluded from the wholesale and retail business of brewing within the City franchise.²

The regulation and control of the sale of grain in the City was very important. Since the time of Edward I it had been established that grain could only be sold at Newgate or Grace Church Markets, or at Billingsgate and Queenhythe if it came by water.³ The scarcities and dearths of corn in the years between 1410 and 1430 made it particularly profitable to try to avoid the various civic regulations. Foreign cornmongers, whether from Harrow on the Hill or from Ireland in 1417, had to find pledges to observe the City's regulations about the sale of corn, and forestalling seems to have been frequently practised.⁴ There is no evidence, however, that the Court tried to fix the price of grain in the City. Since 1300 it had been customary for the City to appoint cornmeters to be stationed at Queenhythe and Billingsgate but the first one to be recorded in this period is Nicholas Flemyng who was elected and sworn on 23 October 1428.⁵ In 1439 there were

-
1. Temp. John Paddesley (1440-1), Richard Segrym, a Chamber serjeant, ordered the 2 inn-keepers to sell the ale and bring the money into the Chamber as a fine, Brewers' Account Book f.167v.
 2. 31 May 1458, Jour.VI f.243v. 3. Liber Albus, pp.261-2, 432-3, 460-1.
 4. 19 February, 15 December 1417, Jour.I f.11, 40; 16 June 1419, Jour.I f. 56v.; 17 January 1421, Jour.I f.87.
 5. Jour.II f.139v.; L.B.K., p.97; Liber Albus, pp.490-92; L.B.C., p.87. For a list of Cornmeters see Appendix no. 26 p.514.

three cornmeters who acted as the deputies of the bailiffs of Queenhythe and Billingsgate. The measurers were entitled to take a $\frac{1}{2}$ d. for measuring a quarter of grain and for every hundred quarters they paid the bailiff 12d.¹ When Henry Janyver was sworn as a cornmeter in 1454 he had to produce four men each bound in a pledge of £10, to ensure that he would faithfully observe the City's ordinances about grain measuring.²

The City's immediate measures to deal with the corn scarcity of the 1420s will be discussed elsewhere.³ But the most permanent and important of these measures was the decision of Common Council on 18 July 1439 to build two City granaries at the Stocks and at Leadenhall, which the City had owned since 1411. A committee of two Aldermen and nine Common Councilmen was appointed to represent this good cause to the executors of wills.⁴ Dr. Thomas has fully described the process whereby the City built the Leadenhall granary which appears not to have been completed until the mayoralty of Simon Eyre in 1445-6.⁵ The idea of building a granary at the Stocks appears

-
1. 28 January 1439, Jour.III f.6. 2. 5 February 1454, Jour.V f.147.
 3. See Chapter VI, pp.413-415.
 4. 18 July 1439, Jour.III f.18v. In the meantime, 23 September 1439, Nicholas Yeo promised to provide storage space for £20 worth of corn in the coming year, Jour.III f.22v. 3 October 1439, William Milreth promised to provide storage for 500 quarters of grain, Jour.III f.24.
 5. A.H. Thomas, 'Notes on the History of Leadenhall 1195-1488', London Topographical Record, vol.XIII (1923) pp.1-22. There is little to add to this account. Before Richard Whittington and others were licensed by the King to grant the manor of Leadenhall to the City, an inquisition ad quod damnum was held, P.R.O. C143/442/5. Although Katherine Carpenter granted the citizens access to the new granary, 28 May 1444 (L.B.K., p.294) the Common Council was still vexed over the question of security to be offered to her, 5 April 1448, Jour.IV f.214v. The deeds did not receive the Common Seal until 2 September 1448, Jour.IV f.225v. Although the City acquired lands on lease for the new granary from the Rector and parishioners of St. Peter's Cornhill, 12 March 1445 (L.B.K., p.313), yet in January 1452 and June 1453 committees of Aldermen and Commoners were appointed to deal with the recompense to be paid to the Rector and parishioners and to examine the various proofs and evidences, Jour.V. f.70, 111v. After negotiations in July and November 1456, the City

(continued at foot of next page)

to have been dropped. Once built the Leadenhall granary served not only for storing grain but as a City covered market for the sale of poultry and victuals of all kinds, and by the end of the century it was serving also as a market for lead nails, worsted cloth and leather.¹

As with cornmeters, there had also been saltmeters appointed to weigh and measure salt at Billingsgate and Queenhythe since the time of Edward I and the fees which they could charge for this service were laid down in 1349.² In 1419 it was decided that the saltmeter could have 4d. for weighing a waye (i.e. 5 quarters) of salt which the seller was to pay. Whereas before 1426 it appears that the Salters' Company, or the Bailiffs of Billingsgate and Queenhythe chose the saltmeters, in that year it was decided that in future they should be elected only by the Mayor and Aldermen.³ Nicholas James, the Alderman of Queenhythe, appears to have presented Walter Galian to the court to be sworn as a saltmeter in January 1427 and he was required to produce two mainpernors.⁴ The saltmeters were also sworn and an English version of the saltmeters' oath has been copied into Journal III and includes the promises to take only the authorized dues and to observe the civic

-
1. 27 March 1455, Jour.V f.234v.; Thomas, *op.cit.*, pp.20-22.
 2. Liber Albus, pp.240-44; L.B.F., pp.193-94.
 3. 21 September 1426, Jour.II f.84.
 4. 8 January 1427, Jour.II f.88. William Kemp had also to provide mainpernors for his proper execution of the office, Jour.III f.150v. For a list of Saltmeters see Appendix no.25 p.583.

(footnote 5 continued from previous page)

finally agreed to pay a quit-rent of £5 p.a., Jour.VI f.98, 85v., 88v., 92v. Simon Eyre died 18 September 1458 and appears to have left money, or land, for the Leadenhall granary, 10 July, 17 August 1459, Jour.VI f.160v., 136v. Building work was still going on in October 1461 when William Scroggs was appointed to have custody of the new work there, Jour.VI f.49.

ordinances.¹ How many saltmeters there were in the City at one time is not clear although the 1297 ordinances stipulate four, and the fifteenth century evidence reveals that there were at least two at one time.² The main offence recorded in this period in connection with the sale of salt is the forestalling of it before it had been offered for sale at the docks for the requisite three days.³ In 1419 the Salters' Company gained the right, under the Mayor, of supervising the weights and measures used in the (retail) sale of salt and of overseeing the salt exposed for sale.⁴

Closely connected with the sale of salt in the City was the sale of fish, which was controlled in all its aspects by a series of civic ordinances.⁵ The first parliament of Henry IV's reign had abolished the monopoly of the retail sale of fish in the City which Richard II had granted to the Fishmongers' Company.⁶ Hence it is possible to find, for example, men of Kent in 1460 bringing herrings to be sold in London and accepting the Mayor's regulated price of 10s. a barrel.⁷ There were four aspects of the

-
1. Jour.III f.128.
 2. E.g. 13 August 1437, 2 Saltmeters sworn, Jour.III f.194.
 3. 3 November 1418, Bemond and Edward, Salters, enjoined to sell salt in the City at the price at which they bought it, for the common good, Jour.I f.51; 5 August 1438, William Hamond had exposed for sale 28 ounces of forestalled salt, half was to go to the poor prisoners of Newgate and Ludgate, and the rest was to be sold, Jour.III f.173; 7 December 1444, William Smal and Walter Rutland were sent to prison because they had bought salt before it had stood at the quay for three days, Jour.IV f.54v.
 4. 4 February 1419, L.B.I., pp.222-23; on the same day, however, the Company was fined for having usurped the supervision of the buying and selling of salt and for having used measures not authorised by the Chamber, Jour.I f.55.
 5. Liber Albus, pp.373-85.
 6. R.P.III, pp.444, 492. See Chapter I, p.30.
 7. 22 January 1460, Jour.VI f.226.

fish trade in London which particularly concerned the Mayor and Aldermen; the places where fish were sold, the prices of fish, the prevention of forestalling and the elimination of putrid goods. By and large it was through the Fishmongers' Company that the Mayor and Aldermen exercised this control and the masters frequently appear in court to receive instructions of various kinds.¹ On 21 January 1445 the masters of the Company came to court and swore the oath laid down in 1379 and had read to them the ordinance of 1382. They were enjoined that in future they were to swear this oath within two days of their election and to carry out no scrutiny, nor anything else pertaining to their office, until they had done so.²

The sale of fish in the City was restricted to Bridge Street, part of Old Fish Street, the Stock Market and the Butchers markets in Eastcheap and St. Nicholas Shambles; and proclamations were issued to enforce this restriction.³ In 1447 eight fishmongers who had shops in Old Fish Street which lay outside the area designated for such shops during the mayoralty of William Crowmer (1413-14) had to be especially permitted by the Court of Aldermen to sell their fish there. But at the same time the Masters of the

-
1. 16 November 1416, Masters in Court to hear recent ordinance about fish (see L.B.I., p.169), Jour.I f.3v.; 3 November 1418, Masters in Court enjoined to sell fish as cheaply as possible and to obey the ordinances about the sale of whiting, Jour.I f.51; 12 May 1424, Masters enjoined to sell goods at a reasonable price, Jour.II f.18.
 2. 21 January 1445, Jour.IV f.59. For oath and ordinances see L.B.H., pp.142-43, 190-93. Masters of the Company sworn before the Court of Aldermen, 23 January 1447, Jour.IV f.168, 23 October 1450, Jour.V f.49, 3 February 1455, Jour.V f.219v.
 3. c.1407, 27 February, 9 December 1409, c.1413-14, L.B.I., pp.61, 71, 82, 124. 7 May 1423, John Clerk was sworn to ensure that those selling fish stood only at the Stock Market or in the other places detailed by the City, and not in Cheapside, Jour.II f.5v.

Fishmongers' Company were enjoined to ensure that all other Fishmongers only sold their goods within the appointed places.¹

It was the coming of Lent which usually led the Mayor and Aldermen to summon the Masters of the Fishmongers' and Salters' Company to Court and lay down the price at which certain fish, including eels, were to be sold.² The prices seem to have remained constant throughout the sixty years, herrings being sold at 6 for a penny, or 6s. or 6s.8d. the 'cad'. Since the price at which fish were to be sold during Lent was widely proclaimed throughout the City it was possible to prosecute offenders and force them to pay fines.³ The demand for fish during Lent also led Fishmongers and Salters to try to buy up large quantities thus forestalling the market. William Waleys a Fishmonger bought over 1000 tench directly from a ship in February 1429 contrary to the Mayor's ordinance.⁴ Similarly in September 1454 Robert Basset, Salter, and others, bought up large numbers of herrings from a Dutchman;⁵ and in March 1455 Thomas Churchman another Salter and three Fishmongers appeared in Court having forestalled 36,000 herrings by buying them off the ships on their way to market in London.⁶

-
1. 18 April 1447, Jour.IV f.174v.; L.B.I., pp.125-26.
 2. For prices of fish see Appendix no.21. 14 November 1416, Mayor and Fishmongers agreed on prices of Whiting, L.B.I., pp.168-69, Jour.I f.3; 12 January 1442, Masters of Fishmongers to Court to discuss the price of herrings during Lent, Jour.III f.108v.
 3. 4 November 1439, John Grene in Court for selling mussels at 12d. the gallon, Jour.III f.28; 3 March 1440, 3 Fishmongers fined, Jour.III f.38; 3 March 1446, William Smale fined 20s. and sent to prison for selling herrings contrary to the proclamation. He was pardoned prison and fine reduced to 6s.8d., Jour.IV f.119v.
 4. 13 February 1429, he was imprisoned and fined 40s., Jour.III f.130v.
 5. The 6 men had bought between them 6,100 herrings in 4 cartloads, Jour.V f.193.
 6. Jour.V f.233. The Fishmongers and Salters might, therefore, be instructed to ensure that there was a sufficient supply of fish during Lent, Jour.III f.6.

The control and elimination of putrid fish in the City lay practically with the Masters of the Fishmongers' Company, and, only occasionally, would cases come before the Mayor and Aldermen. In February 1429 John Wells the Mayor, ordered four barrels of eels and 2 barrels of tench to be confiscated and dumped in the Thames because they were corrupt and unfit for human consumption. In the same month five barrels of eels belonging to Nicholas Johnson were confiscated.¹ Eels seem to have been particularly suspect and in 1453 the Mayor and Aldermen decided that no red eels were to be sold in the City, whether fresh or salted, on pain of forfeiture and a £10 fine, because it appeared that all red eels were corrupt and unfit for humans to eat.²

Fresh meat was not sold in such quantities as fish in the City and the Court was, consequently, less concerned to control and regulate its sale. There were three meat markets in the City in this period, at Eastcheap, the Stocks and at the Shambles, as well as the Cattle market at Smithfield. The Butchers' Company had six Masters, two to be responsible for each of the markets.³ On only five occasions, however, were the Masters of the Company sworn before the Mayor and Aldermen.⁴ The sale of meat on Sundays in the City had been limited in 1423 to the hours before 10 a.m. In 1444 the sale

-
1. 8, 13 February 1429, Jour.II f.130v.
 2. 17 March, 6 April 1453, Jour.V f.107, 108. This fear about eels may explain why they were to be sold only in the presence of an officer chosen by the Mayor, L.B.K., pp.69-70.
 3. 4 May, 20 June 1426, John/Thomas Bukston and Richard Bolton to supervise East Cheap, John Edward and William Hoke to supervise the Stocks, John Ropele and Richard Fyne to supervise the Shambles, Jour.II f.67, 77v.
 4. 29 January 1420, 4 Masters sworn, Jour.I f.70; 7 May 1423, Jour.II f.5v.; 4 May 1426, 6 Masters sworn, Jour.II f.67; 2 December 1450, 6 Masters sworn, Jour.V f.51v.; 22 June 1452, Jour.V f.76v.

of fish and meat was entirely prohibited in the City on Sundays and in December of that year the sale of meat on Christmas Day was also forbidden.¹

The Court of Aldermen did make some attempt to control meat prices. In 1418 Butchers were forbidden to ride out of the City to buy sheep and in 1439 they were again forbidden to attend cattle markets in Essex since this tended to raise the price. They were only to buy cattle at Smithfield.² There were only five occasions recorded in these years on which the Butchers were enjoined to keep the assize as to the price of lambs and sheep in the City.³ There were convictions for selling meat above the stipulated prices.⁴ But perhaps what concerned the Mayor and Aldermen even more than the price of meat was the problem of hygiene. Not only was care taken that putrid meat should not be sold in the City, but the problems of Butchers' offal and waste products were considered. In 1402 certain Butchers were licensed to hold Betherslane at a rent of 13s.4d. to enable them to throw their offal into the Thames in the ebb tide.⁵ In 1425 the Butchers were instructed to put the intestines and other waste parts of the beasts they had slaughtered, into

-
1. 7 May 1423, L.B.K., p.10; 30 May 1444, Jour.IV f.27, L.B.K., p.293; 10 December 1444, Jour.IV f.54v.
 2. 28 November 1418, Jour.I f.52; 11 March 1439, L.B.K., p.220.
 3. 29 January 1420, lambs to be sold at 8d. each, or 9d. for the best, Jour.I f.70; 14 April 1421, lambs to be sold at 12d., Jour.I f.90; 4 April 1440, Butchers found to be selling contrary to the Mayor's precept, Jour.III f.40v.; 22 May 1441, Butchers enjoined to emend their prices for meat, Jour.III f.85v.; 17 April 1442, the best sheep not to be sold for more than 14d., Jour.III f.90.
 4. 24 April 1421, Richard Hertipole and Simon Gibson convicted of selling lambs for 4d. more than the agreed price, were fined, Jour.I f.90v.; 15 April 1437, William Haukyn in Court for trying to sell a lamb to a woman for an excessive sum, sent to prison, but this may have been because he insulted the Mayor, Jour.III f.117; 5 April 1440, William Curteys and John Pakker in Court for breaking the Mayor's ordinance over the price of sheep, Jour.III f.40v.
 5. 12 May 1402, L.B.I., p.22.

closed boxes until they could be disposed of, so that the stench should not pervade the streets.¹ There were three occasions recorded when the Butchers' wardens brought butchers before the Court for selling corrupt or infected meat.²

The sale of poultry in the City - which included the sale of rabbits, eggs and pigs - was subject to the same sort of supervision as that of meat. In the fifteenth century the Company was not well established, it had no hall and no complete list of its Masters has survived. The free City Poulterers mainly had their shops at the east end of Cheapside, and the markets for foreign poulterers were established at Leadenhall, in the Poultry and at Newgate hill. This distinction between foreign and free Poulterers was very important in the fifteenth century and free Poulterers were not allowed to buy wholesale from foreigners for the purpose of re-selling the goods, nor were they to buy at all until after the general public had had a chance to buy goods first. Hence in 1440 it was decided that the Poultry markets were to close at 11 a.m., and free poulterers and retailers were only to be allowed to make purchases after 9 a.m. Unsold goods were then to be forfeited. The free Poulterers bred their own wares, sometimes to the considerable annoyance of their fellow-citizens. As with other food supplies the City had laid down the prices at which goods might be sold and there seems to have been no marked change in prices between 1416 and 1507.³ Transgressions

1. 13 June 1425, Jour.II f.44v.
2. 29 July 1440, Wardens presented John Pakker and Sayer Crer for selling corrupt meat, Jour.III f.51; 4 September, 28 November 1452, Wardens presented William Scalon for offering for sale 2 oxen with murrain. He was condemned to pay fines of 20 marks to the Chamber and 10 marks to the Company, Jour.V f.85, 94; 7 March 1453, Wardens present John Grene for selling unwholesome meat, Jour.V f.105v. For a defence of the hygiene of the Butchers of Medieval London, as well as much other useful information see, Ernest L. Sabine, 'Butchering in Medieval London', Speculum, vol.VIII (1933), pp.335-53.
3. Much of this paragraph is based upon P.E. Jones, The Worshipful
(continued at foot of next page)

against these price restrictions or prosecutions for selling putrid wares were no more or less frequent than in any of the other victualling trades in the City.¹

The final food stuff with which the Mayor and Aldermen were concerned was wine. They controlled both the price and quality of wine offered for sale in the City. The prices do not appear to have altered greatly during the years between 1409 and 1462.² Such prices were not always observed by the vintners or, indeed, accepted without protest. The price ordinance of January 1439 was resisted by a group of at least eight vintners who agreed to sell no wine at all unless they could sell at the pre-ordinance prices.³ When, in May 1441, the wardens of the Vintners were asked why they were not selling Gascon wine at 6d. a gallon they replied that there were 37 taverns in London where wine was being sold at 6d. or even 4d. or 5d. the gallon. The sceptical Aldermen asked to have a list of such taverns.⁴ Sometimes it was necessary for vintners or taverners to be mainpernored to observe the

-
1. Jones, op.cit. has noted most of such prosecutions during this period and there are only a few to add:- 5 April 1439, Kirby sent to prison for bad language and for selling 10 eggs for 1d. instead of 12 for 1d., Jour.III f.14; 17 October 1440, Philip Nele, John Rede and the wife of Swan, in Court for selling putrid poultry and pigeons, Jour.III f.63v.; 29 May 1441, John Heynington convicted of selling stinking poultry, condemned to be led to Leadenhall, the goods placed around his neck and thence to be led through Cheapside to Newgate, Jour.III f.86v.; 2 October 1444, William Page and others accused of selling geese and young pigs on Sunday (ordinance against this 30 May 1444, L.B.K., p.293) and at unreasonable charges, fined 6s.8d. to Chamber, Jour.IV f.43.
 2. For a list of wine prices in the City see Appendix no.18 p.572.
 3. 19 January 1439, evidence given in Court, Jour.III f.5v.
 4. 27 May 1441, Jour.III f.96.

(footnote 3 continued from previous page) Company of Poulterers of the City of London (2nd edn.1965), esp.chs.5,6,7. 8 January 1445, Free Poulterers enjoined to stand separately from Foreign Poulterers as was of old accustomed, Jour.IV f.57. For prices during the fifteenth century see Jonds, op.cit., pp.130-34.

ordained prices, but there are only three prosecutions recorded for selling at an excessive price.¹

There were far more prosecutions for corrupt and unwholesome wine. The task of searching for such wine was entrusted annually to twelve vintners, six to search the eastern part of the City and six the western part. They were usually appointed by the Court of Aldermen in November and within a month presented not only the defective wine in the City but also the total quantity of wine to be found in their area.² The chief malpractice in the sale of wine carried out in the City was the mixing of inferior with good wine and the colouring of wine with 'unwholesome' things and then placing it in special gummied barrels.³ But the proclamation against such practices in 1416 cannot have been very successful although it was repeated in 1420.⁴ The wardmote of Cheap presented the Taverners for selling corrupted wine in 1422, two Italians had their wares confiscated because they were corrupt in 1427, and Ralph Say was condemned to the pillory in January 1428 for refusing to pay a fine for selling corrupted wine.⁵ In 1439 the Mayor himself destroyed

-
1. December 1428, William de Vina and Nicholas Kent, Taverner, mainpernored to keep prices, s.p.£10, Jour.II f.127v. 17 September 1439, Robert Clybury admitted selling red (Gascon) wine at 12d. the gallon, Jour.III f.22; 13 November 1453, John Neell admits that his apprentice sold red wine for 10d. a gallon contrary to the ordinance, Jour.V f.130v. 1 December 1458, Peter Johnson, Taverner at the Pope's Head, in Court for selling wine at 10d. a gallon instead of 8d. as ordained, Jour.VI f.134.
 2. For a list of Searchers of Wine see Appendix no. 19. For a table of the results of the Searches see Appendix no. 20. Cf. A.L. Simon, History of the Wine Trade in England (1907) vol.ii, ch.4.
 3. 1 July 1419, Proclamation against these practices, Jour.I f.56v.; Memorials, pp.670-72.
 4. December 1420, Jour.I f.86v.
 5. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.136, 212; 3, 7 September 1427, Gerard Galganet and Isuardus Catan, Jour.II f.99; L.B.K., p.114; January 1428, Jour.II f.104v. Cf. 1426/7 'and this year the Mayor did do smytte out many butts of Romensay and red wine of Lombards, that were corrupt in divers places in London, for they were corrupt and poisenous', Vitellius A XVI, p.273. Gregory, p.161.

one hogshead and 6 pipes of corrupt wine and a Genoese merchant who practised some sophisticated forms of dubbing and meddling had to answer for his practices in court in 1454.¹

The searchers of wine not only reported on the corrupted wine in the City but also upon the total amounts to be found in their area.² The quantities could vary widely. In 1454 the searchers in the eastern part of the City reported that there were 538 tuns of red and white (i.e. Gascon) wine in their area; in 1461 there were only 11 tuns. The quantities of sweet wine were more constant, being less dependent upon the Gascon trade. The proportion of defective goods appears to have been small, but this could be explained if the searchers of wine were open to bribery as was alleged by Nicholas John of Lucca in 1421.³

Over and above these specific controls placed upon the prices of goods of certain victuallers, at least from 1446 it appears to have been the custom to appoint annually two Aldermen who should watch out for and fine any hostellers, brewers, cooks, pre-bakers, hucksters and braziers or food retailers who broke the assizes, either by charging too much for their goods or by keeping their establishments open beyond the permitted hours.⁴ In 1444 the Court of Aldermen decided that all establishments selling food should not open before 6 a.m. or close later than 10 p.m., although this may have been

1. 23 December 1439, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.29; 15 September 1454, L.B.K., p.377.
2. See Appendix no.20 p.577.
3. 14, 23 November 1422, L.B.K., p.8, Jour.II f.2.
4. Aldermen appointed 21 November 1446, 3 November 1447, Jour.IV f.149v., 199v., 5 November 1451, 26 November 1452, 12 September 1453, 5 August 1454, 18 July 1455, Jour.V f.64v., 73, 120v., 182v., 250v.; November 1456, 8 November 1457, 21 February 1459, 23 September 1461, Jour.VI f.85, 183v., 150, 22. 24 April 1421, Robert Marcheford, the Master of the Cooks and Piebakers appeared in Court and was sworn to observe certain prices for such things as a side of roast beef (3d.) and roast capon (6d.), Jour.I f.90v.

especially restricted for fear of rioting during the holiday feasts of St. John the Baptist and SS. Peter and Paul (24, 29 June).¹ Even the price at which hostellers could sell oats for the horses of customers and the kind of horsebread which could be offered were controlled by civic ordinance.² Taken altogether the attempts of the Court of Aldermen to ensure that there were sufficient supplies of food in the City, adequately hygienic and sold at reasonable prices, were impressive in their scope, prosecution and persistence. The Aldermen themselves were rarely victuallers (except Vintners) and whether they always understood the pressures which war, trade, disruption, bad harvests and dearth could place upon the City victuallers is doubtful. The civic regulations in these matters were so numerous that it must have been easy to transgress through ignorance. The Aldermen exercised a control that was restrictive and conservative but they bore in mind the needs of the citizens at large.

(xiv) Public Health in London

The Court of Aldermen had an overall responsibility for the health and well-being of the citizens. This can be seen in its measures to ensure that the food sold to citizens was reasonably wholesome, and to provide the City with a more adequate supply of fresh water. Attempts were also made to provide public privies, to ensure that the City's drainage system worked

1. 17, 22 June 1444, Jour.IV f.30v., 31.
2. 17 October 1440, oats to be sold at 5d. a bushel, Jour.III f.63v.,
17 June 1441, oats to be sold at 4d. a bushel, Jour.III f.87;
7 February 1442 oats to be sold at 4d. a bushel, Jour.III f.109v.;
23 February 1445, the sale of foreign horsebread was forbidden and this was reiterated 21 March 1445, Jour.IV f.65v., 66, L.B.K., p.306.

adequately, and to appoint a City sanitary officer, the Serjeant of the Channel who, together with the ward rakers, should oversee this drainage system. Here then are some of the essentials for a healthy community, fresh water, clean food, sanitation and public health officers. Moreover the Court of Aldermen had a residual control over the leper hospitals and over the mystery of Barber-Surgeons. But such measures as the Court of Aldermen took were hampered by the density of the population, the close quarters in which the citizens lived, the constant use of the Thames for refuse, the dirt and lack of hot water for coping with it, and an inadequate knowledge of the nature of infection and the means by which diseases are transmitted. Moreover the overwhelming fear in the City of fire meant that the one anti-septic which the medieval Londoner could have employed was put out of range because of its danger.¹

The food regulations and the appointment and duties of the Serjeant of the Channel and the rakers have been already described.² Something has also been said about the City's ditches in the section on the common soil of the City.³ Apart from the Thames, Walbrook was probably the most important drainage channel in the City. Efforts were made throughout this period to keep Walbrook clear. In 1415 those who owned adjacent property

1. Fire-precautions were the responsibility of the wards, see Liber Albus, pp.334-35, Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp.135, 158, Jour.III f.55v. In 1440 there were nightly vigils because of fear of fire, Jour.III f.57. In March 1454, there was a serious fire at Ludgate, Jour.V f.153. 28 July 1458, the Court of Aldermen decided, because of the danger of fire, that all kilns in the City, whether built for brewing beer or for other purposes, should be destroyed s.p. £10, and the Sheriffs were to pull down any that remained, Jour.VI f.248v.

2. See above pp.239-25 and chapter II, pp.46, 40.

3. See above pp.176-177.

were expected to wall up its banks and in 1425 Charterhouse was instructed to repair that part of the ditch which bordered on its property.¹ In 1445 Common Council authorized the payment of men to clean out Walbrook.² Moreover committees of Aldermen were appointed to inspect the state of Walbrook and report to the Court in 1446 and 1449.³ Into the watercourse of Walbrook flowed a public latrine which had been built over it, near London Wall, in 1415.⁴ There were other public latrines at Ludgate, Baynards Castle, near the church of St. Gabriel Fenchurch and in Broad Street.⁵ These buildings seem to have been of stone, covered with roofs but many of them were considered to be dangerous to women and children on dark nights and there were complaints about all of them in the wardmote inquests of 1422. There were also private latrines, many of which also gave rise to complaints.⁶ As there were no artificial means of flushing or pushing rubbish and refuse through the City's water courses, it was extremely easy for them to become blocked, with very unhygienic results.

Clearly the cleansing of the City's watercourses and ditches left much to be desired. The City's streets were not much cleaner and were often used for the purposes for which the ditches were designed. There appear to have been refuse carts which collected rubbish in the City but their services had to be paid for which made dumping as attractive then as it is now.⁷

-
1. 2 July 1415, L.B.I., pp.137-38; 2 November 1425, Jour.II f.56.
 2. 18 June 1445, Jour.IV f.81v.
 3. 20 May 1446, Jour.IV f.128v.; 13 March 1449, Jour.V f.8.
 4. 2 July 1415, L.B.I., p.137. The inhabitants of Walbrook ward complained about the odours from this latrine, Cal.P.and M.1413-37, p.152.
 5. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, pp., 124, 132, 135, 156, 157.
 6. Ibid., pp.128, 133, 141, 154, 155, 156. See also the description of a private latrine to be built for the parson of the church of St. Michael le Quern, ibid., pp.154-55.
 7. Proclamation about the removal of rubbish from outside houses, carts carrying rubbish were to have a large board at the back to prevent the contents from falling out, L.B.I., p.45; cf. Cal.P.and M.1413-37, p.133 where they are called 'umbrel' carts.

The Court in 1461 had to instruct the Alderman of Billingsgate to inform the inhabitants of his ward that they were to stop dumping dung on Holy Rood wharf and that other provision would be made.¹ The Court of Aldermen tried to ensure the cleanliness of the streets by the use of rushes and in 1419 the Chamberlain was instructed to seize the rush boats moored in the Fleet, and to use the contents for street-cleaning.² Although most street-cleaning was done by private inhabitants it is clear that the Court considered it had a duty to ensure that there was an adequate supply of rushes for this purpose.³ For special occasions the streets might be specially cleaned. William Chedworth, the controller was repaid his expenses, up to £10, for cleaning the streets around the Tower before the arrival of Margaret of Anjou.⁴ But by and large private enterprise and public neglect only just managed to keep the drainage and rubbish of London on the move.

A further means of preventing illness and disease in the City was to encourage personal cleanliness. The bath houses or stews of the City, however became centres for vices of all kinds and in 1417 the Court of Aldermen decided that there should be no stews at all in the City or suburbs because of the enormities committed in them by ecclesiastics and secular men.⁵ Private bath houses were, however, to be allowed, but the distinction between a private and a public 'stew' was difficult to maintain and the ward jurors in 1421 and 1422 had cause to complain of the immoral 'goings-on' at such private stews.⁶ Although various people were summoned before the Court in

1. 12 November 1461, 12 February 1462, Jour.VI f.79v., 15v.
2. 29 September 1419, Jour.I f.61.
3. 19 April 1421, Jour.I f.90; 23 October 1444, Jour.IV f.48.
4. 2 October 1445, Jour.IV f.98v.
5. 19 April 1417, Jour.I f.18v.; L.B.I., p.178.
6. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.131, 154.

1425 and enjoined to abandon their stews, and the Court reaffirmed the ordinance abolishing all stews for men and women in the City and suburbs,¹ yet it appears that there gradually developed a policy of allowing stews to be kept under licence, or rather by a bond to the Chamberlain for their moral conduct.² Then on 10 February 1428 the Common Council decided that all stews, which clearly could not be abolished, were to be run by free Englishmen of the City and no aliens were to have any control.³ As a result of this there were recorded in Letter Book K several of the bonds in which free-born citizens of London agreed to conduct respectable stews under pain of £20.⁴ Whether these measures eradicated immorality from the bathhouses of London seems open to doubt, but the Court of Aldermen ceased to concern itself with stews, although nightwalkers and prostitutes were brought frequently to its attention. Whether such stew-houses or hot baths contributed much, in these circumstances, to the health of the City, is to be doubted.

Turning from the preventative to the curative duties of the Court of Aldermen it is clear that they failed to prevent the occurrence of those two great scourges of medieval society, the plague and leprosy. There are references to the presence of plague in London in May 1418, 1425, October 1426, August 1433, October 1434,¹⁴³⁷ June 1444, May 1449 and July 1455.⁵ The City

-
1. 29 January, 3, 5 February, 20, 24 April 1425, Jour.II f.33, 34, 41, 41v.
 2. E.g. 16 May 1426, Alice Kympton undertook to govern her stew well, Jour.II f.68v.
 3. 10 February 1428, Jour.II f.106v.
 4. L.B.K., pp.75-76. See also Jour.II f.107v., 108v., 113. Cf. 22 March 1439, bond of £10 in which Magdalen Johnson and William Wolnore are bound, that Magdalen will keep a respectable stew house, Cal.P.and M. 1437-57, p.17.
 5. Jour.I f.59; T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.157; C.C.R. 1422-29, pp.278-79; R.P. IV, p.420; R.P. V pp.67, 143, 283; P.P.C. IV pp.282-83, Cont F. Bunt Prue p 467, Arundelham II p. 127.

knew of no cure either for the plague or for leprosy, although the Londoners made more consistent attempts to deal with the latter disease. By 1400 there were in force in the City numerous regulations excluding lepers from London. They were to be imprisoned if they were found walking in the City and the porters at the gates had to swear to prevent their entry.¹ These attempts to exclude lepers from the City and so to prevent infection were not entirely successful. Many lepers were not very ill and wished to practise their craft in the City.² They needed, moreover, to enter the City to beg for alms. The ineffectiveness of these attempts to exclude lepers may be seen from the ward presentments of 1422 and from complaints about the presence of individual lepers in the City made to the Common Council in 1445, 1454 and 1456.³ Robert Sewale was a notorious leper who managed to remain in the City although his name was presented on all these three occasions.⁴ The porters at the City gates were lax in their duty of preventing lepers from entering the City and in November 1454 thirteen keepers and porters of gates and ward beades were sworn in Common Council to keep lepers out of the City.⁵

The lepers, thus excluded, were expected to find refuge in the leper houses outside the City. In this period there were six such houses situated

-
1. See Marjorie B. Honeybourne, 'The Leper Hospitals of the London Area', Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, vol. XX part i (1963), pp. 1-61, and Memorials, p. 384.
 2. See the case of John Mayn, Baker, who continued to try and carry on his trade in spite of leprosy, Honeybourne, op.cit., p. 7.
 3. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp. 125, 132; 7 February 1445, 3 lepers named who ought to be removed from the City, Jour. IV f. 63v.; 17 January 1454, 8 men in the wards of Cheap, Castle Baynard, Tower and Broad Street, indicted of leprosy in the wardmotes, Jour. V f. 216v.
 4. 17 March 1456, Robert Sewale, many times convicted of leprosy, was given until Easter to remove himself and his goods from the City, under peril of losing a limb. He accepted the judgment of the Court, Jour. VI f. 26v.
 5. Jour. V f. 208.

on the roads leading into London. The three most important houses were St. Giles's in the Fields on the road to the west, the lock at Southwark on the road to the south, and the house at Kingsland near Hackney on the road to the north.¹ St. Giles' was a private foundation over which the City had a supervisory control; it was maintained by lands and rents granted to it.² The other two houses were civic foundations and the City was fully responsible for them. The houses were not, however, supported out of the City Chest but by voluntary contributions. Between 1359 and 1400 fifty-seven wills enrolled in the Hustings record bequests to lepers, but after that date there are only four wills making such bequests.³ It is not easy to explain this falling off in public benefactions.

In fact the civic control of leprosy appears to have been confined to the sending of lepers out of the City into the leper houses and the appointment of two wardens whose duty it should be to supervise the three houses at St. Giles, the lock and Hackney. The duties of these wardens, according to their oath recorded in Journal IV were 'well and truly to oversee and govern' the lepers in the three houses mentioned, to maintain the good rules and ordinances made for their government and to administer faithfully the alms entrusted to them.⁴ The men who served in this office in the first half of the fifteenth century were members of the Common Council, Masters of their

1. See Honeybourne, op.cit., p.7 and map p.6.
2. L.B.H., p.155; L.B.I., p.13. Margaret of Anjou wrote to the Master of St. Giles to ask him to admit Robert Uphome, aged 17, lately a chorister at Winchester, who had become a leper, as he had no other livelihood, Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington and others, ed. C. Monro, Camden Series (1863), p.95.
3. There were 37 bequests to the Lock at Southwark, 36 to St. Giles in the Fields, 31 to the Hackney house, 5 to St. James's at Westminster. There were 14 general bequests to lepers. 17 December 1440, it was declared in Common Council that John Pope had bequeathed 13s.4d. p.a. for the repair of a leper house, Jour.III f.69v.
4. February 1447, Jour.IV f.168.

Companies and in general, notable London citizens although not of the Alderman rank. Miss Honeybourne claims that the 'royal and civic ordinances for lepers, and these overseers or visitors of the leper hospitals, seem to have been among the first health regulations and public health officials in England'.¹ Since no cure for leprosy was known it was, perhaps, sensible of the civic authorities to concentrate not upon the cure of lepers but upon the prevention of infection, although their measures smack of a certain inhumanity. Whether the wardens carried out their duties conscientiously is difficult to know but the City was not above admitting Mr. Thomas Kent 'phisicus' to the freedom of the City so that he might receive a fee from the alms granted for the St. Giles lepers. Mr. Kent was later to be of useful service to the City when he was clerk of the King's Council and assisted the Londoners during the dispute with St. Martin's.² But however inhumane, the governors of London thought it to be their duty to preserve the health of London and prevent the risk of infection from lepers.

The Mayor and Aldermen had a supervisory control over the mistery of Barber-Surgeons, as they had, indeed, over all City Companies. By 1400 there were in existence various ordinances governing the conduct of Barber-Surgeons in the City. They had been exonerated from serving on Sheriff's inquests and since 1376 the Barbers were allowed to elect Masters for the Company and supervise the practice of the craft in the City in order that foreigners and unskilled persons might not 'take houses and intermeddle with barbery,

1. Honeybourne, op.cit., p.8.

2. 7 November 1453, 'isto die consensus est Magister Thomas Kent, phisicus, sit liber civitatis ea intentibus [sic] quod admittetur in elemosynam leprosum apud sanctum Egidium sine feodo et fine' Jour.V f.129.
4 August 1455, Kent appointed to the tithe committee, Jour.V f.253; he was involved in the negotiations over St. Martin's in 1457, Jour.VI f.91, 185; 19 September 1458, it was decided that for his good and faithful service to the City, as clerk of the King's Council, he was to be made free of the City in the Mercers' Company, Jour.VI f.231v.

surgery and the cure of other maladies, while they know not how to do such things, nor ever were instructed in such craft'.¹ There is record of these Masters being sworn at intervals throughout this period.² The practice of medicine and surgery was, in fact, divided in the City between the Physicians and Surgeons who formed a more skilled body and the Company of Barber-Surgeons who had also the right to practise surgery. In the conflicts between these groups, the Court of Aldermen upheld the right of the Barbers to exercise the skill of surgery.³ But the Court was concerned to prevent unskilled Barbers from taking on cases which involved complicated and highly-skilled surgery. In 1415 it was decided that two of the Barbers most skilled in surgery should have a general oversight of the serious surgical cases undertaken by Barbers in the City. These measures were not sufficiently effective and so the Court decided in July 1416 that

no Barber, practising the art of surgery within the liberty of the said City, should presume in future to take under his care any sick person who is in peril of death or of maiming, unless he should show the same person, within three days after so taking him under his care, to the Masters inspecting for the time-being'.⁴

Barbers occasionally appeared before the Court of Aldermen and undertook to observe this ordinance.⁵ In February 1451 the Company had new ordinances approved by the Court of Aldermen,⁶ and whatever the defects of the Barber-

1. Memorials, pp.393-94; L.B.C., p.165; L.B.G., p.88; Liber Albus, p.270.
2. L.B.I., pp.153, 173, 209, 288; L.B.K., pp.23, 30, 36, 97; Jour.II f.27; Jour.IV f.229v.
3. 10 November 1424, Jour.II f.27; L.B.K., p.36; see also L.B.K., p.11.
4. Memorials, pp.606-09.
5. 6 August 1438, Bartholomew Hawborough enjoined not to enter upon any cure in the art of surgery until he had first obtained a licence from the Masters s.p. 40s., Jour.III f.168v.; 21 March 1449, Antonius Petre entered into a recognizance not to take on any case touching illness and death unless it were first viewed by the Masters, Jour.V f.8v.
6. L.B.K., p.333; Sidney Young, The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London (1890), pp.44-47.

Surgeons their services were clearly to be preferred to those of ~~casual~~ ^{casual} wiāder. of the knife such as the Tailor Richard Mitton who appeared before the Court of Aldermen in 1458.¹ On one occasion at least the Master and wardens of the Barber-Surgeons carried out a post-mortem and reported to the Court of Aldermen that a young girl found dead near Holy Trinity 'secundum scientias suas' had died of an infirmity and not through a blow or violence.²

Perhaps the most interesting of the City's health measures in this period was the execution of the plan to provide London with a better supply of fresh water.

Originally the City had been well supplied by water from the Thames and the smaller streams such as the Fleet and Walbrook which flowed into it. But as these came to be used increasingly for drainage, sewage and rubbish, and as the population of London multiplied, it became necessary for the City to get a better supply of fresh water from elsewhere. At the end of the thirteenth century (1274) the Great Conduit was built at the meeting of Cheapside and Poultry, opposite the hospital of St. Thomas of Acre. The water for this conduit came from Tyburn, via Charing Cross, and was brought underground in lead pipes. The upkeep of these pipes and the conduit itself were charges upon the community. There was a constant need for repairs and the citizens were much taxed in mind and pocket to keep the supply of fresh water running to the conduit.³ This cause does not, however,

-
1. 20 July 1458, Mitton was enjoined not to practise surgery further without a licence from the Master and Wardens of the Barber-Surgeons, Jour.VI f.249.
 2. 3 November 1461, Jour.VI f.76.
 3. 24 November 1378, a committee was set up to consider the repair of the conduit in Cheap, 3 December 1378, citizens were to make freewill offerings for the repair of the conduit, 6 May 1379, all inhabitants were to provide a labourer, or come themselves, to help to repair the conduit, L.B.H., pp.108, 116, 127-28.

appear to have attracted the beneficent attention of those compiling their wills. Between 1360 and 1421 there were only seven bequests or grants recorded for this purpose.¹ But apart from the civic Great Conduit there were other private or semi-private conduits which tapped other sources of fresh water such as springs within the City itself. There was a conduit in Fleet Street near Salisbury Inn and St. Bride's church which was the responsibility of those who lived in the vicinity and used it. In 1388 they were allowed to build a pinnacle on the conduit to prevent inundations but this was to be done at their own expense.² There was another conduit near the church of St. Michael le Quern in the ward of Farringdon Within which was maintained by the men of the ward. This conduit was supplied from the pipe bringing water to the Great Conduit further east in Cheapside. In this case it would appear that the pipes were the responsibility of the chamber whereas the care of the conduit building itself was a charge upon the ward inhabitants.³ But in 1430, forty years after this conduit was built, the Commonalty decided that it should be repaired at the expense of the City and not fall solely onto the care of the local inhabitants.⁴ When Richard Whittington died in 1423 his executors, according to Stow, used some

1. 1378, executors of Adam Fraunceys offered 500 marks for extending the water supply to the top of Cornhill. L.B.H., p.108; January 1380, John Gitte, Draper, left 20 marks for the work of the Conduit, Hustings Wills, ii, pp.218-19; November 1385, bequest of £10 from Edith, widow of Simon Derlyng, L.B.H., p.79; residual bequests by John Clenhond, John Leycestre, William Howode, William Est, Hustings Wills, ii, pp.301, 307, 430, L.B.H., p.381.
2. 12 June 1388, L.B.H., p.326.
3. 20 July 1389, Chamberlain proposed to renew the pipes and conduit at St. Michael le Quern, L.B.H., p.343; 14 July 1390, the inhabitants of the ward had built a conduit supplied by water from the main City supply but they promised to remove it if it should impede the City's own supply of water, L.B.H., p.354.
4. 29 September 1430, L.B.K., p.110.

of his money to build stone well heads in St. Giles churchyard and at Paul's wharf.¹

There were several projects mooted for improving the supply of fresh water to the City. In 1378 there was a scheme for extending the water supply which came from Tyburn to the Great Conduit in Cheapside, up Cornhill as far as the intersection with Grace Church Street. The executors of the will of Adam Fraunceys were prepared to provide 500 marks for this scheme but it seems to have come to nothing.² But such a conduit was built in Grace Church Street over a hundred years later by the bequest of Thomas Hill, a mayor who had died in 1485.³

But at some point during the 1430s, at a period when the Journals are missing, the citizens must have taken the decision to increase the water supply for the City. On 20 January 1439 Common Council decided to spend £500 on the making and repair of the conduit.⁴ In the following month the

1. Stow, Survey, i, pp.16-17, 208, 300-01. 3 June 1483, the inhabitants of St. Giles's parish who had maintained their own cistern, asked Common Council to maintain it at the cost of the Commonalty as 'other cisterns and conduits'. The petition was granted, L.B.L., p.207.
2. 24 November 1378, L.B.H., p.108.
3. Stow, Survey, i, p.110. 15 April 1491, licence for his widow, Dame Elizabeth, to turn up the soil of Grace Church Street for a conduit, L.B.L., p.280. *The water may have been carried part of the way up Cornhill, see Great Chronicle p 84.*
4. 20 January 1439, the money was to come from the next £500 to be repaid by the King. Common Council decided that those who had not been taxed for this loan to the King, should now be taxed to augment this sum, Jour.III f.6v. The project may have been mooted earlier since on 14 October 1429 the Mayor and Aldermen decided that 20 marks from the bequest of John Clenhond (see n.1, p.267, above) should be spent on the conduit, but this may only have been for repairs to the old conduit, Jour.II f.103.

executors of the will of the Draper, Stephen Speleman, were persuaded to provide a further £500 for the project.¹ A large committee of six Aldermen and seventeen Common Councilmen was appointed to supervise the work and this committee in turn appointed a small sub-committee consisting of the Aldermen John Wells and Robert Large and the four Common Councilmen, Thomas Knolles junior, William Oliver Merter, Richard Lyndesey and John Chesham a Scrivener, together with William Chedworth the Chamberlain's clerk and William Cliff as 'sollicitator'.² Apart from the large contribution from the executors of Stephen Speleman, the project began to attract other bequests and donations.³ Thus encouraged, a year later an indenture was sealed between the Abbot and prior of Westminster, and the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of London, whereby the Londoners were to be allowed to erect a fountain at Oxlese (pasture for oxen) in the Abbey's manor of Paddington, and thence conduct it underground to the City, paying a rent of 2lbs. of pepper p.a. for the privilege. The only condition of this grant was that the Abbey's own water-supply from the manor of Hyde should not be impeded.⁴ This licence from the Abbey had clearly been costly and on 1 September 1440

1. Stephen Speleman had died in 1419, Hustings Wills, ii, pp.418-19. Sir Hugh Lepe was the only executor left. He had £808 to dispose of, of which £500 was to be spent on the conduit and the residue was to be distributed among the poor of the parish of St. Michael, Queenhythe, Jour.III f.8.
2. 16 March 1439, Jour.III f.11.
3. 10 March 1440, Sir Henry Brounfield granted to the work of the conduit all the sums which were owed to him by the King, Jour.III f.38v.; 17 December 1440, it was declared in Common Council that John Pope had given 26s.8d. for the conduit, Jour.III f.69v.; 1 August 1442, John Costyn left the remainder of his goods for the perpetual maintenance of the City's water conduits, Hustings Wills, ii, p.514.
4. 1 March 1440, L.B.K., p.233; W.A.M. no.16340. The Common Seal was attached to this indenture on Palm Sunday (20 March) 1440, Jour.III f.39v.

the Aldermen decided to put to the Common Council the fact that great labour had been expended on getting this licence and yet nothing further had been done.¹ Thus graded Common Council agreed to a tax of 1000 marks to be raised as a fifteenth in the City before Michaelmas. The money was to be used to complete the new conduit and to repair the old one.² The necessary arrangements were made for raising the money³ and on 17 December 1440 the Aldermen William Estfeld and John Wells were chosen to supervise all the work on the aquaduct, and two other Aldermen, John Olney and Robert Clopton, together with four Common Councilmen, Simon Eyre, William Chapman, Thomas Knolles, junior, and John Norman were appointed to supervise the receipt and expenditure of the money voted for the conduit, to audit the accounts of Mr. William Cliff and to pay him whatever should seem to be expedient for his labour.⁴

For a year the work must have gone forward smoothly. It would seem that the City's first efforts were spent on the construction of the piping in Fleet Street and Strand and on the well-head at Charing Cross near the chapel of St. Mary of Rouncevale.⁵ But the money appears to have run out and Common

-
1. 1 September 1440, Jour.III f.55v.
 2. 7 September 1440, Jour.III f.57. The entry in L.B.K., p.243 states that the meeting was held on 2 September.
 3. 4 October 1440, precept to Aldermen to raise half the 1000 marks in their wards, L.B.K., pp.249-50; 23 November 1440, it was decided that Aldermen should be taxed in their wards for the conduit, Jour.III f.67v.; 24 November 1440, 2 Aldermen and 2 Commoners appointed to receive the money and to view the expenditure, Jour.III f.67v.
 4. 17 December 1440, Jour.III f.69v.; L.B.K., p.253. 3 February 1441, it was decided by the Court of Aldermen that each Alderman should bring in the sums raised in his ward for the conduit, together with the names of those who had refused to pay, Jour.III f.74.
 5. 22 February 1442, Mr. William Cliff promised to account for his expenditure of the Fleet Street conduit, but he was unwilling to estimate future expenditure, Jour.III f.109.

Council made some effort to provide the required sums.¹ On 21 September 1442 Mr. William Cliff agreed to present a statement of his account.² This is the last mention of the conduit for two years and it would appear that while the Fleet Street section was completed, the City had run out of energy, cash and enthusiasm to finish the project.

Then on 10 July 1444 Common Council decided that work on the conduit should be rapidly taken in hand.³ New auditors were appointed to examine the accounts, and, in November, more auditors and supervisors were chosen.⁴ It would seem that the work now undertaken was the piping from Paddington (Oxlese) to Tyburn and on to Charing Cross.⁵ But again the project ran into financial difficulties and in June 1445 the ex-Mayor, William Estfeld, offered to lend 520 marks for the completion of the conduit on condition that he was furnished with reasonable security and some assurance that the work would be finished. Common Council accepted the loan and agreed to repay it out of the proceeds of levying an eighth part of a fifteenth in the City every year

1. 2 May 1442, the inhabitants of the ward of Farringdon Without, in which the Fleet Street conduit lay, successfully petitioned Common Council not to have to bear the cost of this operation on their own, Jour.III f.133v.; 19 June 1442, 65 people were listed as entering into obligation to provide 13s.4d. each to the Chamber for the Fleet Street conduit. Against the names of 24 of these the word 'non' was written, presumably indicating that they did not pay. The Alderman, John Paddesley, agreed to pay 40s. when the work was completed, and John Church agreed to give 20s. on the same terms, Jour.III f.138-38v.
2. Jour.III f.151v.
3. 10 July 1444, Jour.IV f.32v.
4. 15 July 1444, in a meeting of Common Council, the Aldermen Nicholas Yeo and Nicholas Wyfold, and the Commoners Simon Eyre, John Sturgeon, Robert Horne and William Thornhill were chosen, Jour.IV f.34; 20 November 1444, in Common Council additional auditors and supervisors were chosen, Roger Heysaunt, Thomas Cook, junior, Thomas Davy and Nicholas Kent, Jour.IV f.52.
5. See the petition of John Croxton, 17 June 1446, in which he refers to his labours for the City at 'Padyngtone, Tybourne, Trippeswelle, Charyngcrosse and Crosse in Chepe', L. .K., p.314.

for ten years.¹ But, curiously, a month later Common Council would not agree to the specific security which Estfeld wanted, viz. 52 marks p.a. for ten years and the conditional security that the work would be completed within that time.² It is not clear whether Estfeld's proffered loan was thus rejected but at a meeting of Common Council held 20 August 1445 it was decided to raise a quarter of a fifteenth every year in the City for five years beginning at the next feast of the Purification i.e. 2 February 1446.³ Accordingly an assessment was drawn up, the precepts to the Aldermen to levy the sum were sent out and additional supervisors chosen once more for the work.⁴ Although the Common Council had not agreed to provide Estfeld with the security which he required for his loan he seems to have been prepared to give 250 marks for the work, but there were conditions attached to this grant which suggest that Estfeld was to have half the water which came

1. 18 June 1445, Jour.IV f.81. The proposed levy would have produced in all £833 6s.8d.
2. 16 July 1445, Jour.IV f.86.
3. 20 August 1445, Jour.IV f.90v.; i.e. the same amount as an eighth of a fifteenth for ten years, £833 6s.8d.
4. The assessment for the quarter fifteenth to be levied every year for five years is entered in Jour.IV f.11v. The precept for the Aldermen is dated 10 February 1446, and the money was to be brought to Guildhall by 8 March, Jour.IV f.112, L.B.K., p.318. 20 August 1445, Richard Alley, Richard Lee and John Feld, Commoners, were added to the supervisors who had already been chosen, Jour.IV f.90v. A list of supervisors drawn up in August is to be found, Jour.IV f.159. It listed Aldermen Supervisors: William Estfeld and John Paddesley (appointed 17 December 1440), Aldermen auditors: Nicholas Wyfold and Robert Horne, who had taken the place of Nicholas Yeo (appointed 15 July 1444), Commoners: Thomas Knolles, junior (appointed 20 January 1439), William Chapman (appointed 17 December 1440), John Sturgeon, William Thornhill (appointed 15 July 1444), Roger Heysaunt, Thomas Cook, junior, Thomas Davy, Nicholas Kent (appointed 20 November 1444), Richard Lee, Richard Alley, John Feld (appointed 20 August 1445).

to the City via the new conduit.¹ Another Alderman, John Gedney, granted 200 marks for the work.² Thus financed by grants from the Common Council, Estfeld and Gedney the work was taken up again. On 12 September 1446 the Mayor and Aldermen decided to advance 100 marks to the 'magistri' of the conduit, but on 26 October the auditors who had been appointed to examine the conduit accounts reported that Mr. William Cliff was owed £50. 13s.5d.³

-
1. 20 August 1445, Jour.IV f.91. 13 November 1445, Common Council agreed that Estfeld could choose supervisors for that part of the conduit which he was now building, Jour.IV f.106. 23 December 1445, Court of Aldermen decided that half the water in the aquaduct at Charing Cross should be disposed of at the discretion of William Estfeld, for the commonalty in those parts, the conduit there appears to have been leaking Jour.IV f.110v. 24 January 1446, Common Council agreed that Estfeld should have the disposal of half the water in recognition of his charity, Jour.IV f.113. What Estfeld did with the water is not clear. Estfeld died between 19 October 1445 and 29 April 1446. By a codicil added to his will 16 March 1445, he instructed his executors to complete the conduit in Aldermanbury at his expense, Hustings Wills, ii, pp.509-11. Estfeld lived in the parish of St. Mary Aldermanbury. This conduit was not connected with the main City conduit bringing water from Paddington, since its water came from Highbury, via Clerkenwell and Cripplegate, to Aldermanbury. It would appear that at his death Estfeld assigned this conduit to the Commonalty of London, for in a meeting of Common Council held on 28 July 1447, the indenture between the City and the Prioress of Clerkenwell, for the conduit made by William Estfeld, was sealed with the Common Seal, Jour.IV f.187. Stow, Survey, i, p.17, states that this work was completed in 1471.
 2. 20 August 1445, Jour.IV f.91. It may be that the gifts of Gedney and Estfeld were promises of bequests to be made in their wills. John Gedney had died by 29 March 1449 and on 7 October 1452, John Stokker, one of his executors, promised to bring into Court, before 7 October 1457, the 200 marks which Gedney had bequeathed for the conduit, Jour.V f.89. If rich men were known to have made bequests for projects in their wills, it would be easier for the Chamber to raise loans to carry on with the work.
 3. 12 September 1446, Jour.IV f.138; 26 October 1446, Jour.IV f.146v. 26 February 1455, Cliff was still owed £50 13s.4d. and 2 Aldermen, John Norman and William Huly, were appointed to discuss the matter with him, Jour.V f.224v. 3 March 1455, they reported that they had agreed that Cliff should be paid £10 at Easter and £10 at Christmas, and then £10 every Christmas until the full sum was paid. Cliff was also to have 26s.8d. every year from the Chamber, Jour.V f.226. 18 November 1446 John West, the City's plumber, who had been employed on the new conduits asked for a renewal of his contract whereby he received a rescried wage and 2 gowns of the Mayor's livery each year, L. .K., p.318.

Cliff, who was understandably anxious about the repayment of the debt owed to him, reminded the Court in December 1446 that Robert Chichele who had died c.1439 had bequeathed £100 on his deathbed for the work of the conduit, in the presence of the Chamberlain John Chichele, William Cliff himself and his other executors. Cliff pointed out that the greater part of the sum was still in the executors' hands.¹

For the next two years there is no mention of the conduit in the City's records. It would seem that the second spurt of building which had constructed the lead piping between Paddington and Tyburn, and from Marylebone to Charing Cross, had ended with the auditing of Cliff's accounts in December 1446.²

According to the decision of the Common Council taken on 20 August 1445 a quarter of a fifteenth should have been collected every year from 1446 to 1450. But it would seem that this had not been done. John Norman, the Alderman of Cheap ward, collected his ward's assessments for the years 1449 and 1450. On 28 August 1452 he brought the money into Court and delivered it to Robert Langford the controller, on condition that it should be used for the conduit and nothing else and also that the other Aldermen should bring in their wards' contributions. A later note in the Journals states that since the other Aldermen did not bring in their money, the money from

1. 18 December 1446, Jour.IV f.153. Cliff promised to account for the 100 marks which had been given to him in September, and referred to his work at the Cross (Charing Cross or in Cheap?) and asked to have an auditor assigned to him for this purpose. The Court appointed John Sturgeon to hear the account. Robert Chichele's wills were dated 17 December 1438, and were enrolled 14 February 1440 and 14 October 1441, Hustings Wills, ii, pp.489-92.
2. 24 January 1449, 3 auditors were chosen for the work on the conduit, John Derby, Alderman and the Commoners William Hulyn and William Tailor, Jour.V f.4v.

Cheap ward was returned to John Norman on 27 May 1453.¹ The reason for this reluctance on the part of the wards to pay their assessment for the conduit may be explained by the hope, entertained since Estfeld's death in 1446 that his executors would bear the cost of the work.² In October 1452 John Gedney's executors promised 200 marks for the work³ and on 28 October 1453 the indenture between the executors of William Estfeld and the Mayor and Commonalty of London finally received the Common Seal.⁴

By this indenture the executors agreed to build the missing sections of the pipe-line from Tyburn to Marylebone and from Charing Cross right into the City where they ~~will~~^{would} make fountain heads and wells as seemed best for the common good. In return the Mayor and Commonalty entrusted the existing water supplies and conduits to the executors and promised never to alter the course of the water chosen by the executors. The Mayor and Commonalty ~~bind~~^{bound} themselves s.p. 1000 marks to keep this agreement. From this time forward the building of the new conduit appears to have been taken entirely out of the hands of the Mayor and Commonalty.⁵ The reason that the

1. 28 August 1452, the Cheap ward assessment for this purpose was £15 14s.0d. For 1449, Norman had collected £15 0s.9d. and for 1451, £15 2s.4d., Jour.V f.84.
2. 13 February 1450, the Court of Aldermen decided that Estfeld's executors should come to Court on the first Monday in Lent to discuss the conduit, Jour.V f.30v.
3. See n.2, p.273 above.
4. Jour.V f.126v.; L.B.K., pp.355-57. The indenture had been discussed by Common Council on 2 May 1453, Jour.V f.110.
5. 25 September 1478, the inhabitants of Fleet Street were given permission by the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council to build two cisterns at the Standard and at Fleet Bridge, on Common Soil, tapping the water brought by Estfeld's executors to the City, L.B.L., p.158. The executors also brought a supply of water from Highbury to Aldermanbury, see n.1, p.273 above.

work had taken so long and had been pursued so half-heartedly by the City was that there was already a water-supply from Tyburn to the City, inadequate and old as it might be, and so the need was not pressing.¹ It required private benefaction and enthusiasm to complete the work. The last reference to the old conduit is to be found in June 1455 and so the new one built by Estfeld's executors must have been completed soon after this.

In this period also fresh water was brought to the prisons of Ludgate and Newgate. The Grocer and Alderman Thomas Knolles appears originally to have been responsible for this work, but he died in 1435 and the project was carried on by his son, also a Grocer named Thomas Knolles.² By two indentures dated 1436 and 1442 Thomas Knolles, junior, made agreements with the Prior of St. Bartholomew's and with the Master of the Hospital there whereby he was allowed to carry off excess water which belonged to the priory, from a cistern near the chapel of St. Nicholas and convey it to the two prisons.³ It may be, however, that when the new City conduit was completed in the 1450s the system of bringing water from St. Bartholomew's was abandoned and, instead, the water from the new conduit, which must have passed close to Ludgate, was tapped and pipes were then laid to convey the water from Ludgate to Newgate. The Aldermen William Hulyng and Hugh Middleton, and the City building surveyor Mr. William Cliff, were appointed in April 1459 to supervise the bringing of water to Newgate for the benefit of the

-
1. Repairs to the old conduit were still being made 9 August 1454 and 10 June 1455, Jour.V f.184, 245v.
 2. Stow, Survey, i, pp.17, 37; he confuses the two Thomas Knolleses.
 3. L.B.L., p.4. These two indentures were of a private nature between Thomas Knolles and Reginald the Prior and John Wakeryng the Master, but 22 January 1460, certain releases made by Wakeryng and other feoffees received the Common Seal, Jour.VI f.288. This entry may well refer to the Knolles indentures which are entered in the Letter Book, c.1462.

prisoners.¹ A proclamation issued in 1475 in which the City takes over responsibility for the upkeep of the water supply for the prisons of Ludgate and Newgate makes it quite clear that the water came via the main conduit to Ludgate and thence to Newgate.²

It is possible to attempt some estimate of what it had cost the City to buy the grant from the Abbot of Westminster, to build the pipeline from Paddington (Oxlese) to Marylebone, ~~and from Marylebone~~, and from Marylebone to Charing Cross and to construct the stone well heads at Paddington, Tyburn, Marylebone, Charing Cross and the Standard in Cheap. It would appear that the City provided, by way of taxation, about £2000 and private benefaction contributed about £1200.³ The work was more than half completed by the time Estfeld's executors took over, so it may be fair to estimate the total cost of the work at c.£5000. The lead was costly and the labour skilled.⁴ But in this project it is possible to see clearly certain features characteristic of London government in this period. There is the boldness and scope of the enterprise itself; the mingling of communal and private effort; the spasmodic progress of the scheme; the raising of money by a civic tax assessed in the wards; the overall executive supervision of the Court of Aldermen; the more remote, but tight, financial control of the Common Council; the appointment of Committees to supervise the work, receive the money and audit the accounts; and above all, the overriding sense of what was necessary for the common good and for civic pride.

1. 2 April 1459, Jour.VI f.153v.

2. 15 June 1475, L.B.L., p.130; 20 July 1475, Cal.P.and M.1458-82, pp.92-93.

3. For the costs of building the new conduit see Appendix no.38 p.602.

4. John Atherley, Mayor in 1442-43, received a royal licence to buy 200 fothers of lead and to take workmen, plumbers and labourers for the construction of conduits and a Cross in West Cheap, 25 June 1443, C.P.R.1441-6, p.188.

CHAPTER IV

AN OPPOSITION PARTY IN THE CITY, 1438-1444.

The opposition which the ruling oligarchy encountered in these years, represented a variety of grievances but its unity and driving force depended upon one man, a Tailor named Ralph Holland. The fundamental trouble was a dispute between the Tailors and Drapers which, on the face of it, was simply one of the many demarcation disputes between City Companies, which are common in this period. But the conflict between the Tailors and Drapers symbolized the fundamental rift in City life; the rift between the artisans who, however ancient their companies, were poorer and less powerful than the merchants, who, by reason of their wealth, controlled the City government and therefore gained the royal ear also. Ralph Holland by his personal abilities articulated the artisan grievances and from the original Tailors/ Drapers dispute there developed an opposition party in the City. This party first attacked the method of electing the Mayor and then attacked the new Commission of the Peace which gave the Mayor and Aldermen powers as Justices and over and above their powers as Guardians of the Peace. When their attempts at reform within the existing framework of City government failed, the opposition party resorted to an attempt at an armed uprising. The failure of this marked the triumph of the conservative merchant elements, but during their brief period of agitation, Ralph Holland and his allies left

2

behind them a record which illuminates the actions and desires of that elusive being, the medieval common man.

The Tailors and linen-armourers of London had received letters patent from Edward III in 1327 whereby they were allowed to hold their gild once a year and to exercise the rights of search and correction subject to the Mayor or his deputy.¹ It was not until 1364 that the Drapers first received letters patent. By these the Drapers were granted a monopoly of buying and selling cloth, and the power to elect four wardens to oversee and rule the mystery of Drapers in the City by the aid of the mayor and sheriffs if need be.² Originally there appears to have been no conflict between the Tailors and Drapers. In the fourteenth century the Tailors made up cloth, especially linen cloth and do not appear as retailers, whereas it seems pretty certain that the London Draper actually did little in the way of superintending the manufacture of cloth and that trading was by far the more important of his functions.³

In the years between 1364 and 1438 the Tailors appear to have made several strides forward. In 1390 they received further letters patent from Richard II granting them the right to elect a Master as well as four Wardens and to make ordinances for their better

-
1. F.M. Fry and R.T.D. Sayle, Charters of the Merchant Tailors' Company (1937), pp.9-11.
 2. A.E. Johnson, The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London (1914), vol.I, pp.204-08.
 3. Ibid., pp.121-22.

government, amongst other things.¹ Moreover by letters patent from Henry IV, the Tailors were incorporated, allowed to acquire lands to the value of £100, to have a common seal, and they were licensed to alienate in mortmain.²

It would appear then that in the first thirty years of the fifteenth century the Tailors were the more established and the wealthier Company. They had had a Master since 1390, they were incorporated in 1408 and, according to later records of the Company, Richard II and all the Lancastrian Kings wore the Company's livery.³ Moreover the Tailors' Hall was already in existence by 1392⁴ whereas the Drapers' only began to build their hall in 1425.⁵ Further in 1413 when the annual income from the London property of the Tailors' Company stood at £44 3s.7d. that of the Drapers was only £22 13s.6d.⁶

1. 30 July 1390, Fry and Sale, op.cit., pp.13-15. Entered in Letter Book together with a writ from the King dated 27 September 1392, to Mayor instructing him to allow the Tailors to enjoy their guild and customs, L.B.E., p.384; enrolled in Hustings 121 (1), (2).
2. 2 August 1408, Fry and Sale, op.cit., pp.15-18; P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.12781; C.P.R. 1405-8, p.466.
3. Merchant Tailors' Hall Ms. A/4 1 Accounts 1397-1445, passim.
4. H.L. Hopkinson, The History of the Merchant Tailors' Hall (1951), Chapters 1 and 11.
5. Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, pp.112-13.
6. Archaeological Journal, vol.XLIV (1887), pp.56-82; Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, p.128.

Yet in spite of all this the Tailors appear to have occupied a relatively subordinate position in the government of the City. In the years from 1327 until 1435 when Ralph Holland became an Alderman, the Tailors' Company provided no Aldermen and hence no Mayor, whereas the Drapers in the same period provided 34 Aldermen, 14 of whom became Mayors. For a comparison of the civic success of the different Companies in the period, the following table is drawn up to cover the years 1327-1435.

	Aldermen	Mayors
Mercers	48	19
Grocers	48	18
Drapers	34	14
Fishmongers	40	11
Goldsmiths	22	6
Skinners	17	4
Vintners	13	3
Waxhandlers	1	-
Armourers	1	-
Girdlers	1	-
Saddlers	1	1
Woolmen	3	-
Broderers	1	-
Corders	2	-
Bladers	1	-

What is the explanation of this subordinate position of the Tailors? Why did they not achieve civic office? An explanation may lie in the fact that the Tailors were an artisan guild, albeit an important one. A Tailor worked with his hands; a Draper bought and

sold. A Tailor could make no more money than his hands could earn; a Draper in this period of an expanding English cloth trade was becoming not only an English but a European merchant, wealthy and influential. The Grocers, Mercers, Fishmongers and Goldsmiths, the other great Companies in this period, were also primarily merchant guilds. Many Drapers were rich men (e.g. John Hende, William Crowmer, Simon Eyre), but there is no Tailor who stands out in this way. Furthermore, since the Drapers had the monopoly of buying and selling cloth in the City the Tailor became dependent upon him for the means to carry on his trade. The Draper had established himself securely as the indispensable middle man and the Tailor was forced to accept the position of dependence.

Occasionally men who were Tailors are described as Drapers; indeed Ralph Holland himself is often described in this way, and perhaps if he had not so vigorously identified himself with the Tailors' cause he might have been remembered as yet another Draper holding civic office. Ralph Holland was a Master of the Tailors' Company in 1418-19 and yet contributed 40/- towards the new Drapers' Hall in 1425 and when that Company's accounts end in 1441 he is still paying (and owing) quarterage.¹ It is obvious that in Ralph Holland's case the dual Company does not arise from confusion but because Holland did belong to both Companies; so did John Derby, another Alderman.² It would

-
1. The surviving Drapers' Accounts are printed by Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, Appendix no.18, pp.283-48.
 2. John Derby is variously described as Draper and Tailor, see Beaven, vol.I, p.330 n.1.

obviously be an advantage to a Tailor to be a member of the Drapers' Company and thus able to buy his cloth at wholesale prices. It might be profitable to a Draper to practise the Tailor's craft, but apart from Holland and Derby none of the Wardens or Masters of the Tailors' Company is mentioned in the Drapers' records. Certainly it is clear that the Tailors' Company was less able than the Drapers' Company in this period to assert its interests and promote its members. An ambitious man would choose to be a Draper rather than a Tailor and in the three cases we have of translations from one Company to the other, it was always a Tailor seeking to become a Draper.¹ This fact makes the action of Ralph Holland who, as a Draper, would have achieved conventional civic success but yet consciously championed the Tailors and fought for them against the Drapers, the more remarkable.

Ralph Holland first appears as a Draper in the records of that Company in the years 1413-14 when he was sufficiently advanced in status to be owing money for the enrollment of his apprentice Thomas Holme.² In 1414-16 he first appears as a member of the Tailors' Company when he paid 20/- to enter the livery.³ He must then have been at least twenty. Of his parentage it is difficult to say anything; they are not mentioned in his will. Certainly by 1421 he was married to a wife Mathilda and had by her a son, also Ralph, who entered the

1. 1425, L.B.K., p.39; 1439, ibid., p.224; 1445, ibid., p.309.

2. Johnson, op.cit., p.287.

3. Tailors' Accounts, i, f.90.

livery of the Tailors' Company in 1435/6 but appears to have died before his father.¹ Holland became Master of the Tailors' Company in 1419-20,² and although he is variously described as Tailor and Draper from this time until his death in 1452, it is clear that he identified himself with the Tailors' Company and it is to them that he leaves his property.³ Apart from the Drapers' Company accounts in which Ralph Holland continued to appear as a debtor until they end in 1442, the last mention of Holland as a Draper came in 1440,⁴ and a deed of 13 March 1444 enrolled in the Hustings Court reveals that Ralph Holland had definitely broken with the Drapers. The deed concerned a shop which had belonged to Walter Ridler but which Holland claimed was granted to him in the words 'ego praedictus Ralph Holland per nomen Radulphi Holland pannarii'.⁵ Unless Holland had officially abandoned his connection with the Drapers this explanation would have been unnecessary. That Holland should have severed his connection with the Drapers between the years 1440 and 1444 is explicable and important.

-
1. 26 March 1421 licence to have a portable altar granted to Ralph Holland and his wife Mathilda, Cal. Papal Registers, vol. VII, p. 333. Maud, wife of Ralph Holland entered the livery of the Tailors' Company 1419/20 and 'My Mistress Holland' contributed 20/- for the chapel in 1438/9, Tailors' Accounts i, f. 113, 304v. Ralph Holland junior, in his will dated 24 October 1445, bequeathed tenements in the parish of St. Dunstan in the East. There is no mention of wife or children, Merchant Tailors' Hall, 20th century Ms. B 2 with notes on some members of the Company 1398-1493.
 2. Tailors' Accounts i, f. 112.
 3. Hustings Wills, ii, pp. 525, 526.
 4. C.C.R. 1435-41, p. 378.
 5. Hustings Roll 172 (21).

Ralph Holland first appears in the civic records on 5 September 1426 when he was committed to prison for having criticized the Mayor for correcting the Tailors. This is the first hint of the outspoken radical who was to disturb the peace of the City at frequent intervals in the next twenty years. Holland on this occasion was bound over to behave himself,¹ but in spite of this on 8 October John Olney Mercer, Thomas Cook a Draper and Thomas Reynwell a Grocer gave evidence on oath against Ralph. On that day the Mayor and Aldermen had promulgated ancient ordinances about the manner in which the Sheriffs and the Mayor should be elected in the City. By an ancient writ of 1315 only those who were summoned were allowed to attend these two elections and not the citizens at large.² When this writ was proclaimed Ralph Holland had objected saying that the writs concerning the election of the Mayor were new, fabricated and untrue and were not included in any of the City's ancient books.³ In fact Holland was mistaken on this point but it may well be that the custom of summoning citizens to the elections of Sheriffs and Mayors had lapsed over the past years; instead any freeman had been allowed to take part in the elections. Probably in 1426 the Mayor and Aldermen were reverting to an earlier practice in order to exercise some control over the elections. Holland was committed to Ludgate prison for his recalcitrant words, but the King issued a writ of habeas corpus to the Sheriffs on his behalf. From the

1. Jour.II f.82v.

2. For the writ of 1315, see L.B.D., pp.24-26.

3. Jour.II f.85.

Sheriff's return we learn that Holland had not only 'wantonly declared that such ordinances were fabrications' but had also threatened Thomas Coke with violence.¹ Early, therefore, in his career Ralph Holland fought for a wide civic franchise; the ideal of one man one vote. Early also in his career he fell foul of the ruling oligarchy. This problem of the civic franchise and of the right of the 'inferior' citizens to vote at civic elections becomes again an important plank in Holland's later platform, and by tackling the problem of the constitutional basis of government and consent he showed a political awareness which raised him above his contemporaries. But on this occasion Holland was forced to submit and on 10 October, four men (three of whom can be definitely identified as Tailors) entered into an obligation for £100 to guarantee his good behaviour.²

When the ward of Baynard's Castle became vacant in February 1429 both Holland and Ralph Skinnard (who had been one of his sureties) were presented as candidates to the Court of Aldermen together with Thomas Walsingham, a Vintner, and Thomas Duffhous, one of the Sheriffs and a Fishmonger. The Aldermen unanimously chose Walsingham.³ In spite of this rebuff Holland kept up his trouble-making and on 13 May 1429 Thomas Bradby a Fishmonger reported to the Court of Aldermen that in the meeting of Common Council held two days before, when the question of a loan to the King had been discussed, he had heard Ralph Holland say that the King's necessity was not as great as

1. L.B.K., pp.55-56.
 2. Jour.II f.85v.
 3. Jour.II f.131v.

the Mayor and Aldermen represented.¹ But Ralph Holland finally succeeded in forcing his way into the establishment when on 21 September 1429 he was elected one of the Sheriffs by the Commonalty.² Although a Sheriff only held office for a year the Aldermen must have been exasperated at finding this troublesome upstart in their midst.

Unfortunately the Journals are missing for the seven years from November 1429 so it is difficult to trace Holland's career in any detail.³ In September 1434 he was elected one of the annual auditors of accounts.⁴ In July 1435 he was able to lend £100 to the King⁵ and by October of that year he had been elected Alderman of Bread Street ward.⁶ Already the dispute between the Tailors and Drapers over the respective rights of the two Companies in the matter of searching for

1. Jour.II f.133v.

2. L.B.K.; p.102.

3. Although the civic records are missing the Tailors' accounts reveal some of Holland's activities. He enrolled two apprentices in 1425/6; 2 in 1428/9; 1 in 1433/4; 1 in 1434/5; 1 in 1438/9; 2 in 1440/1; 2 in 1443/4, Tailors' Accounts i, f.159v., 193v., 244v., 303v., 329, 370. It is clear that Holland was one of the most wealthy, probably the most wealthy, member of the Tailors' Company. His contributions to the new kitchen in 1425/6, 1430/1 and 1432/3 were larger than those of any other member of the Company, Tailors' Accounts f.161v., 216v., 237v. Holland's contribution of £4 towards the new charter in 1439/40 was larger than that of anyone else, and in 1433/4 he lent the Company £15 but took as security 2 gilt basins and 2 pottles of silver. He was repaid 10 years later, Tailors' Accounts i, f.317v., 375v.

4. L.B.K., pp.183-84.

5. 9 July 1435, C.P.R. 1429-36, p.467. Received at Exchequer 7 July 1435, P.R.O. E 401/742.

6. L.B.K., p.193.

defective cloth in the City was already apparent. In the year ending August 1435 the Tailors had spent £14 4s.4d. on fees and entertaining men of law to help them construct their case against the Drapers.¹

The situation was aggravated by the Act of the Parliament of 1437 whereby the rules and regulations of all guilds, fraternities and Companies were to be approved by the local Justices of the Peace or Governors of the cities concerned.² In London it had always been necessary for the Companies to submit their rules to the Mayor and Aldermen, but as a result of this act many of the City Companies sought - or were compelled to seek - royal confirmation of their charters. On 30 November 1438 the Drapers' Company received new letters patent whereby the Company was incorporated and they were empowered to

1. Tailors' Accounts i, f.258v.-259v. It is worth noting here that the Company took considerable trouble to cultivate the Duke of Gloucester as a patron. He entered the livery in 1414 (f.73v.), and men were enfranchised in the Company at his request in 1416, 1417 and 1436 (f.89v., 94v., 265v.). Other men entered the livery of the Company in 1425 and 1433 (f.150v., 237). He was given a hood in 1432, 1436, 1437, 1439, 1441-45 (f.229v., 272, 283, 309, 333, 346, 361, 376, 397). Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester was enrolled in the livery in 1434 (f.246) and Richard Nedeham, described as 'with my Lady of Gloucester' entered the livery in 1445 (f.388). In 1431 Gloucester sold the 'Maison de Riall' to the Company for £40 and the sale was negotiated by Holland (f.216v.-217v.). Whether this property can be identified with La Ryole or La Rirole is not clear. See C.L. Kingsford, 'Historical Notes on Medieval London Houses', London Topographical Record, vol.XII (1920), pp.9-11. When the trouble with the Drapers became serious the Tailors spent 36/8d. on cloth for Gloucester's confessor in 1435 (f.259v.) and in 1439 paid Gloucester £30 (a bribe?) and at Christmas 1440 the Company paid his Mummings £6 13s.4d. (f.313v., 332v.).
2. R.P. IV, p.507; see L.B.K., p.xli.

elect a Master annually as well as four Wardens.¹ The charter does not specifically mention the Drapers' right of search for deficient cloth in the City but there must have been trouble on this subject.² Moreover the King appointed two Drapers as aulnagers in the City, i.e. as collectors of the tax payable to the King on each piece of cloth. No cloth was supposed to be sold or made up until it was sealed by the aulnager to show that the tax was paid and that the cloth was of the correct width and length. Although the aulnagers were concerned with money and not quality, the grant of the farm of the aulnage of cloth to two Drapers in February 1439 cannot have been pleasing to the Tailors.³

But the Tailors were not to be outdone. They also received royal letters patent dated 24 February 1439 confirming the previous royal grants but with the additional clause that the Master and Wardens 'may have and make full search in and of the misteries aforesaid and of all those persons who are or shall be privileged with the Tailors and Linen Armourers ... and may be able to correct and reform all defects found among them ... ^{by} but the survey of the Mayor of your said city for the time being and that no other person or persons shall in any way make search in or of the persons of misteries aforesaid save only the aforesaid Mayor.'⁴

1. Text of charter, Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, pp.214-15.
2. 17 December 1439, Court of Aldermen decided that the Wardens of the Tailors' Company were only to carry out the scrutiny on the mandate of the Mayor, as was customary, Jour.III f.3.
3. The Drapers were Robert Shirborne and John Derby. Grant printed by Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, pp.216-20.
4. Fry and Sale, op.cit., pp.21-22.

The Tailors had spent £79 18s.3d. on obtaining their charter but by it they had ^{secured.} ~~obtained~~ the privilege of searching members of their own mystery for any defects.¹ The Drapers began to make moves to have the Tailors' charter annulled and they chose to attack it on the grounds that the Tailors' charter infringed the liberties of the City, i.e. that it detracted from the Mayor's privilege - almost always deputed to the Masters or Wardens of the Company concerned - of searching the defects of workmanship of any citizens. The new Tailors' charter does not allow the Mayor to appoint those deputies he chose to carry out the survey for him, but it was specified that these deputies could only be the Master and Wardens of the Tailors' Company. Hence before October 1439 the Tailors' charter and that of the Saddlers which included a similar right of search clause appeared enrolled in the plea and memoranda rolls under this heading:

'Memorandum that the following charters were brought into Guildhall by order of Stephen Brown, mayor, to be examined by the counsel of the City to ascertain whether they were contrary to the city's liberties or not'.² The Tailors found themselves fighting not simply the Drapers

1. Tailors' Accounts i, f.313v., 302. The largest items of expenditure were £30 for the Duke of Gloucester and £10 for the Bishop of Bath, the Lord Chancellor. Adam Moleyns, the Clerk of the Council received £8 6s.8d. and also cloth worth £2 (f.309). Most of the rest of the money was spent on dinners for important people, and fees for writing and enrolling the charter. See also C.M. Clode, The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Tailors (1888), part I, Appendix III, pp.345-46.

2. Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.33. In 1439/40 the Tailors paid 1/8d. 'for a copy of the bill which the Mayor of London brought to our Lord the King and to the Council, for the charters of all the different mysteries of the City', Clode, op.cit., p.346.

but the City in its corporate capacity. That the Drapers were taking steps can be seen from the following entries in their accounts for the year ending August 1440.

For a copy in the chancery of the newe article in the Taylours charter	2/-
For 2 billes devysing and writing to the mayor for the same article	2/-
For Haydok man of lawe	20/-
For boat hire to Westminster and home diverse times	6d. ¹

In this year also the Tailors spent £60 on a confirmation of their new charter as well as other expenses.²

Meanwhile Ralph Holland had been behaving quietly.³ Indeed he had so much become accepted by the Court of Aldermen that in January of 1439 he was commissioned by them to act on their behalf in putting their case against John Sevenoke the new Prior of Christ Church, to the Duke of Gloucester.⁴ Moreover in March he was appointed to the committee to supervise the new aqueduct.⁵ On 13 October of that year for the first time there were recorded in the Journals the names of the two men whom the Commonalty presented to the Court of Aldermen for

-
1. Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, p.337.
 2. Tailors' Accounts i, f.317v.-319v.; Clode, op.cit., pp.345-46.
 3. Holland had, of course, been much involved in the activities of his Company. The Recorder of London in 1438/9 had been entertained at Holland's house when his advice was sought by the Company, and Holland had contributed £4 towards the cost of the new charter, Tailors' Accounts i, f.302, 317v.
 4. Jour.III f.7, and see n.1, p.287 above. In July 1443 Holland also acted as financial agent for the Duke of Gloucester who received repayment of £166 13s.4d. through Holland, P.R.O. Issue Roll E 403/762.
 5. Jour.III f.11.

their choice of Mayor. Robert Large a Mercer and Ralph Holland were presented. The Aldermen chose Robert Large.¹

In spite of this set back there were no signs of rebelliousness on Holland's part. Ill feeling certainly existed between Tailors and Drapers as can be seen from the case of John Pevnel who, on November 27, was sent to Newgate for saying that he could prove six members of the Drapers' Company to be false when in fact he could prove none to be so.²

Ralph Holland continued to serve on committees of Aldermen. In August 1440 he was appointed to oversee the work on the new bars at Smithfield;³ in September he was one of the Aldermen sent to the King to put the City's case about the abuse of the sanctuary at St. Martin's le Grand and he was on a second and smaller committee set up later in the same month to deal with the problem.⁴ On 13 October 1440, the date for the election of the Mayor, the Commonalty again presented two candidates - John Paddeley a Goldsmith and Ralph Holland. The Aldermen chose Paddeley.⁵

It was during Paddeley's Mayoralty that the latent trouble between the Tailors and Drapers began to come to a head. In this intervening period since early 1439 both Companies had been arguing their case before the Chancellor and before the Court of Aldermen.

1. Jour.III f.14v.
2. Jour.III f.30v.
3. Jour.III f.52v.
4. Jour.III f.59, 60. See Chapter VI, pp. 393-408.
5. Jour.III f.62v.

On 5 August 1441 the Wardens and good men of the Drapers' Company complained that they did not have their accustomed scrutiny of the measures of the Tailors, meaning the lengths of cloth in Tailors' hands. This complaint was probably made with particular reference to the St. Bartholomew's Fair held for three days around August 24 when much cloth was sold both by Drapers and Tailors and the Drapers had usually exercised the right of search. The Mayor and Aldermen replied somewhat cautiously to this complaint and postponed a decision until the Mayor should have consulted with those Aldermen (Holland among them) who were absent.¹ On 14 August the Mayor and Aldermen decided that the Master and Wardens of the Drapers should continue their search as before, but for the purposes of peace, until the Tailors should have come and put in a reply, the Mayor took again into his own hands the search of woollen cloth exposed for sale by Tailors at St. Bartholomew's Fair.² Clearly therefore by this date the Tailors were actually selling some cloth - at any rate at the fair - but although by this compromise they were not allowed to carry out the search themselves, the Drapers were not to carry it out either but rather the Mayor who, in this case, appointed the City Chamberlain aided by a Shearer and a Fuller to exercise that duty as his deputies.

But while the Drapers had been busy furthering their case at the Court of Aldermen, the Tailors had persuaded the King, on the same day 14 August 1441, to write a letter to the Mayor instructing him to allow

1. Jour.III f.93v.

2. L.B.K.; pp.259-60.

the Tailors to search and remedy defects in their mistery in accordance with the royal letters patent of February 1439.¹ Whether the Mayor and Aldermen obeyed the royal mandate is difficult to tell. On 23 August, the day before the St. Bartholomew's Fair, four Drapers were sworn in court to exercise their scrutiny.² And the absence of any Tailors similarly sworn would indicate that the Mayor stuck to his original plan of exercising the search over the Tailors at the Fair himself.

The election to the Mayoralty the following October was of more than passing significance. Success or failure in the dispute over the rights of search would depend very largely on the decisions of the Mayor during the coming year. The Commonalty presented two candidates for the choice of the Aldermen, Robert Clopton a Draper and Ralph Holland the Tailor. During the last year Holland had behaved in exemplary fashion. He had served on the committee to supervise the new work on London Bridge;³ and on the committee to deal with the accounts for the aqueduct,⁴ and later on the committee set up to arbitrate between the bridge wardens and the auditors of their accounts.⁵

-
1. L.B.K., p.260. The Tailors' Company spent a considerable amount of money upon divers men for the search of St. Bartholomew's Fair'. They paid 6/8d. to a secretary 'for devising and writing a letter from the King to the Mayor of London' (the letter of 14 August 1441), and other sums upon travelling expenses and suppers, amounting in all to £6 12s.1d. Tailors' Accounts i, f.351-351v.
 2. Jour.III f.94v.
 3. Jour.III f.67.
 4. Jour.III f.67v.
 5. Jour.III f.76v.

A hint of trouble can be found in the entry of March of that year, when John Russel the Mayor's Sergeant was examined about certain words he had heard spoken by Ralph Holland.¹ But there was no clear excuse whereby the Court of Aldermen could reasonably for the third time reject Holland as Mayor.

The events on 13 October 1441 were of such a striking nature that they were recorded in some of the contemporary chronicles. The usual immense Commonalty, having chosen Holland and Clopton, waited breathlessly in the outer hall of Guildhall while the Mayor and Aldermen inside made their choice. John Paddealey the current Mayor then appeared leading on his right hand the Alderman's choice - Robert Clopton the Draper. Instantly a commotion broke out and the Tailors and other 'handycrafty' men called out 'nay, not that man but Raulyn Holland'. Nothing the Mayor could do, or his Sergeant's attempts at crying 'zey' could quieten the incensed Tailors, until the Sheriffs were sent to round up the troublemakers who were sent to prison.² Indeed it appears that not only did the Tailors cry out against Clopton but they even unofficially declared Holland to be elected Mayor.³

This story in the chronicles is substantiated by the official version of the events of 13 October, to be found in the Journals.⁴

1. Jour.III f.80.

2. Vitellius A XVI, p.154-55; Continuation G of Brut, Brie, p.508; Great.Chron., p.175-76; Fabyan, p.614.

3. Bale, p.115.

4. Jour.III f.97v.

An ad hoc jury of eighteen found that eleven men were responsible for breaking the King's peace - six Tailors and five Skinners.¹ These eleven were committed to prison and the following day the Master, Wardens and men of the Tailors mistery asked to be allowed to go bail for the prisoners. This was refused on the grounds that a royal mandate had instructed the Mayor that the Tailors were not to be allowed bail.² On 4 November the men were still in prison and a committee of five Aldermen was sent to the King's Council to discuss the matter.³ Three days later a further committee of more senior Aldermen was sent to the Council in order to persuade them not to free the Tailors and Skinners except on the advice of the Mayor and Aldermen. A note was added in the Journals to say that the Aldermen were graciously received and their petition heard.⁴ On 8 November, Shefuld, the Warden of Newgate prison where the Tailors and Skinners were kept, reported to the Court about his prisoners. They claim, he said, that they are not guilty of the charges for which they are imprisoned and that they know that their release depends, not upon the Mayor, but upon the Lords of the Council. Shefuld further informed the Court that Kent and White both Tailors and Sherde and Palmer, Skinners, were the 'regulatores' of the others and that Palmer and

-
1. One of the Tailors, William White, appears also to have been one of the City Serjeants, Jour.III f.97v., 103, 153.
 2. Jour. III f.98.
 3. Jour.III f.101v.
 4. Jour.III f.102. Ralph Holland did not attend the Court of Aldermen between 11 October 1441 and 31 January 1442, and his attendance after this date is very infrequent until July 1442.

Kent had declared that even if they never left prison they would make no 'mediaciones' to the Mayor for their freedom.¹ These were brave words. Subsequently the men were released by a writ of privy seal and they were bound over to keep the peace, to appear before the King's council and the Mayor's Court and to make reparation for their transgressions.²

With the troublesome Tailors and Skinners thus subdued the new Mayor, Robert Clopton the Draper, no doubt considered the possibility of having ^{the} obnoxious scrutiny clause of the Tailors' charter suspended. From the Drapers' accounts we learn that the Company paid a total of £10 2s.11d. during this year.³ What did they achieve by this outlay? On 21 August 1442 the King wrote to the Master and Wardens of the Tailors withdrawing the exclusive right of search which he had previously

-
1. Jour.III f.102v.
 2. Only eight of the men appear to have been bound over in this way, in the sum of 100 marks each. They largely acted as mainperners for each other although a John Russell (possibly the Serjeant at Mace), George Aston and Nicholas Toller, Skinner, also appear as mainperners. Toller came into prominence as a leader of the rebellious Skinners in the following year, Jour.III f.103v.-104. The Tailors' Company paid 6/8d. to 'men of our craft and others that were at Newgate', Tailors' Accounts i, f.351v.
 3. Johnson, *op.cit.*, vol.I, pp.343-44. Their expenditure included £3 12s.0d. to Lord Salisbury and 18/- to Adam Moleyns, the Clerk of the Council, and the costs of employing lawyers. Moleyns, since 1439, had also been receiving gifts of cloth from the Tailors to the value of 33/4d. p.a. Tailors' Accounts f.321, 333.

granted to them and vesting this right entirely, once more, in the hands of the Mayor, i.e. leaving the Mayor free to appoint any deputies he liked.¹ A further royal letter addressed to the Mayor confirmed the Mayor's right of search in respect of victuals and over all misteries in the City, according to the City's ancient liberties and customs notwithstanding the opposition of certain men of the mystery of Tailors and others.² Thus at one blow the Tailors found themselves subject to the scrutiny of the Mayor, who was currently a Draper and was always representative of the merchant classes. Their indignation can be well imagined and the thought of the considerable sums of money which had been spent on buying letters patent from the King, which were now reversed and had to be taken back to the King's Council by Michaelmas 1442, cannot have made the bitter pill any easier to swallow. How differently might things have gone for them had their own candidate Ralph Holland been elected Mayor.

It is not surprising that in these circumstances the City governors feared renewed trouble at the election of the Mayor due to take place on 13 October 1442. Accordingly they procured a royal writ on 10 October whereby the Mayor and Sheriffs were to proclaim that because of recent disturbances no one but the Aldermen and other discreet and powerful citizens was to attend the Mayor's election.³ As early as

1. L.B.K., pp.260-61; P.P.C., V, p.196.

2. L.B.K., p.260. These two letters were received and read in the Court of Aldermen, 23 August 1442, Jour.III f.150.

3. L.B.K., pp.274-75.

1426 Ralph Holland had protested at this limitation of the civic franchise, and for fear of trouble the Aldermen decided to proclaim not only the King's recent writ but also the ancient one of 1315 to prove that this limitation was no innovation.¹

At the election on 13 October 1442 John Atherley, an Ironmonger, was chosen at a meeting consisting only of those who were summoned and whose names were checked off at the gate of the hall.² The Journals do not record the election so the name of the rejected candidate is not known. The election did not, however, pass off entirely peaceably. On 16 October Master Gerseth³ was summoned before the Court of Aldermen to answer for a sermon which he had preached at St. Paul's Cross and which was considered to be seditious. He asked to present the written text of his sermon to the Court.⁴ What this seditious matter was can be learnt from an entry in the Journal the following day when the Court was informed that an Alderman, or his nominee, gave false information to the preacher at St. Paul's Cross to the effect that a Cordwainer named Walsh was the first and best Mayor that the City had ever had. Such information, although false, could have been used as an incentive to the artisan classes to rise up and get one of their number into civic office. Such at any rate was the opinion of the Court and

1. 11 October 1442, Jour.III f.152v.

2. L.B.K., p.275 and n.1.

3. Possibly William Gerveys, Rector of St. Mary le Bow 1421-54 or Nicholas Gerboys, Rector of St. Alphege 1439-51.

4. Jour.III f.153.

it was decided that each Alderman should declare his innocence of passing on such seditious information. All who were present swore on the Holy Gospels that they were innocent. Nine Aldermen were absent of whom Ralph Holland was one, and the only artisan Alderman at that. His guilt appears likely but not proven.¹

Even if Ralph Holland was not the ultimate source of Master Gerseth's seditious sermon, he was certainly stirring up trouble elsewhere. On 25 October 1442 the Court received information about Ralph Holland and his activities and the following day he was questioned about his statement that John Paddesley, during his Mayoralty (1440-41), had spent a thousand marks belonging to the City for his own purposes.² Holland's dislike of Paddesley is not difficult to explain, for it was during Paddesley's Mayoralty that the compromise was drawn up whereby the scrutiny of the Tailors at St. Bartholomew's Fair was taken back into the hands of the Mayor while the Drapers retained their right of search. Also Paddesley the late Mayor could be held responsible not only for the choice of Clopton the Draper to succeed him but also for the stern imprisonment of the Tailors and Skinners who raised their voices in protest at Clopton's election. Similar attacks on Paddesley were made at this time by Nicholas Toller, who emerges as the ring leader of the Skinners in these years.³ Toller

1. Jour.III f.153.

2. Jour.III f.154v.

3. Toller first appears in 1426, J.J. Lambert, Records of the Skinners Company (1933) p.94. He was a Master or Warden of the Company in 1438/9, L.B.K., p.222. It would seem that the artisan Skinners, as opposed to the Merchant Skinners like Henry Barton, sided with the Tailors in their opposition to the City government in these years. Apart from the obvious community of *interest*, an explanation may lie in the fact that Nicholas Toller's brother John, was a Tailor, C.C.R., 1429-35, p.351.

had apparently declared openly at Stourbridge Fair that he had been falsely judged by the Mayor, that Paddealey had been a false judge during his Mayoralty and that, in particular, Paddealey had falsely and unjustly imprisoned people at Newgate. Clearly Toller here was referring to Paddealey's imprisonment of the eleven Tailors and Skinners in the previous October 1441. As a result of these injudicious complaints, Toller emerged with an obligation to keep the peace under penalty of paying £20 to the Chamber.¹

From the end of September the King's Council had been considering the Tailors' charter which had been suspended since August of that year when the Tailors' right of search had been granted back to the Mayor; but the charter itself had not been quashed. On 20 October 1442 it was obviously still under discussion, for the Mayor and Aldermen decided to send the City Recorder to the King's Council to have the Tailors' charter repealed since it was contrary to the City liberties,² i.e. in spite of the royal letters patent which had invested the Mayor with the right of search over the Tailors, the Court of Aldermen was still anxious that the more authoritative charter should be totally repealed. Moreover on 5 November two sergeants at law - Markham and Fulthorpe - were employed to argue the City's case against the Tailors.³ The Tailors' difficulty was that their charter was contrary to the City liberties since the right of search over all misteries lay with

-
1. 11 October 1442, Toller was bound over to abide by the decision of the Court. 29 October 1442, the £20 obligation was substituted for the earlier one, Jour.III f.153, 154v.
 2. Jour.III f.153v.
 3. Jour.III f.156.

the Mayor or deputies appointed by him. Thus for misteries like the Drapers whose influence in civic affairs was considerable this Mayor's right of search presented no difficulty; the Mayor might be a Draper or at any rate he could be urged to appoint Drapers as his deputies. The Tailors, on the other hand, had no influence over the Mayor and so it was essential that they should enjoy a right of search independently of the civic authority. If they could make their influence felt in civic affairs, and more particularly in the Court of Aldermen, then this independence in the business of search would not matter. Either they must get their royal right of search confirmed or they must get a foot inside the door of civic government. It seemed as if they were to lose both battles and so the situation between the artisans in the City who sided with the Tailors and the merchant governors who supported the Drapers remained explosive. While the Tailors fought for their hard-won charter, resentment seethed amongst the lower classes in the City.¹ It is not surprising that Robert Clopton the Draper and lately Mayor should have thought it worthwhile to get a charter of pardon from the King for all trespasses and quarrels during his Mayoralty.²

On 13 August 1443 a new Commission of the Peace was read in the Court of Aldermen.³ The text of this Commission was not enrolled in chancery and does not survive in the City records. In all probability,

-
1. In 1442/3 the Tailors' Company spent a total of £11 16s.9d. on expenses for legal counsel at Westminster and Guildhall, dinners and journeys to the King, Tailors' Accounts, f.365v.-366.
 2. C.P.R. 1441-46, p.136.
 3. Jour.IV f.1.

it regularized the judicial powers of the Mayor and Aldermen, making them Justices of the Peace with power to hear and determine. Certainly the later charter of October 1444 was granted to the City for this purpose and was the subject of a year's negotiations.¹ Until this time the Mayor and Aldermen had always been wary of acting as judges in criminal cases especially where City Companies were involved. For example when Paddesley the Mayor in October 1442 had had the Tailors and Skinners arrested for breaking the King's peace they were put into Newgate prison and it was a royal judicial decision by which they were freed.² It was no doubt, the need for stronger powers to safeguard law and order and the King's peace in the City which led the Aldermen sometime between November 1442 and the following August to seek for this regularization of their powers.³ In the circumstances already described, it is not difficult to see why the Commission of the Peace provoked opposition among the non-ruling classes and heralded the last and most serious outbreak of artisan lawlessness in the City during this period. One chronicler makes a unique reference to this event with the words 'A commission was sued for the City of London which was called a charter, and the Commons were greatly aggrieved therewith'.⁴

The Aldermen may have particularly wanted their new Commission in operation before August, since the St. Bartholomew's Fair of that month

-
1. Cal. Charter Rolls 1427-1516, vol.VI, pp.41-44; G.R.O. Charter 55.
 2. For a full discussion of the process whereby the Mayor and Aldermen became fully integrated into the national system of local jurisdiction, see A.H. Thomas, Cal.P. and M. 1323-64, pp.i-xxxiii.
 3. Journal III ends 17 November 1442 and Journal IV begins 13 August 1443.
 4. Bale, p.117.

was likely to be the scene of some disturbance. The Tailors and Drapers dispute about their rights of search was still not settled and on 19 August the Master and Wardens of the Tailors were summoned to Court and enjoined to observe the form of search at the Fair which had been laid down in Paddeasley's Mayoralty two years before. That is that the Drapers should exercise their right of search and the Mayor should search cloth exposed for sale by Tailors.¹ Whether there was trouble at the Fair is not known, but on 5 September the Mayor and Aldermen decided to have a copy made of the commission.² It is no surprise in these circumstances to find Ralph Holland attacking the new commission in words both vehement and interesting. He accused the Recorder - Robert Danvers - and the Common Clerk of the City - Richard Barnet - of being the principal movers and instigators in procuring the King's letters patent for keeping the peace, which, Holland claimed 'will subvert the peace, and undermine the customary good rule in the City to the detriment of the artificers of the City'. The entry in the Journal records that Holland said many more shameful words against these two people and he ended on a ringing note 'this is a commission', he declared, 'not of peace but of war'.³ Indeed he was almost proved right.

The storm broke on 21 September 1443; the customary day for the annual election by the Commonalty of the Chamberlain and Sheriffs.

-
1. Jour.IV f.lv. The Wardens of the Drapers' Company were sworn to exercise their scrutiny, 21 August 1443, Jour.IV f.lv.
 2. Jour.IV f.3.
 3. Jour.IV f.4v.

A great number of inferior citizens, after the election of the Sheriffs, refused to agree that John Chichele should continue as Chamberlain for the next year. Instead they raised their hands and cried for 'Cottisbrook'.¹ Why Chichele should have been singled out for attack is not clear except that as Chamberlain he controlled the City finances, and was thought to have helped to buy the obnoxious commission. But it may well have been that since the office of Chamberlain was one of the important civic offices which the citizens controlled by annual election, their purpose may have been to exercise their powers rather than to attack Chichele. But they did not succeed, for the Mayor ordered that all those who had not been summoned should depart and that the election should be made by those who had been summoned, 'thereupon the question being put, John Chichele was nominated Chamberlain with the unanimous consent of the Mayor and Aldermen.' The official entry in the Journal where Chichele's election is recorded, attempted to cure his wounded pride with the additional rider that he was elected 'as a man faithful, wise, diligent and prudent'.²

It is not easy to associate William Cottesbrook with the radical artisan cause before these events. He was a Common Councilman and had served on two committees³ and in 1441 he had been elected an M.P.

1. L.B.K., pp.286-87; there is a rough draft of this entry in Jour.IV f.6, 6v.

2. Jour.IV f.5v.

3. Jour.III f.76v., 115.

for the City.¹ Moreover he was not unqualified to act as Chamberlain since he had been one of the City auditors for a year.² After his rejection as Chamberlain he becomes one of the more vocal and intelligent of the City radicals but he appears to have died in 1444 or 1445.³

The City governors moved quickly. John Bakwell, a member of the household of a Skinner, Christopher Water (who was later associated with Ralph Holland's conspiracy), was imprisoned for saying to one of the City sergeants that he would call down both his own, and God's, curse upon the sergeant's authority.⁴ John Arcall, a Tailor, who was earlier recorded as having insulted the Chamberlain,⁵ now declared in court that he would not, for £100, that Chichele should be Chamberlain again, because he had acquired the royal letters patent for keeping the peace.⁶ So just as Ralph Holland had attacked the Recorder and Common Clerk, Arcall attacked the Chamberlain. The whole of the City bureaucracy was under fire. Obviously the Mayor and Aldermen felt themselves to be under attack. On 24 September 1443 the Master and Wardens of the Companies were summoned to the Court and enjoined to warn the men of their Companies and households, to

-
1. Jour.III f.108v.; see Chapter V, pp.337 & Appendix 42 p.606.
 2. 21 September 1442, L.B.K., pp.273-74. Cottisbroke was re-elected in 1443, ibid., pp.287-88.
 3. The last reference to Cottisbroke is in July 1444, Feadera V, part I, p.136.
 4. Jour.IV f.7.
 5. 19 September 1443, Jour.IV f.4v.
 6. Jour.IV f.7. Arcall was associated with Holland in April 1441, Cal. P. and M. 1437-57, p.165.

refrain from spreading false rumours and scandals about the Mayor and Aldermen.¹ Three days later the Wardens of the Companies were again summoned to the Court of Aldermen to be told that the new Commission of the Peace was not contrary to the liberties of the City.² But this did not deter William Goldynton, a spirited Carpenter, from declaring to the Mayor's sergeant that he had enough hurdles to draw all those who had obtained the new Commission of the Peace from the Tower to Tyburn because they were traitors to the King. The new Commission, he added, was contrived to bring the citizens of London into bondage.³

It is clear from the somewhat incoherent evidence of witnesses brought before the Court of Aldermen during these weeks that opposition to the new Commission had led to secret meetings and that some considerable show of force was planned for the Mayor's election on 13 October 1443. John Bale, a Tailor, had urged Thomas Shrub to attend a meeting to discuss the new Commission.⁴ Clement Lyffyn, a Draper, gave evidence at second hand that two thousand people were ready to rise and that if such an insurrection took place Mr. William Clif would lead it.⁵ Mr. William Clif however was a seemingly quite respectable surveyor

1. Jour.IV f.7.

2. Jour.IV f.7. When the charter which incorporated the new Commission of the Peace was finally sealed in October 1444, it included several clauses emphasising that the liberties of the City were to be in no way impaired by the new charter.

3. Jour.IV f.7v. 5 October 1443, Goldynton was released on bail of £100 to appear in the Mayor's Court, Jour.IV f.9.

4. Jour.IV f.7v.

5. Jour.IV f.8.

employed by the City subsequently on a variety of tasks and his connection with the radical cause is very doubtful. A man named Fayrefeld gave evidence that there was a meeting of men from the Tailors, Saddlers, Skinners, Goldsmiths and Brewers Companies held at the house of the Friars Minor and summoned there by the headles of the Tailors.¹ Another Draper - Thomas Cook - gave evidence against the conspirators. He said that in the house of Lambe, who was a Pewterer, John Blake, a Tailor, had spoken words which violently threatened the King's peace. Lambe when examined reported that Blake had said that if the Commission continued the commons would rise, and if the commons rose then there would be great danger.²

The fact that much of the evidence was provided by Drapers and that the ringleaders in the conspiracies were Tailors shows the basic rivalry between the two Companies which lay now underneath the more extensive dispute between the merchant governors and the governed artisans. That some Company rivalry lay at the base of the dispute can be seen from the petty quarrel about Company halls which is revealed in a batch of evidence brought before the Court on 30 September 1443. John Gedney, the distinguished Draper and Alderman, Master of his Company and already once a Mayor, apparently spoke some disparaging words about the dilapidated state of the Tailors' Hall, which certainly

1. Jour.IV f.9v.

2. Jour.IV f.9v. Blake was examined 16 October 1443 when he claimed that he had said nothing, and was allowed bail, Jour.IV f.10v.

was one of the older Company Halls at the time. Gedney had apparently complained also that the Grocers' Hall (recently completed in 1431) obstructed his view of St. Paul's and that he hoped it would be destroyed. Gedney was also reported to have said that he hoped and believed that the Drapers Hall would be finer than any when it was finished.¹ Whether Gedney actually said any of these things is less important than the fact that he was believed to have said them which is a good indication of the kind of Company rivalry on which civic discontent fed at the time. No doubt such words were used to stir up feelings against the Drapers and the governing classes by the artisan agitators.

That the City governors were worried there is no doubt. In the Journals there appear two rough drafts of letters in English, one addressed to Nicholas Wotton the venerable Alderman who had not attended the Court since August 1443, and the other was simply addressed to 'worshipful brother'. The letter to Wotton, apart from being interesting for its use of English, shows well the feeling of crisis.

'Worshipful sir, for as much as diverse matters of great change that be full peysaunt touching the governance of the City of London remain in suspension and undetermined, in the which your sad counsel, good advice and consent be to the city full necessary, and according we charge and require you on our sovereign lord the king's behalf as much as in us is, that all other matters 'omitted' you be with us with

1. Jour.IV f.8v.

all goodly haste there to counsel and advise us as shall be for the good state and prosperity of the said city in true acquittal of your person which our lord keep in good prosperity.* Dated 30 September 1443 under the Mayor's seal.¹ The letter addressed to 'worshipful brother' is similarly drafted although it emphasises rather more strongly the need both for speed and secrecy.² Obviously the Mayor and those Aldermen who were in the City felt the need for the support of the whole body. A third of the Aldermen had not attended the Court since early September. By 22 October all except one of the absent Aldermen were back in Court.³ Ralph Holland, not surprisingly, ceased to attend after 19 September except once on 5 October. He was engaged in other activities.

In the midst of these examinations, recriminations, tales and hearsay, it was necessary to elect a new Mayor. On 8 October a writ came from the King - as in the previous October - which declared that only those who were summoned might attend the Mayor's election.⁴ This was proclaimed in the City on 12 October, the day before the election was due to take place, and in these restricted conditions, Thomas Catworth a Grocer was elected.⁵ Whatever action by force had been planned by the artisan conspirators for this day failed, although the Tailors had prepared men armed with swords and poleaxes and other weapons. The attack on the new Commission emerged into a tumultuous

1. Jour.IV f.7v.

2. Jour.IV f.8.

3. By 10 October 1443, Estfeld, Brokle; Chalton, Wandesford had returned; by 16 October 1443, Broun; by 22 October 1443, Clopton, Catworth, Wotton.

4. L.B.K., p.288.

5. Ibid., p.288.

criticism of the method of electing a Mayor for the City and this, in turn, led to an attack upon the Mayor's authority.

From the subsequent collection of evidence William Cottisbrook the Grocer whom the 'inferior' citizens had voted for as Chamberlain emerges as the theorist behind the movement and Ralph Holland as the organizer. Cottisbrook had objected to the royal writ which excluded many of the radical faction from the Mayor's election and he displayed a copy of the Londoners' great charter, i.e. the Charter of 1319 which had been confirmed in Parliament, around the City, in order to undermine the Mayor's authority.¹ Three informers examined later said that they heard Cottisbrook say that an elected Mayor is not the Mayor of those who have not elected him; hence those who had been excluded from the election could withdraw their obedience to the Mayor.² These were indeed radical doctrines as to the basis of authority and they must have appeared very novel to most of the contemporary Londoners. But for the moment Cottisbrook's courage must have failed him.³ In Court he denied that he said or did any of these things and instead gave evidence about some words spoken by John Bale the Tailor who acted as an agitator and tried to get people to attend conspiratorial meetings.

John Bale's reported words reveal that there was a wide belief amongst the artisan conspirators that the royal writ restricting those

1. Jour.IV f.10; Charters, pp.45-50; G. Williams, Medieval London (1963), pp.282-83.
2. Jour.IV f.10v.
3. Jour.IV f.10.

present at the Mayor's election, was in fact a fabrication. John Bale claimed that he heard the Lord Chancellor say that the writ had not been recorded and that it had not passed through his hands nor come to his notice.¹ In fact such a belief formed the basis for the discussion at a conspiratorial meeting held at Ralph Holland's house on 15 October. Christopher Water, a Skinner with radical tendencies² was present at this meeting when a group of Tailors entered and reported that twelve Tailors who had been accused had gone to the Lord Chancellor to make their excuses. There the Lord Chancellor had told them that there was no record of any such writ sent from him.³ The twelve Tailors accused before the Lord Chancellor were probably those who had made some sort of armed - but obviously ineffective - rising or protest on the occasion of the Mayor's election two days before. From later evidence it appears that a Tailor named Kyng was the spokesman on this occasion.⁴ When Kyng himself was examined on 19 October he said that a man named Henxton had told him that there was no writ to prevent any freeman from attending the Mayor's election and that the Lord Chancellor had told him this and Adam Moleyns had confirmed it.⁵

1. Jour.IV f.10.

2. See above p.306 . With Ralph Holland, Christopher Water and others held the Lordship of Ayresford, Kent, 18 October 1444, C.P.R. 1441-46, p.298.

3. Jour.IV f.10.

4. Evidence provided by Robert Horne, Fishmonger, Thomas Canynges, Grocer, Robert Bertyn, Draper, Jour.IV f.10v.

5. Kyng also gave evidence that a Common Councilman had gone to the Lord Chancellor and had told him that the Tailors had ready for the day of the Mayor's election, men armed with swords, poleaxes, and other weapons to achieve their ends by force if necessary. This would bear out the suggestion that the twelve Tailors appeared before the Lord Chancellor accused of breaking the King's Peace, Jour.IV f.11v.

It would seem unlikely that the Lord Chancellor or Adam Moleyns would have taken rebellious Tailors into their confidence in this way. But whatever the true authority of the writ, many fair words were tossed about at the meeting of indignant men at Ralph Holland's house on 15 October. ~~A man named~~ Henxton had claimed there that in any case the King's writ was not authoritative since the power and authority of Parliament lay behind the City Charter.¹ No doubt he was thinking of the same Great Charter which Cottisbrook had displayed to support the radical cause. It is of no little interest that as early as 1443 an ordinary workman was aware of an antithesis between the authority of Parliament and of that of the Crown. Indeed this Henxton, whoever he may have been, fits more closely into the pattern and ideas of seventeenth century history than fifteenth. A child born before his time. John Bale the Tailors' organisation man, had more pressing matters at heart when he, stoutly maintained in Court, that the prosperity of the City depended upon the artisans and not upon the merchants.²

Clearly it was with Ralph Holland's authority and at his house that these meetings had taken place. His role in the conspiracy which had abysmally failed by force of ^{arms} aims but which had produced a brief flowering of something which might be dignified by the title of political thought, was an important one. He was the most powerful

1. Jour.IV f.10.

2. Jour.IV f.10.

and probably the richest of the radical agitators.¹ Thomas Thornton - another Draper and therefore somewhat suspect when giving evidence about Tailors - claimed that he heard it said that Ralph Holland had many deputies appointed who had been nominated by him for six years, i.e. since 1437.² There may in fact have been some kind of primitive organization which used the facilities of the Tailors' Company, and lay behind this haphazard outbreak of protest.

But whatever the movement failed to achieve, it marked the end of Ralph Holland's civic career. On 19 October 1443 the Court of Aldermen turned its wrathful attention to Ralph Holland, who was not, in fact, present. John Reynwell, an Alderman and Fishmonger, however listed for the benefit of the Court, the various obnoxious sayings of Ralph Holland. He had abused the City, its franchise, the City

-
1. Ralph Holland's wealth see n.3, p.287 above. When he died Holland was possessed of two considerable houses - Basset's Inn and Pembridge's Inn - and eight other tenements in seven London parishes. On Basset's Inn and Pembridge's Inn, see C.L. Kingsford, 'Historical Notes on some Medieval London Houses', London Topographical Record, vol.X (1916), p.56, vol.XI (1917), pp.67-68. He left these to the Tailors' Company, the Rector of St. Margaret Patyns and the Priory of St. Leonard at Stratford, Middlesex, Hustings Wills, vol.II, pp.522, 525, 526, 563. He also bequeathed £80 to prisoners and £40 to hospitals (Rous P.C.C. 11). His property in London and Surrey was assessed as worth £24 p.a. in 1436, Thrupp, Merchant Class, p.381. He may have come from Newington, Surrey since he made a bequest to the poor there in his will, Thrupp, op.cit., p.350. In 1454, Oxford University wrote to his executors asking for a bequest from the goods of that 'worshipful and notable man Raulyn Holand' for the work of the new Divinity Schools, Epistolae Academicae Oxon, ed. H. Anstey (Oxford Hist.Soc.1898), pp.323, 326. Apart from the loan to the King noted in n.5, p.287 above, Holland also lent in June 1437 (£100), April 1442 (£200), April 1445 (£200), July 1449 (£100), July 1449 (£500), April 1451 (£100), all recorded in the Receipt Rolls under the relevant term.
 2. Thornton said that he heard Chantrell, a Tailor, declare this, Jour.IV f.10v.

officials, and the Mayor and Aldermen. Thomas Catworth the Mayor elect, William Comber and John Sutton, two Aldermen, and others affirmed that they were present when Holland spoke these free and fearsome words. Since Holland himself was not in court it is possible that the statements attributed to him were somewhat exaggerated, but the general tenor of the remarks seems probable. He was accused of saying:-

1. That the control of Smithfield Fair belonged to the Prior of St. Bartholomew's and was no concern of the City's. (Smithfield - or St. Bartholomew's - Fair was the occasion on which the Mayor in accord with the temporary arrangement of August 1441 exercised the right of search over the Tailors. The Fair was the property of the Prior but was the subject of much dispute between him and the City.¹ Clearly the Tailors in these circumstances would wish to extol the Prior's rights as against those of the Mayor).
2. That the King's writ (i.e. the writ restricting those present at the Mayor's election of October 1443) was not proclaimed as it had been written under the King's seal, i.e. the Aldermen were accused of having tampered with the writ.
3. That John Paddesley the Mayor in 1441-42 was a brawler and always was and always would be.²
4. That the Common Clerk - Richard Barnet - was out of his wits.
5. That the Recorder - John Danvers - was a disturber of the peace in his own part of the country and had come to spread discord in the City.³

1. See Chapter III, p. 228.

2. Holland had already attacked Paddesley, see p. 300 above.

3. Barnet and Danvers had also been attacked before, see p. 304 above.

6. That Sir William Estfeld, the venerated Alderman, had revealed the City's secrets to Lord Cromwell the King's Treasurer. Holland had further suggested that there was some kind of deal or understanding between the two men.
7. That the whole Court of Aldermen was under the sway of two or three of its members.
8. That he himself was the most able amongst the Aldermen to deal with the Lords of the Council and Holland had further offered to expedite any business at the Council for the Mayor. (A touch of condescension which would not have been appreciated).
9. That the Commonalty should present two bills against the Mayor and Aldermen to right their wrongs; first to the effect that those who were party to a case should not act as judges (clearly this refers to the fact that a Draper as Mayor, or Drapers as Aldermen, should not judge on the dispute between the Tailors and Drapers) and secondly to the effect that the Commonalty had been denied their customary freedom of election (that is in the elections both for the Chamberlain and for the Mayor).
10. That he wished that all those who were in prison for love of him should be sustained.¹ Indeed here speaks a man truly a forbear of John Wilkes. The fifteenth century radical also knew how to play to his gallery.

Three days later nineteen Aldermen testified that they were present in the King's Court when Ralph Holland had taken up the Tailors' case

1. Jour.IV f.11v.

contrary to the City liberties. It is not surprising therefore that it seemed expedient to the Mayor and Aldermen that Ralph Holland should be exonerated from his Aldermanry. But first it was decided that he should reply to the articles against him.¹ When Ralph failed to appear the next day John Corbes one of the sergeants was sent to collect him. He reported back to the Court that Ralph Holland had said that he could not come because his wife was lying gravely ill and so he had to go to Newgate to distribute money to the poor people there that they might pray for her recovery.² Ralph continued to avoid an appearance in court,³ and on 6 November he received a royal exemption from holding any civic office such as the Mayoralty or Escheatorship; although nothing is mentioned in the writ about the office of Alderman.⁴

In the City at large the Court of Aldermen had the situation under control although there was still evidence of the rebellious spirit. On 16 January 1444 a man named John Farndon was in trouble for having presented an unsuitable and scandalous bill in the wardmote of Bishopsgate against Thomas Chalton the Alderman, affirming that Chalton by delay, favour and negligence had perverted the course of justice. Farndon was sent to Newgate.⁵ Again the movement seems to have been fairly widespread

1. Jour.IV f.12.

2. Jour.IV f.12.

3. 25 October 1443, Holland had still not appeared. 28 October was appointed as the day he should make his answer, Jour.IV f.12. 4 November he was given a day two weeks away.

4. C.P.R. 1441-46, p.220.

5. 24 January 1444, Jour.IV f.13.

for three men took a copy of the bill to Cornhill ward and it appears to have been distributed in other wards also. The idea was, presumably, to launch a mass attack upon the justice administered by Aldermen within their wards. Further evidence presented later in the month revealed that similar bills had appeared in the wards of Bread Street, Broad Street and Queenhithe.¹ On 19 February John Farndon was examined about the clauses of these bills and although he largely retracted on what was written it is possible to find out what these obnoxious clauses had been. The bill had accused the Aldermen of being oppressors of the people and supporters of robbery and adultery; they were also usurers into the bargain. The Chamberlain had appropriated the common soil for the use of the Chamber and the Recorder had forced men into obligations of £20 to observe ordinances they considered to be unjust. There was, it had been claimed in the bill, one law for the rich and another for the poor.²

This touching loyalty to Holland which clearly lingered on amongst the artisan classes and, indeed, as late as 1459 his acts were to be found cited as precedents,³ but his days of authority were numbered. On

1. Jour.IV f.14, 16v.

2. Jour.IV f.17v. Farndon also stated in the bill that William Estfeld, when Mayor (1437-8), had unjustly brought a case against Holland. If there had been some personal dispute between Estfeld and Holland this would help to explain Holland's attack upon Estfeld for collusion with Lord Cromwell, see p.316 above.

3. 19 June 1459, Jour.VI f.95v.

18 May 1444 he was exonerated from his Aldermanry, in the traditional formula that he had sought to be dismissed and that the court had found his excuses 'reasonable'. A new Alderman was to be elected for Bread Street ward as soon as possible.¹ So ends the civic career of a premature radical and the movement to which he have given impetus, organization and expression died with him.² It had run the normal course of such movements working at first through the legitimate channels in attempts to get an artisan elected as Mayor and then, thwarted in this, the movement had turned to attempted violence and conspiracy in October 1443.

The struggle over the new Commission of the Peace, however, continued. In January of that year William Haylyn a Dyer had been sent to Newgate because he complained at the spending of 2000 marks to buy a charter which was contrary to the liberties and franchises of the City and would destroy freedom. Haylyn was particularly indignant because he had had to

1. Jour.IV f.25.

2. There is no reference to Holland in the City Journals after May 1444, although he features in the Patent and Close rolls until June 1452 when he received 2 tenements in Watling Street from the King for his good service and personal kindness to the King and Henry V, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.861. Holland died between 3 May 1452 (date of his last will) and 23 October 1452 (will enrolled). His executors appear to have had considerable trouble settling the estate and were not helped by the reckless behaviour of one of their number, Holland's nephew, Thomas. The other four executors had to petition Parliament to have Thomas's powers as an executor annulled, P.R.O. C49/File 32/15. Holland appears to have died with many outstanding debts, see G.R.O. Mayor's Court Files 3 nos.288, 291; C.P.R. 1452-61, pp.455, 620.

contribute 2/- towards this new charter.¹ In August a draft of the new charter was read and the Aldermen decided to continue negotiations with the King and also to consult the Commonalty.² Perhaps they had learnt a little prudence. On 7 September 1444 the Commonalty approved the draft charter no doubt because it included many clauses other than those specifically creating the Mayor and Aldermen Justices of the Peace. The City gained extensive rights in Southwark amongst other concessions. Moreover the fact that nothing was to be done to the derogation of the City liberties was constantly reiterated. Indeed the coating of sugar to the pill was so deceptive that the Commonalty agreed that it should be paid for out of common funds and they voted great thanks to the Mayor and Aldermen for their great labours in achieving the charter.³ Certain alterations were made to the draft in a meeting on 18 September.⁴ In spite of this the transformation of the draft into a charter was not completed without a further levy of £3 per Alderman with which to buy the favour of the King's Council.⁵ On 26 October 1444 the charter was finally sealed although the means of paying for it continued to vex the City.⁶

1. Jour.IV f.14.

2. 21 August 1444, Jour.IV f.39.

3. Jour.IV f.47v. For the other concessions which the City gained by this charter see Chapter VI, pp. 381, 385, 386, 392.

4. Jour.IV f.42.

5. 19 October 1444, Jour.IV f.44v.

6. 19 November 1444, Jour.IV f.51; 7 January 1445, Jour.IV f.57 where there is a list of payments to Lord C[romwell?]; 28 January 1445, Jour.IV f.60v.

The matter between the Tailors and Drapers took longer to settle but the fire had gone out of the conflict. In 1447 the compromise of Paddesley's time, i.e. of 1441 whereby the Drapers, at St. Bartholomew's Fair, were to have the scrutiny of all cloths except those of the Tailors, was reiterated. The Chamberlain on behalf of the Mayor was to search the Tailors.¹ On 6 October of that year the Drapers' right of search over woollen cloths sold by retail in the City was confirmed by the Mayor and Aldermen. This confirmation was subsequently cut out of the Letter Book of the City - no doubt by the indignant Tailors.² In January 1448 John Lucok a Tailor protested at the scrutiny and Richard Adkyns the Warden of the Tailors was examined.³ That the Tailors were still fighting can be seen from the fact that the case between the two Companies went to the Lord Chancellor in April.⁴ The case must have dragged on for in February 1450 the King called the matter into his own court.⁵

But in fact stalemate must have been reached and the Tailors, who had had an iron yard made for measuring cloth in 1445, retained their right of search over unmade up cloth sold by Tailors at St. Bartholomew's Fair. They also maintained their right of search

-
1. 23 August 1447, Jour.IV f.189.
 2. L.B.K., pp.321-32; Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, Appendix 14, pp.233-35, printed from the Drapers' Book of Evidences A no.338 f.161a.
 3. 12 January 1448, Jour.IV f.205.
 4. 19 April 1448, Jour.IV f.216. Bale, p.122 'The Drapers and Tailors of London made great suit upon a truce between them but the Tailors obtained and recovered'.
 5. 4 February 1450, Jour.V f.30.

for made up cloth in Tailors' shops in the City. But the Drapers had the right to search unmade up cloth in the City generally.¹ The quarrel probably died because of the need for joint action against the shearmen.²

This opposition movement led by Ralph Holland was short lived, primitive and unsuccessful; but it need not be disparaged for that. It showed what an able and fiery leader could do for a cause; indeed there is more to admire in Ralph Holland than perhaps in either Wat Tyler or Jack Cade. The opposition which he formulated and nurtured was not simply a case of the 'have nots' against the 'haves'; there lay behind it a seriousness of purpose and an awareness of the way in which civic government could function. It is surely of importance that in the years between 1435 and 1445 men of little learning but much zeal were formulating ideas which were to continue to be the backbone of the good old cause for centuries to come. The advocacy of a wide civic franchise; the belief that the authority of a governor lies upon a basis of conscious consent; the assertion of the greater authority of an act of Parliament than an act of the King; the consciousness of the well being of the whole depending upon all its parts - in this case the artisans as well as the merchant governors; and lastly the determination that all men should be equal before the law; these beliefs are all important ones and perhaps especially so for being found so early and in such a humble context.

-
1. Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, p.119; Clode, op.cit., pp.128-29; the Tailors had their standard meter yard 'tynned' for 4d. in 1455/6, Tailors' Accounts, vol.ii f.75.
 2. Johnson, op.cit., pp.119-20.

CHAPTER V

LONDON AND PARLIAMENT, 1400-1450

There is a puzzling and exasperating divergence between the recognized importance of London as a whole in the national economy and in the political scene, and the almost complete absence of any recorded activities of London M.Ps. in Parliament. At least for the town of Lynn, for example, there exist some of the reports which the town M.Ps. made of the events which took place in Parliament.¹ For London, however, no such reports ~~were recorded~~ ^{have survived} and the references to meetings of Parliament are haphazard and largely uninformative. An explanation of this apparent detachment on the part of the City may lie in its great importance. Unlike lesser towns for which a meeting of Parliament was their only contact with the great and influential in the corridors of power, the City of London and its greater citizens were in constant and direct touch with the King, the Chancellor, the Treasurer and the Lords of the Council. Meetings of Parliament were not, therefore, the great occasions for the London citizens which they were for the burgesses of lesser towns. Familiarity, perhaps, bred a certain contempt.

But, in spite of the paucity of evidence, there are some questions which need to be asked about London and Parliament in this period,

1. M. McKisack, The Parliamentary Representation of the English Boroughs during the Middle Ages (reprinted 1962), pp.139-45.

however tentative and incomplete the answers must be. How were the City's M.Ps. elected? What sort of men served the City in this capacity? What provision was made for their expenses and clothing? What problems of food-supply and peace-keeping did the holding of a Parliament at Westminster provide for the City? What role did the London M.Ps. play in the proceedings of Parliament? How concerned was the City with events taking place in Parliament?

The first question about which there is the most evidence is by no means the easiest to answer. Since 1355 the City had been represented in Parliament by four members - two Aldermen and two Commoners. When Dr. Sharpe wrote in 1895 of the election of City M.Ps. his statement was intentionally vague:

The Parliamentary elections were originally carried out by the Mayor and Aldermen and a deputation specially summoned from each ward, but the choice of members practically lay with the Mayor and Aldermen. In course of time the Commoners came to be elected by the Common Council, but the Aldermen still kept a hold on the election by nominating certain individuals of whom the citizens were to make their choice.¹

In the fifteenth century, however, the City was not the sole arbiter as to how its M.Ps. were to be elected. Since 1372 Sheriffs had been excluded from acting as M.Ps. and in 1406 Parliament decided that knights and burgesses should be chosen by free choice of the county court (in London this would be the Hustings Court) and that the return should be made on an indenture containing the names of those elected and sealed with the seals of the electors.² Hence

1. R.R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom (London, 1895), vol.III, p.469.

2. R.P. III, p.601.

subsequent writs to the Sheriffs of London enjoin that the proclamation and the election are to take place in the Hustings Court. In 1413 these statutes were confirmed and enlarged to include the provision that electors and elected were actually to be resident in the shire or borough for which they were elected.¹ This provision does not appear in the writs and seems to have been frequently ignored, if not in London. A further statute in 1445 specified the procedure to be observed by the Sheriff in greater detail; but it largely followed the lines of the 1406 statute.²

The aim of the statutes of 1406 and 1445 was, clearly, to prevent the election of M.Ps. from being monopolized by a small group of burgesses. Since any freeman could be a suitor to the County Court, he could have a say in the choice of M.Ps. and his presence there would be witnessed by his seal on the Sheriff's indenture. The problem, however, is to discover how far, if at all, London procedure in electing M.Ps. conformed to the regulations of these two statutes. Professor McKisack studied this problem and detected that in spite of the injunctions of the statutes and writs, the real elections in London took place, not in the full Hustings Court, but in the smaller bodies of the Court of Aldermen and Court of Common Council, with a proclamation and formal ratification of the election in the Hustings Court.³ These conclusions have been reinforced by the work of

1. Statutes of the Realm (1916), vol.II, p.170.

2. Ibid., pp.340-42; translated by J.C. Wedgwood, History of Parliament 1439-1509 (London, 1938), vol.I, pp.731-32.

3. McKisack, op.cit., pp.49-51.

Mr. Houghton who examined Parliamentary elections in the second half of the fifteenth century. He claims that 'particular regard was paid to the literal interpretation of the law in London, but the practice at elections was anything but legal', and that 'election procedure at London is indicative of the general tendency among the ruling class to tighten its ranks'.¹

It seems certain that, as both Professor McKisack and Mr. Houghton have pointed out, the elections in London did not take place in the Hustings Court. Whether, however, the motives for this flouting of the 1406 statute were as sinister as those suggested by Mr. Houghton, is perhaps more doubtful. Speed and convenience were as likely to affect the citizens' choice of venue for Parliamentary elections, as matters of policy. Moreover to assume that an election which took place in the Court of Common Council was less democratic than one which took place in the Court of Hustings is not necessarily justified. There is no evidence of hopeful voters being excluded from elections and, on occasions, the London populace could be very articulate on such matters. During the time of Ralph Holland's conspiracy their indignation at being excluded from the Mayoral election was frequently voiced and evidence adduced. If the election of M.Ps. was thought to have been controlled by a small monopoly the artisans would have been the first to point it out. But of such protests there is no hint.

A study of the Journals reveals that no consistent policy over the election of M.Ps. was pursued during these years, but rather the

1. K.N. Houghton, 'Theory and practice in Borough Elections to Parliament in the later Fifteenth century', B.I.H.R., vol. XXXIX (1966), pp.130-40.

manner of election varied according to convenience and circumstances. There are ~~eight~~^{nine} occasions when there are preserved both the Sheriffs' indentured return and a record of the election in the Journals, and in only one case (1447) do the dates from the two sources correspond.¹ Since it can be shown from the Hustings Rolls that meetings of the Hustings Court were always held on the dates named by the Sheriff in their indentures, it seems likely that the election was either proclaimed or ratified on the date stated by the Sheriff. But although the Hustings Rolls confirm that meetings of the Court were held on these days, there is no record in them of any activity in connection with the election of M.Ps. between the years 1406 and 1459.² Clearly, therefore, the election proper was held elsewhere.

The procedure may have been illegal: it was certainly not standardized. It might have been expected that the Court of Aldermen would choose the two aldermen M.Ps. and the Court of Common Council the commoner M.Ps. In fact it appears to have happened in this way on

-
1. For a list of the surviving returns in the P.R.O. see Appendix, ap 44.
- | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|
| P.R.O. C219/12/3 | 9 Oct. 1419 | Jour.If.60,60v. | 19,21 Sept.1419 |
| P.R.O. C219/13/5 | 6 Oct. 1427 | Jour.IIf.99v. | 16 Sept. 1427 |
| P.R.O. C219/15/1 | 19 Nov. 1436 | Jour.IIIIf.l. | 20 Nov. 1436 |
| P.R.O. C219/15/2 | 15 Jan. 1442 | Jour.IIIIf.108v. | 16 Jan. 1442 |
| P.R.O. C219/15/4 | 16 Jan. 1447- | Jour.IVf.155v. | 16 Jan.1447 |
| P.R.O. C219/15/6 | 27 Jan. 1449 | Jour.Vf.4,4v. | 22,24 Jan.1449 |
| P.R.O. C219/15/7 | 6 Oct. 1449 | Jour.Vf.14v. | 15 Oct. 1449 |
| P.R.O. C219/16/1 | 19 Oct. 1450 | Jour.Vf.47v. | 2 Oct. 1450 |
| P.R.O. C219/16/3 | 9 June 1455 | Jour.Vf.245v. | 10 June 1455 |
2. G.R.O. Hustings Rolls of Common Pleas and Pleas of Land. These are almost complete for these years.

only three occasions (1419, 1439, 1449).¹ Sometimes all four M.Ps. were chosen in the Court of Aldermen (1421, 1425, 1426, 1436),² and most frequently, on six occasions, all four M.Ps. appear to have been chosen in the Court of Common Council (1442, 1447, 1449, 1450, 1453, 1455).³ It would be possible to attach more significance to these figures if one could be convinced that the clerk who compiled the Journal took care to record carefully the nature of different meetings. His apparent lack of concern over terminology may be indicative of the general feeling in the city that what mattered was that M.Ps. should be elected rather than precisely how they were elected. Peculiarities certainly occur. At what appears to be a meeting of the Court of Aldermen in 1427 two Aldermen were recorded as having been chosen M.Ps. by the Aldermen and two Commoners 'by the commonalty'.⁴ Certainly on occasions the Aldermen prepared

-
1. 19 September 1419 Court of Common Council Jour.If.60v.
 21 September 1419 Court of Aldermen Jour.If.60.
 21 October 1439 Court of Aldermen Jour.IIIIf.25v.
 23 October 1439 Court of Common Council Jour.IIIIf.25v.
 22 January 1449 Court of Aldermen Jour.Vf.4
 24 January 1449 Court of Common Council Jour.Vf.4v.
 2. 14 April 1421, Jour.If.90; 19 March 1425, Jour.IIf.40;
 19 January 1426, Jour.IIf.62; 20 November 1436, Jour.IIIIf.1.
 3. 15 January 1442, Jour.IIIIf.108v.; 16 January 1447, Jour.IVf.155v.;
 15 October 1449, Jour.Vf.14v.; 2 October 1450, Jour.Vf.47v.;
 15 February 1453, Jour.Vf.103v.; 10 June 1455, Jour.Vf.245v.
 4. 16 September 1427, Jour.IIf.99v.

the ground; for example in a Court held on 21 January 1445 it was decided who all the four M.Ps. should be and at a Common Council held a week later the two Commoner M.Ps. whom the Aldermen had already designated, were chosen.¹ That the Common Council may have been suggestible is likely but at least from 1439 onwards its separate ratification, if not choice, of Commoner M.Ps. was sought; and in 1450 the Court of Aldermen decided that a Common Council should be held for the express purpose of electing M.Ps.²

If we can detect here more than simply a move towards greater accuracy and definition on the part of the Journals' scribe, it is a move away from control of elections by the Court of Aldermen. The Court of Common Council comes to play a greater part. On the other hand the aims of these two groups of men were not dissimilar and the practice is still a long way from the wide freeman franchise envisaged by the act of 1406. But before we condemn elections which took place in the Court of Aldermen and Court of Common Council as undemocratic, it is necessary to remember that the Common Council numbered 96 men at the beginning of this period and by 1454, if not earlier, its size had grown to 188 members.³ Hence an election which took place in a meeting of the Common Council was not the work of a small ruling clique. Table I, p.603, shows the number of non-Aldermen who attended the elections of M.Ps. during this

-
1. 21, 28 January 1445, Jour.IVf.59v.,50v.
 2. 1 October 1450, Jour.Vf,57v.
 3. See Chapter II, pp. 52-53.

period compiled from the 28 Sheriffs indentures which have survived. The smallest number of non-Aldermen recorded as attending is twelve and on one occasion there were as many as 65. There is a striking rise in attendance from the 1420s onwards reaching a peak of enthusiasm in the 1440s. Since those whose names are listed attached their seals to the other half of the indenture, it would have made a physically cumbersome document if too many eager electors had wished to attach their seals to record their presence. The indenture always closes with the words 'and many others'.

Moreover it is possible that those whose names are recorded on the indentures as having been present at elections, may not all have been Common Councilmen. In an attempt to analyse those present at elections, three of the indentures have been examined more closely, those dated 15 January 1442, c. February 1453 and 9 June 1455. These indentures were chosen because they are the nearest in date to the two (admittedly incomplete) lists of Common Councilmen of 25 October 1441 and 21 March 1454. In order to check the lists of those present at the elections not only these two lists of Common Councilmen were used, but also a card index of Londoners compiled from the six volumes of the Journals, in which any appearance as a Common Councilman was recorded. The results of these researches are tabulated in Table II, p.664. This shows that about a third of the non-Aldermen present at the election of L.Ps. were either not Common Councilmen, or else were so inconspicuous as Common Councilmen that they have left no record of their activities as such in the City's journals. It was

not, therefore, simply a small group of men, active in City business and on committees, who monopolized the election of M.Ps.

A similar picture emerges from an examination of the companies to which these non-Aldermen electors belonged. From the twentieth-eight surviving Sheriffs' indentures can be obtained the names of 390 people, other than those who were Aldermen at the time of the election, who were present at Parliamentary elections in the City between 1407 and 1455. 278 of these men belonged to the greater companies (Mercers, Drapers, Grocers, Fishmongers, Goldsmiths, Tailors, Skinners, Vintners and Ironmongers), 58 belonged to lesser companies and for 54 of them it has not been possible to trace the company. About 17% of those whose trades are known came from the lesser companies; moreover those for whom it has not been possible to trace a company are, for that reason, more likely to have belonged to the smaller companies and to have been men of less wealth and repute whose activities have gone unrecorded and whose wills were not enrolled.

A final analysis which suggests that these civic elections were not monopolized by a hard core of men representing only a minority interest, is provided by an examination of the number of times any non-Alderman is recorded as having been present at these elections. These figures are set out in Table III, p. 605, which shows that there were 184 electors who never became Aldermen and who were present only once at elections. A further 88 men were present only two or three times and the 'hard-core' comprising those who voted four times or more often, numbers only thirty or 11% of the electors who did not become Aldermen.

We may conclude therefore that the city franchise was not monopolized either by the active group within the Common Council, nor by the Aldermen, nor by the great companies, nor by a small clique who were constantly present at elections. The rather casual evidence from the Journals suggests that the holding of elections at meetings of the Common Council was for convenience rather than through sinister design. Moreover the Common Council was itself broadly based and to confine an election to a body of some 150 men was a comparatively democratic franchise in the medieval period. Finally the possibility that men who were not themselves Common Councilmen attended the elections of M.Ps. cannot be ruled out.

There is some scattered evidence to suggest, however, that towards the end of the Lancastrian period, when attendance at meetings of Parliament could mean involvement in dangerous political situations, the Aldermen began to take more trouble to record that the election of M.Ps. had taken place where the royal writ enjoined.¹ Both Professor McKisack and Mr. Houghton pointed out the discrepancy between the Sheriffs' indenture which always stated that the election had taken place in the Hustings Court in accordance with the royal writ, and the actual manner of election as recorded in the Journals.² The form that this new 'legalism' took was not to transfer the elections from the Court of Husting but rather to arrange that the Court of Common Council and Court of Husting should meet on the same day.

-
1. This development may also have owed something to the Statute of 1445, see n.2, p.325 above.
 2. McKisack, op.cit., pp.49-51; Houghton, op.cit., p.133.

Although they might be called by different names the personnel on both occasions could be the same - just as the Court of Aldermen could become the Mayor's Court to deal with certain judicial cases. In the development of this practice we see again the operation of the dictates of convenience rather than of sinister design.

In January 1447, when the writs went out to summon a Parliament to Bury St. Edmunds, for the first time a meeting of the Common Council at which the four M.Ps. were elected is recorded as having taken place on the same day (16 January) as a Hustings Court of Common Pleas. The Sheriffs' return states that the election took place in this meeting of the Hustings Court. Both the meeting of the Common Council and the meeting of the Hustings Court (at which no mention of Parliamentary elections is recorded) appear on the same page of the Journals.¹ A similar situation occurs again in 1459 when M.Ps. were chosen to attend the Coventry Parliament. The meeting on November 5th is headed 'Meeting of the Common Council and Hustings Court'.² This is a development from 1447 where the two courts, although held on the same day, were recorded as meeting separately. Perhaps because of the political situation, the King's writ is copied into the Journals - a unique instance during this period. A similar situation occurred in the following year although the

1. Jour.IVf.155v.; for the records of the Hustings Court, see Chapter II, p. 49 n.4.

2. Jour.VIf.166; unfortunately there are no Sheriffs' indentures surviving for this election or for those in 1460 and 1461.

evidence is slightly different. The Journal records that a meeting of the Common Council was held on Monday, September 22nd 1460 at which the four L.Ps. were elected.¹ In the Hustings Book, however, it is recorded that on this same day a proclamation was made and a writ read for the citizens to be elected to Parliament.² So again, as in 1447 and 1459, the two bodies coalesced. Finally in 1461, the Journal records that on Tuesday, June 9th there was a meeting of the Common Council and Court of Hustings at which the four M.Ps. were elected.³ Since the Court of Hustings was always held on a Monday this would suggest that the meeting of the Common Council at which M.Ps. were elected was coming to be called a meeting of the Hustings Court in a purely perfunctory way.

We have seen that the Aldermen occasionally suggested suitable Commoners to act as M.Ps., but this apart, we have little evidence as to how the citizens chose their representatives. On two occasions, however, it is clear that the Aldermen voted for their candidates: in January 1449 and in November 1459. It was not a secret ballot but followed the practice used when voting for a new Alderman. Above the name of the Alderman listed as present on this occasion would be the initial letter of the name of the man for whom he had given his vote.⁴ It seems more likely that it was usually an occasion

1. Jour.VIf.267.

2. G.R.O. Hustings Book, Vol.I, 1448-84, f.43v.

3. Jour.VIf.51.

4. 22 January 1449, Jour.V.f.4; 5 November 1459, Jour.VIf.166.

for volunteers rather than fierce competition. To serve as an M.P. could be expensive and was certainly time-consuming. In 1447 Henry Frowyk only agreed to serve on certain conditions¹ and in the following year John Olney was considered to be receiving a privilege when he was exonerated from serving the City in future as an M.P.² No doubt the choice was usually unanimous. On the two occasions when we have this record of voting, the candidates never vote for themselves and on the indentures returned by the Sheriffs none of the four M.Ps. is recorded as having been present at the election.

We turn now to the second question posed at the beginning of this chapter, namely what sort of men served the City as M.Ps. The two Aldermen M.Ps. were clearly substantial citizens, able and willing to bear the burdens of civic office. Their comparative wealth and social standing are not matters of debate. Of more interest, however, are the Commoner M.Ps. Between the years 1402 and 1460, 64 men served the City in this capacity of whom 35 subsequently became Aldermen. Of the remaining 29, 6 were, or became, City officials.³ This leaves 23 men who served the city as M.Ps. and

-
1. 15 January 1447, Jour.IVf.155v.
 2. 28 October 1447, Jour.IVf.199.
 3. John Prophet, M.P. 1402, 1403, City Chamberlain 1404-1416.
 John Bederenden, M.P. 1435, City Chamberlain 1420-1434.
 John Carpenter, M.P. 1437, 1439, Common Clerk 1417-1438.
 Thomas Burgoyne, M.P. 1445, Undersheriff 1434-1435, 1441 onwards.
 Thomas Billing, M.P. 1449, Common Serjeant 1443-1449, Undersheriff 1449-1450.
 John Nedeham, M.P. 1449, Common Serjeant 1449-1453.

yet never became Aldermen or City officers. Table IV, pp. 606-607 gives some indication of their standing and influence according to certain comparatively easily ascertainable criteria. Almost all of them were men of property as can be seen from the two assessments and the deeds enrolled in the Court of Eusting. Some of them, such as Hugh Ryebrede and Robert Haxton remain strangely obscure and the path by which they rose to represent the City as M.Ps. is not clear. Fourteen of them are recorded as attending elections of M.Ps. on occasions other than that on which they were chosen to serve - William Burton holding the record by attending nine times between 1413 and 1447.¹ Five of these M.Ps. served as Sheriffs, four got as far as being candidates for Aldermanries and six are known to have been Masters of their Companies. Almost all of them can be traced as Common Councilmen. There is little to suggest that they represented a body of opinion or interests alien to those of the Aldermen themselves.

But in one or two cases there is a little more evidence than can be shown on this table. Occasional signs of individuality break through the circumscribed evidence. Thomas Mayneld spent a period in Newgate in 1415 for having insulted the Alderman William Sevenoke and threatened him with the fate of Brembre.² Of more interest however is the fact that John Leving and William Cottisbroke were

-
1. Burton did not die until c.1466, Eustings Wills, vol.II, pp.555-56; he was clearly associated with the aristocracy in that Beatrix, Countess of Arundel was Godmother to his son.
 2. L.B.I. p.132; Memorials, pp.605-06.

both involved in the Ralph Holland conspiracy. John Levying was present at Christopher Water's house during the hectic planning sessions of the first half of October 1443.¹ William Cottisbroke was already one of Holland's associates by 1441. He was the popular choice for Chamberlain in September 1443 in opposition to Chichele; and, from the evidence collected by the Court of Aldermen about the conspiracy, it is clear that Cottisbroke was one of the most articulate and coherent of the conspirators. He had 'modern' ideas about the relationship of the elected and the electors and maintained that those excluded from an election were not bound to obey those elected in their absence. Moreover it was he who carried round copies of the City's Great Charter which had been confirmed in Parliament and was, therefore, thought to have a greater validity than any royal writ. It is interesting that he was elected to serve as an M.P. in 1442, in the middle of the artisan trouble which centered on Ralph Holland and at an election attended by the largest number of citizens recorded as present at any parliamentary election during this period. After 1443 Cottisbroke disappears from civic view but he is certainly the most interesting of those who served the City as Commoner M.Ps. in these years. Taken as a whole, however, these M.Ps. were of the same stuff as the Aldermen - conscientious, careful, comfortably off and moderately ambitious. They are not prominent in the affairs of

1. For an account of this conspiracy see Chapter IV.

Parliament and at home in the City they are on the whole, law-abiding and ordinary citizens.¹

The summons to a Parliament could involve the citizens in a considerable amount of expense. Not only had London a reputation to maintain as the premier city in the land, but it also sent four, rather than two, members to Parliament. It became necessary to limit the amount of cloth and fur which the M.Ps. could have at the common expense for the common glory. In 1425 it was decided that the two Aldermen M.Ps. could have ten yards of cloth each for their gowns and the Commoners, five yards each. Aldermen M.Ps. who had served as Mayor were entitled to 100/- for fur trimming, Aldermen L.Ps. who had not been Mayor 66/8d. and Commoner M.Ps. 33/4d. A certain allowance was also made for cloth for the gowns of servants. These regulations were confirmed in 1429.²

But the clothing of their M.Ps. was not the only expense which the citizens had to consider. It appears to have been necessary for the L.Ps. to have some ready cash for oiling the machinery of petitions and other general expenses. In 1426 money was granted for the expenses of the Knights in Parliament and in the following year £5 was allowed

-
1. John Abbot, William Burton and John Higham were all accused of usury in 1421 and were found guilty on some counts. William Mitchell and John Whatele were two of the Commoners assigned to try the usury cases, Cal.P. and l. 1413-37, pp.95-109.
 2. 20 April 1425, Jour.IIf.41; 12 August 1429, L.B.K. p.101; the particulars of these regulations are set out by Sharpe, op.cit., vol.I, p.274. In 1439 the livery allowance for Sir William Estfield was doubled because he was a Knight, 21 October 1439, Jour.IIIIf.25v.

for the M.Ps.¹ In 1440 the Chamber of the City was so impoverished that a special Common Council was summoned to consider how to raise the money for the expenses of the City's M.Ps. at the Reading Parliament.²

On 1st February 1445 it was decided by Common Council that 500 marks would be needed to promote the City's business in the next Parliament, summoned to meet on February 25th. It was decided that this money should be raised by ward assessments and the sum was subsequently increased to £500. But the need was urgent and the money from the wards could not be raised until June, so certain City Companies provided over £400 until the money should be collected from the wards.³ Of this £500, £100 still remained unspent in January 1447 and Common Council agreed that this should be used for the expenses of the new Parliament at Bury St. Edmunds, but it was reiterated that the money was only lent to the Chamber and was to be returned, ultimately, to the citizens.⁴ It seems that John Olney the Mayor at this time also provided £100 towards the expenses of Parliament for, although the Chamber subsequently refused to acknowledge any obligation for Olney's loan, he was, in October 1448,

-
1. 6 April 1426, Jour.IIf.85v.; 20 August 1427, Jour.IIf.96v.
 2. 8 January 1440, Jour.IIIIf.33v.
 3. 1, 20 February 1445, Jour.IVf.62, 64v.-65; ward assessment, Jour.IVf.82v.
 4. 24, 26 January 1447, Jour.IVf.158,158v.; if the Chamberlain retired he was still to be held responsible for repaying this £100.

exonerated from any liability to serve the City as an M.P.¹ Similarly in February 1449 John Chichele the Chamberlain, was authorized to borrow £20 from the City's finances to give to the M.Ps. but he was to be responsible for repaying the sum and for rendering an account.² This £20 was to be borrowed from £500 which had previously been raised for a different purpose and when, in May, Parliament was adjourned from London to Winchester, the Common Council authorized the Chamberlain to borrow a further £100 from this source provided that he produced a written obligation for repayment.³

Perhaps because of these somewhat hard to mouth measures, usually provoked by the summoning or prorogation of Parliament to a town away from London, it was decided by Common Council in April 1450 that in future, London M.Ps. were to receive 40/- a day when Parliament sat at some place remote from the City.⁴ When, however, Parliament

-
1. 28 October 1447, Olney exonerated, Jour.IVf.199; 6 February 1449, the auditors declared that the Chamber had not acknowledged liability for Olney's loan, Jour.Vf.5v.
 2. 11 February 1449, Jour.Vf.6.
 3. 30 May 1449, the money was lent on the same terms as the £100 provided in January 1447 for the Bury St. Edmunds Parliament, Jour.Vf.10; in August 1449 John Norman, one of the City's M.Ps. was paid £10 for his Parliamentary expenses, Jour.Vf.13v.
 4. 1 April 1450, Jour.Vf.32; L.B.K., pp.330-31. The kind of problem which these remote Parliaments could provide may be seen from the case of Henry Frowyk who was elected as an M.P. to the Bury St. Edmunds Parliament in January 1447. He agreed to serve only on condition that he was assured of sufficient lodging and heating for himself and his servants. Jour.IVf.155v.

was summoned to Coventry in 1459 it was decided that since this was such a long way from the City the four M.Ps. were to have their 40/- a day but with the proviso that if it seemed necessary they would be given more.¹ This was the case for, in September 1460, the Chamberlain agreed to pay the M.Ps. their extra expenses.²

If the holding of a Parliament away from London involved the citizens in considerable extra expense (e.g. Reading 1446, Bury St. Edmunds 1447, Leicester 1450 and Coventry 1459), the holding of a Parliament at Westminster provided the City rulers with problems of food supply and peace-keeping. The influx of lords and their retainers and of M.Ps. and their servants could cause serious problems for the City. In 1406 the Court of Aldermen clearly expected trouble, for it was decided that armed men should patrol the wards during the sitting of Parliament and a lighted lantern was to be hung outside every house.³ In the same way a Common Council was summoned in January 1454 to discuss how to maintain good order and peace in the City during the meetings of Council and Parliament.⁴ That such efforts were not always successful can be seen from the extensive rioting which took place at the meeting of Parliament in the Autumn of 1450.⁵ Such sessions were, however, normally welcomed by

-
1. 8 November 1459, Jour.VIf.166v.
 2. 5 September 1460, the Chamberlain agreed to pay the money in instalments - the first before 2 February 1461 and the second before 1 August 1461, Jour.VIf.204.
 3. Mayoral precept, 26 February 1406, L.B.I., p.45.
 4. 19 January 1454, Jour.Vf.142v.
 5. Great Chronicle p.185; Bale p.136.

London traders who benefited from this increased demand not only for food but also for clothing and services. In times of scarcity, however, this influx of people could present problems and in 1435 a special licence was issued to two men to bring 1000 quarters of wheat from Wiltshire and Yorkshire to London to provide for the large numbers of people attending Parliament and Convocation.¹

By comparison with their wealth and influence the role played by the London M.Ps. in Parliament is comparatively unimportant, or at least, no record of it has survived. No Londoner was chosen to be Speaker of the Commons in this period although Sir Thomas Charleton who was Speaker in 1453-4 was related to the man of the same name who was Mayor of the City 1449-50.² In 1404 three of the four Treasurers chosen by the Commons were Londoners although none of them was currently an M.P. John Hadley and Richard Merlawe had both served in this capacity although Thomas Knolles, the third London Treasurer, had never been an M.P.³ William Staundon and Nicholas Wotton, the two Aldermen M.Ps. in the Parliament of 1406 were members of the committee appointed to be present during the compilation of the Parliament roll.⁴ Although the references to the activities of

1. 25 October 1435, C.P.R. 1429-36, p.489.

2. See Sylvia L. Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London (Paperback edn. Ann Arbor 1962), p.330; J.S. Roskell, The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments 1376-1523 (Manchester 1965), pp.255-57, 352-53.

3. Cal.Fine Rolls 1399-1405, p.253.

4. R.P. III p.585. On this question of Burgess activity in Parliament see McKisack, op.cit., chap.VII.

City M.Ps. are so meagre one is left with the impression, but not the evidence, that London M.Ps. played a greater part in the deliberations of Parliament than can be proved. Their knowledge of continental affairs and of royal finance cannot have been ignored and although meetings of Parliament may not have been for them the great occasions which they were for lowlier burgess M.Ps. such evidence as we have does suggest that the London M.Ps. attended meetings of Parliament conscientiously.

For 21 of the Parliaments held between the years 1416 and 1460 it is possible to check the attendances of the Aldermen M.Ps. by comparing the dates of Parliamentary sessions with attendance charts for the Court of Aldermen (see Table V, p. 608). In all, forty sessions of Parliament were involved and in only nine of these sessions is there any record of either Aldermen attending a meeting of the Court while Parliament was sitting; moreover on only three occasions did both Aldermen leave Parliament at the same time. Since eight of these nine sessions were held at Westminster it would be very easy for the Alderman M.Ps. both to attend the Court of Aldermen and conscientiously carry out his duties in Parliament. It is more than likely that Robert Clopton appeared in the Court of Aldermen on February 1 during the session of Parliament held in Reading in January-February 1440, in order to report on events there and, perhaps, to receive new instructions. In fact the striking correlation of Alderman M.Ps.' absences from the Court, with sessions of Parliament, is one of the few pieces of evidence which remains to indicate that

the City's M.Ps. were assiduous in their attendance at Parliament, and, if constantly present, it seems reasonable to assume that they were also active, influential and vociferous.

The main concern of the City during this period was the problem of competition from foreign merchants and the attendant dues and taxes which those merchants who traded in England, and particularly in the City, should pay. These problems are examined elsewhere.¹ But even if the City's sphere of activity tended to be dominated by self-interest, within this sphere the citizens took considerable trouble to prepare bills, organize a 'party' in the house and brief the City's M.Ps. In 1426 when Parliament was summoned to Leicester (this venue was chosen largely because the Londoners had taken sides during the Gloucester/Beaufort struggle) all four M.Ps. were present at the Court of Aldermen on March 26th to report on events during the first session of Parliament. Three years later the City organized a petition to the Commons in order to get the statute of 7 Henry IV repealed which had enjoined that only those parents who had land or rent to the value of £2/-p.a. might place their children as apprentices. This cut across an ancient privilege of Londoners that every freeman of the City might place his child as an apprentice. The citizens' petition was successful and the statute was repealed.² But this result had not been achieved without expense on the part of the City. The Grocers Company contributed 40/- 'also payed to William Estffeld mayr For costes off our parte off Repelying off ye statut off

1. See Chapter VI. pp. 365-378.

2. Statutes of the Realm (1816), vol. II, pp. 157-58; L.B.K., pp. 104-5; P.R.O. Ancient Petition 4238; R.P. IV, p. 354; see Chapter III. p. 211.

prentysbodys';¹ and the Taylors contributed £4 'for discharging statute of apprentices against the king'.² On the day before Parliament assembled in November 1439 it was decided by the Court of Aldermen that certain citizens should meet to discuss those matters which it would be useful to the City and kingdom if they were brought up in Parliament by Sir William Estfeld and his fellow M.Ps.³ The Londoners continued to take a keen interest in these events of this Parliament and, during its second session at Reading, the Court of Aldermen deliberated whether the Recorder should ride to Parliament to help to prosecute the City's business.⁴ Perhaps instead of this in February it was decided that a letter of instruction should be sent to Estfeld.⁵ Finally, after Parliament had been dissolved on February 26th Estfeld and Clopton reported on the proceedings in Parliament, to the Court of Aldermen.⁶ This agitation was probably concerned with the petition which the City had put to the Commons about the conservancy of the Thames. This was finally granted by the King, albeit in a limited form.⁷ There were, however, other matters decided upon in this Parliament which would have concerned

-
1. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, vol.II, f.204.
 2. Merchant Taylors' Hall, MS.A 4 Accounts 1397-1445, f.207v.
 3. Jour.III f.29.
 4. Jour.III f.34.
 5. Jour.III f.35v, the date is given as Thursday February 30th which must be a scribe's error.
 6. Jour.III f.37v.
 7. See Chapter VI, pp. 561.

some, at least, of the citizens. More stringent regulations were introduced safeguarding the Calais monopoly of exports, foreign merchants were to be subject to stricter control, uniform standards of measure were to be maintained for cloth, wine, oil and honey, and a bill asking for freer trade in corn within England was refused. In the succeeding Parliament held in the early months of 1442 the Court of Aldermen decided to propose bills in Parliament against the royal charters granted to winedrawers, woolpackers and chalkers, and also against privileged places like St. Martin's which provided sanctuaries for robbers.¹ There is no record of such petitions either enrolled on the Parliament roll nor surviving amongst the Ancient Petitions in the P.R.O.; so such bills were, clearly, unsuccessful.

During the Parliament of 1453-4, which had three sessions in all, it was decided in Common Council that a common petition being discussed by Parliament and dealing with the process of prosecuting bills of attainder, was contrary to the City's liberties.² The City's M.Ps. were instructed, therefore to frustrate this common petition when Parliament reassembled. Their expenses were to be borne by the Commonalty.³ These efforts appear to have been successful for there

1. See Chapter VI, pp.380,384,401.

2. A writ of attainder was issued to enquire whether a jury had given a false verdict, so that the judgment could be reversed if necessary. How the City's liberties were threatened is not clear.

3. Jour.Vf.123, 129v.

is no record of such a petition on the Parliament roll. Such success may have been partly due to the favour of the Speaker, Thomas Charleton, who was sent a gift of red and white wine during February for his many services and good will both past and to come and especially for his services in the 'present parliament'.¹

Before the largely Yorkist Parliament met in the Autumn of 1460 a committee of two Aldermen and four Common Councilmen was appointed to consider which causes, matters and bills for the good of the City should be presented in Parliament.² In fact the main concern of this Parliament was the Duke of York's claim to the throne and it does not appear from the Parliament roll that any business which concerned the City specifically was transacted.

Again in 1461 during Edward IV's first Parliament, the City was not slow to try to press its advantage. The Court of Aldermen decided to put bills to the King in Parliament asking to be allowed to recoup some debts from the Earl of Wiltshire's confiscated lands.³ At the same time, however, the Hanse merchants were trying to get their trading privileges in England confirmed and had put a bill up to Parliament to achieve this end.⁴ The Londoners hastily appointed a committee of four Aldermen and eleven Common Councilmen to resist

-
1. 18 February 1454, Jour.Vf.149. This session of Parliament began on 14 February and continued until 17 April 1454.
 2. Jour.VIf.272.
 3. Jour.VIf.76.
 4. See C.L. Scofield, The Life and Reign of Edward IV (London, 1923) vol.I, pp.196-97.

this bill. One of the Common Councilmen even provided a loan of £20 towards the expenses of the committee.¹ The City drafted its own bill on this subject which was first drawn up by the Court of Aldermen, then shown to the City's counsel and finally presented to the King, Lords and Commons in Parliament. It seems that the Commons adopted the cause of the Londoners but Edward, in direct opposition to their wishes, confirmed the Hanse privileges until Christmas 1462. None of this appears in the Parliament roll.

There is only one case on record in which the citizens seem to have taken a disinterested concern in the affairs of Parliament. Usually the City was only roused to action in defence of its liberties and privileges, but on this occasion the Londoners appear to have acted out of chivalry. In the spring of 1428 the citizens decided to petition Parliament on behalf of the Duke of Gloucester's neglected and rejected wife, Jaqueline Duchess of Hainault. The petition appears to have had little effect upon Gloucester's policy and he finally married his mistress Eleanor Cobham in the same year.²

But it was not only the City in its corporate capacity which was concerned with events taking place in Parliament. Some of the company accounts reveal that the City Companies took trouble to influence events in Parliament when their interests were affected. The motives which lay behind such payments are sometimes obscured, as,

1. Jour.VI f.76v.

2. 8 March 1428, L.B.K., p.68.

for example, when the Grocers paid £6.13.4. to Robert Chichele by common consent for the Shrewsbury session of Parliament in January 1398.¹ At the time of the Bury St. Edmunds Parliament the Mercers paid £10.19.2. for unspecified 'costs of Parliament'.² Matters which concerned the Grocers' Company were clearly under review in the Parliament of 1453 for the Company paid for boat-hire and wine 'for matters in the Parliament'.³

The Brewers' accounts reveal that they waged a long campaign to try to establish that a quarter of malt should consist of 8 bushels of clean malt; for when the malt was sold uncleaned the Brewers got less for their quarter. In the first year of Henry VI's reign the London Brewers petitioned the King saying that they had previously petitioned Parliament but that on that occasion self-interested persons who sold malt had had the Brewers' petition put aside.⁴ Clearly the royal response to this petition was unsatisfactory; for, ten years later, the Company was paying to have fourteen copies of a bill made 'for to have eight bushels of clean malt'.⁵

-
1. The London M.P. at this time was William Chichele, also a Grocer, and the two men were brothers. This may be a mistake in the Grocers' records, or it is possible that Robert received the money for his brother, Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, vol.I, f.81.
 2. Mercers' Hall, Warden's Accounts 1347-1464, f.161.
 3. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, vol.II, f.347; the total outlay on wine and boat-hire was 8d. This could, perhaps, be connected with the attempt by the Grocers to get the Italian merchants to garble their spices, R.P., V, p.32.
 4. Guildhall Library, Ms.5440, Brewers Accounts Book f.77v.-78.
 5. *Ibid* f.203v.; the total cost involved was amounted to 7/4d. In the following year the company paid 1/1¹/₂d for a bushel that was made after the standard of Westminster, *Ibid* f.225.

Moreover even where no Company accounts survive there are ancient petitions in the P.R.O. and the Parliament Rolls which bear witness to the activities of the City Companies in Parliament. The quarrel between the Goldsmiths and the Cutlers led to three petitions to the Parliament of 1403-4¹ and the Cordwainers petitioned the King, Lords and Commons to make an act preventing foreigners from becoming Cordwainers under threat of a £20 fine on the grounds that the young men who could not get jobs were 'idle and turn to thieving'.² Moreover the native weavers of London took their case against the foreign weavers to Parliament but, in the end, they were unable to prevent the foreign weavers from forming a separate guild of their own.³

-
1. The quarrel was caused by the Goldsmiths' claim to search the gold and silver work executed by the Cutlers on knives. The Goldsmiths appear to have asserted their right of search successfully, Cal. Charter Rolls 1341-1417, p.424; P.R.O. Ancient Petitions 5070, 6042, 9889; R.P. III, p.536-37. See O. Welch, History of the Cutlers' Company of London (London, 1916), vol.I, pp.106-10, 273-81.
 2. P.R.O. Ancient Petition 1323, which is undated but it is similar in purport to a petition put up by the Cordwainers to the Mayor and Aldermen, 6 April 1451, L.B.K., pp.335-37.
 3. c.1407 the English Weavers persuaded the Commons to adopt their petition against the Foreign Weavers as a Common petition. The English Weavers requested that the Foreign Weavers, who had been exempted by Edward III, should come under their own control and so contribute towards the farm payable to the King since the reign of Henry II. The Royal Council was authorized by Parliament to deal with the case and the Archbishop and others decided accordingly that the English Weavers should enjoy all their charters and confirmations. Edward III's charter to the Foreign Weavers was to be revoked, P.R.O. Council Proceedings C49/13/13 and Ancient Petitions 4239, 7494, R.P. IV, p.50. The ordinances of the English Weavers were confirmed by the Mayor and Aldermen, 20 November 1407, L.B.I., p.62. But c.1432 the Foreign Weavers petitioned the Duke of Bedford to confirm Edward III's letters patent, P.R.O. Ancient Petition 6094. Their petition appears to have been successful since royal writs were issued 1 November 1432, 1 March 1433 instructing the Mayor and Aldermen to enforce the Letters Patent of Edward III, L.B.K., pp. 150-51, 167. By 1441 the Foreign Weavers had ordinances of their own and the right of search, L.B.K., p.255-4.

Moreover the early Parliaments of Edward IV saw a number of petitions from London Companies to the Commons.¹

The actual drafting of Parliamentary bills and the necessary research could be an expensive business for the Companies. Occasionally a petition was drafted which was presented to the Mayor for him to put - presumably as a City petition - to the Parliament. This is what the Grocers did in 1461-2.² But, more often, the Companies appear to have presented their petitions directly. When the Pewterers wanted a charter for their craft to have the right of search throughout England in 1452-3, they paid two men five shillings to do the necessary research among statutes and other records with 'the entent to labour to the Parliament'.³ In fact the Company did not get the charter which they sought until 1473, although, ten years after their first attempt, the Company paid 10/8d. to men of counsel for drafting a bill and 'in expenses done on such as should put it up'.⁴ The Mercers' Company appear to have been particularly concerned about the privileges enjoyed by the Hanse merchants and at a meeting of their court held sixteen days before Edward's coronation, they decided that the Wardens and eight others should 'devise a bill for the Parliament' at the common cost. The Company's accounts make clear

-
1. Parliament 1463-4 received petitions from 'Artificers and Handymen' and from the Silkwomen, P.R.O. Ancient Petitions 1410, 1411, 1412, R.P. V, pp.506-07; Parliament 1464 received petitions from the Patymakers, the Horners and Cordwainers, P.R.O. Ancient Petitions 1420, 1421, R.P. V, pp.566-68.
 2. Guildhall Library, Ms.11571/2 Grocers' Accounts 1461-1471, f.18v.
 3. Guildhall Library, Ms.7086/1 Pewterers' Accounts, f.8.
 4. Ibid., f.24v. See also C. Welch, History of the Worshipful Company of Pewterers (London, 1902), vol.I, p.19.

that this was a bill against the 'Esterlings' i.e. the Hanse merchants and it was probably the Mercers who stimulated the City into taking the action which has been noted above.¹ Perhaps the most revealing statement comes from an account roll of the Cutlers' Company. During Edward's first Parliament in 1461 they paid £5.5.8. in expenses 'in suing certain matters in Parliament for the weal and profit of the said craft of Cutlers and in money given to divers persons to show their good wills and to be friendly and solicitors in the same matters'.² This element of bribery was ever present. The City gave gifts to Thomas ~~Chalton~~^{Charleton} the Speaker in the Parliament of 1453-4; and the Mercers paid 6/8d. to Whitokesmede 'for being our "amy" in the Parliament' of 1455-6.³ On this occasion, however, it appears that the Mercers were anxious about matters of national rather than

-
1. Laetitia Lyell and F.D. Watson, eds., Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company 1453-1527 (Cambridge, 1936), p.50; Mercers' Accounts, op.cit., f.202. The Company paid 1/8d. for making a bill against the Esterlings. In the Mercers' Accounts for 2-3 Edward IV there is recorded the payment of 1/4d. 'for writing two bills of Parliament House', f.205v.
 2. Guildhall Library, Ms.7146 Cutlers' Rolls no.11. It is not clear what the Cutlers were hoping to achieve by this outlay for there is nothing to their advantage to be found on the Parliament or Patent rolls.
 3. Mercers' Accounts, op.cit., f.183v. The Company also paid 13/4d. to the City Recorder for delivering two of the Company's supplications, one to the King and the other to the Commons. John Whittocksmead was L.P. for Calne in the Parliament and his good offices may have been sought since he was a Serjeant at Arms. For his biography see Wedgwood, op.cit., vol.II, pp.944-45.

parochial interest for their complaints were concerned with the heavy burden of the wool subsidy and the failure of the King to guard the seas.¹

Occasionally the Companies took trouble to get copies made of Parliamentary acts. The Mercers paid 4d. for a copy of the Parliamentary grant of a subsidy of 3/4d. to the King in 1455 and the Brewers in 1429-30 paid 2/- to have a French copy of the new statute of labourers together with an English translation.²

Although the City as a whole appears to have treated the election of M.Ps. and the events in Parliament with a certain restraint there are signs that amongst the populace at large Parliament was beginning to have an image which was venerated and respected. The evidence for such an impression can only be of a scattered kind, but there are straws in the wind. A loan which was guaranteed by Parliament was more readily granted.³ The Genoese desired that the final agreement with the City over the scavage dispute should not only be exemplified under the common seal of the City but should also be confirmed in

-
1. Mercers' Accounts, op.cit., f.183v. The drafting of these bills cost the Company 13/4d. There is no record of any petition dealing with the seas although a Lord's Committee was appointed to examine the matter, R.P. V, pp.279-80. A request by the Commons for an extension of the exemption of natives from paying some of the wool subsidy, was objected to by the Lords and refused by the King, R.P. V, p.331.
 2. Mercers' Accounts, op.cit., f.183v. Brewers' Accounts, op.cit., f.165v. The 'new' statute of Labourers referred to is, presumably that of 1423 which was made permanent in 1429, Statutes of the Realm (1816), vol.II, pp.225, 244.
 3. E.g. Common Council agreed to lend a further 2000 marks to the King on having the security of a Parliamentary guarantee, 24 March 1442, Jour.IIIIf.114v.

Parliament.¹ The Girdlers' Company took the trouble to get their ordinances for the good government of their mystery confirmed in Parliament.² The Brewers in 1438 paid money to an agent John Brook 'for to get to us friendship for to have our charter confirmed by the Parliament.'³ The largely illiterate artisans who rebelled against the civic authority in 1443 were aware of the distinction between the King's writ and the City charter which had the greater validity through having been confirmed in Parliament.⁴ There are indications also of the nascent idea of the responsibility of M.Ps. to their electorate, to be seen in the reporting back to the Court of Aldermen by the M.Ps., and in the complaints of two London skimmers who accused John Sturgeon, one of the City's M.Ps. in the Parliament of 1445, of having done much harm in Parliament contrary to the good of the City.⁵ In this same year John Bale a London tailor quarrelled with Carolus de Contaryn a Venetian merchant about some red dye which Contaryn had sold to him. When Bale claimed that the dye was defective, Carolus had replied that this was no concern of his. The indignant Bale then said that he would like Carolus to declare that in Parliament whereupon the shameless Venetian is reported as saying 'I care nat

1. 13 November 1454, Jour.Vf.206v.-207.

2. L.B.I., p.158; R.P. IV, pp.73-74.

3. Brewers' Accounts, op.cit., f.328. The Charter to the Company was dated 22 February 1438, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.142. There is no record of a Parliamentary confirmation.

4. See Chapter IV, p.313.

5. Jour.IVf.119v.

for the parlement of a strawe, do yo^r best and youre worste for the brasill; I set nat by the parlement for al that ye can do to me for this matere, do youre best and your worste^t. From the subsequent account it is clear that these denigratory words about Parliament were Carolus^t greatest sin, by comparison with which the defective red dye paled into insignificance.¹ Whether the London eyes looking to Parliament were self interested, hopeful, selfish, rebellious or simply visionary, it was, nevertheless, upon this institution that their gaze was becoming fixed.

1. 18 November 1445, Jour.IVf.107v.

CHAPTER VILONDON AND THE CROWN, 1400-1450: THE CITY AS SUBJECT

The ways in which the Crown could interfere in the government of the City were manifold and there was no sphere in which the Londoners could act independently of the Crown, for all their rights and privileges stemmed from royal grant. Royal intervention was, however, in some matters an accepted and regular hazard. In the administration of justice and the business of keeping the peace in the City, for example, the Crown's interest in, and ultimate authority over, these matters was acknowledged. For this reason these are best discussed in the chapter dealing with the government of the City. But there were four outstanding matters which arose during these years in which either the City needed royal support particularly or the Crown flouted the City's desires flagrantly. These matters were the exercise of the City's rights in the Thames, the position of foreign merchants living in London, the grants of monopolies by the Crown and the privileges claimed by the sanctuary of St. Martin's. All the disputes or troubles extended over a period of years and serve to reveal the City's dependence upon the Crown and the limitations which Charter and custom imposed upon the Londoners' freedom.

* * * * *

Since 1237 the City had exercised jurisdiction over the Thames as far up river as Staines and over the waters of the Medway. This jurisdiction covered such matters as the types of net to be used when fishing and the problems caused by the erection of fish weirs which later impeded navigation and caught fish before they had spawned. In other parts of the country the jurisdiction in these matters was exercised by Justices of the Peace.¹

In August 1406 the Mayor of London carried out an extensive scrutiny of the Thames to enquire into the devices used to destroy young fish. He was aided by the Sheriffs of the counties of Middlesex, Surrey, Essex and Kent and by City Companies including the Tailors and Mercers.² The operation seems to have taken the form of an armed expedition and there was a considerable amount of local resistance to the destruction of fish weirs, but they were destroyed, one chronicler writes 'because they were against the commonalty and franchise of London'.³

1. Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, p.71, n.2.

2. 13 August 1406, ibid., pp.282-83. 18 June 1406, Royal writs to the Sheriffs instructing them to help the Mayor, L.B.I., p.47. The Mercers paid 25/5d. in costs 'about the weirs', Accounts i, f.45. The Tailors paid a total of £12 12s.0d. which included the purchase of gunpowder, dinners, cheese, garlic onions and salt, Accounts i f.36v.

3. Great Chron., p.86; Julius B.II p.64; Gregory, p.104; Vitellius F.XII p.10 records that a great dispute arose between Thomas Arundel, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Londoners on this account, but that the City of London recovered its rights by virtue of the King's charter and statutes.

In February 1407 the City's water bailiff, Alexander Boner, was attacked by the men of Kent and Essex when he was destroying some nets of the incorrect gauge. The City took the case to the King's Council and the royal sergeant at arms was sent to arrest the twenty-eight principal offenders. The case was examined by the Duke of York and Lords Roos and Burnell. Under this awesome pressure the offenders submitted and their nets were restored to them on condition that they provided themselves with ones of the correct type by Easter.¹ The scale of the resistance, possibly encouraged by the Archbishop of Canterbury, had forced the City to turn to the King for help.

In 1414 the City petitioned the King in Parliament to destroy the weirs in the Thames - presumably those that lay outside the City's jurisdiction. The King's answer was equivocal and unsatisfactory.² It appears that this failure to get adequate royal help may have led to some decline in diligence on the Mayor's part. In 1421 the Thames fishermen petitioned the Commons about the Mayor's failure to deal satisfactorily with the widespread use of trynk nets (nets of a small gauge hence liable to catch very young fish). In reply the King enjoined the Mayor to search the Thames diligently twice a year on pain of a 100 mark fine.³

-
1. L.B.I., pp.58-59; P.P.C. I, pp.298-300, 19 February 1407.
 2. R.P. IV, p.36. The King's answer was that the Mayor was to exercise his powers of conservancy with those whom the King would appoint.
 3. R.P. IV, p.132. 11 June 1421, the Duke of Bedford sent a writ to the Mayor informing him of the King's decision in Parliament, L.B.I. p.256. 22 July 1421, the Sheriff of Middlesex was also to proclaim the ordinance of the last Parliament about the protection of fish in the Thames, and to ensure that the peace was not broken while the ordinance was being executed, L.B.I., p.257.

As a result of this royal pressure a full scale search of the Thames and Medway waters which lay within the City's jurisdiction was carried out. Illegal weirs and small gauge trynk nets were to be destroyed. The City Companies again provided help for the Mayor and the Brewers' clerk has preserved a vivid account of the City mustering its forces in boats. At a meeting of the Common Council it had been decided that twenty six Companies should go with the Mayor to carry out the search. The Brewers took a joint barge with the Girdlers, Fletchers, Salters, Barbers, Dyers and Tallow Chandlers.¹ The search extended westwards as far as Kingston and eastwards to Greenwich. The Brewers' costs were at least £4 16s.; the Tailors paid over £20 in labours over the weirs and the Grocers and Mercers each contributed over £10.² The City followed up this activity with an ordinance forbidding the fixing of trynk nets in the river but allowed their use under certain specified conditions.³ In December 1422 the King asked the City for information about the regulations governing the size and use of trynk nets and a return was duly made stating City custom.⁴

-
1. Guildhall Library Ms.5440, Brewers' Account Book, f.56v-57. The Fletchers did not come in person on the grounds that they were too busy making artillery for the King, but the Brewers' clerk notes with some satisfaction that they had, nevertheless, to pay their share.
 2. Tailors' Accounts i f.127, total costs £21 11s.0d. Grocers total costs were £10 13s.11d., Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, vol.I, f.136, 143. Mercers costs £14 5s.4d., Accounts i, f.81. The Drapers contributed 50s. for costs about the weirs with the Mayor in September 1423, Johnson, Drapers' Accounts, vol.I, p.290.
 3. November 1421, L.B.K., pp.6-7.
 4. 10 December 1422, ibid., p.6.

In the Parliament of 1423 a statute was passed which forbade the fixing of trynk nets to posts or boats.¹ Moreover a petition from the Commons asking the King to deal with illegal weirs and trynk nets outside the jurisdiction of the City, implies that within its own sphere the City was considered to have carried out its obligations adequately.²

But in 1424 the Mayor of London had to be again pricked into action by a writ from the King which instructed him to carry out the provisions of the ordinance of 1421 and the statute of 1423.³ As a result of this there is some record of activity to be found in the Journals. Illegal nets were to be burnt and various owners of them appeared in court.⁴ Such men continued to be rounded up well into 1425 and a trickle of prosecutions and the seizing of nets continued.⁵ But the Mayor and citizens clearly considered that the powers granted

-
1. Statutes of the Realm (1816), vol.II, pp.225-26.
 2. R.P. IV, pp.255-56. The King agreed to send a commission to enquire into offences committed outside the City's jurisdiction.
 3. 4 September 1424, L.B.K., p.31.
 4. Jour.II f.20v., 27.
 5. 24 January 1425, 8 fishermen mainpernored, Jour.II f.32v.
5 February 1425, the 8 men promised not to use trynk nets again, Jour.II f.34. April 1425, the men were fined £5 each, Jour.II f.41.
26 July, 27 August 1426, William Tallworth seized several nets, Jour.II f.80v. 14 December 1426, John Godfrey in court for catching a salmon called a 'kipper'. He was sent to prison and his net was burnt. Together with four other fishermen he swore not to catch fish out of season in future, and to inform the Mayor if anyone else did so, Jour.II f.87.

to them were inadequate. In 1427 they petitioned the King in Parliament to give them powers as Justices of the Peace, to execute the statutes about weirs and trynk nets. The City would not allow justices into the City to execute the statute in the areas under their conservancy, on the other hand their own powers were not adequate to enforce the statutes. The King's reply was to ask the City to display proofs and evidences.¹ But there is no record of the City's powers being extended and the fishermen with their illegal nets continued to appear in court. These comprised, no doubt, a small proportion of those who used such nets.² Finally, however, in 1439 the Mayor and citizens, after further petitioning the King in Parliament, were granted power as Justices to execute the statutes within the area of their conservancy - but only until the next Parliament.³ But in October 1444 the City received an additional charter whereby the Mayor and those Aldermen who had served as Mayor were given powers as Justices of the Peace.⁴ In this way the City's hand was considerably strengthened in trying to preserve the Thames conservancy.

1. R.P. IV, p.330.

2. 9 September 1427, 2 fishermen, Jour.II f.99; 30 July 1428, 8 fishermen Jour.II f.117v.; 14 October 1428, John Frost appeared for the third offence, Jour.II f.123; 21 January 1429, John Poleyn, Jour.II f.129v.; 7 December 1437, Robert Henton, Jour.III f.185; 8 March 1438, Robert Shirborne, Jour.III f.178v.

3. R.P. V, p.34. 22 April 1441, the Mayor's powers were extended by a commission to enquire into offences against the statutes in the waters of the Thames and Medway, not only in the area of the London conservancy, but also in Kent, Surrey, and Middlesex, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.573. In September 1442 a search of the Thames waters was arranged, Jour.III f.151.

4. Cal. Charter Rolls 1427-1516, vol.VI, pp.41-4; @.R.O. Chater 55.

In August 1445, however, the Mayor John Reynwell and the Water Bailiff William Veyse had clearly met with a considerable amount of resistance when carrying out the scrutiny. Many of the nets which had been confiscated had been recaptured and on 18 August the Court of Aldermen decided to seek the help of the Lord Chancellor.¹ Several of those using illegal nets had come from Erith and the Bailiff there was bound over to keep the peace.² Much of the work of seizing illegal nets had been done by John Russell, one of the permanent Serjeants at Mace serving the Mayor, and it was decided that his actions should be defended at the expense of the commonalty.³ The occasion provided something of a free for all. Richard Seebur who was sent to Newgate for using a casting net was also accused of inciting the Duke of Norfolk's servants to attack Richard, one of the servants of the Water Bailiff, William Veyse, and seize a confiscated net from him.⁴

There are records of searches carried out in 1449 by two Aldermen and in 1453 by the Chamberlain.⁵ In 1454 there was a further major

-
1. Jour.IV f.89v. 5 fishermen who had been using trynk nets appeared in court 12 August 1445, and three of them were granted bail the next day, Jour.IV f.88v., 89v.
 2. Robert Hynd or Hend, Bailiff of Erith mainpernored, 20 August 1445, Jour.IV f.91; 1 October 1445 he was bound over to keep the peace under penalty of £10, Jour.IV f.98.
 3. 27 October 1445, Jour.IV f.102v. Russell was defended by William Moyle, Serjeant at Law, who received 40^s from the Chamber in payment of his services, 7 December 1446, Jour.IV f.152.
 4. 14 December 1445, Jour.IV f.110.
 5. 27 August 1449, John Sutton and William Cantelowe appointed, Jour.V f.14. 12 September 1453, Chamberlain appointed, Jour.V f.120v. 6 April 1453, six fishermen from Chiswick were found to have illegal nets, Jour.V f.108.

scrutiny of the Thames. The search to the west in the counties of Surrey and Middlesex was to be held on August 12 and that of the Thames to the east was to be done before September 8.¹ Sixteen Companies were to provide sixty eight men between them, who were required for three days, so arrangements had to be made for provisioning them. This scrutiny received the support of the Duke of York, who sent a writ to his tenants and servants in Erith to assist the Mayor, and from the King who sent writs to the Justices in Kent and Essex.²

But in spite of this help from high places the scrutiny did not go smoothly. The greatest resistance came not from those using illegal nets but from the wardens or owners of illegal fish weirs. By 30 September it was decided that a separate expedition to destroy these weirs was necessary and the six men who had been appointed to carry out this task reported to the Court of Aldermen on 4 October that they had been successful in destroying weirs everywhere except in parts of Kent.³ At the weir belonging to William Wangford near Northflete in Kent the Londoners had encountered archers and armed men and the local inhabitants had called out 'Hence traitors of London'. As a result of their resistance the weir remained intact.⁴ A hastily-summoned Common Council decided to send an armed expedition to destroy the weir, consisting of four Aldermen and eight Common Councilmen who were provided

-
1. 29 July, 5 and 16 August 1454, Jour.V f.180v., 182v., 184v.
 2. 20, 21, 29 August, 5, 20, 23, 26 September 1454, Jour.V f.185v., 186, 187v., 188, 189v., 191v., 192v., 193v.
 3. 30 September 1454, Jour.V f.195.
 4. 4, 5 October 1454, Jour.V f.196v., 197.

with food and arms. The help of the Lord Chancellor was sought and these combined activities brought the recalcitrant William Wangford to his senses. On 10 October the Common Council was told that he had destroyed his own weir and ^{had declared} that it had not been his intention to displeas the citizens with whom he wished to stand in love and charity.¹ Two days later Wangford's servant, William Wombewell asked pardon of the Court of Aldermen for resisting the Londoners when they came to destroy the Northflete weir.² The search to the west caught nineteen fishermen and eleven wardens of weirs, all of whom appeared in the Mayor's Court.³

But in spite of these searches the City seems to have been unable to prevent fishermen using illegal nets on the Thames, and, as with street traders today, it was clearly more profitable to break the law and pay the necessary fines. In December 1454 eight fishermen appeared in court; in March 1455 the owner of a weir at Braynford was present; in March 1457 three fishermen were convicted of using illegal nets, in December 1458 several others were pardoned their offences and gave security for their good behaviour, and in August 1461 ten men were presented in court for having committed crimes in the Thames waters.⁴

-
1. 9, 10 October 1454, Jour.V f.198, 198v.
 2. 12 October 1454, Jour.V f.199.
 3. 21 October 1454, Jour.V f.200v., 201.
 4. 16 December 1454, 17 March 1455, 18 March 1457, 1 December 1458, 28 August 1461, Jour.V f.212v., 216v., 230v.; Jour.VI f.115v., 134, 18. For a discussion of the office of Water Bailiff and a list of the occupants of the office, see Chapter II, pp. 135-136 and Appendix no. 11 p. 565.

The Mayor, as conservator of the Thames, was clearly saddled with a task which, without adequate royal help, was impossible and the statutes were frequently and openly violated.

* * * * *

A discussion of the position of the foreign merchants living in London is most conveniently divided into two sections. Firstly the Hanse merchants will be discussed and then the Italian merchants with special reference to the Genoese. These were not the only foreign merchants living in London during this period but the relations between these two groups and the citizens were particularly strained.²

The political and economic relations between London and the merchants of the Hanse towns have been thoroughly examined by Professor Postan. In his view England, through piracy, the French wars, enmity with Burgundy, bad government and self interested royal councillors, threw away a golden opportunity of achieving equality of treatment with the Hanse merchants in the decades after 1437. Moreover Edward IV's indebtedness to the Hanse merchants in 1471 meant that the Baltic trading towns were able to win back in 1474 at the Conference of Utrecht, all their trading privileges in England, without conceding any reciprocity for English merchants in the Baltic.¹

In all the negotiations, barterings, accusations and counter-accusations which distinguish the relationship between England and the

1. M.M. Postan, 'The Economic and Political Relations of England and the Hanse from 1400-1475' in Studies in the History of English Trade in the Fifteenth Century, ed. M.M. Postan and E. Power (London, 1933), pp.91-153.

2. On the size of the alien population in London c.1440 see J.L. Thompson 'A survey of the alien population in England in 1440' Speculum vol. xxii (1957) pp.262-78; also 'Aliens in & around London in the fifteenth century' in Studies in London History (London, 1969) pp. 251-272.

Hanse during these years, the Londoners were deeply involved. So too were the merchants of the eastern English ports but neither the volume of their trade nor their say in royal policy was as great as that of the Londoners. Moreover the main centre for the Hanse merchants in England was the Steelyard in Dowgate ward which they had occupied since 1320.¹ It is difficult to tell how large a community they formed in London.²

At the beginning of his reign Henry IV had exemplified the commercial agreement between English and Hanse merchants.³ This agreement was publicly proclaimed but such was the commercial rivalry that it, like its successors, only marked a lull in the acts of reprisal. While concerned with the wider issues involved in the embargo on English cloth entering the Baltic and the perennial acts of mutual piracy, the Londoners were also vexed about the civic obligations of the Hanse merchants living in London. In 1411 and again in 1418 it appears that civic officers tried to exact toll from the Hanse merchants who claimed, successfully on both occasions, that this was contrary to the ancient 'composition' of 1237.⁴ Although the Court of Aldermen on 9 February 1418 acknowledged the Hanse merchants exemption from paying toll, in the following year these tolls were again

-
1. On the origin of the Steelyard see Harben, Dictionary of London, pp.549-51.
 2. There were at least 13 Hanse merchants in London in August 1385, and 18 in July 1388, see Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, pp.100-01, 143-44.
 3. 6 December 1399, L.B.I., pp.5-6. See Chapter I, p.31.
 4. L.B.I., pp.95-96, 198. 14 February 1418, the references to the City's Books where the civic case against the Hanse merchants are noted in the margin, Jour.I f.43. 7 February 1419, merchants of Almaine were given a day on which to appear before the Mayor, Jour.I f.55v.

demanded.¹ When the Hanse merchants petitioned the King's Council the Court of Aldermen claimed that their decision the previous year was not authoritative since it had not been ratified by Common Council.² The matter was still under review when Henry V died and Estfeld and Tatersale (the Sheriffs for 1422-23) distrained the goods of the Hanse merchants in lieu of the tolls. The merchants petitioned the King in Parliament and it was decided that while the case was being reviewed by the Council, the Sheriffs should not molest the Hanse merchants.³ When the Council considered the matter in July 1423 the question under review was not simply the matter of the London tolls but tannage and poundage in general to be paid by the Hanse merchants. The Council decided that these merchants were liable to pay tannage and poundage as aliens and the plea of the Hanse merchants living in London that they should be utterly quit of payments because of their privileges, was overruled.⁴

But even if the Hanse merchants were liable to pay tannage and poundage in future, they did gain two advantages. Since 1418 when the negotiations over toll began the Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs had not assigned to the Hanse merchants of London the customary Alderman. In 1425, therefore, the merchants petitioned Parliament for such an Alderman to be specifically named, and in response to their petition

-
1. The Court of Aldermen may have made this concession to the Hanse merchants because of the City's need for corn from Prussia, L.B.I. p. 174.
 2. L.B.I., p.260.
 3. R.P. IV, p.192. The tolls in question were 2d. on each tun of wine, 2d. on each *scaphus* of wax, 3d. on each last of herrings, 4d. on each bale of rice, 2/- on each carriage of merchandise, i.e. each 'tonnetight'.
 4. P.P.C. III, pp.110, 111-12, 117.

William Crowmer was appointed by the King and for the rest of the period there was always an Alderman assigned to the Hanse merchants.¹ The second concession which they obtained in 1427 was the confirmation of their exemption from civic tolls payable on imported merchandise. In lieu of this the Hanse merchants were to pay 40/- every year to the Sheriffs of London and 2 barrels of best herring, one barrel of sturgeon and 'a hundredweight of good and clean Polish wax' to the Mayor.² In return for this concession the Hanse merchants were to persuade the Master of the Teutonic Order in Prussia and the Council of Danzig, to allow English merchants the freedom to do business and govern themselves 'as has been customary'.³

In the decade leading up to the Treaty of 1437 the Londoners appear to have lived peaceably with the aliens in their midst, although there were attacks and reprisals further afield.⁴ But in April 1440 the

-
1. R.P. IV, p.303. 18 February 1427, William Crowmer appointed, C.P.R. 1422-29, pp.346-7. As this appointment makes clear the Hanse merchants desired an Alderman, in order to achieve speedy justice, see L.B.L., pp.vii-viii. Crowmer appears to have been succeeded by William Estfeld, acting April 1440, Jour.III f.40v. 12 November 1442, Henry Frowyk appointed, C.P.R. 1441-46, p.133. 30 March 1460, William Marowe, C.P.R. 1452-61, p.566. 16 March 1466, Ralph Josselyn, C.P.R. 1461-67, p.529.
 2. 20 February 1427, L.B.K., p.46. For the discussion leading up to the compromise, see Jour.II f.89.
 3. 20 February 1427, Jour.II f.90. See also 10, 11 March, 4 July 1427, Jour.II f.91, 94v.
 4. Postan, op.cit., p.116; R.P. IV, pp.403-04. 10 December 1433, protection for one year for merchants of Almaine living in London, C.P.R. 1429-36, p.328. In 1435 a ship belonging to a Hanse merchant was taken by pirates (English?) and sold to English merchants who fitted it out for a voyage to Bordeaux. From the royal writ it appears unlikely that the ship was ever returned to its Hanse owner although some steps were taken to have it valued before it left for Bordeaux, Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.283-84.

Hanse merchants were prohibited from acting as hosts to foreign traders.¹ In November 1441 the Londoners began to launch a more intensive campaign against their treatment in the Hanse towns. Eight Common Councilmen were assigned to treat with the Hanse merchants about this and a petition of complaint was put to the King's Council.² The Lord Chancellor heard the arguments of both sides and decided that unless the Hanse towns allowed the English merchants to enjoy their accustomed freedoms abroad, their privileges in England would be withdrawn. The English merchants were to choose one of their number to act as ambassador to Prussia and it is possible that John Atherly was selected.³ This embassy may have been delayed while complaints were collected, for eighteen months later the Council decided to send a clerk and a merchant to Cologne with the complaints of the English merchants and meanwhile the merchants were to be allowed free entry into England.⁴ Clearly this solution seemed somewhat remote so the Mayor and ~~various~~ ^{certain} commoners of London asked the King's Council to appoint the Bishop of St. David's to settle the matter between the men of Prussia and the King's subjects. They were told to draw up their complaints and right would be done to them. Then the Mayor and commoners went on to ask the Council, somewhat disingenuously

1. 4 April 1440, Jour.III f.40.

2. 6 November 1441, Jour.III f.102.

3. R.P. V, pp.167, 170-1, 177. John Atherly was one of those who advised the Council to collect information from different parts about the wrongs suffered by English merchants in the Hanse towns.

4. 27 February 1443, P.P.C. V, p.228.

that if anything were sued to the King to the contrary, the Council would not attend to it but only to the Londoners.¹

An embassy did, finally, begin negotiations in Lübeck in 1449 and the English delegation was headed by Thomas Kent the Clerk to the Council. The negotiations were, however, broken off in May of that year when the Hanse Bay fleet was captured by a band of semi-official English privateers under Robert Winnington. When, therefore, the following year English Ambassadors ^{again} left to negotiate in Prussia, the incensed men of Lübeck captured the ship in which they were travelling and subjected Thomas Kent and John Stokker, a London Draper who was one of the ambassadors, to a period of imprisonment.²

Professor Postan paints a gloomy picture of the relations between the English merchants and the Hanse towns during the last decade of Lancastrian rule when piracy, embargoes and mutual acts of retaliation were the chief characteristics. Against this can be set the comparatively harmonious relations between the Hanse merchants of the Steelyard and the citizens of London. There is none of the irrationality and violence which marks the Londoners' treatment of the Lombards in this decade. In December 1452 the Court of Aldermen agreed that the Hanse merchants should be allowed to measure their own canvas and linen cloths imported into England.³ In March 1456 the London Sheriffs were instructed

-
1. 5 March 1443, *ibid.*, pp.233-34. 7 September 1447, Ambassadors from Prussia were in England, Jour.IV f.190.
 2. Postan, *op.cit.*, pp.127-30; *C.P.R. 1452-61*, p.119. John Stokker first appears as a Common Councilman in February 1441, Jour.III f.76v. He and Thomas Kent were captured 20 July 1450, and the length of their imprisonment is not known. Stokker was, however, able to serve on a Common Council committee appointed 15 July 1451, Jour.V f.58v.
 3. 15 December 1452, Jour.V f.99. The Common Measurer of linen cloth in the City was to be advised accordingly.

to proclaim that no one was to molest the Lübeck merchants in the enjoyment of their liberties in England. Perhaps as a result of this writ a petition against the Hanse merchants was rejected by the Court of Aldermen the following month.¹ Certainly there was a feeling amongst the Londoners that the Hanse merchants abused their acknowledged privileges 'to the harm of the well-being of the City and its franchises'. In June 1456 it was decided that there should be talks with the Hanse merchants and the matter was debated in Common Council in August when a decision was postponed because so few Councilmen were present. At a future meeting it was to be decided what legislation, if any, was needed for the good of the City and for a reform of the excesses of these merchants. In fact the matter appears, wisely perhaps, to have ended there.² Moreover in 1461 the Hanse merchants agreed to provide £20 towards the Dowgate ward contribution for the defence of the City. Although this contribution was not entirely spontaneous the Hanse merchants took trouble to have it recorded as a 'free-will offering'.³

But the events during the Parliament of 1461 when the Hanse merchants and the Londoners openly competed for the new King's ear, destroyed the restraint which had governed the City's attitude to the Hanse in the last decade.⁴ It is, therefore, on a note of violent disagreement that this survey of their relations must end. The trouble arose early in 1462 over the obligation of the Hanse merchants to repair Bishopsgate.

-
1. 1 March 1456, C.C.R. 1454-61, p.149; 20 April 1456, Jour.VI f.66.
 2. 3 June, 28 August 1456, Jour.VI f.59v., 103.
 3. 8 January, 11 February 1461, L.B.K., pp.397, 403.
 4. See Chapter V, pp. 347-348.

This, the merchants claimed, they were only bound to do if they had the mansions over the gate but this had, in September of the previous year, been granted by the Court of Aldermen to a Sergeant at Mace William Caldebek.¹ Since the gate was in a state of disrepair and the Hanse merchants refused to do anything about it, they were summoned to the Mayor's Court on 27 January to give up the keys. It was decided, when they refused to do this, that the Mayor should go in person to take possession of the gate which he did on 25 March. New keys had to be made and Caldebek was instructed to repair the gate at the Chamber's expense.² The Hanse merchants appear to have been unable to resist this assertion of the City's rights in spite of two royal protections in December 1461 and March 1463.³

The anti-alien feeling in London was sharpest against the Italians and culminated in the riot against them in 1456-7,⁴ but the outstanding dispute during these years was over the vexed question whether the Genoese merchants were liable to pay the tax called scavage in London. This tax was demanded, according to certain agreed rates, on all imported merchandise sold by foreigners in the City.⁵

-
1. 21 September 1461, Jour.VI f.21v.
 2. For the course of this dispute see Jour.VI f.41v., 8, 15v., 52, 17v.; L.B.L., pp.13-14 and p.vi.
 3. L.B.L., p.18; C.P.R. 1461-67, p.261.
 4. R. Flenley, 'London and foreign merchants in the reign of Henry VI', English Historical Review, vol.XXV (1910), pp.644-55.
 5. For a typical dispute see the case between the merchants of Genoa and four Londoners, William Waldern, William Flete, Walter Cotton and William Reynwell, which was finally settled by the King's Council. The English merchants received £5000 compensation, 8 June 1420, P.P.C. II, pp.270-71. For the City's regulations about scavage see Liber Albus, pp.223-26, 230. Half the profits from this tax went to the Sheriffs and half to the host in whose house the foreign merchant was living.

In the Parliament of 1402 the Genoese merchants petitioned the King against paying scavage in London on goods which they had imported via Southampton where they had paid the required customs. They complained that they now had to pay scavage twice: both in Southampton and in London. The King was sympathetic to the Genoese complaints and agreed that since there was nothing about scavage to be found in the London charters, the merchants should be free to bring goods from Southampton to sell in London without paying scavage in the City. But the King required the Genoese to bring testimonials to show that they had paid customs and scavage in Southampton.¹ On 8 May 1404 the Mayor was instructed to release the merchandise belonging to the Genoese merchants in the City which he had arrested by royal command - no doubt while this decision about scavage was pending.²

For nearly thirty years the matter appears to have rested there, most unsatisfactorily for the Londoners.³ But in 1428 the matter arose again when four bales of mercery belonging to Bartholomew Spynull, a Genoese merchant were confiscated because scavage had not been paid on them.⁴ During the mayoralities of John Wells and John Perneys (1431-33) this policy was continued and merchandise was seized by the Sheriffs because the Italian merchants had failed to pay scavage.⁵ As a result

-
1. 8 March 1396, Mayor and Aldermen had decided that Italian merchants were liable to pay scavage on goods brought to London by land, as well as by water, L.B.H., pp.429-30. The Italian merchants then took the case to the King's Council, 18 May 1398, and it would appear that the matter was still sub judice when Richard II was deposed, P.R.O. E28/4/64. R.P. III, pp.491, 520-21.
 2. C.C.R. 1402-5, p.334.
 3. Trade with the Genoese was temporarily interrupted in 1413, but this was not because of the scavage dispute, 3 February 1413, C.C.R. 1409-13, p.437; 21 March 1413, C.C.R. 1413-19, p.60.
 4. 16 December 1428, Jour.II f.128. (Footnotes continued on next page)

of this the case went to the King's Council where three Justices were appointed to hear the arguments on both sides.¹ But the Council avoided coming to a decision and in June 1434 simply issued a seven year protection for the Genoese.² During this time the dispute was referred to the Chief Justices of both Benches and the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, moreover the Mayor and Sheriffs were forbidden by the King to levy scavage from the Genoese under penalty of £1000.³

In February 1441, just before the seven year protection expired, the citizens offered a 'compromise' solution to the Genoese, whereby they were to be allowed to import goods freely on condition that they offered security for payment of scavage in the future and agreed to obey the ordinances which had been made previously. As this was a request to the Genoese not to compromise but to capitulate, they refused.⁴ Until 1454 the matter continued to take up the time of the Council, the citizens and the Genoese. A scheme was devised whereby the Genoese did not pay

-
1. L.B.K., pp.174-76. The City's case, in answer to that of the Genoese, is set out in full in the Letter Book.
 2. P.R.O. Council Proceedings C49/31/1 6 June 1434.
 3. See two royal writs to this effect, 12 December 1440, 14 February 1441 with the Mayor's return stating that no scavage has been levied, L.B.K., pp.252-53.
 4. 25 February 1441, Jour.III f.77v.

(Footnote 5 from previous page)

5. L.B.K., p.167, royal writ to the Mayor to restore the merchandise of the Italians which had been seized. The Grocers' Company paid 20/- in 1431 for a copy of the safe-conduct which had been given to the Genoese and for the fee of John Pyrye, man of law, 'to seek against the said Genoese', Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, ii, f.204.

scavage in the meantime but provided security that if they were eventually found liable to pay the tax they would make back payments. The Londoners, for their part, were not to molest the foreigners or 'seize their goods.'¹

Throughout these years the matter was frequently before the King's Council; in May 1443, in January 1445 when the King instructed the Lord Chancellor to deal with the matter, in August 1445 when a deputation of Londoners complained to the Chancellor about scavage and in July 1446 when the Sheriffs informed the keeper of the Privy Seal that they did not know how much scavage was owed to them by the Genoese for the current year.² Other solutions to the dispute were tried. It was enacted in the Parliament of 1444 that if the Londoners could prove in the Exchequer that they were entitled to levy scavage from the Genoese, then the London Sheriffs would be authorized to deduct from their annual farm, the amount of scavage which they considered to be due to them from the Genoese, i.e. in effect the King was prepared to pay the scavage for the Genoese merchants. But the initial demand that the Barons of the Exchequer should be satisfied that the Londoners were entitled to scavage and the complicated procedure to be followed, meant, in fact, that this was no solution at all.³

-
1. 21 April, 20 May 1441, Jour.III f.83, 83v., 85v.; 25 November 1441 P.P.C. V p.169. 7 December 1441, the obligations of the Italians agreeing to pay scavage were listed and read out in the Court of Aldermen, Jour.III f.106v.
 2. 24 May 1443, P.P.C. V p.278; 3 January 1445, L.B.K., pp.303-04, Jour.IV f.57v.; 18 June, 18 August, 20 August 1445, Jour.IV f.81v., 89v., 90v.; 19 July 1446, P.P.C. VI, p.54.
 3. R.P. V, p.68. This ordinance was to be kept from year to year.

In 1446 the Londoners tried to come to a final arrangement by a different means. Common Council discussed and rejected certain solutions such as a compounded annual payment by the Genoese in lieu of scavage and decided, instead, to terminate the matter by means of a court case. The Common Council did not want the current Sheriffs to be involved in a legal case so it was decided that Stephen Foster and Hugh Wyche who had been Sheriffs 1444-45 should prosecute the Genoese on the City's behalf. Meanwhile, as before, the foreigners were to be allowed to bring in merchandise while providing security for the future payment of scavage if they were found to be liable.¹ But this test case seems to have come to nothing.

After these protracted and unsuccessful negotiations, when the King's Council appears to have been completely unable or unwilling to decide on the matter, the Londoners decided in 1451 that a 'final arrangement' must be made with the Genoese.² In February 1453 the current Sheriffs, Richard Lee and Richard Alley, entered into mutual recognizances with John Ambrosious and Lewis Scot, two Genoese merchants, that they would abide by the arbitration of Sir Thomas Tyrell and Thomas Billing, the City's Sergeant at Law.³ Eighteen months later on 31 October 1454, a final arrangement was finally made. In lieu of scavage the Genoese merchants agreed to pay £28 p.a. for merchandise

-
1. 27 May, 15 June, 17 June 1446, Jour.IV f.129, 130v.
 2. A committee of 3 Aldermen and 7 Common Councilmen was appointed 29 November 1451 to come to a 'final arrangement', Jour.V f.65, 66.
 3. 6 February 1453, Jour.V f.102.

which they imported into the City from Southampton.¹ The foreigners wanted this agreement to be exemplified under the common seal and to be confirmed by Parliament. Instead of Parliament, the agreement was laid before the Lords of the Council on 3 December 1454 and placed on record, and the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council agreed that the common seal should be attached to the document with the words 'quae quidem arbitrium, ordinationem et iudicium iuxta omnem vim formam et effectum eiusdem, Nos praedicti Maior, Vicecomites ac Communitas eadēdem civitatis tenorem praesentium confirmamus, ratificamus et approbamus in perpetuum per praesentes litteras nostras sub nostro communi sigillo roboratas'. This was finally done on 20 February 1455 and eleven days later the Genoese paid £14 as their first instalment of the £28 due from them.² The delay between reaching the agreement and the fixing of the common seal may be partly accounted for by the need to get the arbitration properly composed and written.³

Unfortunately the agreement did not prevent the citizens from rioting and attacking the Lombards in 1456 and 1457; nor did it deal with the problem of scavage paid by other foreign merchants, or by

-
1. L.B.K., p.366. This form of compounded agreement had been earlier rejected by the Common Council, 27 May 1446, Jour.IV f.129. This was a similar arrangement to that agreed with the Hanse merchants in 1427, see p.368 above.
 2. L.B.K., pp.366, 367; Jour.V f.206v., 207, 211, 233v. There is no mention in the agreement of back payments for scavage.
 3. This task was entrusted to Robert Shodewell, scrivener, who was paid 13/4d. for his labours, 21 September 1455, Jour.V f.263.

English merchants who were not citizens of London.¹ But it does show that the King and the Council failed the Londoners in this matter and that if a solution was to be found it must be by the unaided efforts of the citizens and the Genoese. Yet the King's power is well manifested by the fact that under cover of the royal decision in their favour in the Parliament of 1402, the Genoese paid no scavage in London for fifty years. In such matters as these the City was completely at the mercy of the King.

* * * * *

The exercise of the royal prerogative in the granting of letters patent to be operative within the City was a serious cause of friction between the Londoners and the Crown during this period. Where such letters patent granted to an individual or group of individuals the right of monopoly in some essential process in the distribution or marketing of goods in London, then the patents were bound to cause trouble. There were six offices in particular which the King tried to control during this period: the packer of woollen cloths, the gauger of wines, the drawer of wines from the ships to the taverns or shops, the garbeller of spices, the aulnager or measurer of woollen cloths and the scrutineers of beer-brewing. The corporate objection of the citizens to royal letters patent granting these offices to individuals was first

1. 14 September 1457, John Cook, a Southampton merchant, entered into recognizances to pay £5 scavage which he owed, Jour.VI f.177.
23 November 1459, Simon Nory, a Florentine merchant, was to pay the late Mayor and Sheriffs £36 16s.0d. which was the scavage which he owed for 184 tuns of oil and other goods, Jour.VI f.141. As a result of this latter case it was decided that four Aldermen should work out reasonable rates of scavage for different types of merchandise, 29 November 1459, Jour.VI f.141v.

voiced in February 1441 when it was decided in Common Council that the King should be asked to revoke such patents and to refrain from granting them in future since they were to the prejudice of the Great Charter of the City and of the jurisdiction of the Mayor. As a deterrent it was decided that any freeman who occupied such offices by royal grant was to lose his freedom and pay a fine of £20.¹ Only when the City's opposition to this exercise of the Lancastrian prerogative is fully understood can the letters patent which Edward IV granted to the Mayor and citizens in August 1461 be seen for the considerable concession which they were. By these letters four of the disputed offices, namely those of gauger, garbeller, cloth packer and wine drawer, with their accustomed fees, were granted to the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty.² This grant marked the end of a period of protracted conflict between the Crown and the City and constituted a tangible concession wrung from the new King. In June 1478 these letters patent were formally incorporated in a new charter whereby the Mayor and Commonalty were empowered to exercise these offices and collect the revenues for ever.³

-
1. 9 February 1441, Jour.III f.75.
 2. 26 August 1461, C.P.R. 1452-61, pp.69, 70. The original letters patent with the seal attached are in Guildhall Record Office, Charter no.57. 30 July 1461, the King had agreed that the citizens should have the disposal of the disputed offices for the next six years, but the Londoners pressed for a grant to them of the offices in perpetuity, Jour.VI f.45v. 14 August 1461, three Aldermen and the Recorder rode to the Lord Chancellor in the attempt to get the letters patent for the 'offices' which had been lately granted by the King, Jour.VI f.23v.
 3. The Londoners paid £7000 for this charter, 20 June 1478, Birch, Charters, pp.90-93.

In the first Parliament of his reign Henry IV reversed the policy of Richard II and granted that the citizens might be free to pack their own woollen cloths.¹ But the financial pressures upon Henry VI led him, to reverse his grandfather's policy of freedom. In November 1440 he granted letters patent to John Noreys Esquire and five others to occupy the office of cloth packer in London in survivorship.² The City's reaction was rapid. In April 1441 John Honeybourne, a Draper who had been acting as deputy in the office to one of the grantees, appeared in court and said that although he had no written authority to exercise the office, his master did have such authority. The court heard a considerable amount of evidence from which it emerged that the Drapers felt very strongly on this issue. William Estfeld had said that the King did not understand what he had granted and Henry Frowyk had declared that all such patents could be rejected since they were contrary to the City's liberties.³ In January 1442 it was decided to petition Parliament against the packers and in March the Common Council attempted to make a loan to the King conditional upon the charters to the packers being revoked.⁴ Neither of these methods succeeded.

-
1. Richard II had, twenty years before, established the office of packer, who was to have a monopoly of cloth packing in London. The packer could charge 1d. per cloth and 1d. per three pieces of kersey, R.P. III, pp.443-44.
 2. 27 November 1440, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.490. For John Noreys see Chapter IX, p.516 n. 3 . The other grantees were Thomas Aventure, Sampson Vickers, John Norman, William Norman, John Baker.
 3. 21, 23 April 1441, Jour. III f.83-83v. George Lambeth said that he had been imprisoned for seeking letters patent from the King.
 4. 23 January, 24 March 1442, Jour. III f.109, 114v.

But the October 1444 charter from Henry VI to the City did make a partial concession to the citizens. The King acknowledged that the right to appoint packers of woollen cloths lay with the citizens although John Noreys and the other five were to continue to occupy the office. When it again fell vacant, however, it was to be at the disposal of the Mayor and citizens and no such royal grants were to serve as precedents.¹ This partial concession did not satisfy the City for part of a subsidy voted by the Common Council in January 1445 was to be used for making a defence against the packers.² In July 1446 the Mayor and Aldermen complained to the Council about the great impositions which had recently been placed upon the citizens of London, chief of which was the farming of the office of packer by the Crown for £48 p.a.³ But the City's protests in this matter achieved nothing until the letters patent of Edward IV in August 1461.⁴

-
1. 26 October 1444, G.R.O. Charter 55. For other aspects of this charter, see Chapter IV, pp. 320-10, 28 July 1444 a copy of the cloth packer's patent had been shown to the Common Council, Jour.IV f.32v., 36v.
 2. 28 January 1445, Jour.IV f.60v. 1 December 1444 the Court of Aldermen had appointed John Norman, one of the packers, together with Nicholas Wyfold and Hugh Wyche, to discuss the office of cloth packer with John Noreys, Jour.IV f.53v.
 3. July 1446, P.P.C. VI, p.50.
 4. 6 July 1461, the cloth packers put a bill to the King which the City decided to oppose, Jour.VI f.44. The cloth packers must be distinguished from the wool packers. The wool packers formed a fellowship and the King did not grant patents covering ^{new} office nor did the citizens object to their activities. A bill which was put to Common Council 8 October 1453, on behalf of the wool packers was granted, Jour.V f.124v. See E. Power, 'The wool trade in the fifteenth century', in Studies in the History of English Trade in the Fifteenth Century, ed. M.M. Postan and E. Power (London, 1933), pp.55-58.

It was the duty of the royal gauger to assess the capacity of tuns and pipes of wine to ensure that they were of the required size and that they were full. No wine imported to London could be sold until it had been gauged, for which service the buyer and the seller each paid $\frac{1}{2}$ d.¹ The first appointment to this office was in 1344 and in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries several statutes were passed which confirmed the King's right to appoint gaugers and amplified the duties of those officers.² Royal appointments continued as did royal writs prohibiting the secret sale of ungauged wine in London.³ It may be that the appointment of a gauger in London had lapsed under the early Lancastrians, for the first grant of the office in the fifteenth century was made to Thomas Multon in 1432.⁴ In the 1440s when other royal appointments in the City came under attack, the gauger's patent was also questioned and in July 1446 the Mayor and Aldermen complained to the Council that the gauger was taking 4d. for gauging a tun of wine. This was clearly a steep rise from the fourteenth century 1d. per tun.⁵ The October 1444

-
1. See A.L. Simon, The History of the Wine Trade in England (London, 1906), vol.I, pp.300-01; vol.II, p.62.
 2. February 1344, Thomas de Colleye appointed, L.B.F., p.95. Statutes of the Realm, vol.I (1810), pp.331, 350; vol.II (1816), p.16
In April 1409 the King ordered that all statutes were to be proclaimed in the City, L.B.I., p.72. Further statutes followed in 1423, Statutes of the Realm, vol.II (1816), p.222; 1439, ibid., p.313.
 3. E.g. L.B.F., p.134; L.B.G., pp.215, 224, 277, 278; C.P.R. 1401-5, p.49.
 4. 29 November 1432 appointment of Thomas Multon, C.P.R. 1429-36, p.248; 23 October 1434 appointment of John Stokes, ibid., p.442; 5 March, 8 April 1437 appointment of William Ludlowe, C.P.R. 1436-41, pp.40, 44. Ludlowe was allowed to exercise the office through a deputy, one of whom was John Grove, another William Newton vintner, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, pp.48, 53. Ludlowe's accounts covering certain periods were enrolled P.R.O. 8 April 1437-8 June 1442, receipts £5 4s.6d. E364/75/m 13v.; 23 May 1445-29 December 1447 receipts nil, E364/81/m 2v.; 29 September 1456-29 September 1457 receipts nil, E364/91/m 7v.
 5. P.P.C. VI, p.50. 20 July 1444 the gauger's patent had been exhibited in court, Jour. IV f36v. A bill presented to the parliament of 1445-6 against the extortion of the King's gaugers produced a statute, R.P. V. pp.113-15.

charter has no mention of gaugers but the August 1461 letters patent of Edward IV granted the office to the citizens. Thus although the new King made grants of the office of gauger in many English ports, there is no grant of the office in London.¹

The word wine drawer covers men acting in two capacities, as carriers of wine and as drawers of wine from the casks. It is with the wine drawers in their former capacity that the citizens were concerned in the fifteenth century.² As early as 1301 wine drawers had been put on oath only to charge agreed sums for carrying casks specified distances.³ In 1394 it was laid down that a wine drawer could receive a maximum of 8d. per pipe and 10d. per tun carried within the walls and 12d. and 16d. respectively for pipes or tuns carried outside the City walls.⁴ When, therefore, in 1418, the Court of Aldermen decided that wine drawers were to receive only 3d. for each cask of wine handled for the King at the siege of Rouen, this was clearly considerably below the normal rate charged.⁵

In December 1440, however, the King granted a monopoly of wine drawing to two men, William Styce and Thomas Quayne, to hold the office

-
1. The City's first appointment as Mayor's deputy seems to have been John Williamson, who was to remain in office as long as it pleased the Mayor and Aldermen, 19 August 1462, Jour.VI f.42. It appears that although the King had granted the office with its profits to the City, the Mayor had still to account at the Exchequer. The accounts of the first Mayors of Edward IV's reign are to be found enrolled PRO E364/102/m 2v. Richard Lee, Hugh Wyche and Thomas Cook declared there were no receipts during their time. Matthew Philip (Mayor 1463-4) declared receipts of 66s.8d. and Ralph Josselyn (Mayor 1464-5) declared receipts of £665. In these 2 cases the Mayors were not excused payment by the Exchequer until a privy seal writ had been received from the King. The following mayors declared no receipts.
 2. In the Iter of 1321 it was asserted that every man had the right to see his wine drawn, and the Vintners were fined for refusing this, Liber Custumarum, pp.304, 425. This is clearly referring to wine drawers in their second capacity.
 3. November 1301, L.B.C., pp.111-12.
 4. L.B.H., p.424; Liber Albus, p.526.
 5. 15 September 1418, Jour.I f.48; see Chapter VIII, p.456.

by deputies if they wished, together with all the accustomed fees.¹ As a result the citizens petitioned the Court of Aldermen complaining about the activities of these new wine drawers. It was claimed that from the first citizens had been free to carry their merchandise by members of their own household or by their deputies without paying carriage, and it was, therefore, unjust that they should now be forced to pay for these services.² The King's grant led to violence, for in December Peter Pope and his household assaulted the wine drawers, so breaking the peace and impeaching the authority of a royal charter.³ The City decided to take up the issue in a corporate manner by putting a bill to Parliament against the wine drawers in January 1442.⁴ The loan in March was made in the (unsuccessful) hope that the wine drawers' patent would be revoked by the King.⁵ In 1444 the City's protests continued. The Commonalty petitioned that Quyne should lose his freedom for having obtained letters patent contrary to the liberty of the City and the patent was again examined by the Court of Aldermen.⁶ The City's protests on this matter achieved the same partial success

-
1. 28 December 1440, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.485; L.B.K., pp.278-79.
 2. 20 October 1441, Jour.III f.99. 8 November 1441, Styce and Quyne appeared before the Court of Aldermen and exhibited their patent, Jour.III f.103.
 3. 7 December 1441, Jour.III f.106v.
 4. 23 January 1442, Jour.III f.109v.
 5. 23 March 1442, Jour.III f.114v.
 6. 20 February, 28 July 1444, Jour.IV f.18, 36v.

as those about the cloth packers' patent. By the charter of October 1444 Styce and Quyne were to occupy the office as long as they lived but the reversion was granted to the citizens. Clearly the citizens were not satisfied for a subsidy was voted for the City's defence against the winedrawers in January 1445 and the Mayor and Aldermen complained about their activities to the Council in July 1446.¹ The August 1461 letters patent of Edward IV gave the office to the citizens and there the matter ended.

The duties of the garbeller involved the sifting of refuse and extraneous matter (garble) from spices before they were offered for sale in the City. In 1393 the Grocers had asked the Common Council to allow the Company to appoint a garbeller and, this was granted the following year. The new garbeller, Thomas Halfmark, was to receive 4d. for garbelling each bale of merchandise.² The system appears to have worked satisfactorily and in 1425 it was established that even goods which were to be exported should be garbelled.³ In 1439 the Commons petitioned the King in Parliament that all spices sold either by aliens or denizens, throughout the kingdom, should be garbelled as in London. Although the royal answer to this petition was equivocal, it may have suggested to the King that there was room for the creation of a profitable royal office.⁴

1. 28 January 1445, Jour.IV f.60v.; P.P.C. VI, p.50.

2. L.B.H. pp.400, 406-07. Fifteenth century oath of the garbeller to be found, L.B.D., p.196.

3. 23 August 1425, Jour.II f.51.

4. R.P. V, p.32. The King's answer was that the previous good ordinances were to be observed.

In October 1442 Richard Hakedy a Grocer, and William Aunsell the King's sergeant, received jointly the office of garbeller in London, Southampton and Sandwich, in survivorship.¹ The City resisted the royal garbeller in London. The King had to send a writ to Thomas Burbage, the City garbeller chosen by the Grocers' Company, instructing him to allow William and Richard to exercise their office in the City or to show cause why not. Burbage did not carry out the royal writ and when asked in June 1444 to show cause, replied that the right to garble spices had always belonged to the Mayor and citizens and the King had no right to regulate the matter by letters patent.² Meanwhile the Common Sergeant had presented a bill on behalf of the Commonalty asking that Hakedy should be exonerated from the freedom because he had procured the office of garbeller contrary to the City's liberties.³ As in the case of the cloth packers and wine drawers, the compromise came with the charter in October 1444 whereby the King conceded that the office of garbeller in London belonged to the Mayor and citizens but Hakedy and Aunsell were to occupy the office for their lives.⁴ In July 1446 the Mayor and Aldermen still complained to the King's Council that the occupation of garbelling in the City was farmed out to men of 'little behaviour or value' which bore heavily on the citizens.⁵

1. 3 October 1442, C.P.R. 1441-6, p.128.
 2. Burbage also said that he had not hindered Hakedy and Aunsell from garbelling goods in Southampton and Sandwich, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, pp.60-61.
 3. Hakedy was given a day on which to appear. The outcome is not recorded, 31 March, 4 April 1444, Jour.IV f.22, 22v.
 4. 28 July 1444, a copy of the garbellers' patent was examined by the Court of Aldermen, Jour.IV f.36v.
 5. P.P.C. VI, p.50.

It was the Grocers Company which, having virtually controlled the garbelling of spices in London, was most concerned about this royal intervention. The Company managed to procure letters patent in March 1448 whereby they were granted the right to garble spices in Southampton, Sandwich and elsewhere in the realm except in London. The wardens were to answer annually at the Exchequer for the fines which they received from the exercise of this office.¹ This left the situation still very unsatisfactory both from the Grocers' and from the citizens' point of view.² The Grocers' accounts bear witness to their anxious activity at this time. They paid 4d. for seeking evidence about the garbeller at Guildhall; 2/- for a copy of the 'garbellershepe' from Guildhall and 3/4d. for a copy 'out of the Exchequer to know the garbeler's office'.³ The Grocers' Company also pursued the quarrel against Richard Hakedy but he appears to have died by March 1458.⁴ If William Aunsell were also dead then the office would revert to the Mayor and citizens and hence to the Grocers' Company.

-
1. 8 March 1448, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.107. The Grocers paid 18/- to the Exchequer for this new patent, Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, f.305. See S. Thrupp, 'The Grocers of London: a study of distributive trade', in Studies in the History of English Trade in the Fifteenth Century, ed. M.M. Postan and E. Power (London, 1933), pp.258-59. Miss Thrupp cites three of the garbeller's accounts where it is declared that there is no profit, P.R.O. Various Accounts Miscellaneous 515/8, 9, 12.
 2. March 1456, Thomas Little, acting as deputy either to Hakedy or Aunsell, agreed to stand by the decision of the Court of Aldermen, Jour.VI f.33v.
 3. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, vol.II, f.43v., 63, 94.
 4. Hakedy's widow, Joan, and his executors acknowledged a quitclaim to the present and past wardens of the Grocers' Company of all actions in respect of an arbitration made between the wardens of the Company and Hakedy on 26 November 1456, Cal.P. and . 1458-82, p.1.

Certainly by 1460 the Company appears to have been exercising a general oversight of garbelling in the City.¹ The letters patent of August 1461 confirmed that the office of garbeller of spices belonged to the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of London and on 21 October the office was granted to John Stokes, Grocer, who was to pay 20/- p.a. to the Chamberlain to exercise the office.²

These four offices, of cloth packer, gauger, wine drawer and garbeller were all confirmed to the City by Edward IV's letters patent in August 1461. The other two offices which caused friction in the relations between the Crown and the City were settled in other ways.

From the reign of Edward III the office of aulnager, i.e. the man who measured cloth to ensure that it was of the correct length and breadth, was farmed out by the Crown. These farmers paid an annual sum to the Crown and recouped themselves from the fees charged for measuring cloth and from the fines and confiscated goods.³ Thus there were two things at the disposal of royal patronage: the office of aulnager and the annual subsidy derived from it. One of Henry Bolingbroke's first acts even before he became King, was to appoint Robert Sherwynd a London Mercer, to the office of measurer of woollen and canvas cloths sold by anyone who was not an enfranchised citizen.⁴

-
1. The wardens of the Grocers' Company removed ungarbelled cinnamon belonging to foreign merchants in September 1460, Jour.VI f.265v.
 2. 6 October 1461, Jour.VI f.49; 21 October 1461, L.B.L., p.8. For the later history of the office see Thrupp, op.cit., p.259.
 3. A.H. Johnson, History of the Drapers' Company (Oxford, 1914), vol.I, p.116 n.1.
 4. 27 September 1399, C.P.R. 1396-99, p.596. This was confirmed 24 October 1404, C.P.R. 1401-5, p.481.

The terms of this grant suggest that the oversight of cloths sold by enfranchised citizens lay elsewhere - probably with the Drapers' Company. In December 1407 the office was granted to the King's Butler John Merssh on the same terms.¹ The Mayor and Sheriffs refused to admit Merssh on the grounds that the King had already granted the office to Thomas Wottone.² In fact the King had only granted the subsidy to Wottone. But the Mayor and Sheriffs appear to have laid claim to the profits of the office which would explain their contention that having agreed to pay Wottone the subsidy, the remaining profits ought to belong to the citizens and not to some further royal nominee. The citizens further claimed that Sherwynd had exercised the office unlawfully. The outcome of this dispute is not recorded.³

Just as the Grocers' Company was concerned with the office of garbelling spices, so the Drapers were concerned with the measurer of cloth. In February 1439 the Company achieved the grant both of the annual subsidy and the office of measurer of all cloths sold in the City (whether by citizens or not) to two Drapers Robert Shirborne and John Derby. They were to hold the farm and office for ten years paying

1. 26 December 1407, C.P.R. 1405-8, p.405.

2. L.B.I., p.52.

3. Ibid., p.84. 11 October 1425 the Court of Aldermen decided that the Chamberlain should collect aulnage on behalf of the City, and he was to be indemnified, Jour.II f.54.

£35 6s.8d. with an increment of £4 13s.4d.¹ It may be that the Drapers only gained control over the search and measuring of woollen cloths although Shirborne and Derby's patent does not so specify. But in 1442 William Prentys was sworn as measurer of linen and canvas cloths in the City, as was John Wode in 1445.² Perhaps they were acting as deputies to the two Drapers in this capacity. But with the Drapers in control the matter ceased to trouble the relations between the Crown and the City.

Finally trouble arose between the King and the citizens over the royal patents granting the right of search over beer brewers. Although much beer was brewed in London in the fourteenth century, and was the subject of many civic regulations, the relationship between the Brewers and the City was not clarified until 1406 when the Brewers were allowed, by the Mayor and Aldermen, to have eight men of the Company to search to the east and west of Walbrook and control all who brewed ale within the City's franchise.³ Although there were many

-
1. 16 February 1439, printed by Johnson, op.cit., vol.I, pp.216-20. The Drapers paid in boat-hire divers times 'in and out for the aulnage' 12d., and for a copy of the oath for the aulnager 12d. Johnson, Drapers' Accounts, p.336. Various other entries in the Drapers' Accounts suggest that the Company had to pay to get the consent of the Mayor and Aldermen to this grant.
 2. William Prentys, Mercer, sworn 23 February 1442, Jour.III f.111; John Wode sworn 17 April 1445, Jour.IV f.75v. For their oath see Jour.IV f.166v. By 15 December 1452, John Derham, gentleman, was measurer of linen cloth, Jour.V f.99. 24 March 1457, Peter Bowman, the aulnager in London, complained to the Court of Aldermen that Robert Overton, the deputy of the King's aulnager in Sussex, Peter Preston, had come to the City and had sealed various woollen cloths with the seal of his county. Bowman claimed redress, Jour.VI f.116v.
 3. For the fourteenth century regulations about brewing in the City see Liber Albus, pp.698-702; 13 October 1406, L.B.I., pp.50-51.

complaints against the Brewers in the next decade, their right of search was confirmed by the City in 1420.¹ There continued to be complaints against the Brewers who, in their turn, tried to exclude foreigners from the manufacture of beer.² In February 1438 the Brewers received their first charter by which they were incorporated but it did not give them the right of search.³ The Mayor and Aldermen viewed the Brewers' new charter with some suspicion for fear that it infringed the rights of the Mayor. The Company paid 26/8d. for counsel 'to be had when the mayor desired to have sight of the said charter as he had of other charters within the said city'. The Brewers submitted themselves to the Mayor and all must have been well for their charter was enrolled at Guildhall.⁴

But in January 1441 the King granted to William Veysey and Richard Lounde the office of searching and surveying all beer brewers in England, whether within liberties or without, together with the profits of the office.⁵ The Brewers' Company complained to the Court of Aldermen that

-
1. 18 January, L.B.I., pp.235-37.
 2. See royal writ to protect the Brewers of Holland and Zeeland, 15 June 1436, L.B.K., p.205.
 3. 22 February 1438, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.142. The patent roll records that the Brewers paid 50 marks for the charters, and from the Brewers' accounts it is clear that they had to pay out a further £100 in bribes and miscellaneous costs, Guildhall Library Ms. 5440, Brewers' Accounts, f.290-290v.
 4. 19 March 1439, Jour.III f.11v.; Brewers' Accounts, f.290v. The Company paid 26/8d. for the enrolment.
 5. 29 January 1441, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.495.

these royal valets were asking 1d. for surveying each barrel and 4d. for each pipe. The valets were also accused of imposing rules and assizes on the barrels and of hindering their easy transport in the City.¹ The October charter of 1444 reached the same compromise about the searchers of beer as it had done about cloth packers, garbellers and wine drawers. Lounde and Veysey were to occupy the office for their lives and it would then revert to the disposal of the Mayor and citizens.² The City, however, continued to protest and a further compromise was reached in September 1446 when the King's nominee, William Veysey, was accepted but he was sworn to his office by the Court of Aldermen.³ The mark of the beer searcher is also recorded and reveals the same compromise - it is a fleur de lys of the House of Lancaster surmounted by the arms of the City. It appears that Edward IV overrode the provisions of the charter of October 1444 for in his letters patent whereby the citizens gained so much, there was no grant either to the City or to the Brewers Company of the right to appoint searchers of beer. Moreover in February 1462 Edward appointed men to carry out the scrutiny of beer throughout the realm, although they were

-
1. 27 May 1441, Jour.III f.86, 86v. Unfortunately the Brewers' accounts for this period do not survive so there is no record of their efforts to get this charter revoked. It was necessary for the King to send a writ to the Mayor and Sheriffs bidding them assist Veysey and Lounde in their office as searchers of beer brewers, 21 November 1441, L.B.K., p.270.
 2. 28 July 1444 the Brewers' patent had been exhibited in court, Jour.IV f.36v.
 3. 13 September 1446, Jour.IV f.138. Part of the subsidy voted by Common Council, 28 January 1445, was to be used against the searchers of beer brewers, Jour.IV f.60v.

to receive only $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per barrel for this service.¹ Probably the citizens still retained the right to swear these men to perform their duties in the City.²

In all these cases the City was completely dependent upon the King; there was no way in which they could counter these royal grants of monopolies and they had to accept such terms as the King chose to offer to them. Henry VI resorted to such measures because of financial pressure, and Edward IV's concessions to the City in August 1461 show both the extent of his debt to the City and the extent to which he was prepared to 'live of his own'.

* * * * *

The existence of privileged places within or near the City was a constant source of trouble calling for the intervention of the King from whom the special privileges both of the City and of the ecclesiastical institutions, stemmed. The main sanctuaries which troubled the City were St. Katharine's Hospital which lay outside the City boundaries to the east of the Tower; the Church and Priory of St. Bartholomew to the north-west of the City in the ward of Farringdon Without; the area known as Blancheapleton in the ward of Al^dgate; the Churches of St. Peter, Westminster and St. Mary Without Al^dgate; and, finally and most

-
1. 4 February 1462, 29 June 1465, C.P.R. 1461-67, pp.75, 246. None of these recipients was Veyse or Lounde.
 2. It appears that the City may have gained the right of search over beer by September 1493 when the Mayor and Aldermen were able to grant a petition from the Brewers' Company to taste and assay beer (inter alia), L.B.L., p.296.

important, the Church and precinct of St. Martin's le Grand. From the City's point of view these sanctuaries provided refuge not only for law-breakers and criminals of all kinds but also for those who wished either to open shops while not being free of the City or to practise a craft free from the Company search.

For the first thirty-five years of this period the discord between the City and the privileged places was not serious. In 1402 the Commons complained to the King that from the safety of St. Martin's precinct the inhabitants could forge indentures, steal goods and find refuge after committing crimes. In spite of the King's decision that the Council should consider the matter and provide a reasonable remedy, nothing was done.¹ On instructions from the King in 1414 the Sheriffs destroyed a passage St. Martin's Lane from where felons could commit crimes and then have easy access back into the sanctuary.² In 1430 in response to a royal writ the Mayor arrested Roger Bukke and Henry Ciprian who were hiding in the house of John Belle the warden of St. Martin's precinct. As a result of this arrest both the Mayor and the Dean appeared before the Council to argue whether the warden's house were privileged or not. The Council decided in favour of the City and the Mayor's action in arresting the two men was upheld.³

1. R.P., III, pp.503-04.

2. 28 July 1414, C.C.R. 1413-19, p.147; L.B.K., p.159.

3. 5 September 1430, L.B.K., pp.106-07. The City's evidence in support of its claim, L.B.K., pp.151-60. An important source of information about this quarrel between the City and St. Martin's is the Register of the College of St. Martin's, now in the Westminster Abbey Muniment Room, Book no.5. This volume was probably compiled c.1440 as a necessary record because of the dispute with the Londoners. It was subsequently added to. The volume has been described by L.E. Tanner, 'Nature and Use of Westminster Abbey Muniments',

(continued at foot of next page)

In the 1420s the use of the City sanctuaries seems to have been intensified and in the late 1430s the Court of Aldermen decided to challenge the rights of privileged places.¹ In 1438 William Estfeld the Mayor, together with William Hale one of the Sheriffs took a soldier from St. Katharine's on suspicion of felony.² Similarly in November 1439 the Mayor and Sheriffs went to Blancheapleton and extracted several criminals who were staying there in the belief that the place was privileged. One of these, Robert Green, was sent to Newgate and was later hanged at

-
- 1. There were at least eight withdrawals to St. Martin's or St. Peter's Westminster between 1425 and 1429, see Cal. P. and M. 1413-37, pp.180, 201, 203, 206, 216, 220, 227, 236.
 - 2. 10 June 1438, Jour.III f.171.
-

(footnote continued from previous page)

T.R.H.S., Fourth series, vol.XIX (1936) esp. p.80. In the sixteenth century this volume was used by William Fleetwood when he compiled the book known as 'Liber Fleetwood' which is now in the Guildhall Record Office. I have read through both sources and found that Fleetwood copied out from the St. Martin's Register carefully and fairly. My references are to Liber Fleetwood, and only to the St. Martin's Register when there is a discrepancy, or additional material to be found there.

Tyburn.¹ In August 1440 the Sheriffs took a man named William Foyle from the church of St. Bartholomew the Great.² These flagrant breaches of

1. 27 November 1439, Jour.III f.30v. Blancheapleton had been in the possession of the Bohun earls of Essex and Hereford. When the Countess of Hereford died, 8 Richard II, the property was divided, C.P.R. 1385-9, p.57. Blancheapleton appears to have passed into the Lancastrian inheritance and hence became the property of the Crown. By 1439 it was leased to Sir John Steward, Jour.III f.33v. In 1445 both the Constable of Aldgate ward and Henry Frowyk, the Alderman, tried to establish civic authority there, Jour.IV f.88, 102v. In July 1446 the Londoners complained to the Council about the shops which were opened there and about the immorality, Jour.IV f.96; P.P.C. VI, p.50. In July 1447 the City considered buying the lease of Blancheapleton from Sir John Steward and his wife at the cost of £20 p.a. but decided against it, Jour.IV f.184, 187. In 1451 the Cordwainers complained about foreigners who carried out their craft there, L.B.K., p.336. A bill protesting against the activities of the Mayor and Sheriffs within the privileged place was presented to the Council in 1458, Jour.VI f.236v. There were riots there in May 1459, Jour.VI f.110. 26 May 1462 the City received the lease of Blancheapleton and Steward's Inn from the King for £20 p.a., Jour.VII f.2; Merchant Tailors' Hall, Miscellaneous document 8a. The King's secretary, Mr. William Atcliff received 100s. from the Chamber for his services, Jour.VII f.107v. In 1478 Edward IV granted that the City should hold Blancheapleton and Steward's Inn, as they held them of him before 26 May 1462, in consideration of the City's remitting £4000 of the debt of £12,923 9s.8d. which Edward owed to the City, Merchant Tailors' Hall, Miscellaneous document 8b; Jour.VIII f.145v., 168v., 169v.-70, 173v.
2. 22 August 1440, Jour.III f.54.

privilege were bound to provoke a reaction and the strongest reaction came from the place with the most secure privilege, namely St. Martin's.¹

On September 1st 1440, John Knight a soldier was being taken from Newgate prison to Guildhall for his trial, escorted by John Norburgh an officer attached to the Sheriff's counter. As Norburgh and his prisoner approached the south end of St. Martin's Lane, five of Knight's associates darted out of Panyer Lane to the south with daggers drawn and the six of them ran up the Lane towards the Church with Norburgh in pursuit. He failed to recapture his prisoner before he reached the Church.² On the same day the Common Council decided that the Aldermen and Chamberlain should go to St. Martin's to extract the men who had taken sanctuary there.³ The Canons were adamant in their refusal to deliver the men until they had heard from the King or from their Dean, Richard Caudray, who was out of London. In the evening therefore, the Sheriff's came and forcibly seized the six men and led them to Newgate. The canons then wrote an anguished letter retailing these events to their Dean, and the City's Sheriffs, Philip Malpas and Robert Marshall, described what had happened to a meeting

1. The heading in the St. Martin's Register to the account of the dispute with the City states that after Philip Malpas and Robert Marshall, the Sheriffs, had broken the franchises of Elancheapleton, St. Katherine's and St. Bartholomew's Smithfield, they then came to St. Martin's and broke the immunity there, f.41.
2. Liber Fleetwood, f.142v.
3. Jour.III f.55v.

of the Common Council where it was agreed that the costs of sustaining the case should be borne by the City.¹ The Dean, on receiving the letter from his canons, rode to London and sued the Sheriffs for restitution of the prisoners but, getting no satisfaction, he put his case to the Mayor and Aldermen who asked him to appear in five days time. Caudray decided to use the intervening time to ride to the King at Windsor.²

Caudray's petition to the King survives in which he says that he has refused to show evidences about the sanctuary to the citizens 'the which I ought not to do to them as for your place where ye be only lord, founder, protector and grantor of all that is there'. The Dean asked the King to command the Lord Chancellor to ordain that the prisoners should be restored since 'without your grace and help it lieth not in your poor Dean's power to resist or sue at the Common Law against so mighty a Commune as is in London'.³ Caudray's petition was successful for when he returned to London he brought with him a signet letter from the King addressed to the Mayor, Sheriffs and Aldermen of London which had been written on 11 September and also a writ addressed only to the Mayor and Sheriffs. For a variety of reasons the citizens did not obey the injunctions of the letter and writ to return Knight and his associates to sanctuary.⁴

-
1. Liber Fleetwood f.141v.-142; L.B.K., pp.241-2.
 2. Liber Fleetwood f.142v.
 3. P.R.O. Ancient Petition no.13497; Liber Fleetwood f.143v.-145.
 4. Lord Huntingdon and Lord Tiptoft presented the letter and writ to the Mayor and Aldermen in the Tower of London. The Londoners claimed that the Tower was privileged and that there were too few Aldermen present. The letter was subsequently opened in Barking Church, Liber Fleetwood, f.143v.-146; L.B.K., pp.243-5; C.P.R. 1436-41, p.569.

On 15 September a deputation of eight Aldermen and two Sheriffs was appointed by the Court of Aldermen to ride to the King at Waltham to excuse and explain the Sheriff's action.¹ When the deputation arrived the King was so displeased with the City for failing to carry out his letters and writ, that he refused to meet it. The deputation therefore, aided by Markham the City's sergeant-at-arms, and John Carpenter lately Common Clerk, had to put its case to the Bishop of Salisbury, Sir Ralph Botiller, Sir Thomas Stanley and Sir James Fienes.² At least the deputation achieved a delay until the case could be properly heard and the prisoners remained in the control of the City at Newgate until 13 October when the King returned to London.³ The City began to prepare its case and collect evidence; a committee of experienced Aldermen was chosen to act on its behalf.⁴ The King appointed the Chancellor, the Treasurer, Sir Ralph Botiller and the Archbishop of Canterbury to deal with the case and the citizens agreed to accept their arbitration.⁵

-
1. Jour.III f.59; L.B.K., p.245.
 2. Liber Fleetwood, f.145v.-146. The City deputation said that they would gladly release the prisoners if commanded to do so by the King, but they would not restore them to the sanctuary, Register of St. Martin's, f.45v.
 3. Liber Fleetwood f.147.
 4. 23 September 1440, Jour.III f.60.
 5. 15 October 1440, Jour.III f.63; Liber Fleetwood f.147. 10 October 1440 the Court of Aldermen decided that the Chancellor and the Treasurer should be visited when they came to London, Jour.III f.62v.

The case was begun on 16 October and the arguments on both sides are set forth fully in the Liber Fleetwood.¹ The City's defence was based on three arguments (i) the Mayor could not carry out the King's writ without harm to the Sheriffs; (ii) the case against Knight was a suit for debt and St. Martin's had no immunity for cases of debt; (iii) the other five men should be handed over to answer a suit of trespass brought against them by John Norburgh. The Dean's reply on 19 October states that the Sheriff's answer is not sufficient to excuse their violence, that St. Martin's does provide sanctuary for cases of debt and - a sharp dig here - that whereas the City's franchises have often been taken away, those of St. Martin's have not. Each party presented a roll of evidences to be considered by the two Chief Justices who asked for delay in giving judgment.²

The course of the succeeding events is difficult to make out since two different versions exist; the City's version recorded in the Letter Book and the St. Martin's version recorded in Liber Fleetwood and derived from the Register of the College. The Dean became impatient at all these costly delays and at his instance the King ordered that the case should be quickly terminated, the prisoners returned to sanctuary and the Sheriffs punished. The Council decided to send for the five men by a writ of corpus cum causa³. When the Recorder reported on this to the Court of

-
1. Amongst the Council proceedings there exists an undated complaint addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Treasurer and Ralph Botiller from the Dean of St. Martin's complaining that nothing has been done about his case and that the royal letters and writ have been ignored, P.R.O. C49/68/15.
 2. Liber Fleetwood f. 146-146v., 147, 150-153, 160v. An undated document listing various points in the case for the privileges of St. Martin's, temp. Henry VI,
 3. Liber Fleetwood, f. 160v. | can probably be dated to this year, P.R.O. E 135/2/56.

Aldermen the Sheriffs brought the prisoners before the Lord Chancellor. The Liber Fleetwood records that the Chancellor declared in favour of the immunity of St. Martin's with the result that the five men were restored to the sanctuary. The City version is that since the cases against the five persons were private ones and those who had begun them were 'induced to declare themselves satisfied', the Sheriffs had no further case for prosecution.¹ The return of the prisoners was accomplished by 1 November and the process was entered as of record in Chancery.² A week later the Dean thought he could afford a visit to the Court of Aldermen where he declared his good will towards the City; recalled how he was brought up in the mystery of Mercers, promised to devise a better method of correcting wrong-doers within St. Martin's precinct, and protested that he had not intended to offend the City when he sued the two Sheriffs for taking the men out of sanctuary.³

In this case the sympathies of the King had clearly lain with the Dean. The City, in spite of its brave face, was defeated on this occasion although there is no evidence that the Sheriffs were punished. But the City did not let the matter rest there. In January 1442 the Court of Aldermen decided to draw up a bill to be presented in Parliament against privileged places which served as hideouts for thieves.⁴ Nothing came of this and in May of the same year the privileges of St. Martin's received a

-
1. L.B.K., p.246; Liber Fleetwood f.160v.; Jour.III f.64v., 65. The terms of the royal writ suggest that the Chancellor decided in favour of the immunity of St. Martin's and that the City had to put the best face which it could on the matter, C.P.R., 1436-41, p.569.
 2. 26 November 1440, C.B.P., 1436-41, p.569.
 3. Jour.III f.65v.
 4. 23 January 1442, Jour.III f.109v.

general confirmation.¹ The royal influence was still on the side of St. Martin's. In July 1446 the City complained to the King's Council about the failure of the inhabitants of St. Martin's to contribute to City taxes.²

There was trouble again in 1448 but the dispute arose this time over the use of the sanctuary as a refuge for shoddy workers who could thus escape the Company searcher. On 14 March the wardens of the Goldsmiths' Company searched the shops in the sanctuary for defective work. The Dean, who sympathised with their case, accompanied the wardens on a second round of inspection and ordered the defective work to be destroyed and those who were guilty were sent to the Dean's prison within the sanctuary. With the matter amicably settled the Goldsmiths and Dean drank together. The Company, however, felt the situation was unsatisfactory and complained to the King at Windsor, asking that they might have unfettered right of search within the sanctuary. This the King did not grant although he sent a signet letter to the Dean on 18 March instructing him to make a diligent search for all those who sold plated latten and copper in the guise of gold or silver, within the sanctuary.³ The Goldsmiths continued to try to get an unimpeded right of search and they succeeded in extracting a Dutchman named Joze from the sanctuary in order to prosecute him.⁴

1. Liber Fleetwood f.181v.-189v. This confirmation cost the College 10 marks and was done by the authority of Parliament.
2. P.P.C. VI, p.50.
3. Liber Fleetwood, f.174v.-175.
4. Goldsmiths' Hall, Ms. 1520 B 39, Accounts 1444-1516, f.20. The Company spent £4 0s.1d. on different suits at Westminster in order to obtain the right of search. The Joze case cost the Company 19s.2d.

So far the royal influence had been used in favour of the Dean and his privileges. In 1451 the emphasis began to shift a little. The sanctuary was involved in three cases this year. In July Matthew Philip the Alderman of Aldersgate ward in which St. Martin's was situated, tried to levy money from the inhabitants of St. Martin's Lane for the City's costs in providing soldiers crossing to Calais.¹ When they refused he distrained their goods. The Dean complained to the King who denied that Philip had any authority to distrain the goods of the inhabitants of St. Martin's Lane. The City decided to defend Philip's action since it had always claimed that those who followed a trade within the precinct should share the City's burdens along with the other inhabitants of the City.² A royal writ of alias, however, moved Philip, on the advice of the Court of Aldermen and the Recorder, to return the distrained goods. If this had not proved effective the Dean had an extremely stern letter to Philip from the King which he could have delivered.³

On the other two occasions, however, the Dean himself had to defend his privileges against the King. One of Cade's 'petty captains', William Caym of Sittingbourne, Kent, took refuge in the sanctuary and the Dean had to argue his case before the King at Rochester. On this occasion the King acknowledged the Dean's rights and merely demanded that the prisoner be closely guarded.⁴ In November 1451, however, the Duke of York's

1. See Chapter VIII, p.462.

2. L.B.K., p.160; Liber Fleetwood f.176v.-177.

3. Liber Fleetwood f.177v.-178.

4. February 1451, Liber Fleetwood f.175v.-176. See Chapter IX, p.533 n.2.

chamberlain, Sir William Oldhall, was accused by Walter Burgh of treason and fled to St. Martin's. The King tried to get Oldhall out of the sanctuary on the grounds that its privileges did not extend to those accused of treason, but the Dean stood firm. In January 1452 therefore the Earls of Shrewsbury, Wiltshire and Worcester, together with Matthew Philip the ward Alderman, entered the sanctuary and dragged Oldhall from his hiding place in the turret of the Church. It is doubtful whether the King authorised such action and after the Dean had pleaded his case, Oldhall was returned. When, however, the Duke of York began to make his opposition to the King more obvious, the Dean was required to display his privileges before the King's secretary, Mr. Richard Andrew. As a result of this, nine men were sent to guard Oldhall in the sanctuary which was a breach of St. Martin's privileges and the men were only removed after a great deal of costly labour by the Dean.¹ As a result of these two cases the City had a better chance of finding the King sympathetic when they had cause to complain about privileged places.

At the end of 1454 the City decided to try to make the privileged places less attractive. No freeman who remained in a sanctuary or privileged place was to be allowed to enrol an apprentice; those freemen who lived in privileged places and did not pay their share of civic burdens were to be deprived of their freedom as long as they remained there; and foreigners who opened shops at Blancheapleton and other places as if they were free of the City were to have their shops closed.² These measures were an

1. Liber Fleetwood f.179v.-181v. See J.S. Roskell, The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments 1376-1523, pp.247, 360.

2. 9 October, 6 November, 13 December 1454, Jour.V f.198, 204, 212.

attempt to declare economic warfare against the privileged places for, if the precincts were starved of inhabitants, then the Dean of owner would be starved of revenue. But such decisions of the Court of Aldermen were not easy to carry out.

In May 1455 it was decided by the Common Council that foreigners who lived in St. Martin's Lane were to contribute towards subsidies in the same way as other foreigners since the road was common soil, like other king's highways, and lay within the liberty of the City.¹ In the same month, the King confirmed the privilege of St. Martin's, notwithstanding the privileges of the City of London, although it was stated that those who used the sanctuary as a base for committing abuses, were not to be allowed to re-enter once they had left.² Unfortunately for the City, rioting broke out at St. Martin's on the night of 21 September, centring on the misbehaviour of Thomas Kaythes who had taken refuge there.³ The City was anxious, for it was decided to send letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Earl of Salisbury.⁴ The Dean, as usual, rode to the King who was at Hertford and managed to stay the City's execution of judgment upon the men taken from the sanctuary. The City also sent a deputation to Hertford consisting of the Recorder, Undersheriff, Common Sergeant, four Sheriffs servants and the Alderman, William Marowe⁵ As a result of this deputation the King sent a considerate letter to the

-
1. 13 May 1455, Jour.V f.242.
 2. 20 May 1455, Liber Fleetwood f.178-179v.
 3. This was probably the same Kayles who appeared before the Court of Aldermen, 27 July 1454, accused of having threatened to kill the Sheriff with a sword and declaring, 'I wolle visage the shāref and these meyne with the bridbolt', Jour.V f.180.
 4. Jour.V f.263v., 264, 264v.
 5. 26 September 1455, Jour.V f.264v.

Londoners saying that he would appoint certain of his counsellors to hear the case. Meanwhile the prisoners were to be kept in good care, and the King concluded with the assurance 'that we wol see that ye have and enjoye the franchises and libertees of oure saide Citee to you by us and oure noble progenitours graunted and confermed as largely and freely as ye have had in tyme passed'.¹ The City took trouble to prepare its case and a levy was raised from the City Companies 'for the plea that was between the citizens and St. Martin's'.² Moreover Dr. Aleyn, Dr. Styllington, Dr. Wardale, Dr. Lucas and Dr. Morton were retained to be of the City's Counsel. Further Dr. Ebrale and Dr. Godard were to be consulted to see if they would be favourable to the City in this matter and a deputation was appointed to ride to meet the Lord Chancellor to seek his favour.³ Since there is no further record of the matter for eighteen months it seems likely that the doctors and counsel took some time to deliberate.

1. 27 September 1455, L.B.K., pp.370-71.
2. Ironmongers' Hall, Company Register I 1454-1543, f.1. The Company contributed 35s.6d.
3. 30 September, 6 October 1455, Jour.V f.265, 266. Dr. John Aleyn had been retained by the City to plead its case against increased tithes since 1451, and had only just arrived back in London after a period at Rome; possibly the same man as Emden, Biographical Register, p.22. Dr. Robert Styllington succeeded Caudray as Dean of St. Martin's 28 November 1458. He became Keeper of the Privy Seal and Lord Chancellor under the Yorkists, see Emden, op.cit., p.1777. Dr. John Wardale was Vicar of St. Mary's Islington, Emden, op.cit., p.1981. Dr. John Lucas had counselled the City about tithe paying since 1452, Jour.V f.92v. Dr. John Morton became later Bishop of Ely 1479 and Archbishop of Canterbury 1486, Emden, op.cit., pp.1318-20. Dr. Thomas Ebrale was one of the clerks chosen by the City to preach at St. Mary Spittal in 1445, 1446, 1452, 1454, Jour.IV f.110v., 150v., Jour.V. f.93, 212v., see Emden, op.cit., p.622-3. Dr. Godard preached at St. Mary's in 1452, Jour.V f.93, see Emden, op.cit., p.776.

In January 1457 three Aldermen and the Recorder were appointed to form a committee with the Dean of St. Severin, Mr. Thomas Kent and Dr. Stjllington to discuss and reform the excesses perpetrated in the close of St. Martin's.¹ On 5 February ordinances to regulate the behaviour of those living in St. Martin's were drafted with remedies for most of the City's complaints; stolen goods were to be restored to their owners and forgers were to be excluded.² On the same day the King paid Kent and the Dean of St. Severin £20 for their labours in drawing up these regulations.³ The ordinances were not, however, finally ratified by the King until 24 November of that year, when they received the Great Seal. The City also rewarded the Dean and invited Thomas Kent to dinner with the Mayor.⁴ When the new regulations were read to a delighted Common Council on 29 November they decided to send thanks to the King. In this case it is clear that the royal favour was more evenly divided between the City and St. Martin's with the result that a compromise, satisfactory to both parties, could be achieved. The Dean of St. Martin's not only accepted the regulations but also declared that his new building would not project into St. Martin's Lane so causing a nuisance to the City.⁵

In 1458 Caudray was succeeded by Dr. Stjllington as Dean of St. Martin's, but some problems about the sanctuary still remained, namely the inmates

-
1. 12 January 1457, Jour.VI f.91.
 2. L.B.K., p.392. Inspeximus dated 24 November 1457. Ordinances printed in A.J. Kempe, Historical Notices of the Collegiate Church of St. Martin's (1825), pp.146-51. Damaged copy in Exchequer P.R.O. E135/23/49.
 3. P.R.O. Warrant for Issue E404/71(1)/51, endorsed that it was paid by assignment in that term.
 4. Jour.VI f.185. 19 September 1458 Kent was made free of the City in the mystery of Mercers without paying a fine 'for his good and faithful service to the City' Jour.VI f.231v.
 5. Jour.VI f.185.

who by living there escaped both the craft search and City taxes. In 1459 the Sheriffs tried to levy a City subsidy from the inhabitants of St. Martin's Lane and, failing that, attempted to distrain their goods. The King sent a writ to the Sheriffs instructing them not to molest the inhabitants since the Lane lay within the liberty of St. Martin's. The Court of Aldermen decided that the writ could not be returned without prejudice to the City since it was the Londoners claim that St. Martin's Lane was part of the King's Highway.¹

* * * * *

In the four cases which have been examined the City's need for royal favour extended over a period of time and these matters formed a background for the negotiations over royal loans. But there are other cases, less important, usually short and sharp, which further reveal the City's dependence upon the Crown.

The abuses which followed in the wake of royal purveyance and the grievances which Englishmen felt about them were not peculiar to London. It is doubtful whether the more stringent regulations to govern the activities of purveyors proclaimed after the Parliament of 1407, were observed.² Purveyance, particularly of men, was acute in London. In 1408 Armourers were to be purveyed, in 1413 Broiderers, Tailors, Painters

-
1. Jour.VI. f.169. The Liber Fleetwood contains copies of the writ to the Sheriffs dated 6 November 1459, an undated writ to Matthew Philip, and a further writ to the Sheriffs dated 7 November 1459, f.194-196. A copy of the last writ is also to be found among the records of the Dean and Chapter at Westminster, W.A.M. 13164.
 2. R.P. III p.609. 16 November 1407, Royal writ to the Sheriffs to proclaim in London that no-one was to be compelled to provide goods for the King's household unless the officers first showed their commission, L.B.I., pp.60-61.

and workmen, and in 1414 Painters again.¹ Ships were frequently purveyed to transport armies to France and the relations of the royal purveyors and their suppliers cannot have been improved by decisions, such as that in June 1414, to postpone payment to those owed money for purveyed goods.² In May 1415 it appears that those workmen who had been purveyed for the King's work in London had had to be imprisoned.³

Perhaps because the campaigns of Henry V had involved a great deal of purveyance the first two Parliaments of Henry VI's reign enacted further statutes to control it.⁴ These statutes may have had some effect for there were no complaints in the City for the next twenty years. In 1441 the citizens clashed with members of Gloucester's household who had tried to purvey a horse from a poor man who had been wounded in resisting their attempts.⁵ Further the Parliament of 1442 enacted regulations about the amount of resistance which could be offered to royal purveyors and this was proclaimed in the City.⁶ But the grievances about purveyance must still have festered in the City for the Common Council in April 1448 drew up a bill to be presented to Parliament against the purveying of beasts and victuals belonging to citizens.⁷ In 1458 however Robert Whittingham was

-
1. C.P.R., 1408-13, p.35; C.P.R., 1413-16, pp.12, 175.
 2. C.C.R., 1413-19, pp.180-81. For purveying of ships, 1 June 1416, L.B.I., p.162, March 1443, P.P.C. V, p.237.
 3. 27 May 1415, P.P.C. II, pp.167-68, cf. note 4, p.416 below.
 4. R.P. IV, p.190; Statutes of the Realm (1816), vol.II, p.213. 20 February 1424, writ to Sheriffs to proclaim these statutes. The statutes were translated from French into English and were entered in the Letter Book, L.B.I., pp.288-98.
 5. 3 March 1441, Jour.III f.78.
 6. R.P.V., p.55; Statutes of the Realm (1816) vol.II, p.320; L.B.K., p.269.
 7. Jour.IV f.214v.; this may have led to the statute of the Parliament of 1449/50 whereby certain patents to make purveyance were declared void, R.P. V, p.202; Statutes of the Realm (1816) vol.II, pp.354-55.

given wide powers not only of purveyance in London and the suburbs for the Queen's Wardrobe, but also of imprisonment for those who resisted him.¹ Such grants cannot have endeared the Lancastrian dynasty to the Londoners but in this respect at least Edward IV was no improvement. In 1462 rioting, ~~arising-rioting~~ arising from abuse of purveyance, broke out between the citizens and royal servants which was serious enough for the Mayor and Aldermen to go to the Lord Chancellor.²

The right of the King to purvey goods was not questioned but the abuses of the system rendered it obnoxious. Imposters, such as William Redhede in 1417 and John Toterich in 1422, were rampant.³ Moreover genuine purveyors were open to bribery. In 1410 the Bridgewardens paid 3s.4d. to William, one of the King's purveyors 'so that he should not take our workmen for the King's work'.⁴ Similarly in about 1421 the Brewers paid 16d. to a 'taker of the King's' so that he would allow the carpenters to go on working at Brewers Hall.⁵

There were certain actions for which it was necessary to get a royal licence. Those which, in this period most concerned the citizens were

1. C.P.R., 1452-61, p.429. These powers may have been given to Whittingham to purvey men for building works. The Carpenters' accounts for 1458 record payments at different times when 'we went with the purveyors', Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters, vol.II, ed. Bowers Marsh (Oxford, 1914), p.28.
2. Jour.VI f.8v., 15.
3. L.B.I., pp.174, 270.
4. G.R.O. Bridge House Accounts, Payments Series I 1404-12, f.271. During the week ending 27 February 1417 12d. was paid to John Carleton one of the Mayor's serjeants, for going to the Clerk of the King's works in order to get the Bridge employees, who had been taken for the King's work, exonerated from arrest, Ibid., Series I 1412-21, f.238.
5. Guildhall Library Ms.5440, Brewers' Account Book, f.100v.

licences to alienate in mortmain, import corn into the City and use building materials to which the King had a preemptory claim.

The right of freemen of London to alienate land which they held in the City, into mortmain was confirmed by the Charter of 1327.¹ With the growing number of City Companies which wished to own land or tenements, the problem in the City became more pronounced. The same customs which governed the devising of land to the Church were supposed also to govern the devising of land to City Companies. The usual practice, however, was for groups of freemen to receive a request, in order to hold it for the benefit of the Company i.e. as feoffees *tà uses*. This method whereby City Companies had been evading the provisions of the statute of 1279 were revealed in the enquiry of 1388-9, and a new statute was passed which made the acquisition of land on behalf of Guilds and Fraternities subject to the same restraints as other lands covered by the act of 1279.² Hence it became necessary to sue for a special royal licence to cover each bequest.

-
1. The City wished to uphold its privilege but, like the Crown, was anxious about the amount of City land which was bequeathed to the 'dead hand' and so escaped certain civic dues, see H.M. Chew, 'Mortmain in Medieval London', E.H.R., vol.CCXXXVI (1945), pp.1-15. This problem was largely dealt with by an ordinance passed by Common Council in 1434 whereby the Mayor and Recorder were empowered to supervise all wills devising land in mortmain, L.B.K., p.181. Since wills could not be enrolled in the Hustings Court until they had been approved by the Mayor and Recorder this check was effective. William Aston, gentleman, bequeathed certain tenements in London to the Priory of Holy Trinity, Beauvale, Notts. The will was drawn up in February 1456 and after Aston died two Aldermen were appointed to inspect the tenement thus devised in mortmain. Three days later one of the executors, Robert Cartlege, had to pay the large sum of £18 to have the will enrolled, Calendar of Wills enrolled in the Court of Hustings, ed. R.R. Sharpe (1890), vol.II, pp.542-53; 8, 11 June 1461, Jour.VI f.54v., 51b.
 2. Statutes of the Realm (1816), vol.II, pp.79080.

To deal with this problem City Companies began to become incorporated and, with the grant of incorporation, there would be a comprehensive royal licence allowing the Company to hold lands in mortmain up to a specified annual value. In the 1390s the Goldsmiths', Mercers' and Saddlers' all acquired such charters.¹ But the Tailors, who were not incorporated until 1408, had to buy special royal licences to receive land in 1392 and 1440-1, and they held these lands in their capacity as 'the Guild and Fraternity of St. John the Baptist'.² Similarly the Brewers, who did not receive a charter of incorporation until 1438, when they wished to hold their hall in mortmain had to buy a royal licence for the 'amortisement' which took them five years (1429-1434) and cost at least £5 10s.³

Just as it was necessary for the City Companies to buy licences to hold land in mortmain, so the City itself, in its corporate capacity, found it necessary to pay £100 for such a licence in 1411 which would allow the City to hold lands to the value of £100 p.a. The immediate cause of this move on the part of the Mayor and Commonalty was their desire to receive from Richard Whittington and other feoffees the Manor of Leadenhall with the advowsons of the churches of St. Peter Cornhill and St. Margaret Patyns.⁴



1. G. Unwin, Guilds and Companies of London (1908), pp.159, 163.
2. H.L. Hopkinson, The History of Merchant Tailors' Hall (Cambridge, 1931), p.7. In 1400/1 the Company paid a total of £4 2s.0d. for expenses in obtaining a licence to hold property in Friday Street, Tailors' Accounts i f.11v. When the Tailors received their charter in 1408 they were incorporated and empowered to hold lands to the value of £100 p.a., printed by F. Morris Fry and R.T.D. Sayle, eds. Charters of the Merchant Tailors' Company (1937), pp.15-18.
3. Brewers' Account Book, op.cit., f.165v.-166, 189, 203v., 226v., 230. Charter dated 22 February 1438, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.142.
4. Leadenhall was valued at £12 p.a., see L.B.I. pp.92-3. For the history of the advowson of St. Peter's Cornhill see Chapter II, pp.6-61. For the history of Leadenhall see Chapter III. p.226.

Another respect in which the City was dependant upon royal licences was for the control of the import and export of grain. A great metropolis like London was bound to be sensitive to national famines and the King could grant special licences allowing citizens to travel further afield than was usual to buy a specified amount of grain for sale only in the City. Royal grace and communal foresight could prevent famine in the City, as in 1390-91, but both were necessary.¹ In order to encourage merchants to import corn from abroad the King could waive the import subsidy of 11d. in the £, as he did during the scarcity of 1401-2, when the inhabitants of wards were also enjoined to lay in supplies.² The next serious dearth occurred in 1408-9 when William Sevenokes was licensed to import 1000 quarters of grain to London from Yorkshire and elsewhere.³ Although usually such licences were granted because of dearth, they could also be granted because of an influx of people into London, for example, for the reception of Henry V after Agincourt, or for the large numbers of people attending Parliament and convocation in London in the Autumn of 1435.⁴

Professor Postan points out that England normally grew enough grain for her own needs but in order to supply the garrisons at Calais, Guisnes

-
1. Cal.P. and M. 1381-1412, pp.174-75.
 2. November 1401, P.P.C. I, p.175; 31 March 1402, L.B.I., p.17.
 3. 17 December 1408, C.P.R. 1408-13, p.41. The licence stipulated that the wheat was to be brought to the City by Easter, but 24 March 1409, the licence was extended until Whitsun since Sevenokes had only imported 480 quarters, C.C.R. 1405-9, p.434.
 4. Licence to Richard Merlawe to import 300 quarters of wheat bought in Cambridgeshire, 26 January 1416, C.C.R. 1413-19, p.335. 25 October 1435 licence to William Chyld and John atte wood to buy 1000 quarters of wheat in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire and sell it in London, C.P.R. 1405-9, p.434.

and Aquitaine in lean years it was necessary to import corn from abroad, especially from Prussia.¹ Early in 1417 grain was scarce in England: the Duke of Clarence was licensed to bring 500 quarters of wheat and 500 quarters of beans and peas to London from Yorkshire, Lincolnshire and Nottingham, and the King wrote to the Master General of the order of Teutonics asking him to encourage the export of corn to England because of the scarcity caused by heavy rains.² Since the export of corn was forbidden in February 1419 the dearth must have continued.³

In 1429 there was a further serious dearth and the Common Council sent William Rider abroad to buy corn, which he did successfully in Normandy returning in August of that year, when the accounts were audited.⁴ Because of this same scarcity the King licensed Alexander Reve to bring 200 quarters of wheat from East Anglia to London.⁵ This fear of scarcity in London was never long absent in the 1430s. In 1432 the Common Council petitioned the Mayor and Aldermen to urge the King's Council to restrict the export of corn.⁶ In 1437/8 there was a serious dearth. In September 1437

1. M.M. Postan, op.cit., p.140. There was a direct corn trade between Danzig and Gascony.
2. C.P.R. 1416-22, p.59; L.B.I., p.174. The victualling of the King's troops aggravated the problem, see licence to Henry Barton, 3 March 1417, L.B.I., p.172.
3. 9 February 1419, C.C.R. 1413-19, p.498; L.B.I., p.215.
4. 22 April, 18 August 1429, L.B.K., pp.92, 94; Jour.II f.132v., 137v. William Rider was a fishmonger and was sworn a Bailiff of Billingsgate 29 November 1424, Jour.II f.28v. He was exonerated from jury service 6 September 1429, L.B.K., p.100.
5. 24 April 1429, C.P.R. 1422-29, p.532.
6. 11 October 1432, L.B.K., p.146. P.R.O. Ancient Petition 4504, written in French and addressed to the Duke of Bedford. There is no evidence that anything was done in response to this petition, which was particularly concerned about the export of corn from the seven counties around London.

the Mayor, John Mitchell, was commissioned by the King to search the Thames and retrieve all the wheat which was being exported without licence, since it was needed during the scarcity, and in December the Aldermen made contributions towards buying corn.¹ In the following year, in April, John Leenge received a royal licence to import 160 quarters into the City and in December the Mayor Stephen Broun, was licensed to buy 2000 quarters of corn in Sussex, Kent, Lincoln and Northampton 'for the sustenance of London'. The licence was renewed in May 1439.² As a result of this prolonged scarcity the City decided in July 1439 to build two granaries at Leadenhall and the Stocks.³ Perhaps because of this civic effort, and because of the withdrawal of English garrisons from France only two more royal licences to buy corn were necessary during this period, both in November 1439, by which time the granaries could not have been built.⁴ The City no longer needed to be dependent upon the Crown in this matter.

Finally the City depended upon the Crown for licences to undertake certain civic building projects and to acquire some of the necessary

-
1. C.P.R. 1436-41, p.44; 20 December 1437, Jour.III f.194.
 2. 10 April 1438, C.P.R. 1436-41, p.154. In this month also Margaret Frenssh, the wife of a baker Andrew Frenssh, reported to the Court of Aldermen that she had bought 4 bushels of corn at Friars Minor from a foreigner for 21d. the bushel, Jour.III f.175v. 22 December 1438, 6 May 1439, C.P.R. 1436-41, pp.232, 253. According to Stow, Broun sent to Prussia for corn thereby bringing down the price of wheat from 3s. a bushel to less than half that price, Stow, Survey, vol.I, pp.109-10. c.f. Bale p.114
 3. 18 July 1439, Jour.III f.18v. See Chapter III, p.246.
 4. 7, 11 November 1439, C.P.R. 1436-41, pp.344, 345. The licences were for John West to ship 300 quarters of wheat from Great Yarmouth to London, and for Stephen Broun to buy up 500 quarters of wheat.

materials. Sometimes these licences were sought by the Mayor and Commonalty, sometimes by individual citizens. In 1415 when the Londoners embarked upon the rebuilding of the Guildhall they obtained a royal licence to bring four boats and four carts of rag, lime and freestone to the City, as well as a licence to pull down the old chapel of St. Mary near the Guildhall.¹ In 1435 London Bridge was found to be in urgent need of repair because of the 'vehemence of floods'. The Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs petitioned the King to allow them to employ workmen and labourers on the Bridge and to take such timber, stone, iron and lead as might be necessary for the work.² Again in 1443 the Mayor and Aldermen obtained a royal licence to allow them to acquire 200 fothers of lead for the piping to the new conduits, as well as a confirmation of their right to erect fountains and permission to build a new cross in West Chepe.³ In the same year the executors of John Wells obtained a royal licence to rebuild part of the king's highway and pull down the old standard in Cheapside, and in 1464 the Alderman William Taylor was granted a licence to take stones and workmen for his building projects in the City; these were to be protected from purveyance.⁴

-
1. 4 April 1415, C.P.R. 1413-16, p.296; 16 April 1430, C.P.R. 1429-36, pp.57-58. The first licence contained the proviso that the citizens could only collect such stone etc. as was not needed for the King's works.
 2. P.R.O. Ancient Petition 9386; L.B.K., pp.191, 248. There is no record of a royal licence.
 3. C.P.R. 1441-6, pp.178, 198; L.B.K., pp.292-93.
 4. 15 January 1443, C.P.R. 1441-6, p.161; 7 April 1464, C.P.R. 1461-7, p.324.

In all these cases, the protection of the Thames waters, the granting of royal patents, the tussles with foreign merchants, the battles over the sanctuary rights of St. Martin's, the complaints against purveyance and the search for royal licences; in all these we have seen the citizens of London as royal suitors. They sent deputations, made requests to the Council, petitioned the King in Parliament but almost always without success. As yet they showed little awareness of the weapon which lay to their hand, namely redress of grievances before supplies. Most of the hard-won privileges of the Londoners were not yet sufficiently established for the citizens to be prepared to risk them in open conflict with the King. Thus while Richard II could take away the City's liberties and while Edward IV was able successfully to 'live of his own', even the great City of London had to pander to their royal will. When the vast scope of the royal prerogative is considered with its infinite opportunities for patronage, exploitation, blackmail and reward, then the acceptance and survival of the Lancastrian Kings, in spite of their obvious financial difficulties, can be viewed in its true perspective, as unremarkable.

CHAPTER VIITHE FINANCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN LONDON AND THE CROWN, 1400-1450:THE CROWN AS SUITOR

The purpose of this chapter is to study the corporate loans and gifts made by the City of London to the three Lancastrian Kings. The City as a whole, expressing its opinion through the Common Council, which controlled financial business, frequently lent money to the King. It might also refuse loans while individual Londoners, or the merchants of the Calais Staple many of whom were Londoners (e.g. Richard Whittington, William Estfeld, William Combes, Robert Horne, Thomas Chalton, Nicholas Wotton, John Reynwell, John Mitchell, Nicholas James, William Waldern), continued to lend.¹ When the Londoners in their corporate capacity pleaded 'insufficiency' when refusing to make loans to the ^{Crown} ~~Crown~~, this can usually be shown to be a justifiable excuse since individual Londoners were already lending considerable sums. The Earl of Shrewsbury was finally squeezed out of Aquitaine by the French in 1452-4 and the City appears to have lent nothing to the Crown between 1 March 1453 and 5 June 1454, but in the same period the Londoners individually lent £7084 18s.8d. and the Calais merchants lent ~~£666 13s. 4d.~~ ^{£666 13s. 4d. 2}. Different groups of Londoners provided money at different times and the pattern of corporate lending must not be considered in isolation. But since the Journals of the Court of Aldermen and Court of Common Council are extant from 1416 onwards it is often possible to find

-
1. See Appendix no. 45 for a comparison of these 3 categories of loans.
 2. See Appendix no. 45 and Appendix no. 46 p. 634.

out more about civic loans than about the other forms of London lending. It is possible to trace the history of a loan back beyond its first appearance in the Exchequer Records. Sometimes, also, a discussion about the Crown's failure to repay a loan may be found while in the Exchequer Receipt Roll there is only the bland record of the issue of tallies of assignment ('tallies cashed').

In this study of the financial relations between London and the Crown in this period the Receipt and Issue Rolls and the warrants for Issues at the Public Record Office have been used. The study of these documents has been much helped by the work carried out by several scholars in the last few years who have gone far towards elucidating the hidden meanings of the records of the medieval Exchequer.¹ Some work has been done on the London records of lending to the Crown in this period, by Miss M.I. Peake, in her thesis 'London and the Wars of the Roses' and also in an article published jointly with Miss Jeffries Davies.² But as these studies were compiled only from the City records and used none of the Exchequer material, the picture they present is necessarily incomplete.

-
1. See especially: K.B. McFarlane, 'Loans to the Lancastrian Kings: the problem of inducement', Cambridge Historical Journal, vol.IX (1947), pp.51-61; E.B. Fryde, 'Materials for the study of Edward III's Credit operations 1327-48', B.I.H.R., vol.XXII (1949), pp.105-38 and vol.XXIII (1950), pp.1-30; J.L. Kirby, 'Issues of the Lancastrian Exchequer and Lord Cromwell's estimate of 1433', B.I.H.R., vol.XXIV (1951), pp.121-51; A. Steel, The Receipt of the Exchequer 1377-1485 (Cambridge, 1954); G.L. Harriss, 'Fictitious Loans', Econ.H.R., 2nd series, vol.VIII (1955-56), pp.187-99; G.L. Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', B.I.H.R., vol.XXX (1957), pp.17-40.
 2. E. Jeffries Davies and M.I. Peake, 'Loans from the City of London to Henry VI 1431-1449', B.I.H.R., vol.IV (1926-27), pp.165-72. Miss Peake's London M.A. thesis was summarised in B.I.H.R., vol.IV (1926-27) pp.45-47.

The clearest way of presenting the picture of corporate London lending in this period is by way of a table. In this have been recorded all the financial transactions between London and the Crown; whether these were gifts or loans.¹ The refusals to lend are also recorded in the notes to this table. There were 48 loans to the Crown, 13 gifts and 2 occasions when it is not clear whether the grant took the form of a loan or a gift, making a total of 63 occasions in 60 years when the City in its corporate capacity provided money for the Crown. The details and the sources are in the table, what follows in this chapter is by way of a commentary.

It is necessary first to consider the motives which lay behind the making of these corporate loans or gifts to the Crown. Mr. McFarlane has argued - and he is followed somewhat hesitantly by Principal Steel - that the explanation is to be found in the high rates of interest offered by the Crown.² The lack of convincing evidence for most of these usurious transactions is explained away by the ecclesiastical ban on such dealings which led to full scale deceptions and false entries. Mr. McFarlane has stated uncompromisingly that 'either these loans were unprofitable and compulsory or they were voluntary and carried with them a guaranteed reward'. There appears to be no room for loans that were unprofitable and voluntary, although at the end of his article Mr. McFarlane concedes that 'possibly royal boroughs and other corporations were regarded as having a duty to lend without gain'. Mr. Kirby seems to have doubted Mr. McFarlane's

1. See Appendix no. 46

2. K.B. McFarlane, op.cit.; Steel, op.cit., esp. pp.261-64.

concealed usury hypothesis and Mr. Harriss has argued this point further by drawing a distinction between usurious loans known as 'chevaunces' made by merchants and non-usurious loans which 'were an expression of the subjects aid to the Crown in time of necessity. This meant that by their very nature they were interest free. The subject was expected to aid the King and not to make a profit from his plight'.¹ Although Mr. Harriss was mainly concerned with the small loans made by individuals in response to the demands of royal commissioners, his theory of obligation clearly applies also to the City of London and, no doubt, to other boroughs also. The belief that the corporate City loans were usurious cannot be supported when the City and Exchequer records are used together. Some of the loans from individual London merchants may have been usurious but the corporate loans advanced by the City in this period certainly were not.

There are 12 loans during this period for which we have both the Common Council's decision to lend the money recorded in the Journals and the sum received recorded in the Receipt Roll at the Exchequer.² In every case except one the size of the sum agreed by the Common Council and that recorded in the Exchequer are the same. It is possible that the Londoners and the Exchequer officials were all party to a huge deception but it seems unlikely. In the only case where the sums are different, that recorded in the Receipt Roll is smaller.³ This particular loan of 23 March 1442 is

-
1. Kirby, op.cit., and G.L. Harriss, 'Aids, Loans and Benevolences', Hist.Journal, vol.IV (1963), pp.1-19.
 2. See loans nos. 11, 23, 26, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 50.
 3. Loan no.41.

confusing in many ways and Principal Steel' wrote of it 'here the case of concealed interest may well arise' for he believed that the further £666 13s.4d. which was recorded on the Receipt Roll on 18 July 1442 was not a real loan but the interest on the previous loan of 23 March 1442.¹ But an examination of the Journals shows that this £666 13s.4d. was in fact a separate loan, separately granted by the Common Council on 26 July 1442 to which no sinister theories can be attached.²

Since the Exchequer clerk wrote up the Receipt Roll sometimes many days or months after the transaction had taken place, it would be possible for him to alter the figures as he entered them.³ It is less likely that the clerk who compiled the City Journals and who wrote his rough notes daily - and very hastily - would have been able to record a concocted total. But against those who would still maintain that the corporate City loans were usurious there remains a further piece of evidence. After 1439 there sometimes appear in the Journals the assessments by wards whereby the City apportioned the sum that was to be raised, whether for advances to the Crown, Parliamentary grants or exactions for civic purposes. There are ten assessments that were made for collecting the money for loans to the Crown.⁴ In every case except one the assessment comes within a few pounds of the amount voted by Common Council and therefore, in the four cases

1. Steel, op.cit., p.262.
2. Loan no.42.
3. See Fryde, op.cit., pp.137-38 and Kirby, op.cit., p.26.
4. Loans nos. 38, 39, 41, 46, 50, 53, 59, 60.

where the loan is also to be found on the Receipt Roll, within a few pounds of that sum also.¹ It seems inconceivable that these assessment lists, compiled for the use of the collectors and for the Aldermen, should have been falsified. Their detail - down to the last farthing - is so exact that the hiding of interest within these sums would have been impossible. The City, therefore, did not lend money to the King in order to make money, but out of a sense of duty and in response to the King's necessity which he presented in as bleak a light as possible. Because these loans were not usurious it does not necessarily follow that they were forced or even 'semi-forced' as Principal Steel has called them, but they were the oil with which the City lubricated the lumbering machine of royal favour and privilege.² If the King appears to come as a beggar to the City, it is necessary to remember that even as a beggar he could bestow favours and - more to the point - withdraw privileges. These aspects of royal borrowing have been examined in Chapter VI.

Since, therefore, the corporate lending to the City was not usurious, it was necessary for the King to persuade potential lenders and to convince them of his necessity. Sometimes when the King had a particularly expensive and important project on hand, a distinguished royal servant would be sent to urge the King's case before the Common Council. In March 1415 the

-
1. The case where the difference is larger than a few pounds is loan no.39. The assessment fell short of the required £1333 6s.8d. by £72 10s.8d. It is possible that the assessment for a quarter fifteenth made in May 1440 was to make up the required sum, Jour.III f.43. But more probably the Aldermen made up the difference in February 1440.
 2. Steel, op.cit., p.262.

Archbishop of Canterbury came to the Guildhall to expound on the virtues of the invasion of France and in July 1444, Suffolk in person came to explain the need for a loan to bring Margaret of Anjou from France and to make a final peace between the two countries.¹ More often the King sent a letter which was read to the Common Council and the matter was then discussed.² The Council could act very rapidly. In 1442 three days after the Council decided to ask the City for money, Common Council was discussing the request.³ Sometimes the City might receive a request for help direct from France as when in June 1435 and in July 1451 the Mayor and Aldermen of Calais wrote for assistance, or when in January 1453 the beleaguered Earl of Shrewsbury wrote direct to the Mayor, Aldermen and citizens from Aquitaine.⁴

Clearly the loans were not forced, for on eight occasions we know that Common Council refused to lend any money to the King; five of these refusals are to be found during the years 1453-55.⁵ Where a reason for the refusal is recorded, it is always the plea of poverty; the royal necessity is never questioned. Ralph Holland who was a member of the Common Council in May 1429 claimed that the King's necessity was not as great as the Aldermen had represented it to be.⁶ For Holland this was a protest against the ruling merchant Aldermen rather than a protest against the King, but his statement

-
1. See loans nos.10, 46. 2. See loans nos.40, 42, 57.
 3. See loan no.43. 4. See loans nos.35, 55, 57.
 5. See notes to loans nos.23, 50, 54, 59, 60.
 6. Jour.II f.133v.

does reveal that, in some cases at least, the Aldermen took it upon themselves to urge the King's case before the Common Council.¹ The necessity that the King pleaded - where it is known in this period - could always be classed under one of the five following headings:- the Welsh war (1403-9), the wars in France (1412-59), the defence of the realm, guarding the seas and the expenses involved in the King's marriage with Margaret of Anjou. There was, of course, no guarantee that the money lent by the City would be spent upon the projects for which it was requested. It was suspicion of this kind which no doubt led to the appointment in Parliament of Treasurers who were to collect and spend the new land tax in 1404.² In one case we have proof that the King spent a London loan in ways other than those intended. On 27 July 1441 Common Council agreed to lend £666 13s.4d. for the relief of the Duchy of Guienne. On 31 July the King issued a writ to the Treasurer to pay to his clerk, Mr. Richard Morgan, £40 as a reward in ready money from that recently lent by the Londoners for the relief of Guienne.³

Where perhaps the need was urgent, the City sometimes made arrangements to provide soldiers or wages direct rather than entrust the money to the royal Exchequer.⁴ Occasionally the City provided financial supplies in the

1. See loan no.40.

2. R.P. III, p.546.

3. See loan no.42. The writ for Mr. Richard Morgan is endorsed as paid this term, i.e. Easter 1441, E404/58/183.

4. See loans no.14, 55, also provision for Rouen, loan no.51 and for Sandwich, loan no.60. In 1453 Parliament decided to provide 13,000 archers of which London was to contribute 1,137, R.P. V, pp.231-32.

form of goods.¹ But the failure of some of the City loans to appear in the Exchequer records may have been due as much to the King's desire to circumvent that institution as to the Londoners mistrust of it. This failure of London money to reach those for whom it was intended can be clearly seen in a case in 1409. The Londoners lent £4666 13s.4d. for the expedition of Prince Henry to Wales. This money was paid to those officers whom the King had specified, but the Prince informed the Mayor that he had not received it. In December, therefore, the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty wrote to the King assuring him that they had, in fact, paid the money.² Clearly also some of the civic loans or gifts were only nominally made to the King and the money was paid to individuals, to the Duke of Bedford in January 1420 and December 1425 and to the Duke of Gloucester in April 1424 and April 1426.³ In these cases there is no record of the transactions in the Exchequer and the citizens had only the personal security provided by the recipient, although the money was most probably used for 'national purposes'.⁴ No doubt the good will of two such important men - especially during the absence abroad of Henry V and the minority of Henry VI - was sufficiently important for the citizens to overlook the question of security. The Duke of Gloucester on several occasions supported the rights of the Londoners and the Court of Aldermen in 1439 declared that he 'had often been a gracious

1. See L.B.I., p.200.

2. See loan no.7 and L.B.I., p.200.

3. See loan nos.15, 19, 21, 22.

4. See loan no.22. The Londoners asked the Duke of Gloucester to provide sufficient security himself.

and favourable lord to this City', so it is clear that the loans and gifts, whether repaid or not, had yielded dividends.¹

In every case where we have a record of the amount of money for which the King asked as a loan, we know that the sum granted was less than that requested.² But as Miss Jeffries Davies pointed out 'this was so much a matter of course that no conclusions can be drawn from its occurrences in any particular case concerning the relations then existing between the sovereign and the city'.³ If the King asked only for a small sum his necessity would appear less great and the result might be no money at all.

Once Common Council had agreed to a loan or gift the machinery for raising the money was quickly put into motion. It was unusual for there to be enough money in the City's treasury to advance money to the King without recourse to the citizens, although part of the sum might be provided from money in the hands of the Chamberlain - even if it were money repaid by the King from an earlier loan and due to be paid back to the citizens.⁴ The process whereby money was raised in the City seems to have followed a standard pattern. The first step was to appoint a committee to receive the

-
1. Jour.III f.24v. December 1419 the City found it to be politic to give to Lord Humphrey 'locum tenens' 8 pipes of red wine and 4 butts of sweet wine, Jour.I f.67v. There are several occasions which show that the City and the Duke of Gloucester were on friendly terms. In October 1439 the City granted a petition because it had the support of the Duke, Jour.III f.24v. The City wrote to him for help during the crisis over the Commission of the Peace in October 1443, Jour.IV f.8v. In September 1445 Richard Greneland, a servant of the Duke, was allowed to marry a City orphan 'for love of his master' Jour.IV f.96. The Duke also supported the City when its privileges in Southwark were threatened, Jour.II f.7.
 2. See loans nos.41, 43, 49.
 3. Jeffries Davies, op.cit., p.166 n.2.
 4. See loan no.45.

money. This might consist of Aldermen or Common Councilmen or both.¹ For example the committee of eight Common Councilmen appointed in February 1440 was not only to receive the money and pay it over to the King, but also to receive the security offered by the King and work for the repayment of the money.² Possibly such a committee - or the Court of Aldermen - then drew up an assessment list, dividing the burden amongst the different wards. There were standard assessments for a fifteenth (and for multiples and fractions of it) and for such sums as 2000 marks (£1333 6s.8d.), but the standard assessment was always altered and certain wards would have their burden increased, and others reduced. Several of these assessments survive and provide an interesting picture of the relative wealth of different wards.³ There is evidence, both from the adjustments made to the standard assessment, and from the stipulations enjoined by the Common Council when agreeing to a loan, that there was a genuine humanitarian attempt not to press too hardly upon those who could not afford to pay. Frequently the Common Council decide that anyone who was assessed to pay less than 3s.4d. was not to contribute and occasionally that no one was to pay more than 6s.8d.⁴ But on one occasion it is clear that an attempt by the Aldermen to make the richer wards help the poorer ones met with opposition from the Common Council.⁵

The next step, once the burden had been divided amongst the wards, was to write a precept to the Alderman which instructed him to collect the amount

-
1. See loans nos.37, 38, 39, 42, 45, 47, 53, 55, 57, 59, 62.
 2. Loan no.39.
 3. See Chapter III, pp. 149-150. Assessments for loans or gifts to the King; see loans nos.38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 50, 53, 55, 57, 60.
 4. Loans nos.41, 42, 50.
 5. Loan no.56.

which his ward had been allotted, and which declared the cause of the levy, and the date when the money was to be brought to Guildhall. Often the rough draft of the precept appears in the Journal and it was probably the responsibility of the Common ~~Council~~ Clerk to write and deliver them, since he was instructed by the Common Council to do so in October 1449.¹ The most interesting feature of these precepts is the speed at which the Alderman was expected to collect the money in his ward. In the five cases where, for loans, we have dated precepts, the greatest length of time given for collection is eleven days and the least, four days.²

At the ward level it is more difficult to know what happened. Probably, as appears to have been the case in July 1442, a small committee of men of the ward - perhaps the Common Councilmen - assessed their fellow inhabitants.³ There is extant a partial list, covering some wards, showing the amounts at which individuals were assessed but it is not for a royal loan.⁴ There is also a list of October/November 1449 showing the contributions made by individuals towards the defence of Rouen which fell to the French. But this levy seems to have been a hasty ad hoc measure and did not go through the normal routine.⁵

The part played by the Aldermen in raising a loan for the King was more than purely administrative. Although it was the Common Council which decided whether a loan should be made or not, such a levy, once granted,

1. Drafts of precepts for levying money, see loans nos.11, 14, 38, 41, 53, 55; instructions to the Common Clerk, loan no.50.
2. Loan no.14 (6 days); no.38 (4 days); no.41 (11 days); no.53 (9 days); no.55 (4 days).
3. See loan no.42.
4. Jour.III f.149-149v., 179-179v., 176-178.
5. See loan no.51.

would dip most deeply into the pockets of the Aldermen and this financial liability was, no doubt, one of the more burdensome aspects of an Alderman's duties. It seems clear that the amount of his contribution was not left open to choice and where the assessments - after deductions - fell slightly short of the sum to be raised, it must surely have been the Aldermen who made up the difference and ensured that the completed sum was taken to the Exchequer.¹ The loan of £2000 which the City agreed to provide for the King in the spring of 1442 fell short of 2000m. by about £300, and it was necessary for the Aldermen to provide the extra money since the Exchequer was withholding any security at all until the full amount was received.² Sometimes the Aldermen, when they believed that a loan to the King was a necessary act of policy, lent the money themselves rather than ask an unwilling Common Council to tax the City again. In August 1445 the Mayor and Aldermen provided a loan of £100, in March 1453 a loan of £333 6s.8d. and the last civic contribution to the Lancastrian government was a gift of 100 nobles (£33 6s.8d.) by the Aldermen.³ This derisory sum was clearly nothing but a face-saver. The Aldermen did not want to refuse outright to make a contribution towards the wages of the Lancastrian soldiers but clearly they believed that a considerable investment in Lancastrian goodwill was not worth-while.

Occasionally a deficit in the required sum was not made good by the Aldermen but by a contribution from the City Chest; or an individual might advance the necessary sum on behalf of the City; or, possibly, there may

1. Loan no.11.

2. Loan no.41 and n.

3. Loans nos.48, 58, 63.

have been a second assessment, although the one possible instance of this is very doubtful.¹ But clearly the main burden of any financial deficiency was borne by the Aldermen, and this was in their own interests, since they were the first to feel the cooling of royal favour. Many Aldermen were also lending to the Crown - perhaps for profit - in their private capacities or as merchants of the Calais staple, with the result that their involvement in the fate of the government was always greater than that of the Common Councilmen, and their more cautious approach to revolutionary movements, therefore, understandable.

The process of raising money for any purpose - whether for royal loans or other levies - did not always go smoothly in the City. Sometimes the Common Council decided that aliens should be included in the assessment and this, while being popular with the 'denizens', could provoke trouble and repercussions.² Because in April 1420 'certain persons used threatening words and resisted the collection of sums assessed' the Common Council took strong measures and decided that those who refused to pay should be deprived of their freedom.³ Men of little substance appear quite often before the Court of Aldermen for failing to pay their assessed contribution.⁴ On the whole, however, there appears to have been no mass protest at the frequent levies which, when Parliamentary grants are taken into account, must have

1. See loans nos.30, 39, 62.

2. See loans nos.15, 55.

3. 16 June 1420 writ of certiorari about the imprisonment of certain Londoners and return made by Mayor and Sheriffs, Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.79, L.B.I., p.245; loan no.15.

4. See loans nos.17, 21, 25, 62.

averaged three levies every two years.¹ If the levies for civic purposes were also considered the average would be more like two every year.

Of course a loan to the King, unlike a gift or a Parliamentary subsidy, was not money gone for ever. Or was it? The careful account of the state of the various outstanding loans made by the citizens to the King, which the Chamberlain compiled in March 1450 is clear evidence that citizens expected to be informed about money they had lent even if ^{it had} not always ^{been} repaid.² From this document we can learn - for example - that of a loan of £333 6s.8d. made to the King in March 1431, only £2500 had been repaid to the citizens by Christmas 1443. Some of this loan was still not repaid by the King in 1450 but the rest of the sum outstanding had been used by the Chamberlain for civic purposes and for a new loan to the Crown. It seems safe to conclude that some, but not all, of the money provided by the citizens for royal loans, was returned to them. What was not returned was usually employed on projects for which there would otherwise have had to be a new levy. It seems impossible to know whether the Chamberlain kept a record of the amount owed to individual lenders or whether his duty was simply to return lump sums to the wards where the money would be paid out to the citizens in accordance with some ward record. The absence of any ward or Chamberlain's

-
1. 25 Parliamentary grants; 63 loans or gifts to the King. Cf. Chapter III, pp. 152-153.
 2. Jeffries Davies and M.I. Peake, op.cit.; Jour.V f.227-228v.

records for this period renders the problem insoluble.¹

In every case where the decision of the Common Council to lend the King money, is recorded in the Journals, it is always accompanied by a proviso that sufficient security shall be obtained to ensure the repayment of the loan. If the problem was particularly complex and involved security not only for the new, but also for past, loans, a committee might be appointed to examine the securities which the King was offering.² The security offered to a royal creditor had two aspects. Firstly there was the source of revenue from which the creditor was to derive payment and secondly there were the guarantees which he could acquire to ensure that his demand for repayment would be given preferential treatment by the local collector and that if one source of royal revenue failed another one would be made available for repaying his debt. The 'sufficient security' which the Common Council demanded was an all-embracing term to cover both these aspects of the repayment of the civic loan.

Lending to the Crown in this period was not a simple matter. A royal creditor who brought a cash loan to the Exchequer was very rarely repaid the sum owed to him in ready money. Instead the lender was given tallies of assignment, that is, he was given authorization to draw on royal revenue at

1. The Brewers preserved a list of those who contributed towards the expense of providing Henry V with beer for the troops in France and towards the expenses of Queen Katherine's coronation in 1421. Each individual named with the sum of his contribution and against this was noted the amount which he was repaid. The total outlay was £125 2s.10d. and from this was subtracted £2 9s.6d. which comprised the amount spent in achieving repayment. Therefore a proportion of this sum was deducted from the money repaid to each individual, Brewers' Account Book, f.46-46v.
2. See loans nos.38, 41.

its source to the sum of the Crown's indebtedness to him. These tallies were made out in the name of the local collectors - not the creditor's name - and so they could be negotiable instruments. The Exchequer clerks kept half of the tally and when the customer or tax collector came to account at the Exchequer he could present tallies that he had paid on behalf of the Crown against his account. These tallies would be married up with their halves that had remained in the Exchequer and the collector would then proceed to the Upper Exchequer of account with his now complete tally. The system of assignment was not intrinsically bad since it meant that the Crown could draw on local sources of revenue for local expenses and hence the transport of large sums of money around the country was avoided. But by the fifteenth century the Crown was in a perpetual state of indebtedness with the result that sources of revenue were constantly overburdened with tallies that could not be paid. Little cash came to the Exchequer apart from loans, and the lenders had to compete with household officials, wardens of the Marches, Exchequer clerks, government servants, leaders of expeditions to France, those responsible for the upkeep of Calais and many more, for repayment. In these conditions of great competition to draw first upon the royal revenue, every stage towards repayment was a struggle and those who were in a position to give preference, such as Exchequer clerks and local collectors, could line their pockets with the bribes they received.¹ Mr. Harriss has examined the different forms of security that a creditor might be given and the priority

1. See R.P., V, p.203. Petition to Parliament 28 Henry VI against bribetaking by Exchequer clerks.

that existed between different instruments - for example - grants of revenue under the Great Seal took precedence over both tallies and writs under the Exchequer seal and warrants under the privy seal. Hence it was known both, that some sources of revenue were richer than others and that some forms of security for repayment were better than others. In this acute shortage of money, Dr. Harris concludes 'the Crown strove, by making promises to some of its creditors and by breaking them to others, to obtain the cash it needed'.¹

In the Parliament of May 1421 the Council was empowered to give security for all debts contracted by the King for the expedition to France. This gave greater security for repayment since, in theory at least, Parliament would guarantee the repayment of the creditor. It became usual for Parliament to authorise borrowing by the Council up to a specified sum and these authorisations were connected with a grant of a Parliamentary subsidy.² But the last Parliament of Henry VI's reign to grant such authorisation was that of February-July 1449, and it is interesting to note the decline in London lending after the loan of October 1449, when there was no longer this Parliamentary security. In the fourth and last session of the Parliament of 1453/4 which sat from 14 February until 17 April 1454, arrangements were made to raise £1000 immediately from certain towns for the defence of the

1. Harriss, B.I.H.R., op.cit., pp.33-34.
2. Every Parliament after May 1421 passed such an act except the Parliaments of December 1421, November 1422, October 1423-February 1424, May 1432, January-March 1437. The Parliament of February to July 1449 was the last one to authorise Council borrowing. Cf. loan no.41 where Common Council agreed to lend £2000 on the authority of Parliament which had just authorised the Council to raise loans up to £200,000 and had granted a tenth and fifteenth.

sea.¹ The Londoners lent the £300 which they were allotted but noted that this was done by authority of an Act of Parliament. Clearly such authorisation was an added inducement to lend but was, for this decade, unusual.

The first step towards repayment of a loan was, of course, that the Exchequer should acknowledge receipt of the money, and the usual method of doing this was to enter a mutuum on the Receipt Roll for the term in which the loan was made. But it is necessary to state here that the date on which the mutuum is entered may not be the actual date on which the money was brought in. Exchequer dating was arbitrary and transactions were written up when it was convenient to the clerk to do so although the term is usually correct if not the exact date.² The recording of a loan in this way was not a matter of course. For the first forty years of the period under review all except one of the London loans or gifts was entered in the Receipt Roll.³ After 1440 only the loan of September 1449 is entered and the gift of December 1452. Clearly the Exchequer - now without the Parliamentary guarantee - saw little hope of repayment and so would not even acknowledge receipt by entering a loan on the Receipt Roll. For it was becoming Exchequer practice by this date for the entry of a loan to be accompanied a few days later by the issue of tallies of assignment. Thus the process of acknowledging receipt had become indivisible from the process of issuing

1. R.P.V., pp.245-46. Loan no.59.

2. Fryde, op.cit., pp.137-38; Kirby, op.cit., p.26.

3. Loan no.5 is the exception. Obviously loans made to the Dukes of Gloucester and Bedford were not entered in the Receipt Roll.

tallies and if all the sources of royal revenue were so overburdened with unpaid tallies already that the Exchequer could issue no more, then it would not even acknowledge receipt on the Receipt Roll, ~~either~~. The London loan of July 1444 provides an example of this. The citizens ask that, if they cannot get tallies of assignment, they may have a written guarantee from the Treasurer or receivers at the Exchequer that they will be repaid the £2000 loan from the next Parliamentary subsidy. It was stated that no money ~~was~~ to be handed over until the citizens obtain such a guarantee. But, in fact, the City received neither assignment nor guarantee but only a 'bill of the hands of Pontrell made after the use of the king's receipt of the receiving to the behove of the King'.¹ There is no entry of any kind in the Receipt and Issue Rolls of this term or later. The Exchequer clerks could not give an assignment so they would not enter it as received in the Receipt Roll.

The Exchequer system had, in fact, become too fossilized to deal adequately either with the cash or book keeping transactions. Originally it was a cash institution and its mechanisms were not well adapted to a government which lived on continual credit. Whereas in the early years of the century there were occasions when London loans were recorded as received in one term and the tallies of assignment were not issued until several months later, by 1420 the two transactions are always recorded in the same term, i.e. the term of the payment by assignment.² Clearly the Exchequer rolls are becoming an increasingly untrue picture of royal finance although Mr. Kirby believes that as late as 1433 'the bulk of the King's revenues and of the

1. Jour.V f.227; loan no.46.

2. See loans nos.3, 10, 13.

normal expenditure did at this period pass through the Receipt'.¹ It may well be that towards the middle of the century money continued to pass through the Receipt but was simply not recorded. But in 1450, so remote was the Exchequer becoming from the control of royal revenue, that for their loan the citizens by-pass it altogether and deal with the collectors of the Parliamentary subsidy direct. No entry appears in any Exchequer roll to show that the Londoners made a loan or had been given tallies of assignment on that source of revenue.² With the advent of Edward IV the Exchequer was once again in control. On 22 June 1461 the many corporate loans made by the Londoners in the past year were entered as received - in a lump sum - in the Receipt roll although no assignments were made. In August Richard Lee informed the Court of Aldermen that the amount lent by each inhabitant and the date of repayment had been entered as a record in a book at the Exchequer.³ We are back to a rational state of affairs where acknowledgment of receipt is the first step towards repayment.

As has been pointed out the Londoners were rarely repaid in cash by the Exchequer. On 13 June 1425 a loan of £2000 from the Londoners made in May 1421 is recorded as repaid in cash to Alexander Anne, at this time Common Serjeant at Law of the City. But in fact this £2000 was only repaid in order that it might be lent again by the City together with a further £1000 on the same day.⁴ On two occasions tallies which had been issued to the Londoners in lieu of the original ones, on which they had failed to get payment, were paid in cash

-
1. Kirby, op.cit., pp.142-43.
 2. Loan no.53.
 3. Jour.VI f.46v.
 4. Loans nos.17, 20.

by the Exchequer. But the sums involved were small.¹ The usual practice was for the citizens to receive tallies of assignment.

If the ~~landowners~~ ^{Londoners} had difficulty in getting tallies of assignment for some reason or if they failed to extract payment on the tallies they had received, they might appeal to the King directly to intervene. If they were successful this would result in a warrant for issue whereby the King, by writ under the privy seal, would instruct the Treasurer and Chamberlains to make an assignment - usually on a specified source of revenue. In the eight cases we have of the King sending a warrant to the Treasurer on behalf of the Londoners, it always produced rapid results.² Dr. Harriss pointed out that these warrants could be phrased in varying terms of urgency. Since, however, the Londoners could bring some pressure to bear upon the King in the form of no new loans until assignments were made for paying the old ones, warrants on their behalf secured rapid attention.³

When Common Council appointed a committee to examine the security offered by the King for a loan, the main task of such committees was to persuade the Exchequer to issue tallies of assignment on rich sources of revenue.⁴ Most frequently the Londoners were given tallies on the wool subsidy payable in London. Another frequent assignment was on the collectors of the Parliamentary subsidies. This latter often took longer to collect and involved the Londoners in dealings with various different collectors, since an assignment

- 1. Loan no.33 tally for £49 3s.10½d. paid cash 21 July 1435, loan no.40 tally for £29 3s.3d. paid cash 28 November 1444.
- 2. See loans nos.7, 10, 17, 20, 37, 43.
- 3. Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer, op.cit.
- 4. Committees appointed, see loans nos.38, 41.

on the London Parliamentary subsidy alone would rarely yield as much as the citizens had lent.¹ An assignment on the London wool subsidy, on the other hand, involved negotiations with only two collectors (who were usually Londoners) of an extremely rich source of revenue. Less frequently the citizens might receive assignments on the clerical subsidies or on customs revenues other than the wool subsidy. Only twice did the Londoners receive assignments on sources of revenues of a different kind.² It seems clear that when the citizens received tallies of assignment they were drawn on rich sources of revenue, easily accessible to London.

Once a royal creditor had secured tallies of assignment his next task was to extract the money from the local collector. This was governed by the amount of influence that he could bring to bear on the local collector. Where there were many assignments on the same source it was often necessary to secure royal intervention to achieve prompt payment. Tallies which were authorized by Parliament might have a prior claim on the revenue or, as was frequently the case in this period, all tallies on a certain source would be suspended in favour of the treasurer of Calais or the royal household or some other pressing need. The tallies which the Londoners received in May 1444 were only to be paid after the Lord Cardinal had been satisfied.³

-
1. See loan no.50 when Londoners were assigned tallies on the collectors of the fifteenth in Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent, City of London and Middlesex, E401/813.
 2. In the Parliament of 1427/8 the Commons agreed to give the King, not a sum based upon the tenth and fifteenth but on a new assessment by parishes and knight's fees. Hence the Londoners, in repayment of loan no.23, received 11 tallies of assignment on the collectors of the parish subsidy, R.P. IV, p.318. In return for loan no.34 the Londoners received assignments on the Receiver-General of the Duchy of Lancaster and on the temporalities of the Bishop of London.
 3. Loan no.45, E401/786.

In these times of shortage and financial insecurity one of the best ways of ensuring prompt payment by the local collector, was to get Letters Patent under the great seal ordering payment. In the words of Dr. Fryde 'letters obligatory under the royal seal gave to a Crown creditor as great a guarantee of repayment as it was possible for a document to give'.¹ In the fourteen cases where the Londoners received Letters Patent they are issued within a few days of the date when the money is recorded as received at the Exchequer or when the tallies are issued.² The Letters Patent were not issued to prick the Treasurer into granting tallies of assignment but were given to a creditor as extra security, since they would help him to jump the queue at the local level. The local collector was continually besieged with instructions as to who was to be given preference over whom and the Letters Patent served as authorisations to pay a particular creditor. These letters could be very specific as, for example, those issued on behalf of the Londoners in July 1429 which stated that the collectors of the wool subsidy were to pay all they received to the Londoners, as if to the King; only assignments for Calais or the household were to be excepted. No grant on the wool subsidy was to be made to anyone until the Mayor and Commonalty were repaid.³ But even this seemingly complete grant for repayment failed to achieve its object and in five other cases where the Londoners received the extra security of Letters Patent, we know that they had to get new tallies of assignment since payment could not be had on the old ones.⁴ Further it

-
1. Fryde, op.cit., p.115.
 2. See loans nos.3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 20, 25, 26, 28, 29, 34, 35, 37.
 3. Loan no.26, C.P.R. 1422-29, p.518.
 4. See loans nos.20, 25, 26, 34, 37.

is interesting to note that the last Letter Patent to be issued to the Londoners as security for repayment of a loan was in June 1439, clearly these ceased to be effective guarantees.¹

There were several ways in which the Londoners could be given added security that they would be promptly paid from the source of revenue on which they were given assignments. The local agent might give written security to the creditor that a loan would be repaid but this, almost private, arrangement between agent and creditor would seem to indicate the inability of the Royal Exchequer to control royal finance. It is perhaps the indication not of greater, but of lesser, security.² In some cases, where the assignment had been made on the wool subsidy, the Londoners might be given half the cocket seal. This seal was divided into two halves; one of these was held by the two collectors and the other half by the controller of customs who had been, originally, appointed by the King as a check upon the activities of the collectors. It was the controller's half that was given to the citizens as security since no wool could be legally exported before the captain of the ship had received a licence under the cocket seal to show that the requisite duty had been paid. If, therefore, the citizens held half the seal for the port of London, no wool could be exported without their knowledge and so

1. See loan no.38.

2. See loan no.53.

they could collect the money owed to them as soon as it was received.¹

Occasionally the Londoners were provided with even greater security, that is, they were given security from which they could gain payment if the tallies of assignment for some reason could not be honoured. The citizens might be given a bond or sealed indenture whereby certain individuals undertook to be personally responsible for the repayment of the loan.² Alternatively the King might pledge some of his jewels or regalia which the citizens would be entitled to sell if the loan were not repaid by the appointed date.³ Whether the objects pledged were ever as valuable as the amount lent is doubtful. The Spanish sword pledged to the Londoners in 1417 was certainly not worth £1860.⁴ Such pledges were an earnest of good faith on the King's part and he appears always to have been able to save his jewels from sale just in time. When, after 1449, the Exchequer no longer appeared to be able to give securities for London loans, the Crown increasingly had to have recourse to these more unusual forms of security.⁵

-
1. See loans nos. 3, 12, 24, 26. The giving of half the cocket seal as security for loans dates back to the reign of Edward II. See H.M. Mills, 'The Collectors of Customs' in English Government at Work, 1327-36, vol. II, ed. W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), pp. 168-200; R.L. Baker, 'The English Customs Service 1307-1343', Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series vol. LI part vi (Philadelphia, 1961). By the fifteenth century both collectors and the controller were appointed by the King. It is unlikely that any part of the cocket seal was permanently in the hands of the Mayor. The reference in Liber Albus, p. 45, which misled Riley (L.B.L., p. 253n.) must refer, not to the King's cocket seal but to some civic seal which was called by this name, connected possibly with the Sheriffs (see Liber Albus, p. 121) or with the Assize of Bread. It has been suggested that the origin of the word derives from the final words of the document on which the seal was used, i.e. 'quo quietus est' see S. Dowell, A History of Taxation and Taxes in England, vol. I (2nd edn., 1888), pp. 171-172.
 2. See loans nos. 3, 48, 58.
 3. See loans nos. 10, 13, 54.
 4. This sword appears in lists of royal regalia in Palgrave, Ancient Kalendars, vol. iii, pp. 309, 313.
 5. See loans nos. 53, 54, 58, 59.

We come now to one of the great problems which faces all those who try to examine the procedure of royal borrowing in this period. It seems to be almost impossible to know whether a creditor received payment on a tally of assignment or not. Since there are no private accounts, there is nothing with which to check the Exchequer records, although the London Journals do provide a kind of check in some cases, for corporate loans. The Receipt Roll at the Exchequer is - as Sir Hilary Jenkinson pointed out as long ago as 1911 - 'no more than a register of tallies issued'.¹ But the form in which the Roll is written might lead one to suppose otherwise, for example, 'X and Y collectors of the woll subsidy in the Port of Ipswich £60' followed in the right hand margin with the word 'pro' and the name of the person to whom the local collector is to pay the money. Once the Exchequer clerks have, thus, recorded the issuing of a tally for the repayment of a loan or some other purpose, the creditor is assumed paid. There is no way of telling from the Exchequer records whether a tally was honoured at the local level or not. Historians have, therefore had to assume that all tallies were 'good', i.e. paid, unless proved otherwise.² But this study of London loans has shown such an assumption to be dangerous.

Sometimes the fact that a tally has not been cashed is noted in the Receipt Rolls, but only if the creditor received a new assignment. In this case the original entry in the Receipt Roll where the issue of the tallies is recorded, is crossed through and the person for whom the tally was issued

1. Sir H. Jenkinson, 'Exchequer Tallies', Archaeologia, vol.LXII (1911), pp.367-80.
2. E.g. Kirby, op.cit., p.137.

is credited with what Principal Steel called a 'fictitious loan'. The purpose of this form of cancellation was to avoid having to alter the day totals which had been added up when the roll was compiled.¹ The issue of new tallies is recorded on the current Receipt Roll. Principal Steel concluded from his examination of the Receipt Rolls that the number and value of these fictitious loans ^{provided} ~~was~~ evidence not only of the financial embarrassment of the Crown in any given period, but also ^{from when it was possible to} ~~that one could~~ calculate whether a man stood high in royal favour or not, on the grounds that those who were favoured did not have to have their tallies cancelled. This conclusion has been questioned by Dr. Harriss who points out, most convincingly, that those who had their tallies cancelled were, in fact, the lucky few who could get new assignments. The presence therefore of a fictitious loan is evidence not of a man's disappointment but of his hope.² We can, therefore, know when tallies were not paid but for which new assignments were made. We have no way of knowing whether other tallies were ever paid or not.

There were certain events which automatically invalidated a tally and made its re-issue essential: one was the death of a sovereign and the other was a change of personnel amongst the collectors which would invalidate any tally on which the name of the old collector was written. As Dr. Harriss has pointed out 'the rise in fictitious loans at the end of the reign of a sovereign is not a sign of financial stability but an indication of the degree to which the next sovereign was prepared to honour his predecessor's debts'. In 1446 the Bishop of Carlisle who was the new Treasurer, dismissed

1. Steel, op.cit., p.xxxiii.
 2. Harriss, 'Fictitious loans', op.cit.

one collector in every port in order to invalidate all tallies. In these cases a royal warrant to the Treasurer was necessary to achieve a new assignment. In order to guard against these invalidations by death or policy, a creditor would try to get a guarantee that his tallies would be changed if necessary.

There are thirty five corporate London loans in these sixty years which are recorded in the Exchequer; on thirteen occasions the City was assigned tallies, which were, subsequently, converted into 'fictitious loans'.¹ In two cases the new tallies suffered a similar fate and in one case - the loan of March 1438 - the Londoners received new tallies three times.² The delay involved between the receipt of money at the exchequer and the issue of new tallies averages two years. Where the delay is longer the sums involved are usually very small - for example a tally for £20 10s.8d. out of a loan of £2666 13s.4d. which was issued in July 1436 was not cancelled until 11 June 1442.³ The delay in the repayment of the £2000 lent in May 1421 was occasioned by the death of Henry V. It was not until June 1425 that the City could get a warrant for a new assignment. This was the occasion on which the citizens were paid in cash in order that they might lend the money again to the Crown.⁴ On another occasion the force of a London tally lapsed because John Botiller had been moved from his post as collector of the wool

-
1. On three occasions the warrants for issues authorising new assignments are extant, see loans nos.7, 17, 20.
 2. Loans nos.2, 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 31, 33, 39, 41 new tallies issued once; loans nos.7, 34 new tallies issued twice, loan no.37/38 new tallies issued three times.
 3. Loan no.34.
 4. Loan no.17.

subsidy in London and the new collector's name was not on the Londoners' tally.¹ There seem to be no sources of revenue which were more prone to bankruptcy than others although it is interesting that when the City was given tallies on the wool subsidy in London and in Ipswich, it was the Ipswich tallies which were, on three occasions, converted into fictitious loans.² The Londoners could exert more influence in their own City than elsewhere.

In several cases where we know that the Londoners achieved a new assignment in lieu of a useless tally, this was often 'bought' with a new loan, or, looked at from the royal angle, the King had to bribe the Londoners into providing him with a loan, by a new assignment for a still-outstanding debt. Either way, the new assignment for useless tallies must have been an important factor in the negotiations that preceded the granting of a new loan by Common Council. In five cases it is possible definitely to connect, from the Exchequer records alone, the new loan with the issue of new tallies for an old loan.³

-
- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Loan no.20. | 2. Loan no.37/38. |
| 3. Loan no.17 new assignment for £2000 on 13 June 1425 | |
| Loan no.20 new loan | £1000 made 13 June 1425 |
| Loan no.25 new assignment for £2000 on 18 December 1429 | |
| Loan no.27 new loan | £733 6s.8d. made 18 December 1429 |
| Loan no.26 new assignment for £1846 13s.2d. on 26 April 1429 | |
| Loan no.28 new loan | £4820 0s.2d. made 26 April 1429 |
| Loan no.31 new assignment for £286 13s.4d. on 16 July 1435 | |
| Loan no.33 new loan | £2666 13s.4d. made 3 June and 7 July 1435 |
| Loan no.34 new assignment for £1333 6s.8d. on 28 February 1440 | |
| Loan no.38 new loan | £1333 6s.8d. on 26 February 1440 |

From the Exchequer records, therefore, we can learn about tallies which were not paid, but we can never learn definitely about the tallies that remain in the Receipt Roll as paid. If a new assignment, provoking a cancelled entry in the Receipt Roll, was the mark of royal favour, then the uncanceled entries must hide many a disappointed creditor. The City Journals in some cases provide us with a check upon the Exchequer records.

Such checks as the Journals may provide have been entered in the table under the heading 'Repayment'; they are not numerous and begin with the loan of March 1431. The main source of evidence for the repayment of royal loans is provided by the statement of account which the Chamberlain of the City, John Middleton, rendered to the citizens in March 1450.¹ He concluded that the King owed the citizens from various loans between the years 1431 and 1450, the sum of £3230 12s.4½d. There is a much briefer statement made in February 1439 when the King is in the City's debt by £2666 13s.4d. but in this case no details are given.² In the case of the statement of March 1450 is it possible to assume all loans not mentioned in this account have in fact been paid by the King? There were twenty two loans in the years 1431-1450 and the Chamberlain accounts for only five of these. On the other hand the Chamberlain does preface his account with the words 'what loonys have be lent to oure souveraine lorde the kynge atte diverse tymes yet beyng due to the citezeins of the said Citee unpaid'. Moreover where we have evidence about the repayment of loans, other than those dealt

1. Jour.V f.227-228v, transcribed by M.I. Peake, op.cit., pp.169-72.

2. Jour.III f.9v.

with by the Chamberlain, it seems to indicate that the citizens had been satisfied.¹

The Chamberlain's account reveals that on two occasions the citizens offered the King tallies, which they had previously received, as part of a new loan. In March 1444 the citizens succeeded in lending the King £166 13s.4d. contained in two tallies on the customs which had been given to the citizens in payment for their loan made in March 1431.² In July 1444 the citizens tried to lend the king £233 13s.9½d. in tallies on the clerical tenth which they had been granted in payment of their loan of August 1442.³ On this occasion the lords of the King's Council considered that the tallies 'might not ease the king our said Sovereign Lord then at his said great need', with the result that the new loan was reduced by that amount. Clearly these were attempts, in effect, to get new assignments for old tallies but in both cases there is no indication in the Receipt Roll either that the tallies had not been paid or, in the case of the first instance, that an old tally had come back into the Exchequer in the form of a new loan. The whole sum appears as a cash payment into the Exchequer. From a study of the Receipt Rolls alone, however, one would have considered these two loans to have been fully repaid. Indeed in the case of the five loans discussed by the Chamberlain in 1450 which still remained either completely or partly unpaid by that date, there is no hint of this in the Exchequer records and the loan

-
1. Loan no.41 made in March 1442 (£2000), £1333 6s.8d. definitely repaid by December 1443; loan no.48 made in August 1445 (£100), £71 10s.0d. definitely repaid by October 1446.
 2. Loan no.45.
 3. Loan no.46.

of July 1444 does not appear in the Receipt Roll at all. We know therefore that the picture derived from the Exchequer records alone, while not being untrue, is certainly incomplete.

On the other hand two examples will show that the evidence from the Journals and the Exchequer records can sometimes produce consistent accounts. In January 1440 the Common Council demanded that as a condition of a new loan the Mayor and Aldermen were to get a new assignment for £1333 6s.8d. which was that part of the loan of June 1435 still remaining unpaid. The assignment which the citizens received in February is specifically stated in the Issue Roll to cover both the old loan and the new.¹ Similarly in March 1442 Common Council stipulated that they would only lend to the King if they could have a new assignment for the £333 6s.8d. still owing from the loan made in February 1439. In this case the assignments for the new loan and for the old one are separate; the assignment for the new one is to be found in the Issue Roll in April 1442 and for the old one in June of that year.²

There were, therefore, two ways in which the citizens might try to get payment on old tallies. They could try to lend the tallies - as cash - to the King and in this case the Exchequer would remain innocent of the transaction, or the citizens could get a new assignment and the original one would be cancelled in the Exchequer records and a fictitious loan recorded. The loan made to the King in March 1442 provides a good example of both these types of transaction. The City lent to the King £2000 which was composed of

1. Loan no.39.
2. Loan no.41.

£1333 6s.8d. in cash and £666 13s.4d. in old tallies of 1429; but the citizens only lent this money on condition that they received a new assignment for the old tallies of February 1439. Both methods of tally-renewal can be seen here.¹ Why the Londoners chose to have some tallies incorporated into a new loan and others simply reassigned is not clear. It may be that different policies were necessary in the case of tallies which were actually invalid from those which were simply proving difficult to turn into money.

It may be possible to draw some conclusions from this study of corporate London lending, for a pattern does emerge. It reveals moderate support for the Crown until 1410, considerable support from then until 1430, moderate support again until 1450 and decreased support in the years between 1450 and 1460.² But against this must be set the pattern of lending by individual Londoners and the Calais merchants in the same period. This shows considerable support until 1410, very little support between 1410 and 1430 and moderate support from then until 1460.³ When all the London lending, i.e. corporate loans and those from the Calais merchants and individual Londoners,

1. Loan no.41.

2. Average corporate London loans per annum:-
 1399-1410 £1333 6s.8d. including one gift.
 1411-1420 £2402 12s.0d. " " "
 1421-1430 £2438 19s.3d. " two gifts.
 1431-1440 £1866 13s.4d. " " "
 1441-1450 £1473 4s.5d. " four "
 1451-1460 £ 566 13s.4d. " five "

3. Average ^{total} individual and Calais loans from Londoners per annum:-
 1399-1410 £5917 8s.2d.
 1411-1420 £1171 19s.9d.
 1421-1430 £ 967 6s.8d.
 1431-1440 £4537 12s.0d.
 1441-1450 £4236 6s.7d.
 1451-1460 £3932 13s.0d.

are considered together the picture is that of the greatest support coming in the first ten years of Lancastrian rule, the least support between 1411 and 1430 and moderate support continuing from then until the end of the period.¹ The early support for the Lancastrian dynasty is most marked. What also emerges is that the mercantile community was less interested in the aggressive expansionist policies which marked the years 1410-1430, than in the critical defensive measures to save Calais, Normandy and Aquitaine to which the English government was driven in the years 1430-1460.

Dr. Fryde, and others, have argued that the business community was becoming indifferent to the fate of the regime and had lost all trust in it. 'The repeated refusals of the Londoners to lend money to Henry VI during the last disastrous campaigns in France in 1448-1453 show this very clearly'.² But is this really the case? It is true that the City refused to lend the King money in February 1448, September 1450 and five times between May and December 1453.³ But the City either lent or gave the King money nine times within this period, and ^{further,} individual Londoners and the Calais merchants provided over £48,000.⁴ This is hardly a picture of failing support. There was an unprecedented number of refusals by the Common Council to lend money

1. Average total London loans per annum:-

1399-1410	£7250 14s.10d.
1411-1420	£3574 11s.9d.
1421-1430	£3406 3s.11d.
1431-1440	£6404 3s.4d.
1441-1450	£5769 11s.5d.
1451-1460	£4499 6s.5d.

2. E. Fryde, Cambridge Economic History, vol.III, ed. M. Postan, E. Rich and E. Miller (Cambridge, 1963), Chapter VIII, section IV iii, 'The Royal Credit system in decline', pp.463-72.

3. See notes to loans nos.50, 54, 59.

4. See Appendix no.45

to the King during this period because there was an unprecedented number of royal requests for loans. Aquitaine had been an English territory for nearly three hundred years and its impending loss to the French crown produced an acute crisis which was not only financial.¹ But London did not fail the King in this crisis. Not only is it certain that the City provided considerable sums lent through Common Council, the merchants of the Colais staple and privately, but these sums may be even larger. The exact amount of three of the corporate loans is not known.² Moreover the last corporate London loan to be recorded in the Exchequer is that which was made in the autumn of 1449. From this date until the end of the reign only the Londoners' gift in 1453 is recorded. From a study, therefore, of the Exchequer evidence alone one would conclude that the citizens had withdrawn all support for the Lancastrian crown. But because the Exchequer was no longer able, or willing, to record loans or to issue tallies, this does not mean that loans were not made. From the Journals of the City of London it is clear that the City corporately made seven gifts (£5575 8s.8d.) and six loans (£1966 13s.4d.; size of three loans unknown), but only one of these appears in the Exchequer records. Moreover Journal no.6 which covers the years from 1456 is much damaged. If

-
1. The King's desperate measures to raise money in the summer of 1453 can be seen in this writ to Arnald Hoffeman instructing him to sell all the goods in the King's weigh house and to answer for the money with all haste, 14 July 1453 P.R.O. E28/83/21; also 4 August 1453 a letter was sent to Nicholas Wyfold, a grocer (amongst others) asking for a loan of £100 for the relief of the Earl of Shrewsbury, repayable from the fifteenth due the following summer, E28/83/42 and Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France, vol.III, n. pp.487-89. 13 August 1453 a further letter was sent to Wyfold reciting the earlier letter, stating that no reply had been received and ending 'Do not fail this time as you would eschew our displeasure or you will be noted as a cause of the breach of our said army' E28/83/35. The King also on 7 and 28 August 1453 tried to persuade the London grocers to sell some confiscated Genoese alum and lend him their profit on the transaction, P.P.C. VI, pp.152-54 and E28/83/16. This may explain certain payments in the Grocers' accounts 1452-54, for boat-hire to Westminster to speak with the King's Council 'for the black alum', Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, p.347. 2. See loans nos 54, 56, 62

it were more complete it might reveal evidence of more considerable financial support for Henry VI in his last years.

What is remarkable is that the City of London, both corporately and privately, continued to support the Lancastrian regime when its credit was abysmal, when, after 1449, Parliament had ceased to authorise the Council to raise loans, when the Exchequer neither recorded loans nor issued tallies and when there was virtual civil war at home. This study of London lending leads to the conclusion that what failed in the last decade of Lancastrian rule was, not so much the financial support from London, but rather that branch of the government which was supposed to deal with the recording and repayment of loans, namely the Exchequer.

CHAPTER VIIILONDON AND THE CROWN 1400-1450; A MARRIAGE OF CONVENIENCE

Whereas the two preceding chapters discussed some of the causes of friction between the Crown and the City during this period, in this chapter those spheres of activity will be examined in which the citizens and the King acted harmoniously together, when mutual interests could be served by some joint enterprise. These spheres of activity were first, the provision of troops or supplies for the royal enterprises in France when the City had the opportunity to gain new markets, as at Rouen in 1418, or to prevent the loss of old ones as when Calais was threatened in 1436, 1449 and 1451; secondly, the filling of civic offices by royal nominees, and thirdly, the sumptuous entertainments provided for royal occasions, when the King gained an impressive reception and the Londoners could display their skills and enhance their prestige in the eyes of potential customers.

There were four occasions when, for reasons of its own, the City's help for the Lancastrian kings in their French entanglements, rose above the luke-warm. These occasions were Henry V's siege of Rouen in 1418, the siege of Calais by the Duke of Burgundy in 1436, the renewal of the French war and the fall of Rouen in 1449 and the renewed threat to Calais in 1451.

By the end of July 1418, Henry V had taken Louviers and had moved on to besiege Rouen. On 10 August he wrote to the Londoners asking them to send victuals to the besieging troops, via Harfleur and thence

up the Seine to Rouen.¹ As a result of the King's letter proclamations were issued in the City enjoining anyone who wished to go to Rouen or to the Normandy ports to report to the Mayor who would provide them with transport and free victuals. A committee of Aldermen was appointed to deal with the supplies to be sent to the King and victuallers were to notify this committee of the volume of their victual and transport would be provided. Anyone who volunteered for service in France was to receive a noble for his provisioning.² At a special meeting of the Court of Aldermen prices were fixed for the ale, cups and beer to be sent, as well as for the carriage charges involved.³ Although the King's letter had only been sent on 10 August the Mayor was able to reply by 8 September informing the King that the supplies were being despatched and taken to France by John Credenche, a Sheriff's Sergeant and John Combe, a Mayor's Sergeant.⁴

-
1. L.B.I., pp.199-200.
 2. Ibid., pp.197-98, 201.
 3. Memorials, pp.665-66 printed from Jour.I f.48. Ale was to be bought at 30/- a tun (200 tuns were sent), wooden cups at 4/- the hundred (2,500 were sent), beer at 13/4d. the tun (300 tuns were sent). There were also 30 butts of sweet wine which made in all 515 tuns. Those who rowed the tuns to the boats were to receive 4d. a tun; the wine-drawers who drew the wine to the docks were to receive 3d. a tun, and the carters of beer 4d. a tun.
 4. L.B.I., p.200. John Credenche was sworn as a Sheriff's sergeant 9 November 1417, Jour.I f.39v.; John Combe described as one of the Mayor's sergeants, 16 March 1417, Jour.I f.13. The Londoners also sent a special gun which contributed to the successful siege of Melun in November 1420, Streche p.49.

These supplies must have cost the City at least £522 but it is not clear how they were paid for. There may have been a levy in the City of which no record survives, but it seems most likely that the City and suppliers shared the cost of provisioning the King on the basis of a loan. In the Brewers' account book it is recorded that the Company was owed £125 2s.10d. by Henry V for providing ale for the King in France and for the Queen's coronation. The Company obtained repayment of this sum in the first year of Henry VI's reign, and each individual supplier was scrupulously repaid.¹ There is no surviving record of any other Company being called upon to give help at this time nor any record of the City providing a loan with which to buy provisions.

The next occasion on which the City came materially to the aid of the Crown was in 1436 when Calais was threatened by the Duke of Burgundy. As early as June 1435 the Mayor and Aldermen of that town had written to their opposite numbers in London asking them to use their influence with the King to protect Calais from the threatened French attack.² In April 1436 Paris fell to the French and the Duke of Burgundy threatened Calais. In ^{June} ~~time~~ the King's Council displayed signs of panic and at least ten ^{writs} ~~units~~ were directed to the Mayor and

-
1. Guildhall Library, Ms. 5440, Brewers' Account Book 1418-1440 f. 46-46v. The costs involved in obtaining repayment of the money amounted to £2 9s.6d. and so a small amount was deducted from the sum which every man received. A Brewer, William Payne, was punished by the Masters of the Company for failing to contribute any tuns to those to be sent to Henry V, Ibid., f. 16-16v.
 2. 27 June 1435, L.B.K., p. 190.

Sheriffs between 18 June and 26 July instructing them to deal with victuals and the equipment of troops to be sent to Calais;¹ to freeze the price of armaments and food in London,² to protect the position of loyal Flemings in the City³ and, above all, to collect an army to accompany John, Earl of Huntingdon, the Admiral of England or Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the Captain of Calais.⁴

When Gloucester sailed on 27 July 1436 his force included soldiers and archers paid for by the City Companies. For four Companies, the

-
1. 5 July 1436, L.B.K., p.205; C.C.R. 1435-41, p.65.
 2. 6 July 1436, L.B.K., pp.205-06; C.C.R. 1435-41, pp.20-21. In 1415 there was a similar attempt to freeze the price of arms in London, P.P.C. II, p.154.
 3. 21 July 1436, L.B.K., p.206, cf. writ of 28 March 1436 instructing all natives of Flanders to take an oath of fealty to the King, C.C.R. 1435-41, p.58.
 4. 18 June 1436, L.B.K., p.205; 17 July 1436, writ to John Harwe to collect 6 surgeons in London to accompany Gloucester's expedition, also a writ to the Mayor and Sheriffs to help him to do this, C.C.R. 1435-41, p.21; 21 July 1436, writ to Sheriffs instructing them that all knights to be at Sandwich by 22 July, L.B.K., p.206; 23 July 1426, writ to Sheriffs instructing them that the muster was to be on 26 July, L.B.K., pp.206-07; 26 July 1436, commissions to various people to take the musters of men to be sent to rescue Calais, C.P.R. 1429-36, pp.611-12. Also to this period, before 17 July 1436, must belong an undated Council minute, P.P.C. V pp.74-75. (Nicolas dates this to 18 November 1439 but this would seem to be incorrect). In this minute the Council decided that if the name of the Captain were announced men would more readily enlist (the earliest reference to Gloucester as Captain of Calais is 17 July 1436); letters were to be sent to towns to raise loans; further loans were to be raised in the country at large; general commissions were to be issued to array soldiers; Armourers and Bowyers in London were to be put to work; the Mayor of London was to be put in charge of the King's Esquires to see that they were properly armed, and men were to be forced to become knights according to the Statute.

Tailors, Goldsmiths, Brewers and Grocers, the costs of their contributions survive. The Tailors provided four soldiers and six archers at a cost of £28 7s.7d.;¹ the Goldsmiths, two spearman and twelve archers at a cost of £34 19s.0d.;² the Grocers, two spears and four archers at a cost of £14 1s.8d.;³ and the Brewers gave £12 8s.0d. to the Mayor and Aldermen.⁴ The Tailors' accounts provide the most detailed picture of the costs of this operation. The soldiers (or spears) were hired at 16d. a day for 60 days, i.e. at a cost of £4 each. One of the soldiers provided by the Company was not a hired professional but William Lynde, a Tailor. He, however, was only paid 40/- for his 60 days' service but he was provided with his equipment which cost the Company 23/7d. The six archers were each paid 40/- for their 60 days' service and the provisioning of the contingent of ten men cost the Company 23/-.⁵ After all this effort and expenditure,

-
1. Merchant Tailors' Hall Ms. A 4 Accounts i 1397-1445, f.268-269v., 276v. There were 220 Tailors who contributed to this levy.
 2. Goldsmiths' Hall Ms. 1518 Account Book A 1332-1442 f.166; Ms. 1520 Account Book A 1444-1516 f.32-33. There were 128 Goldsmiths who contributed to this levy.
 3. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, f.236.
 4. Brewers' Accounts; *op.cit.*, f.265v.-267, 267v., 270. The Company also paid 3d. for a skin of parchment for bills to gather the money to keep Calais from the Duke of Burgundy, f.256. There were 213 Brewers who contributed to this levy.
 5. Tailors' Accounts, *op.cit.*, f.276v.

by the time Gloucester reached Calais the siege had already been raised by Edmund Beaufort, Count of Mortain and by the defection of the Duke of Burgundy's Flemish levies. Gloucester, therefore, ravaged western Flanders and brought his troops home.

The third occasion when the City became involved in the fate of the King's French possessions came in 1449. An English attack upon the Breton town of Fougères resulted in a renewal of the war against Charles VII in June 1449. On 13 June the Court of Aldermen decided that the situation was serious enough for the City to raise its own contingent. The Mayor and 24 other Aldermen were each to provide one lance[†] and two archers. Thirty-five of the lesser Companies were assessed to provide contributions varying from eight archers from the Pewterers to 6/8d. from the Netters. Several of the smaller Companies provided cash rather than men. The total number of troops provided by these recorded lists would be 26 lance[†]s and 106 archers, but the clerk has written into the Journal that the total of lance[†]s was 43; the total of archers 319.¹ The explanation of this discrepancy may perhaps be sought in the fact that the greater Companies, whose names do not appear on this list, provided and equipped their own contingents to join the City's company. This suggestion is borne out by an entry on the Grocers' accounts where 130 members contributed £40 12s.10d. for soldiers going to Calais. Their contribution comprised twenty men, four of whom were spearmen and sixteen were archers. Moreover the Company paid 37/2d. for buckram cloth to

1. 13 June 1449, Jour.V f.10v.-11v.

clothe their men and also various sums for buying drink and taking the muster.¹ This muster was held at Dover and four Aldermen were sent to visit the camp and inspect the arms of the men provided by the Companies.² By 1 July John Asshely had been appointed as Captain of the soldiers hired by the City and he was to receive 20 marks in wages, 20 marks as a reward and 5 marks for armour for his horse. Before he left he received £20 out of this £30 due to him.³ It is clear both from the Grocers' accounts and from the City records that this force was raised by the City for the defence of Calais, to ensure that this town at least did not fall to the rapidly advancing French forces.⁴ It is not clear how long the army stayed at Calais but the Grocers' soldiers were paid for 40 days or six weeks.

The crisis continued throughout the summer and in October Rouen was threatened. This time the City decided to raise money rather than men and to do this through the wards. The Mayor and Aldermen between them raised £97 17s.4d. and 130 men in the twenty-five wards produced £94 18s. But the clerk noted in the Journals that as the town was taken by the French (29 October 1449), before the money could be used, it was repaid to the individuals who had lent it.⁵ The City's continuing anxiety can be seen in the decision to grant the King half a fifteenth for the defence of Calais in November.⁶

1. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, f.301, 307.

2. Jour.V f.12v.

3. Jour.V f.12v.

4. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, f.301, where the list of payments is headed 'Soldiers going to Calais'. The audit of the City's accounts refers to soldiers 'sent for the defence of Calais', Jour.V f.105v.

5. Jour.V f.20-24v.

6. 26 November 1449, Jour.V f.26v.

The fourth and last occasion in this period when the City actively helped the King in France was in July 1451 when Calais was again threatened. Letters from Calais were read and the Mayor, Alderman and Common Council granted one and a half fifteenths to be levied as quickly as possible. The writs were sent out on 15 July and the money was to be at the Guildhall by 19 July. A captain, Sir Thomas Fyndern, was chosen to lead the City's troops to Calais and a committee of two Aldermen and nine Common Councilmen was appointed to deal with receiving the money, hiring the mercenaries and *omnia alia faciendum, ministrandum, et providendum in praemissis prout eis melius videbitur*.¹ By 16 August Sir Thomas Fyndern had sailed in a ship called the James of Calice with 200 men, 29 shipmen and a groom and he had been paid £3 5s.0d. by Lord Beauchamp for his travelling expenses.² It is not clear how long this force remained at Calais.³ The City's accounts were audited in March 1453 when two Common Councilmen were appointed for the purpose. When it was decided in September of that year that Fyndern should receive a reward of £10 it was revealed that there was not that much money left.⁴ William Hulyn agreed to make up the necessary sum and to be repaid later.

-
1. 15 July 1451, Jour.V f.58v.; Assessment to bring in £945 13s.0 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., Jour.V f.59.
 2. P.P.C. VI, p.113. T.C.D. Ms E.S.10 f 171 says London sent 1000 men to Calais.
 3. Fyndern had been appointed Captain of Guisnes by 22 February 1452, see C.P.R. 1446-52, p.525.
 4. Peter Calcote and Ralph Verney appointed 5 March 1453, and results of audit made public 24 September 1453, Jour,V f.105v., 121v. There is a rather puzzling reference to this levy on 5 May 1455 when a new committee was appointed to audit, among other things, the account dealing with money for the defence of Calais and Sir Thomas Fyndern. The sums mentioned, however, were a half and a quarter fifteenth, whereas in 1451 it had been one and a half fifteenths which were agreed upon, Jour.V f.240v.

When the extent and expense of the Lancastrian commitment in France is considered, the London contribution on these four occasions, can be seen to be comparatively small. But it is notable that when the Londoners were really concerned about events in France, they chose to send a contingent under their own captain and under their own financial control, rather than simply to vote a loan or gift to the King. Moreover when the City chose to become involved to the extent of sending either supplies or men, they did so efficiently and rapidly - in marked contrast to the efforts of the Council. The protection of Calais remained, understandably, the Londoners' chief concern throughout the period.

As the Lancastrian finances worsened and the Crown lands shrank, it became necessary to reward royal servants in new ways. Royal influence was brought to bear upon the citizens as a whole, or upon certain Companies, in order that they might enfranchise some royal servant or, even more desirable, grant him a City office. Although the first such requests to the Common Council appear in 1437 a similar practice had been in operation in the Tailors' Company since the beginning of the century. Between 1404 and 1442 at least fourteen men were made free of the Company or became members of the livery at the request of the King, the Queen or the Dukes of Clarence, Bedford or Gloucester - all of whom were themselves members of the livery.¹ These men were

1. Tailors' Accounts, op.cit., i f.22v., 73v., 81v., 89v., 94v., 101, 150v., 265v., 315v., 341.

usually admitted without paying the customary entry fine of 20/- and their membership of the Company could be of considerable benefit to them. Not only were they entitled to partake in the feasts and festivities of the Company but they could enjoy the privileges of City freemen. In return the Company hoped thus, to win the favour of highly placed and influential people.

Since the royal charter of 1319 the City Companies had controlled entries to the freedom for a man could not be made free of the City unless he were presented by the Company in which he wished to be enfranchised.¹ It appears, however, that by the mid-fifteenth century it had become customary for the King to request the Common Council to enfranchise a royal servant and then a suitable Company would be persuaded to adopt him. For example, in November 1437 Thomas Brown of the royal larder and John Elyngham one of the King's valets were admitted as freemen by the Common Council in the misteries of Chandlers and Pinners respectively at the King's request and without paying a fine.² Further such enfranchisements at the royal request followed in 1440 (William Bowier),³ 1448 (William Ludlowe and John Yorks, royal sergeants, in mistery of Bakers and again Thomas Lipney in mistery of Bakers),⁴ 1449 (Alexander Doner),⁵ 1452 (James Falleran, a Lombard, in Drapers'

-
1. See Chapter III, pp. 199-209.
 2. November 1437; Jour. III f. 188.
 3. 4 November 1440; Jour. III f. 65.
 4. 18, 22 November 1448, Jour. V f. 2.
 5. 15 September 1449, Jour. V f. 14v.

Company, but it was decided that he should pay £20);¹ 1455 (Roger Lichfield, paid 40/-)² and 1460 (Mr. William Gorney, in ^{Bakers'} Fishmongers' Company).³

Royal intervention was not always aimed at rewarding royal servants. In December 1438 Richard de la Felde was dismissed from his office as clerk to the ^{Common} Town Clerk because he had married Eleanor Waldern the orphan daughter of the former Mayor William Walden, without permission. In October 1439 the King sent a letter on Felde's behalf asking that he should be reinstated, but the Court of Aldermen refused on the grounds that it would be prejudicial to the City to do so.⁴ The King accepted their decision.

But the attempts at royal intervention and patronage which were such a marked feature of sixteenth century London government, were only just beginning. In May 1440 Robert Watson was granted the office of collector of the London Bridge rents, at the King's request.⁵ The office of Water-baillif seems to have been particularly subject to external influence. In 1431 John Houghton was appointed at the instigation of the Duke of Gloucester and when the King, in 1445, provided in some way for Houghton, he expected his candidate William Veyse, to receive the office in Houghton's place. The City complied with this request.⁶

-
1. 17 October, 17 December 1452, Jour.V f.90, 93v.
 2. 19 February 1455, Jour.V f.223.
 3. 17 March 1460, admitted at the instance, not of the King, but of the King's secretary, Mr. Thomas Mannyng, Jour.VI f.206v.
 4. 5 December 1438, 17 October, 20 October 1439, Jour.III f.160, 25, 25v. See L.B.K., pp.222-23. Felde later received his wife's property in January 1445.
 5. 13 May 1440, L.B.K., p.238.
 6. Jour.IV f.59v., L.B.K., pp.133, 302-03. See Chapter II, p.136.

More crucial, perhaps, was the King's attempt to force the hands of the citizens in their choice of Mayor in October 1444. The King wrote on behalf of William Estfeld but the citizens, while admitting that he was well suited to be Mayor, firmly stated that he was not eligible since he had filled the office within the last seven years, and they proceeded to elect Henry Frowyk.¹ It was probably the impending arrival of the new Queen and the necessary entertainments which led Henry VI thus to intervene in the City's choice of Mayor. Moreover it was not only the King and Queen who interfered in City appointments in this way. John Westercotes, a Sheriff's serjeant was, in September 1439, banned from holding civic office in future, and lost his freedom. Less than a year later, however, at the instance of the Earl of Suffolk, he was restored to his freedom, and possibly also to his office.²

An independent spirit on the part of the citizens was shown in 1450 when they rejected the Queen's request to reinstate Alexander Manning as Warden of Newgate prison³ and again in 1453 when, in spite of another letter from the Queen asking that the office of Common

-
1. L.B.K., pp.301-02.
 2. 23 September 1439, 29 July 1440, Jour.III f.22v., 5l, 129v. The cause of his dismissal is not clear although it may have had something to do with the case of Elizabeth Peynton, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, pp.14-15.
 3. Jour.IV f.172, Jour.V f.16, 48, 5l. Letter from Queen Margaret printed in Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou, Bishop Beckington and others, ed. Cecil Monro (Camden Series, vol.LXXXVI, 1863), pp.161-63. See Chapter II, p. 99.

Serjeant should be given to William Cole, skilled in law, the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty elected instead Thomas Ursewyk.¹

Similarly the King's request that his servant John Aungewyn should be Common Serjeant in February 1460 was refused and John Asshe was appointed.² Moreover it was not only these Lancastrian requests which were refused. Although Roger Spicer who had been ^{Common} ~~Town~~ Clerk since 1446 was dismissed in August 1461 for offences against Edward IV, the new King's request that the office should be given to Robert Osbarn was rejected and William Dunthorne was elected in October.³ Apart, therefore, from one appointment to the office of rent collector and two appointments of Water bailiffs, the City successfully resisted intervention in its choice of important offices such as Mayor, ^{Common} ~~Town~~ Clerk and Common Serjeant. But that the practice of suggesting men for offices within the City was growing, cannot be doubted. It troubled the City Companies also and, in June 1461, the Mercers' Company made it an offence to suggest to highly placed lords or ladies that they should petition on behalf of individuals for the offices of Silk Weigher or Company Clerk. The Company noted that this had become a frequent practice which must be stopped.⁴

-
1. 19, 27 June 1453, Jour.V f.112v., 113v.
 2. 27, 28 February 1460, Jour.VI f.203-203v.
 3. 5 August, 25 September, October 1461, Jour.VI f.46, 22v., 7v.
 4. Mercers' Hall, Ms. Laws and Ancient Ordinances of the Company, f.19.

The third way in which the King depended upon the assistance and co-operation of the City was in the matter of state entertainments for visiting sovereigns or for royal occasions. Royal coronations, marriages and funerals could be expensive occasions for the citizens but new Kings and Queens had to be cultivated as potential patrons and customers. By the displays and massed welcomes not only the City as a whole, but individual Companies, hoped to attract royal notice and patronage.

When Henry IV was crowned both the Grocers and Tailors provided minstrels to enliven the occasion and, in the following year when Henry married Joanna of Brittany the Grocers paid out over £90 for new liveries and in other expenses.¹ The Tailors confined their efforts to providing musicians so that their costs were considerably ^{lower} less and the whole affair must have been somewhat muted compared with the City's later efforts.² In this year also the Mercers provided minstrels to meet the King on his return from Wales, perhaps to cheer him after his abortive efforts there.³ Also in this year the Emperor of Constantinople came to England and stayed for some time at the house of St. John in Smithfield; he was received by minstrels provided by the Mercers' Company.⁴ Moreover when Henry returned victorious

-
1. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts 1, f.83, the 7 minstrels cost 48/4d. Tailors' Accounts, op.cit., 1, f.7, the minstrels cost 33/4d. and their drink and hoods 6/9d. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, 1, f.89, 91.
 2. Tailors' Accounts, op.cit., 1, f.16v., the Company provided 4 minstrels 1 clarioner, 2 trumpeters and gave them hoods and drink at a total cost of £3 10s.3d. See Great Chron., p.85.
 3. Mercers' Hall, Accounts 1347-1464 f.32v., the minstrels cost 41/18d. Two men were fined 3/4d. each for failing to meet the King.
 4. Mercers' Accounts, op.cit., f.32v., the minstrels cost 40/4d. See Vitellius A XVI, p.267.

after the battle of Shrewsbury against the Percys he was met by the Mayor and delegates from the different Companies.¹

When Henry IV died in 1413 men of the misteries of Waxhandlers and Painters made his hearse and the citizens escorted the body to Canterbury.² Henry V chose to be crowned not three weeks after his father's death and this may explain the somewhat meagre preparations which were made for this event in the City. Certainly the Companies spent comparatively little, although the Harley chronicler records that Henry was met and escorted to the Tower by the men of London, and the Bridge Masters were allowed £9 14s.10d. in their account for staining and painting a giant with *works* and singers on London Bridge 'prepared for the coming of the King at his coronation'.³ But the King on arriving in the City a month after his victory at Agincourt in 1415 was received with a great procession, the magnificence of which was celebrated by John Lydgate in a cumbersome poem.⁴ The Bridge was decorated with the figures of a giant, 'to teach Frenchmen curtesy', St. George, an antelope and a lion and many singing angels, all of which

1. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, i, f.96.

2. 25 May 1413, C.P.R. 1413-16, p.64.

3. The Drapers spent 8/- on horses and livery for their beadle when they rode to meet the new King and the Dowager Queen Joanna, Johnson, Drapers' Accounts, i, p.286. The Mercers spent a total of £3 16s.2½d. on expenses for the coronation, Mercers' Accounts, op.cit., f.98v. The Grocers spent £4 2s.7d. on minstrels for the occasion, Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, i, f.110. G.R.O. Bridge House Accounts: Payments, vol.II, 1412-21, f.26. Harley 565, p.95.

4. For Lydgate's poem, see Harley 565, pp.216-33.

cost the Bridge Masters £18 12s. 11½d.¹ There were further tableaux at the Tower in Cornhill, and at the Cross in Cheapside.² Some chroniclers record also that the King was presented with two golden basins containing £1000 although there is no trace of such a sum being collected in the City at this time.³ The only Company which is recorded as having contributed towards these festivities is the Grocers⁴ who paid minstrels to meet the King on his coming out of France.⁴

In 1416 the Emperor Sigismund was expected to visit Henry V to cement the anti-French alliance. In April the Council made arrangements for his reception and the Mayor, Aldermen and good men of London were instructed to assemble at Blackheath to meet the Emperor.⁵ Sigismund arrived at Dover on 4 May and reached London two days later when, as the author of the Great Chronicle points out, at the King's command he was escorted from Blackheath to St. Thomas' watering place by the Mayor and commoners of London. Here Henry met him and conducted him through the City to Westminster.⁶ The Emperor came accompanied by a large retinue, which, together with the lords, knights and esquires summoned by Henry, converged on the City and precautions had to be taken to keep the peace and to stabilise the price of food.⁷

-
1. Bridge House Accounts, op.cit., ii, f.171.
 2. Great Chron., pp.93-94; Giles Chron., pp.53-60.
 3. Harley 565, p.103; Usk, p.312; Stow Annals, p.351. The chroniclers may be confusing the gifts made to the King in 1421.
 4. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, i, f.115. The minstrels cost £2 18s.7d.
 5. P.P.C. II, pp.193-94.
 6. Great Chron., p.94; Harley 565, p.103; Cleopatra C IV, pp.125-26.
 7. L.B.L., pp.xxviii, 158, 160-61 and n.2, xxviii.

The next occasion on which the City staged an elaborate display was in 1421 when Henry's new Queen, Katherine of France arrived in England to be crowned. The King and Queen arrived together at Dover on February 2nd and then Henry came alone to London and was met by a band of minstrels and greeted by a giant's head placed on the Bridge especially for the purpose.¹ Katherine arrived on February 22nd and was met by the Mayor and Aldermen and the crafts all wearing white gowns with red hoods with the emblem of each craft embroidered on the gowns. The Grocers had paid £13 6s.8d. to have 94 gowns so embroidered.² Both this Company and the Brewers contributed to the costs of the festivities on this occasion and on the following day when the Queen, having spent the night at the Tower, was conducted through the City. There were many pageants, houses were hung with tapestries, and the conduits ran with wine to delight her on the way to her coronation. The Bridge Masters had paid for eight pairs of singing angels, an image of St. Petronella and 5 torches for the Bridge Chapel.³ The Common Council had decided that the City should give the new Queen, during her overnight stay at the Tower, a pair of basins and 1000 marks.⁴

-
1. Bridge House Accounts, *op.cit.*, ii, f.457. The giant's head cost 18d.
 2. Kingdon, *Grocers' Accounts*, i, f.136; *Brewers' Accounts*, *op.cit.*, f.46-46v. *L.B.L.*, pp.250-51; *Great Chron.*, p.115; Continuation D of Brut, *Bris*, pp.425-27.
 3. Bridge House Accounts, *op.cit.*, 12d. for bread and wine for the Chapel, f.468; 6/8d. to Isabelle Beauchamp for conducting the eight pairs of angels, f.478; 2/- for the image of St. Petronilla f.480; 52/5d. for torches for the Chapel on several occasions, f.496.
 4. 7 February 1421, Jour.I f.87, 88.

But the gaiety and hope which surrounded these events was soon to be frustrated by the death of Henry V on 31 August 1422. The news reached the City on 1 October and the ceremonies surrounding the election of the Mayor were suitably muted.¹ On the day of the Mayor's riding to Westminster to take the oath, the crafts which accompanied him wore only black or russet gowns and went by barge without minstrels.² On that day it was decided that the crafts should provide 200 torches for the King's funeral and the torchbearers were all to wear white. The Brewers paid 5l/9d. for the eight torches which they provided and a further 3d. a day to each of the bearers. The Grocers paid 39/6d. for their quota of torches.³ It is clear that the Mayor, Sheriffs, Aldermen, Common Councilmen and crafts of London provided the principal group of mourners who accompanied the coffin from Southwark to St. Paul's on 5 November and from St. Paul's to the Abbey on the following day. In each ward from St. Magnus at the Bridge to Temple Bar through which the catafalque passed, every householder had provided a servant holding a torch at his door.⁴ Moreover on the anniversary of Henry V's death all the Companies sent torchbearers to the celebration of the King's obit.⁵

1. L.R.I., p.270. Brewers' Accounts, op.cit., f.71-72.

2. Continuation E of Brut, Brie, p.449.

3. Brewers' Accounts, op.cit., f.71-72. The Company's total expenditure was 5l/9d. for the torches and 4/- for the bearers, but they were able to sell their torch ends for 28/- which reduced their total outlay to 37/9d. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, i, f.149.

4. Brewers' Accounts, op.cit., f.71-72; Longleat Ms. p.100; Continuation E of Brut, Brie, p.449.

5. See the accounts of the Brewers', Mercers', Carpenters' and Grocers' passim.

When Henry VI was crowned in England in November 1429, the Mayor and Aldermen, dressed in scarlet, accompanied the young King from the Tower to Westminster.¹ But his reception on returning from his French coronation which took place in December 1431 was considerably more splendid. John Lydgate again wrote a poem and another account of the King's reception was preserved by John Carpenter the Common Clerk.² The day - 20 February 1432 - began early when the City's deputation met the King at Blackheath with a speech of welcome: 'Thanks be to God in all his gifts that we see you in such good quarter'. Together they then rode to Deptford where the City Rectors, curates and secular shaplains joined the procession. Thus assembled they crossed the bridge and rode through the City with its elaborate pageants at the accustomed places, including a tableaux of three virgins drawing up the waters of mercy, grace and pity from three wells - this being a pun on the name of the Mayor, John Wells. It may be that on this occasion the King dined at Tailors' Hall.³ The procession then moved on to an elaborate welcome and service at St. Paul's and the King finally ended the long day at Westminster Palace. On the following Saturday, 23 February, the Mayor and Aldermen visited the palace and presented the King with £1000 in a gold casket. The City had had difficulty in

-
1. Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, ii, f.204. The author of Continuation E of the Brut says that the Tower was full of angels, the conduits in Cheap were decorated and ran with red and white wine, Brie, p. 451.
 2. For Carpenter's account see L.B.K., p.138; for Lydgate's poem see Great Chron., pp.156-70; a further independent account is to be found in Continuation F of Brut, Brie, pp.461-65.
 3. Tailors' Accounts, op.cit., include for the year 1431-32 expenses on meat and drink for the King, 29/11d., f.229.

raising the money for this reception and gift and although Common Council had authorized a poll tax to pay for the gift, the Chamberlain John Bederenden, had had to provide the money for the reception out of his own purse on the security of the issues of the Common Beam.¹ But the City's splendid reception for Henry VI was not forgotten by the King for when he wrote to the Goldsmiths' Company twelve years later asking the Company to greet his new Queen in an honourable fashion, he thanked them for receiving him so well on his return from Paris.²

Henry was betrothed to Margaret of Anjou in May 1444, and in August the City began to consider the reception which should be provided for her. The problem of the liveries to be worn proved to be a vexed one. In August it was decided that white gowns with red hoods would be suitable since this would symbolize virgin purity as well as being the ancient colours of the City; this was subsequently altered to blue gowns with red hoods and in November plain red liveries were decided upon, without devices.³ The Chamberlain was to buy the material in bulk and divide it among the different Companies. These were to be assessed to provide a total of 2000 marks - £1000 as a gift to the King and 500 marks for the decorations in the City which the Chamberlain was to supervise. The raising of this money clearly presented problems for, in October, it was decided that the Aldermen should collect it by wards.⁴ On 6 November the King wrote to the City and his letter

1. 9 January 1432, L.B.K., pp.129-30.

2. W.S. Prideaux, Memorials of the Goldsmiths' Company, vol.I (1896) p.21.

3. 6 August, 26, 27 August, 20 November 1444, Jour.IV f.38-38v., 39v.-40, 52.

4. 13 October, 10,11 November 1444, Jour.IV f.44, 49v.

on this occasion may well have been similar to that sent to the Goldsmiths on 26 November in which they were asked to receive the Queen honourably.¹

The civic preparations continued. In January 1445 committees were appointed to receive the money voted for the decoration of the City.² Moreover the compiler of the City's Journal was given the task of drafting an address of welcome to the Queen and two of his attempts survive although he does not seem to have got beyond the first line.³ On 9 April Margaret finally crossed the channel and the City's preparations took on a note of urgency. Certain Aldermen were found to be too infirm to ride to meet her so the numbers of Aldermen were to be made up to twenty-four by including those commoners who had served as Sheriffs.⁴ The Court of Aldermen decided that the Mercers alone should provide the minstrels to head the procession to meet the King.⁵ Although no mention of this is preserved in the Mercers' accounts, from two other Companies there survive detailed accounts of their preparations for the Queen's arrival. The Goldsmiths decided upon a ~~upon~~ a very ornate livery for their members which should include silver

-
1. 6 November 1444, Jour.IV f.48v.
 2. 7, 28 January 1445, Jour.IV f.57, 60v.
 3. Jour.IV f.229. The two remaining drafts are 'Right gracious lady, as welcome ye be to this City of London as one ... queen or princess before these days' and 'Right glorious princess and gracious and most benign lady'.
 4. 12 April 1445, Jour.IV f.74v.
 5. 27 April 1445, Jour.IV f.76.

bawdricks and black hoods for apprentices decorated with beaten goldsmiths' work.¹ The Tailors' Company received a total of £17 7s. in fines from 39 members and 97 yeoman tailors who failed to ride to meet the Queen. Out of this money the Company probably provided its livery. But more than £3 was spent by the Wardens in their labours over the device to be used on the livery, in the cost of assessing members' contributions, in their daily labour over the matter at the Company hall for three months and for fuel to keep them warm as they worked. A mantle of silver was fashioned for the sleeves of the gowns of the Master and the four Wardens which cost 25/5d. but this expense was disallowed. Similarly the Wardens were not allowed to claim compensation for their daily labours and their loss of business while attending to this matter for the Company.²

In May the Aldermen took precautions to preserve the peace, the images in the chapel on the Bridge were repainted and gravel was bought to scatter on the Bridge to prevent the great numbers of horses from slipping.³ On 28 May Margaret finally arrived after nine months of preparations. According to the author of the Great Chronicle all the

-
1. Goldsmiths' Accounts, op.cit., ii, f.11-13. Those who could not, or did not intend to, ride agreed to pay the costs of the minstrels. 86 members of the Company appear to have preferred to pay rather than be present in person and their contributions amounted to £23 19s.4d., although over £9 of this was not paid. The Wardens were not allowed in their account, £5 which they had spent on gowns, hoods and other things bought for the Queen's coming.
 2. Tailors' Accounts, op.cit., f.387-387v., 398v.
 3. The Aldermen were to be armed against riots, 13 May 1445, Jour.IV f.77v.; 30 loads of gravel cost 12/6d., Bridge House Accounts, op.cit., iv, f.48l, 480v.

citizens wore gowns of brown-blue, with the Company devices embroidered on them and each had a red hood. There were the usual City displays which the chronicler does not describe since they were largely the same as those in 1432.¹ The Queen spent the night at the Tower and then rode through the City to her coronation on the following day. She must have made a splendid sight, drawn by two horses in a carriage made of cloth of gold, with a canopy of the same ^{Carried} ~~carved~~ over her head and borne by four knights. Margaret herself was dressed in damask, powdered with gold, and her hair, on which sat a coronet of gold and pearls, was combed down onto her shoulders.² The citizens and knights who accompanied her to St. Paul's and thence to Westminster must have been greatly impressed by this specimen of French magnificence.

The City's efforts did not pass unnoticed and Suffolk and other lords came in person to the Court of Aldermen to thank them on the King's behalf for their good gestures and many expenses on the arrival and coronation of the Queen.³ The Common Council thanked the Mayor and each Alderman for their notable efforts in this direction and the Mayor and Alderman in their turn rewarded Richard Power, the Mayor's Swordbearer, for his services in connection with the Queen's coronation.⁴ Henry Frowyk, the Mayor, subsequently received £20 for his expenses and costs at this time.⁵

1. Great Chron., p.178; Bale, pp.119-20.

2. Continuation F of Brut, Brie, pp.488-90.

3. 7 June 1445, Jour.IV f.79.

4. 18 June 1445, Jour.IV f.81v.; 26 August 1446, L.B.K., p.314.

5. 9 September 1448, Jour.IV f.227. This payment was not to be taken as a precedent.

This is the last occasion on which the entertainment provided by the City can be considered as a-political. Although the Aldermen rode to meet the King and Queen separately and together at different times after 1450, these occasions became part of the fabric of the struggle for power which marks the decade 1450-60.

CHAPTER IXLONDON AND THE REVOLT OF JACK CADE IN 1450

Because the revolt of Jack Cade in June and July 1450 was successful, the City of London became involved. But it was only the appearance of the rebel army at Blackheath twice in two weeks, which brought to a head some rebellious and discontented feelings within the City itself. Without Cade and the Kentish discontents, however, there would have been no revolt in London.

There had been friction between the City and the King over such things as the use and abuse of the sanctuary at St. Martin's, the privileges granted to foreign merchants and the granting of royal monopolies to the distributive trades. But this sort of friction was neither novel nor serious. There had also been friction within the City between different classes: between the ruling merchants and the artisans. This had, perhaps, reached a greater intensity of late but it had been controlled and subdued. But there was nothing anti-governmental about this artisan protest; indeed the King was looked upon as a source of justice and power. These tensions were not the stuff of which successful risings are born, but they provided useful pockets of discontent on which the rising could feed.

There are, perhaps, straws in the wind which show that London, like the rest of the country, was uneasy. In 1446 John David accused his master, an armourer named William Catour, of treason and killed

him in combat.¹ Also in this year the bastard son of Lord ~~Seates~~ ^{Scales} was slain in Fleet Street and the City took precautions to keep careful watch with men at arms.² In 1447 the death of Gloucester and the subsequent trial in London of five of his servants, with their dramatic pardon as they were hanging at Tyburn, caused unrest and engendered mistrust in the policies and methods of the government. One of those who nearly died was Richard Nedeham, a London Mercer and this may have helped to arouse posthumous sympathy for Gloucester and his supposed 'cause'.³ It cannot have improved the situation, that it was the Marquis of Suffolk who arrived with the last minute pardon.⁴ In the winter of 1447-8 the Thames flooded at Dartford and north of the river in Essex so that 'meadows and houses and chapels were overwhelmed with no hope of recovery'.⁵ In Easter week 1449

-
1. Great Chron., p.178 states that Catour was overcome because his neighbours gave him wine to drink. David was later taken for riot and misrule and hanged at Tyburn, Julius B I p.135; Rawlinson B 355 p.104; Gregory, p.187. Catour was warden of the mystery of Armourers in 1445 and was involved in a dispute with the Master of the Company, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.77. P.P.C. VI pp.55-57, 59.
 2. Bale p.120. 20 April 1450, Common Council decided that the Sheriffs should receive the fines arising from the judgments in the trial of the servants of Lord Scales and Thomas (?) Daniel who had caused an affray in the City, Jour.V f.34.
 3. Richard Nedeham in 1444 married Joanna/Alice, the widow of John Kyng, Tailor, L.B.K., p.300. In 1444/5 he was described as 'with my Lady of Gloucester' and as such was enrolled in the livery of the Tailors' Company, Merchant Tailors' Hall, Accounts i f.388. He was auditor of London Bridge in 1455/6 and Sheriff 1458/9, L.B.K., pp.370, 381, 395. He was Warden of his Company 1451-2, 1457-8, 1460-1. M.P. for the City in 1460. Last reference to him is in 1464. His pardon dated 14 July 1447, C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.68, 112. One of his step-sons was a scholar at Eton, possibly through the patronage of the 'learned' Duke of Gloucester, ibid., p.61. See Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.624-5.

(footnotes 4 and 5 at foot of next page)

William Turver a Flemish tailor, aided and abetted by another Fleming called Peter Spygger caused chaos during the muster of troops at Mile End. He was believed to be an agent for the Duke of Burgundy, but clearly he was much too unsubtle to be of any use to the Duke. Part of the long indictment declares that he shouted in Flemish 'ye shall drink a hundred nobles of (out off) King Henry's head of Windsor, ere St. George's day next coming'.¹ Such activities, while not seriously threatening the realm, helped to foster a sense of grievance against all foreigners, which was always present in London and upon which Cade played.

The arrest and trial of Suffolk under the shadow of the King's obvious favour towards him, caused unrest and there were risings in Oxford, Suffolk and Kent in February 1450.² In the last county the rising was led by Thomas Cheyny, alias Bluebeard, and was promptly put down by the energetic activities of the Mayor and other officials

-
1. P.R.O. KB9/263/85. Turver was said to have taken refuge at the house of William Yenvey, called Herteshorn, in St. Mary Matfelon parish, and later at the house of Adrian Glasyer, a Dutchman. The indictment was made at Westminster, 2 August 1449. The King's Council was concerned about the molesting of Dutchmen and Flemings and instructed the Mayor and Sheriffs to prevent this persecution, 11 June 1449, P.P.C. VI, pp.74-75.
 2. P.P.C. VI, p.90.

(footnotes continued from previous page)

4. Stow, Annales, p.386 states that the pardon was obtained at the intercession of Gilbert Worthington, Parson of St. Andrew's Holbourn. Worthington died this year.
5. Rawlinson B 355, p.105; Julius B I, p.135; Bale, p.128; Lambeth 306, p.66; Vitellius F XII, p.172 where the author states that in the following year grain was expensive.

of Canterbury; the town was subsequently rewarded with a new charter.¹ The virtual royal pardon of Suffolk in March 1450 caused rioting in London and it was necessary to send writs to the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex, Kent, Surrey and Sussex declaring that noone was to carry arms.² On 21 March, John Frammesley of Ramsey, a London vintner was arrested for declaring in English in the parish of St. Lawrence Dowgate 'By this town, by this town, for this array, the King shall lose his crown'.³ In April the posting of seditious bills in the City had to be prevented⁴ and in May some attempt at pacification was necessary. Clearly Sir Humphrey Stafford and others who had been sent to Oxfordshire in February to put down the incipient rebellion there had been a source of grievance to the local inhabitants

-
1. For chronicle accounts of Bluebeard's rising see Bale, p.125; Stow, Annales, p.387; Great Chron., p.181; T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.166. Cheyny's head and quarters were subsequently despatched to Canterbury, London, Norwich and the Cinque ports with great difficulty by the Sheriffs of London 'for and by cause that unneth any persones durste nor wolde take upon ham the caridge of the seyde hed and quarters for doute of her lyves' P.P.C. VI, p.107. For the part played by Canterbury in suppressing the revolt see H.M.C. IX Appendix (1883) pp.140, 167-68.
 2. C.C.R. 1447-54, p.182; Bale, p.127; William of Worcester, p.765.
 3. 23 March 1450, Thomas Chalton, Mayor, commissioned to examine all the treasons of John Frammesley, late vintner, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.320. P.R.O. KB9/73 whole file devoted to findings of this commission. Bale, p.129 is the only chronicler to notice this event, and states that one John Ramsey, the servant of a vintner, was hanged, drawn and quartered for declaring 'London shall put the King from his crown'. 30 March 1450 Frammesley was condemned to be hanged at Tyburn and his quarters to be sent to Stamford, Winchester, Newbury and Coventry, P.R.O. KB9/73/1. This securely identifies Frammesley with the John Ramsey 'wine-drawer' mentioned in the petition of allowance for expenses made by the London Sheriffs in June 1451, P.P.C. VI, p.107; P.R.O. E28/81/46.
 4. C.C.R. 1447-54, p.194.

and the King appointed a commission to investigate.¹ But pacification had come too late.

Parliament was sitting at Leicester when the insurrection began in Kent, on or about 31 May.² Almost immediately the rebels produced a proclamation, or list of grievances. There are two surviving versions of this document which is crude, violent and immoderate; too violent Kriehn believed to be the list of demands subsequently presented to the King. It was, rather, a manifesto to explain and to justify the rebels' gathering.³ The manifesto attacked the King's evil councillors who thwarted the course of justice, took bribes, named innocent men as traitors to gain their lands, had lost the war in France and advised the King to raise money from his subjects without the consent of Parliament. The commons suggested that the King should take the advice of the Dukes of York, Exeter, Buckingham and Norfolk, and that Gloucester's murderers should be punished, the

-
1. C.P.R. 1446-52, p.386 and see PRO KB9/266 file with findings of this commission.
 2. On the feast of the Holy Trinity, 31 May 1450, according to the records of the city of Canterbury, H.M.C. IX Appendix (1883) p.140.
 3. The two versions are (i) preserved among the historical memoranda of John Stow, headed 3 June 1450, printed J. Gairdner, Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles (C.S. XXVIII N.S. (1880) pp.94-99. (ii) contemporary copy preserved in Magdalen College, Oxford, Miscellaneous manuscripts 306, described H.M.C. VIII Appendix (1881) pp.266-67. The second version omits six clauses which are included in the first, but the remaining fifteen clauses are the same. Stow printed an abbreviated version in Stow, Annales p.389. * See G. Kriehn, The English Rising in 1450 (Strasbourg 1892), pp.30-31. * *Kriehn also prints an abbreviated version taken from Cotton MSS li 23, E 4 L pp. 260-261.*

loss of France should be revenged, purveyancing curtailed, extortioners punished, commissions of enquiry set up and the Statute of Labourers repealed. The Kentish influence is to be seen in the claim that in Kent, gentlemen's lands and goods have been taken by pretending that they were traitors, in the demand for the punishment of the three Kentish Sheriffs - ^{Stephen} Simon Slegge, William Crowmer and William Isle, and in the demand for a commission of enquiry into miscarriages of justice within the county.¹

While the rebels were thus raising their grievances and their flag in Kent, the King, in Leicester, instructed the Duke of Buckingham, and the Earls of Oxford, Devon and Arundel to gather men to punish and arrest the rebels.² In London the Common Council of the City took anxious steps to prepare for the advent of the insurgents. The gates were to be fortified and guarded night and day and Armourers were to be prevented from selling their wares outside the City. The citizens also viewed with some alarm the arrival of nobles with bands of armed retainers, and these, because of the scarcity of food within the City, were only to be allowed to enter for specific tasks and were not to quarter their men inside the City.³ On 9 June, having hastily dissolved Parliament, the King left Leicester. Thomas Cook senior and Thomas Davy, the Masters of the Bridge, were given four hand guns

-
1. William Isle 1446-7; William Crowmer 1445-6, 1449-50; Stephen Slegge 1448-9. Isle, Crowmer and Slegge had all been M.Ps. for Kent.
 2. 6 June 1450, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.385.
 3. 8 June 1450, Jour.V f.36v.

to use in keeping the rebels off the bridge.¹ By 10 June the King had reached Newport Pagnell - half way to London - and from here he issued a commission to ^{Lord} ~~Viscount~~ Beaumont, Sir William Lovel, Sir Thomas DeScales and Lords Rivers and Dudley, to gather troops.² In London it was reported to the Court of Aldermen that men with bundles of arms had been seen travelling by barge down the river towards Gravesend - presumably to join the rebels.³ On 11 June the insurgents encamped at Blackheath and the King settled at the Priory of St. John outside the City to the northwest in Smithfield, accompanied probably by the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Rivers with the troops whom they had been able to collect.⁴ Certain Aldermen were made responsible for the City gates and Robert Horne, the Alderman of Bridge ward was made responsible for keeping the Bridge. Watch was to be kept in the City both by day and night.⁵ A state of uneasy calm seems then to have settled upon rebels, City and court.

-
1. 9 June 1450, Jour.V f.37.
 2. C.P.R. 1446-52, p.385.
 3. 10 June 1450, Jour.V f.37. The informant was Robert Byfield, a Haberdasher, who added that he did not know any of the men.
 4. The date 11 June 1450 for the arrival of the rebels is supported by Rawlinson B 355, p.105 and Gough London 10, p.153, although Bale, p.129 gives the date 12 June. It seems likely that the King arrived on 11 June since a document was sealed at Westminster on that day, C.C.R. 1447-54, p.185. Bale is the authority for the presence of Buckingham and Rivers in the City. Lord Rivers was one of the most active of the King's supporters during the revolt and kept command of 200 men for 6 weeks at the cost of 400 marks to the King, Devon, Issues, p.469, writ dated 13 September 1450, P.R.O. E404/67/19.
 5. Jour.V f.37, 37v.

On 12 June the Aldermen decided to meet in their scarlet robes at St. Bartholomew's Priory, also at Saith^{field}, on the next day, presumably to wait upon the King.¹ John Russell, an unpopular City Sergeant, took the opportunity to seize two horses which, he claimed, belonged to one of the prime movers of the insurrection in Kent.² Russell was but the first to turn disorder to his own profit. The rebels were ill-equipped but strong in numbers (although the chronicles obviously exaggerate the size of the rebel host) and they spent the time after their arrival in Blackheath staking the field and taking up a defensive position.³ On 13 June the Court of Aldermen appointed a London merchant John Judde and a Common Councilman, Richard Horne, as captains of the two barges which the City had provided to ensure that food supplies came through, and also for defence against the rebels. Both these men had some connections with the court circle.⁴

-
1. 12 June 1450, Jour.V f.37v.
 2. John Russell was Common Huntsman 1423-48 and a permanent Serjeant at Mace of the Mayor from 1446. His story about the horses was probably suspect since he was bound over to appear in court on 8 July 1450, Jour.V f.39v. In 1453 he, and his son, appear to have attacked Nicholas Fauconer, P.R.O. KB9/270/59-62, KB27/768. 17 February 1457 he was finally dismissed for neglecting his duties, Jour.VI f.92v.
 3. Great Chron., p.181 states that the rebels were poorly decked with harness. Bale, pp.129-30 states in one place that the size of the rebel host was 10,000 and in another 60,000. Gregory, p.190 states 46,000. The smallest of these figures is likely to be the most correct considering that the population of London was about 30,000 at this time. The defensive nature of the rebel camp is described by Gough London 10, p.153 and Gregory, p.190.
 4. 13 June 1450, Jour.V f.37v. Richard Horne was a Fishmonger who first appears as a Common Councilman in August 1449, Jour.V f.13. He was probably related to Robert Horne, the Alderman of Bridge ward. Being a Fishmonger he was likely to have ships of his own. John Judde features little in the civic life before this date. His selection for this task may have been due to his appointment in July 1449 to take men to sea to fight the King's enemies, in which case he would have had ships and sailors and arms to hand, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.265.

Sunday, 14 June passed without incident and on 15 June the King moved; he sent heralds to Blackheath and it may have been the need to wait for a herald which had caused this delay.¹ But the demands of the heralds that the rebels should withdraw, were defied. In the evening the King sent a force of bowmen and spearmen under the Earl of Northumberland, Lord Scales and Lord Lysle, but they clearly decided that the rebels' staked field was too dangerous to attack and so they returned to the King.² Meanwhile the Earl of Oxford was commissioned to gather men at arms in Norfolk and to guard the castles - this may have been because of fear of invasion but was more probably intended to suppress the nascent rebellion there.³ Until this time none of the chroniclers has mentioned a Captain of the host or Jack Cade but it seems as if the need to send answers to royal messengers led the rebels to choose a leader, and the man they chose was Jack Cade who called himself Mortimer. Or, in the scornful words of the author of Gregory's chronicle 'they kept order amongst themselves for as good was Jack Robin as John at the Noke for all were as high as pig's feet'.⁴ It is important to remember

-
1. Bale, p.129. The Lancaster Herald was subsequently paid for having ridden hastily from Leicester to London, writ dated 11 September 1452, P.R.O. E404/69/19, Devon, Issues, p.476. An Esquire, John Solers, was also sent by the King to the rebel camp, who was taken and bound by Cade, writ dated 21 June 1451, P.R.O. E404/67/187, Devon, Issues, p.470.
 2. Bale, p.130. The Earl of Northumberland had men from Beverly among his troops, paid for by the town, H.M.C. Report on the Manuscripts of the Corporation of Beverley (1900), p.165.
 3. C.P.R. 1447-52, p.389. On the same date that a conciliatory commission was sent to Kent, one was also sent to Norfolk, see p.534 below.
 4. GREGORY, p.190. The identity of Cade has much interested historians
(continued at foot of next page)

that Cade only emerged as the rebel leader during the course of the revolt and, being a man of some ability, it may be he who was responsible for the later moderation of the rebel programme and the good order and cohesion which the insurgents maintained.¹

On 16 June the King wished to go in person with his forces against the rebels but his Council dissuaded him from this. Instead a deputation was sent which included the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Duke of Buckingham, the Bishop of Winchester and Lord Beaumont. It was probably to this deputation that Cade presented the 'Complaint of commons of Kent and cause of their assembling at Blackheath'. While this repeated some of the clauses of the earlier articles, particularly the financial complaints and the demand that those who ^{had} surrendered the French lands should be punished, the main body of clauses dealt with specifically Kentish grievances - the fear that Kent was to be made a forest in punishment for Suffolk's death, complaints against the Barons of the Cinque Ports and officials of the court of Dover, demands for the free election of knights of the shire, impartial choice of tax collectors and sessions in both east and west Kent to prevent long journeys. There were also general

1. Gregory, p.191 states that a different captain led the rebel host when it came to Blackheath the second time. This seems unlikely.

(continued from previous page)

4. but it remains well hidden, see article on Cade by T.F. Henderson, D.N.B., vol.III, pp.623-26; H.M. Lyle, The Rebellion of Jack Cade (Historical Association pamphlet 1950) pp.16-17; R.L. Storey, The End of the House of Lancaster (1966), p.63.

complaints against the Sheriffs and the venality of courtiers.¹

It was an impressive and reasonable document and included no direct attacks upon individuals. Although Stow is the only chronicler to preserve a copy of these articles, other writers notice that Cade's followers called themselves petitioners and not rebels and that they came to have the desires of the commons in Parliament fulfilled.²

A copy of these articles for the reform of the kingdom was taken back to the King for his perusal and, hesitating at this point, the opportunity for conciliation was lost. At this stage a general consent to the rebel demands would have been possible, but the Council clearly believed that a show of force rather than concession was necessary. When he heard nothing from the King in answer to the petition, the Captain withdrew his host from Blackheath in an orderly fashion during the night of 17 June 'taking his ordnance and his stakes'.³

In consequence the King's triumphal ride through the City with his forces, turned out to be something of a fiasco when Blackheath was found deserted.⁴ Detachments of troops were then sent to pursue

-
1. The only version of this is printed by Stow, Annales, p.388. There are 15 clauses. These were probably the articles for which the unfortunate Payn was sent by his master Fastolf, and was subsequently badly treated, Paston Letters 1 pp.131-35.
 2. Rawlinson B 355, p.105; Bale, p.130; Gough London 10, p.154; Vitellius A XVI, p.158; Continuation G of Brut, Brie, p.517; T.C.D. MS.E.5.10 f.167.
 3. Bale, p.131.
 4. Bale, p.131; Gregory, p.191.

the rebels into Kent; the leaders of these troops included Sir Humphrey Stafford, William Stafford, Sir Thomas Stanley, Lord Rivers, Lord Dudley and Thomas Daniel.¹ While the King himself moved on to Greenwich where he stayed for two days, the detachment of royal troops led by the two Staffords was ambushed at Sevenoaks on 18 June and the leaders were killed.² Lord Dudley and Thomas Daniel escaped the ambush and broke into Otford Park nearby to steal horses.³ The defeat of the Staffords provided more than just encouragement for the rebels; they now had some good armour and equipment.⁴ But the news of the defeat when brought to London led to unrest among the King's troops who were quartered outside the City at Blackheath. On 19 June

-
1. All the chroniclers mention the Staffords. Bale, p.131 lists the pursuers as Stanley, Daniel, the Earl of Northumberland, the Staffords, Lord Rivers, Lord Scales, Lord Grey. From the Kent indictments edited by R. Virgoe, 'Some Ancient Indictments in the King's Bench referring to Kent, 1450-1452', Documents Illustrative of Medieval Kentish Society, ed. F.R.H. du Boulay (Kent Archaeological Society, vol.XVIII, 1964), pp.214-66, it is clear that Dudley, Stanley, Daniel and Rivers were all in Kent from 18-20 June and caused considerable distress while they were there, see pp. 216, 223, 224, 233, 239.
 2. For the King's removal to Greenwich see Gregory, p.191, Lambeth 306, p.67, Bale, p.131. Great Chron., p.182 records that the King was advised to send some petty captain against the rebels since they were but commoners, hence the choice of Stafford. Gregory, however, describes Stafford as 'one of the manliest men of all this realm'. Sir Humphrey Stafford's severity in Oxfordshire in February may have been known to the rebels, see p.482 above. Kriehn, op.cit., Appendix, dates the battle of Sevenoaks securely to 18 June from the Inquisition Post mortem on Sir Humphrey.
 3. Virgoe, op.cit., p.223. Daniel and Rivers also assaulted a man in Eynesford that day, p.239.
 4. Great Chron., p.182.

the Duke of Buckingham had to ride to the King at Greenwich to say that he would have no army left if the so called 'traitors' were not hastily imprisoned.¹ In response to this pressure James ^{Fiennes} Ferries, Lord Say, was arrested by the Duke of Exeter and imprisoned in the Tower. No doubt the unpopular Thomas Daniel would have been similarly imprisoned if he had not been with the royal troops in Kent. Together with Dudley and Stanley he was spending this Friday in Sevenoaks raising troops and acquiring horses, money and arms.² It is unlikely that the King intended to sacrifice Lord Say but rather that, by putting him under strong and protective guard, he could keep the loyalty of his troops until the crisis was over. Lord Beauchamp was appointed to succeed him as Treasurer.³ The rebellious nature of the King's troops and the fear that the City would be left without any protection made the Aldermen and Common Council uneasy. When the Common Council met this Friday it was decided that twelve casks of beer and eight casks of white wine should be sent to the King and his lords with their retinues.⁴ This was both a bribe to the King to stay and a sop to the troops to take their minds off desertion.

It seems clear, however, that the King's plan was not to remain in the City, but rather, having provided the Tower with men and arms,

1. Gough London 10, p.154; Bale, p.132; Great Chron., p.182. For a list of supposed traitors see pp.515-6 below.

2. Virgoe, op.cit., p.241.

3. Beauchamp took up office 22 June 1450, J. Ramsey, Lancaster and York (Oxford 1892), vol.ii, p.129 n.2.

4. Jour.V f.38.

to leave the City to resist the rebels on its own. On 20 June, therefore, the King came by water from Greenwich to Westminster to make his preparations.¹ The Court of Aldermen met anxiously in an attempt to persuade the King to remain in the City and their agitation can be seen, perhaps, in the absence of any entry in the Journals until 26 June. It is doubtful however if, as one chronicler relates the Mayor and Aldermen offered to pay the costs of the royal household for half a year if the King would stay in the City.² The King's decision to leave may well have been dictated by the rebellious nature of his troops. But he did what he could to prepare the City. Thomas Vaughan, the newly appointed Master of the Ordnance was equipped with guns, carts, gunners, powder and other arms.³ These were stored in the Tower together with the unfortunate Lord Say who may have visited the King secretly by water while the latter was at Westminster. It may be that the King wished to reassure him, or that he tried to contrive Lord Say's escape and was prevented from doing so by the young Duke of Exeter - who had an eye on the restless troops.⁴ The Duke, who was Constable of the Tower, was probably left in charge both of Lord Say and of the troops stationed there; certainly Thomas Lord

1. Bale, p.132.

2. Lambeth 306, p.67.

3. P.P.C. VI, p.94 and writ 30 June 1450, P.R.O. E28/80/53. That the Tower was well stocked with arms can be seen from the fact that a commission to the Duke of Exeter and others, 5 August 1450, instructed them to enquire into all the arms which had been withdrawn by lieges of the City from the Tower - presumably for the battle of the Bridge.

4. T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10. f.167v.

Scales and the veteran soldiers of the French wars, Matthew Gough and John Fastolf were there.¹ The City was not, therefore, left completely defenceless when the King left Westminster for Kenilworth on 25 June.² But the situation in London was extremely tense and the Mercers' Company forewent their usual feast on 25 June because of the activities of 'the false captain of Kent, John Cade, and the commonalty of Kent'.³

Meanwhile in Kent, Cade seems to have been enjoying something of a triumphal progress. Lord Dudley was at Tonbridge on 20 June, but after that there is no sign of the royal troops.⁴ Perhaps they were too cautious to risk the fate of the Staffords; they may indeed have returned to London although all the known leaders would have done so at the risk of sharing Lord Say's confinement. Cade's success in Kent can be judged from the fact that towns sent him presents

-
1. The Duke of Exeter was described as Constable of the Tower in August 1450, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.388. The Court of Aldermen communicated with him on 29 June, Jour.V f.39. Lord Scales and Gough were present at the battle of the Bridge. John Payn recorded that Fastolf went to the Tower with only two of his men, Paston Letters i pp.131-35.
 2. Gough London 10, p.154, where it is recorded that the King told the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council to keep the rebels out of the City.
 3. Mercers' Hall, Accounts i f.167. The entry states that Jack Cade came to Blackheath on the feast of St. John the Baptist (June 24) and entered the City on the feast of St. Thomas (July 3). The former date cannot be right, but the latter one seems to be correct. Since there was no feast the Wardens simply chose their successors.
 4. Virgoe, op.cit., p.225.

and wrote letters 'of excuse' to him.¹ The origin and the success of the revolt in Kent lies both in political and economic grievances. These have been well examined by Miss Lyle who suggests that the complications of their land tenure made the Kentishmen 'particularly conscious of the recent decay in effectiveness of the legal system'. The decline of trade which followed in the wake of the French wars and the widespread piracy affected this mercantile and industrial county. The wool trade of Sandwich depended on the Calais staple which was not flourishing. The cloth export of Sandwich had dropped from a peak of 7000 sacks in 1442-3 to a mere 337 in 1449-50, with the result that the Flemish weavers of the Weald and the urban cloth workers in the county felt the cool wind of recession. In Kent the revolt of 1450 was, as Miss Lyle sagely remarks, 'not so much a reaction to a very low standard of living as a protest against a loss of recently acquired improvement'.²

On 26 June at a meeting of the Common Council, the commonalty petitioned that Philip Malpas should be dismissed from his position as Alderman of Lime Street ward. The petition was granted - presumably by the Court of Aldermen. Since Malpas was chosen as Alderman in response to royal letters in his favour two years before, historians

-
1. The Corporation of Lydd sent Cade the present of a porpoise when he was on the return journey to London and wrote a letter of excuse to him, H.M.C. V (1876), p.520.
 2. H. Lyle, op.cit., pp.6-8. Export figures for Sandwich printed by E.M. Carus-Wilson and O. Coleman, England's Export Trade 1275-1547 (Oxford 1963), pp.154-55.95-97.

have hastened to interpret these events by claiming that 'The leader of the Court party was Philip Malpas ... At the time of Cade's rebellion in 1450 the commons raised such an outcry against him that he was discharged of his cloak ... It would seem that even amongst the better class of citizens there were some who sympathized with Cade's political aims'.¹ It is necessary to point out, first that there may be no connection at all between Cade's revolt and Malpas' dismissal. But if there is, it may not necessarily be the obvious one which historians have chosen. There are two questions at issue here; first was Malpas the leader of a Lancastrian party in the City? and second was he dismissed at the instigation of Cade or of a group of Londoners who supported Cade?

The answers to both these questions have been bedevilled by the assumption that the inhabitants of the City were divided into a Lancastrian/Court party and a Pro-Cade/Yorkist party. I shall argue against the belief that there was a party in the City which favoured Cade, or that Cade was Yorkist, and the case of Malpas which has been used to demonstrate the existence of such parties can, in fact, only be understood properly if attention is focussed on the individual concerned, namely Philip Malpas.

The widely accepted belief that he was the leader of the Lancastrian party in the City is based upon the fact that it was in

1. C.L. Kingsford, Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth century England, p.115. For similar views see Wedgwood, Biographies, p.569; B.B. Orridge, Illustrations of Jack Cade's Rebellion (London 1869), p.3.

response to royal pressure that the Court of Aldermen elected him to be one of their number in April 1448. But there is more which lies behind this. Malpas first appears in civic records in 1420.¹ He was Warden of his Company - the Drapers - in 1425-6.² In 1431 he was chosen by the commonalty as one of the Bridge auditors for the year and must, therefore, have been a Common Councilman by this date.³ The commonalty further chose him as an M.P. in 1432, as their Sheriff in 1439 and again as an M.P. in 1441.⁴ This is not the record of a man unpopular with the Common Council or with that larger, and more nebulous body, the Commonalty. In 1444 the men of Bridge ward chose him as one of the four candidates whom they presented to the Court of Aldermen. After some difficulty the Aldermen selected Robert Horne to serve.⁵ In October of the same year the commonalty of Walbrook presented him as one of their four candidates, but the Court chose Simon Eyre, another Draper.⁶ In November, Malpas petitioned the Court that he might be exonerated from his liability to become an Alderman, and this was granted 'for many reasons moving the court'.⁷ Since Malpas was a man of considerable wealth one of the reasons which moved the Court was, doubtless, money. It was, in any case, customary to pay for such exemptions. During the next four years, six new

1. 1 March 1420, Jour.I f.88v.

2. Johnson, Drapers' Accounts i, p.307.

3. L.B.K., p.123.

4. L.B.K., pp.139, 229, 266.

5. L.B.K., p.296.

6. L.B.K., p.300.

7. Jour.IV f.50v.

Aldermen were chosen without Malpas being either presented to, or refused by, the Court of Aldermen. Then the Aldermanry of Lime Street, in which Malpas's great house was situated, fell vacant. The commonalty of the ward presented Malpas together with three somewhat inconsiderable men - William Deer, Thomas Beaumont and Christopher Water.¹ Since the Court of Aldermen had agreed not to elect Malpas, they rejected all four men on the grounds of insufficiency. On 1 April 1448 in response to royal pressure Malpas was chosen by the Court as the new Alderman for Lime Street.² Clearly the commonalty of the ward who wanted Malpas to serve and resented that he should avoid the obligations to which his considerable wealth exposed him, persuaded the King to intervene on their behalf. Subjected thus to royal pressure, the Court had to ignore the previous arrangement with Malpas although they added the rider to the notice of his election that this case was not to serve as a precedent. In this case the King and Commonalty were united to thwart the wishes of the Court of Aldermen and Philip Malpas himself. So much for the theory of the leader of the Lancastrian party in the City elected against the will of the citizens by pressure from the King. Malpas's known connections with the court were so slight before this date that it is unlikely that the King would prefer him personally but was, in this case, intervening in the interests of the Commonalty of Lime Street ward.

-
1. 22 February 1448, Jour.IV f.208v. To see how outstanding Malpas was in wealth it is only necessary to look at the lay subsidy roll for 1436 printed Thrupp, Merchant Class, pp.378-88. Malpas had lands valued at £70 p.a.; those of William Deer were valued at £7; those of Beaumont at £12 p.a. Water is not listed so his lands were worth less than £5 p.a.
 2. 1 April 1448, Jour.IV f.213v.

Once elected, Malpas was a conscientious attender at the Court of Aldermen. He continued to serve on numerous committees of the Common Council. He certainly had 'court connections' but by 1450 had made only two loans to the King - fewer than many other Aldermen.¹ So we come to the problem of his dismissal. There is no evidence to suppose that he was disliked except a charge of usury made against him thirty years before.² After his dismissal he remained a Common Councilman and was entrusted with one of the keys of the Common Chest in 1453.³ His two sons-in-law became Aldermen in 1456. If, therefore, it was not dislike which led the Commonalty to petition for his dismissal, what was it? There is no evidence to support the view that his dismissal was contrived by Cade or his adherents, nor is there any evidence that there was a body of men on the Common Council who favoured Cade or sympathized with his aims. The Commonalty must, therefore, have been inspired either by a desire to help Malpas or to help themselves, or both. By this time it may have become known in London that the rebels intended to attack Malpas's house or Malpas himself. His wealth may have been proverbial. In the eyes of the rebels his connection with known 'traitors' such as Lord Say, coupled with his great wealth, may have marked him out for attack. As such

-
1. 7 March 1442 (£50), 22 September 1449 (£66 13s.4d.), P.R.O. E401/778 and 810.
 2. Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, p.103.
 3. 10 November 1453, Jour.V f.130. 27 September 1457, Malpas chosen to serve on a finance committee, Jour.VI f.179.

he was a liability and it may well have been that the petition came not from the Commonalty as a whole but from the Commonalty of Lime Street ward who believed that their lives and possessions would be safer with Malpas out of the City. Considering the peculiar circumstances surrounding Malpas' election, his dismissal on a petition from the Commonalty rather than by action of the Court of Aldermen, may be understood. It is quite likely that the dismissal was perfectly amicably arranged between the men of the ward, Malpas and the Court of Aldermen. It seems as if Malpas made good his escape for, when Cade entered the City, although his house was sacked, there is no mention of any personal violence against the ex-Alderman. The unanimous silence of the chroniclers suggests that Malpas was not in the City during Cade's occupation.

On 27 June, Cade was clearly marching in the direction of London and the Common Council decided to send spies to find out which way he was coming. Further provision was made for guarding the City.¹ The spies brought back news that Cade was coming directly towards the City and so the Bridge was drawn up and the normal business of the City came to a halt.² On 29 June William Ayscough the bishop of Salisbury was murdered at Edington by rebels who dragged him from the church of the Bonshommes while he was celebrating mass.

-
1. Jour.V f.39. Other towns sent riders to spy on Cade. The men of Rye sent someone to spy on Cade while he was at Appledore, H.M.C. V (1870) p.490. The men of New Romney paid 8d. to Alexander Mosewell for making enquiries about the insurrection, ibid., p.542.
 2. 28 June 1450, the Bridge House receipts cease until 18 July, G.R.O. Bridge House Accounts ii f.108.

The news of this reached London the next day.¹ Meanwhile Cade and those of his troops who were mounted arrived at Blackheath on 29 June and those on foot straggled in during that night and the next day. The Court of Aldermen appointed a deputation of five of their number to hold discussions with the Duke of Exeter, the Commander of the royal troops in the Tower.² The court also took steps to ensure that the citizens as a whole should be concerned in the preparations for resisting Cade. It was decided that each Alderman should hold a court in his ward on the next day (30 June) at which all members of the ward were to be present. At this court four citizens 'of dignity and discretion' were to be chosen 'to support and help the Alderman of the ward in its governing'.³ As is often the case, under pressure from some external threat, the ruling class was prepared to broaden the basis of its authority. On the following day the Aldermen were given power summarily to punish those who failed to take part in the vigil which the City had organised on a rota system by wards.⁴ Those wards in which the City gates were situated

1. Gough London 10, p.154.

2. The deputation consisted of Brown, Catworth, Foster, Cantelowe and Combes, Jour.V f.39. That Cade and his troops arrived at different times during 29, 30 June seems most probable and would explain the different dates to be found in the different chroniclers. Bale, whose dates are usually reliable, states that Cade returned on 23 June which cannot be correct since the City sent spies on 27 June to find out which way the Captain was coming.
3. Jour.V f.39. Earlier it had been specified that no-one was to attend a meeting of the Common Council unless summoned, 19 June 1450, Jour.V f.38.
4. Jour.V f.39. Since the vigil had been in operation since 8 June the citizens must have wearied of the sleepless nights.

clearly bore a heavier burden than the others and it was decided that drafts of men should come from the other wards to reinforce them. The Bridge, of course, was especially vulnerable.¹

As Cade's men gathered at Blackheath on 30 June he organized and terrorized them. He issued proclamations in the name of John Mortimer and also some ordinances for the ordering of his motley host. A man named Parry - a 'petty captain' - lost his head for disobeying these ordinances.² Although Cade had not yet, himself, come to Southwark, disorder and rebellion ran ahead of him. Ralph Harries a London Skinner, with forty others 'of Cade's affinity', attacked, imprisoned and ransomed Richard Delweld, a servant of Lord Say, in Southwark. They claimed that by being a servant of Lord Say he was, thereby, a traitor to the King and extorted £20 from him on these grounds.³

-
1. 18 June 1450, Court of Aldermen decided that the ward of Cornhill should help Bridge ward with 10 persons each night and the ward of Candlewick Street should provide 8 persons 'well-armed', Jour.V f.38.
 2. Great Chron., p.182; Gough London 10, p.154.
 3. P.R.O. Ancient Indictment KB9/266/66 and 67. The commission before which the indictment was presented sat 20 November 1451 in Southwark, and included Sir Ralph Butler, Lord Sudeley and the Duke of Norfolk. Ralph Harries entered the yeomanry of the Skinners' Company in 1436, E. Veale, The English Fur Trade in the later Middle Ages (Oxford 1966), p.206. 16 July 1445 Harries made a yeoman skinner of the Wardrobe at 6d. per day, C.P.R. 1442-6, p.349. Why he should have associated with Cade is not clear, unless he were simply an opportunist. After the revolt he 'disappeared' for he failed to appear to justify Letters Patent in his favour granting him a share in the manor of Kennington, Surrey, and so these were revoked in 1452, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.545.

The whereabouts of the King are difficult to discern. He left London 'for Kenilworth' on 25 June but it seems likely that at first he only went as far as the castle of Berkhamstead, where he stayed until 1 July and then he moved on to Kenilworth.¹ During his stay at Berkhamstead the King continued to take measures to deal with the rebellion. Thomas Scargel Esquire and John Hillesdon a yeoman of the crown were sent to Kent and Essex to spy on the rebels and to prevent their rising, if possible.² The treasurer was to provide £100 for further victualling the Tower and 100 marks for Lord Scales who had undertaken to hold together certain soldiers who had recently come over from France.³ These, no doubt, ~~proved~~ ^{formed} the core of the

-
1. Chancery was operating at Westminster 1 and 6 July, C.P.R. 1447-52 pp.328, 388. It would be possible for the King to keep in touch with Chancery if he were at Berkhamstead, but more difficult at Kenilworth. It was probably the advent of the rebels which caused the King to move north from Berkhamstead on 1 July. Julius B I, p.136 and T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.167v. alone of the chronicles mention the King's presence at Berkhamstead but this is confirmed by a warrant for issue which mentions that John Hillesdon brought news of the rising in Essex 'to our castle of Berkhamstead' PRO. E404/67/170.
 2. P.R.O. Warrants for Issue E 404/67/27 to pay Scargel £10 for his services, dated 18 September 1450; E404/67/170 to pay Hillesdon £10 dated 3 June 1451. Hillesdon, a yeoman of the Crown, also crossed to Calais at this time and travelled extensively in the King's service. 20 September 1457, he was granted a pension of £9 p.a. for 7 years for these services, C.P.R. 1452-61, p.385.
 3. P.P.C. VI, p.95; writ P.R.O. E28/80/55; warrant for issue P.R.O. E404/66/186. Warrant for Lord Scales E404/66/187 and Devon, Issues, p.466. By 25 August 1450 these soldiers were clearly a burden on the household and Lord Scales was paid £50 to keep the soldiers for 15 days away from the household, E28/80/70. At this time the Council spent 500 marks on the 'destruction of Jack Cade and the separation of those associated with him' C.P.R. 1452-61, p.329. William Stanley Esq. took the field with the King at this time, ibid., p.570.

defending garrison. Sir Thomas Stanley who had, presumably, by this time, extricated himself from his activities in Kent, together with Sir Thomas Harrington was commissioned to raise troops in Chester and Lancashire.¹

At some time during his stay at Blackheath, i.e. between 29 June and 1 July, Cade issued the mysterious safe conduct and instructions to Thomas Cook, Draper. These documents are preserved only by Stow and may well be later fabrications.² Historians have assumed that these documents provide evidence that Cook was hand in glove with Cade and, therefore, the leader of a 'Yorkist' party in the City. But since one of these documents is a safe-conduct this would surely suggest that Cook was acting as an emissary from the Court of Aldermen or the City, rather than as a partisan of Cade's. The second document was clearly given to Cook to take back to the City, when he visited Cade under cover of the safe conduct. This instructed Cook to command all the foreigners in the City to provide the captain with horses, harness and other fighting equipment under penalty of losing their heads. This selective threat to foreigners was a clever move on Cade's part. All that is known of Thomas Cook senior and of his son (?) Thomas Cook junior would lead one to expect both of them to

1. P.P.C. VI, p.95; writ P.R.O. E28/80/61. Bale, p.131 states that the King increased his forces with men from Lancashire and Cheshire.

2. Stow, Annales, p.388.

be in favour of resisting the rebels.¹ Whether the foreigners in the City did as Cade demanded of them is not known; but there is no record of their having especially suffered during the rebel occupation of the City. Both the Cooks were concerned with the affairs of London Bridge and it may easily have been in this capacity that one of them was sent as an emissary to Cade. Thomas Cook junior married Elizabeth, one of the daughters of Philip Malpas and this close association reinforces the supposition that it is impossible to detect clearly defined parties or clearly defined party leaders, within the City at this time.

On Wednesday 1 July, the Court of Aldermen met to select a deputation consisting of the Recorder and seven Aldermen to report on

-
1. Thomas Cook, senior, first appears in civic records in 1425 as an arbiter chosen by Philip Malpas, Jour.II f.42. From 1440-57 he was a Bridgemaster and, as such, was involved in the preparations to resist Cade. Thomas Cook, junior, first appears in civic records in 1440 acting as an attorney for Nicholas Yeo. He married Elizabeth, one of the daughters of Philip Malpas. In 1442 he was a Churchwarden of St. Mary Woolchurch, a Common Councilman by 1444, L.B.K., p.272, Jour.IV f.52. 1445-6 he was an auditor, L.B.K., pp.309, 315. 1449 he was an unsuccessful candidate for wards of Cornhill and Broad Street, Jour.V f.8v., 9. April 1450 he became a feoffee of London Bridge, Jour.V f.38v. It was probably Thomas Cook, junior, who began to lend money to the King in 1449 and had made 3 loans totalling £130 13s.4d. before the revolt began, P.R.O. E401/810 and 813. Both men were Drapers. It is not certain that Thomas Cook, junior, was the son of Thomas Cook, senior, see Thrupp, Merchant Class, p.333. For the subsequent successful career of Thomas Cook, junior, see D.N.B., vol.IV, pp.1019-20, article by Charles Welch; B.B. Orridge, op.cit., pp.11-20; Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.217-18.

events to the King's Council.¹ Whether this group left the City or not cannot be known for there is no entry in the Journals again until 8 July. It may be that a group of the King's Council was left behind in the Tower or at Westminster. Possibly it was as a result of this conference that a Commission of Oyer and Terminer was issued. It appointed Lord Scales, Sir Thomas Gray, eleven royal judges, Thomas Chalton the Mayor, three Aldermen and Robert Danvers the Recorder, to examine all treasons, felonies and insurrections in London and the suburbs.² The functions of this Commission may have been purposely ambivalent. It could be used to indict Cade and his followers and to mete out summary justice if this were necessary to nip nascent rebellion in the bud in the City. But the Commission could also serve, like that of 23 May for Oxfordshire and 1 August for Kent, as a belated attempt to allow the King's subjects to air their grievances against corrupt officials. This London Commission, since it sat while Cade and his army were in the City, acted, perforce, in the second of these two capacities. The results were more violent and far-reaching than any reforms that can have been envisaged by the Aldermen and King's Councillors.³

On the same day that this all-purpose Commission was constructed, Cade moved from Blackheath to Southwark where he set up his headquarters at the White Hart. The Mayor refused to allow either the Captain, or

1. Jour.V f.39v.
 2. ^{July 1450} C.P.R. 1446-52, p.388.
 3. Cf. C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.386, 388; Virgoe, op.cit., pp.215-16.

his men to enter the City and Cade would not allow any Londoner to come off the Bridge into Southwark.¹ But as the Kentishmen were confined south of the river and the men from Essex were encamped at Mile End, the citizens still had access to Westminster and to the King north west of the City.² Cade did not enter the City until 3 July and it is not clear how he spent 2 July. He may have been trying to gain entry into the City by negotiation. The men of Essex were unable to penetrate beyond Aldgate. Laurence Broke, an otherwise unknown chapman or yeoman of London, was accused of having gathered many traitors on 2 July in St. Mary Matfelon parish outside Aldgate and of leading them to fight with Cade in London.³

It is necessary to say something about the Chronicle accounts of these events which, because of the silence of the Journals and the records of the central government, are the only source of evidence. The authors of Gough London 10 and the Great Chronicle were both writing in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Their affinity suggests that both writers used a source, now lost, called by Kingsford 'The Main City Chronicle'. There is no reason

-
1. Great Chron., p.183; Gough London 10, pp.154-55; Gregory, p.191 dates the Captain's arrival in Southwark to 2 July.
 2. Great Chron., p.183; Gough London 10, p.155; Bale, p.132 states that the men from Essex arrived 3 July.
 3. P.R.O. Ancient Indictment KB9/270A/45. This is an odd indictment and it is not stated before whom it was made. Endorsed as a true bill. The parish of St. Mary Matfelon was notorious as the lodging place of evil-doers, see p.481, n.1 above. Broke was also accused of having stolen a horse from William Staunton of Stanmore, Co.Middx, on 23 June 1451. In this case he was described as a drover, of Sittingbourne Co.Kent. Broke appeared before the King's Bench in June 1453 and was acquitted by a jury in July 1453, KB27/769 f.146.

to suppose that the author of this lost work was especially reliable. In the sixteenth century this same source was used by Fabyan and Stow with some picturesque additions, expansions and explanations.¹ Although these various writers preserve many useful details, the order of their events is often incorrect. Bale continues to be useful but becomes rather brief. The most important source for the events of 2-6 July is Gregory's Chronicle which, whether it was written by the Mayor William Gregory or not, was almost certainly written by a Londoner who was present in the City at the time. Moreover the story it tells makes sense which the others do not.² Bearing this in mind, it is possible now to examine what may have happened at the meeting of the Common Council held on Friday 3 July.

The only direct evidence for this meeting is that the Court of Aldermen decided, on 1 July, that the Common Council should meet on the Friday.³ The author of the Great Chronicle describes a meeting of the citizens at the Guildhall on 3 July when they were charged to 'enquire of all traitors, extortioners and oppressors of the King's people'. Two other chroniclers - whose accounts are largely similar to the Great Chronicle - add that as judges could not be found, the citizens became annoyed.⁴ The author of the Great Chronicle continues his account of the meeting (which took place, of course, before Cade

-
1. See introduction to Great Chron., pp. xxxix-lxxvi; R. Flenley, Six Town Chronicles (Oxford 1911), pp. 74-81.
 2. C.L. Kingsford, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford 1913), pp. 96-98; J. Gairdner, The Historical Collections of a London Citizen, C.S. (N.S. XVII, 1876), pp. i-xliv.
 3. Jour. V f. 39v.
 4. Vitellius A XVI, p. 159; Gough London 10, p. 155.

entered the City) by saying that Philip Malpas was discharged from his Aldermanry and 'at the instigation of the people' Robert Horne was arrested and committed to Newgate.¹ But Malpas had ceased to be an Alderman on 26 June so the account at once comes under suspicion. Fabian adds that Horne opposed the entry of the rebels into the City and that it was for this reason that he was imprisoned. Stow elaborates this further by saying that Horne spoke out against receiving the rebels into the City and so was committed to Newgate. But the more reliable author of Gregory's chronicle says nothing of this meeting but does describe the arrest of Horne on the next day when Cade was in control of the City.² Surely the opposition which Horne offered the rebels was not verbal in a discordant meeting of the citizens, but physical in his capacity as Alderman of Bridge ward? He tried to prevent the rebels from entering the City and having failed he became an object of attack. Horne was, in fact, ransomed and his life was only saved by the action of his purse and the intercession of his friends.³

1. Great Chron., p.183.

2. Gregory, p.192.

3. Robert Horne does not appear in the 1436 assessment so he was not a wealthy man. He was a Common Councilman by 1439, Sheriff in 1447-8, elected an Alderman of Bridge ward in 1444. He was a Bridge auditor in 1437-9 and 1444-6. In 1445-6 he was a tax collector and justice of gaol delivery in London. He ceased to be an Alderman in 1456 and died before April 1459, Jour.VI f.154. The attack on him by the rebels may have owed something to confusing him with Robert Horne who featured on commissions in Kent in the late 1440s, was associated with Lord Say and became Sheriff of the county in 1451 and M.P. in 1460, see Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.470-71.

It would seem likely that the author of the Great Chronicle has rolled several events into one meeting of discordant citizens on 3 July. It is certain that he was wrong about Malpas, and it seems likely that he was wrong about Horne. From other record evidence it appears that the sitting of the commission appointed by the King took place on the next day. Is it possible to believe that there was a discordant meeting on 3 July, when all the record evidence suggests that the civic authorities were united and unwavering in their determination to resist Cade? If the muddled account of the lost 'Main City Chronicle' is discarded there remains no basis for the widely held view that there was a party of substantial men in the City which favoured Cade, that the matter was open to discussion or that Robert Horne led a party which opposed Cade's entry. On the other hand, it is very likely that Cade found some support amongst the poorer citizens who had nothing to lose and much to gain from a period of change and disorder. This divergence of interest was always a source of weakness to the City in times of crisis, and it may have been to guard against this incipient lawlessness among the poorer citizens that the Commission of 1 July was issued.

London therefore at the moment of Cade's entry was not a deeply divided City with its responsible and law-enforcing citizens at loggerheads, but rather an anxious place where the civic authorities were firmly in control of the poorer and more volatile popular elements. So it is possible to see Cade's entry for what it was, namely an accident. Moreover the citizens had been preparing for Cade's attack

for nearly a month; they had been on nightly vigils and now, since Cade's arrival at Blackheath they had been in a state of semi-siege; in the resultant strain and tension those guarding the Bridge made mistakes.

In the afternoon of 3 July Cade launched an assault upon the Bridge. As the draw-bridge was drawn up his men had either to go in boats or to swim and, after some hard fighting, they managed to cut through the two cords which had drawn up the bridge. Thus it fell down and Cade's army, previously pent-up in Southwark, could swarm across.¹ But the draw-bridge was not the only obstacle which the rebels had to encounter: there was also a gate on London Bridge the keeping of which was the responsibility of the Alderman of the ward, Robert Horne, and the two Bridgmasters who had been provided with guns for its defence.² The Alderman had summoned men from his own ward and from other wards in the City to help him hold the Bridge, but clearly the dropping of the draw-bridge had made his task considerably more difficult. The evidence suggests that at this point those guarding the Bridge lost their nerve. The two 'gubernatores' at the Bridge gate at this time were William Constantyne, a Skinner and John Fisshlake.³ Cade threatened to fire the Bridge and Richard Philip, a Grocer who was among those defending the Bridge at the time, believed

-
1. Great Chron., p.183; Gregory, pp.191-92 describes the incident as a 'mishap' and says that the 'two sorry cords' had, by the time of his writing, been replaced by two chains.
 2. See p.484 above.
 3. 14 July 1450 the Court of Aldermen heard evidence as to what had happened on 3 July, Jour.V f.40v. The mention of Constantyne there cannot be definitely identified with William Constantyne, Skinner who was credited with lands to the value of £25 p.a. in 1436. A John Fisshlake was sworn as Bailiff of Billingsgate/Queenhithe in 1419, 1419 T. f. 21

that he meant what he said and that the whole City would go up in flames.¹ It was later reported that Thomas Godfrey, a Spurrier, brought the keys and opened the gates.² Certainly someone opened the gates for Cade did not have to break his way in. Because of this easy entry some writers believed that 'by favour of some men of London he came to the city' and that he was not resisted.³ But noone was subsequently punished for allowing Cade to enter, for the Court of Aldermen realized, as some later historians have failed to do, that it was possible, in a moment of panic, to make the wrong decision, without acting with treacherous intent. By a mixture of cunning and bravado Cade got inside the City with comparatively little trouble.

Once Cade ^{was} ~~with~~ in the City, the authorities seem temporarily to have lost control of the situation. The opposition to the rebels disintegrated and every man fended for himself as best he could. Those who saw profit in the situation flocked to Cade's banner. On

-
1. Evidence of 14 July 1450, provided by William Reynold, Jour.V f.40v. There is no reason to suppose that Philip favoured Cade. He was Warden of his Company in 1454, and in 1459 was discharged from liability for jury service because of his old age, L.B.K., p.396. It is possible that the royal pardon which he received in October 1451 was for his incompetence on this occasion (P.R.O. Pardon Roll C67/46) but it is more likely that it was for acquiring the Saracen's Head without a licence, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.403.
 2. Evidence of 14 July 1450, Jour.V f.40v. It seems to be impossible to identify Thomas Godfrey. Someone of this name, described as 'yeoman of Wittnesham, Kent' received a pardon 7 July 1450, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.361. Lambeth 448, p.150, states that the keys were handed over by the Mayor, Sheriffs and Aldermen.
 3. English Chronicle, p.66.

the City side of the Bridge at St. Magnus Church, Cade proclaimed that noone was to take advantage of the opportunity for robbery on pain of death. This was also proclaimed at Leadenhall.¹ But whatever Cade may have intended, such was not the result and, as the chroniclers later pointed out, it was this inability to control the plundering activities of his men which led to Cade's defeat. Before returning to Southwark for the night Cade may have made contact with the other rebels now at Mile End.²

On 4 July Cade again rode over the Bridge into the City. Under pressure from him and his army, the Commissioners appointed in the King's writ of 1 July were forced to sit and hear charges against traitors and extortioners. At first none of the eleven royal judges named in the Commission could be found but Robert Danvers the City Recorder was persuaded, or induced, to act and he was joined by Peter Ardern and Nicholas Ashton, the only two of the eleven judges who were present.³ It is certain that this Commission actually sat, for some of the indictments made before it have survived and their survival leads on to the track of others who were indicted.⁴ The indictments which survive are those presented against Edward Grimston and Thomas Kent. The jury which presented the indictment and the

-
1. Great Chron., p.184; Bale, p.133; Continuation G of Brut, Brie, p.518.
 2. Gough London 10, p.155.
 3. William of Worcester, p.768; T.C.D. Ms.5.10 f.168.
 4. The two which survive are P.R.O. KB9/265 120-1 and 144-5.

indictment itself are the same in both cases. The Commission, which sat ^{at} Guildhall, consisted of Thomas Lord Scales, the Mayor, three Aldermen and the three judicial officers mentioned above. The indictment accused Grimston of encompassing the King's death with the assent of William de la Pole late Duke of Suffolk who had accepted gifts whereby the King was impoverished and had expelled the King from his French possessions. The treason was said to have taken place on 20 July 1447 in St. Sepulchre's parish in London and the plan was to have made John, the son and heir of William de la Pole, King and to marry him to the daughter and heir of the late Duke of Somerset who had a pretended claim to the throne.¹ The French King Charles was to come to England with a large army to carry this out. Both Grimston and Kent were found guilty and condemned to death. Grimston was treasurer of the Chamber and keeper of the King's jewels.² Thomas Kent was under-constable of England and clerk to the Council.³ It is unlikely that either was present at the trial; Kent was probably in Prussia at the time.

-
1. Cf. the accusation against Suffolk in 1450 Parliament that he had disclosed the secrets of the King's Council to the French in the parish of St. Laurence Pountney, R.P., V, p.178.
 2. Appointment 9 March 1448, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.130. He had associations with London Mercers, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.175; C.F.R. 1447-54, p.103. With John Noreys Esq. he was a recipient of manors in Berkshire which had belonged to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, C.F.R. 1447-52, p.72.
 3. 15 March 1444, appointment as Clerk of the Council, C.P.R. 1442-6, p.235. 7 January 1445, appointment as Under-constable, ibid., p.348. 5 June 1450, appointed to go on an embassy to Prussia, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.330 and Chapter VI, p.370. Kent was granted the manor of Langley in Kent in 1444, C.P.R. 1442-6, p.244.

The subsequent history of Grimston's case is probably similar to that of others indicted on 4 July but, unlike the others, it is possible to trace it in some detail. On 6 April 1451 Thomas Charlton, by this date no longer Mayor of London, was commissioned to enquire into the felonies committed by Grimston¹. He returned the indictment cited above, into Chancery. Two days later a new commission headed by the Earl of Shrewesbury was appointed to proceed with the indictment of Grimston.² On 1 October 1451 Grimston appeared before the King's Bench and was committed to the Marshalsea. On 3 November he was granted bail and was subsequently acquitted.³ The King was prepared to consider these absurd charges against his servants only in order to observe the form of the commission which he had appointed, but there was little danger that those accused would suffer for their convictions on 4 July 1450.⁴ If the accused had been in London on 4 July they might well have lost their lives.

1. P.R.O. KB9/265/120.

2. C.P.R. 1446-52, p.444.

3. P.R.O. Coram Rege Roll KB27/762 f.15.

4. The case of Kent differs in date from that of Grimston. The commission to Charlton was dated 12 September 1451, P.R.O. KB9/265/144. There is no surviving record of a new commission to investigate the case. Kent appeared before the King's Bench 27 September 1451, was committed to the Marshalsea two days later, was granted bail 30 October 1451 and was acquitted on that day, P.R.O. KB27/762 f.8. In the parliament of 1453 the King assented to a petition that all the indictments of 'treasons and felonies under colour of justice before certain commissioners by his (Jack Cade's) tyranny thereto deputed and assigned' should be declared null and void and every man's blood be cleared by Parliament, R.P.V., p.265.

With the cases of Kent and Grimston before us we can trace others who were similarly indicted before Thomas Charlton on 4 July 1450. They include John Say,¹ John Trevilian² and Thomas Daniel.³ That these five were among those indicted this day is certain. One chronicle records that ten 'quests' were heard and certainly those

-
1. Commission to proceed with indictment of John Say, 10 March 1451, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.443. For his career see Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.744-46; J.S. Roskell, The Commons and their Speakers in Medieval English Parliaments (Manchester 1965), pp.362-63. Say was a true courtier and he picked up the offices and rewards for men of his kind, King's serjeant, yeoman of the Chamber, Keeper of the Privy Palace of Westminster, Escheatorships, Wardships, J.P., M.P., Sheriff.
 2. 6 April 1451, commission to proceed with indictment of John Trevilian, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.444. For his career see Jacob, Fifteenth Century, p.497; Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.873-74. Virgoe, op.cit., pp.221-22 prints an indictment accusing him, together with Thomas Bodulgate, of disseising two men of the manor and castle of Stone in Kent. Bodulgate is an associate of Trevilian's on other occasions, e.g. C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.80, 87; C.F.R. 1437-45, p.287. His house at Cranford, Middx, was attacked 7 September 1450 and goods to the value of £40 stolen, P.R.O. KB9/265/56. He seems to have been particularly unpopular in London for at a meeting of Common Council held on 8 June 1450 there was a petition that the enclosure which he had recently built on the bank of the Thames on common soil should be razed, Jour.V f.36v.
 3. 22 October 1451. Commission to proceed with Thomas Daniel's indictment, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.532. For his career see Jacob, Fifteenth Century, p.497; Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.253-55. In August 1451 Daniel was unable to appear in court 'owing to the evil disposition of the King's lieges then rebelling within the realm', C.P.R. 1449-52, p.468. 10 November 1451, Daniel received a complete pardon, ibid., p.498. He seems to have had London connections and, possibly, London relations, C.C.R. 1447-54, pp. 54, 482. His activities in Kent in June 1450 were a source of grievance to the local inhabitants, Virgoe, op.cit., pp.223, 224, 232, 241. Daniel and Trevilian were later to become proverbial in London as oppressors and threateners, see Cal. P. and M. 1458-82, pp.57-64. According to one chronicler, after the Spring Parliament of 1451, Say, Trevilian and Daniel were acquitted by the Londoners, T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.171.

of the unfortunate Lord Say and William Crowmer must have been among them.¹ The other three may well have been John Sutton Lord Dudley,² John Noreys Esq.³ and Reginald Boulers the abbot of St. Peter's Gloucester and the future bishop of Hereford.⁴

-
1. Gough London 10, p.155.
 2. Giles' Chron., p.40; T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.171. John Sutton b. c.1400, Lord Dudley 1440-87. For his career see article by Sidney Lee, D.N.B., vol.VI, pp.107-09; The author of Giles' Chronicles also mentions that his house in London was robbed by the rebels. Sutton may have been particularly unpopular because he served on the peace embassy to France July 1446, C.P.R. 1441-6, p.456. He was unpopular in Kent, see Virgoe, op.cit., pp.224, 225, 232, 241. Lambeth 306, p.67, states that he was one of the traitors whom the rebels wanted removed from the King. 1451 the Commons petitioned for his removal, R.P. V p.216. He is included among the names on the Cotton roll list of indictments, printed H. Ellis, Original Letters Illustrative of English History, Series II (1827), vol.I, pp.12-13, & Kingston, E.H.L. pp.364-365.
 3. For the career of John Noreys see Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.637-39. He was an Esquire of the Body in 1446, C.C.R. 1441-7, p.450. In 1444 he was granted the office of Keeper of the Great Wardrobe, in 1446 the office of Receiver at the Exchequer, C.P.R. 1442-6, pp.311, 436. He collected many Berkshire manors, and had a share in the office of packer of woolfells in London which was much resented by the citizens, C.C.R. 1447-54; Chapter VI, p.380. Noreys had London relations and connections with the Skinners, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.170; C.C.R. 1447-54, p.44. His third marriage was with Margaret, the widow of Nicholas Wyfold, Grocer, in 1464. Giles' Chronicle, p.40 is the only author to mention his unpopularity.
 4. For the career of Reginald Boulers see Emden, Biographical Register, vol.I, pp.228-29. His unpopularity seems to have sprung largely from his position on peace embassies to France in 1448, 1449, and is mentioned by the authors of Great Chron., p.182, Lambeth 306, p.67, Cotton roll, op.cit., Parliamentary petition for the removal of certain members of the household, R.P. V, p.216, in the 'Dirge on the Duke of Suffolk' printed by J. Gairdner, Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles, C.S. (N.S. XXVIII, 1880) pp.99-103. A manor of his was plundered, see R.L. Storey, op.cit., p.66. William of Worcester, p.768, states that the Duchess of Suffolk and the Bishop of Salisbury were also indicted of treason.

The case of James Fienes, Lord Say is somewhat different for he was unfortunately, present when the indictment was presented against him at Guildhall on 4 July. How Lord Scales was induced to let him leave the safety of the Tower is a mystery although it may be that it was found necessary to sacrifice someone to the rebels.¹ The charge was probably the same as the one preserved against Grinston. The impetus for the attack on Lord Say no doubt came from the men of Kent for he had been a Sheriff in that county and was constable of Dover castle.² The author of Gregory's Chronicle believed him to have acknowledged responsibility for Gloucester's death and therefore justly to have met his deserts.³ While the trial of Lord Say was in progress, Cade rode through the City in triumph and drank at the Tavern in Chepe, moving on in the afternoon to Mile End.⁴ On his way there he collected William Crowmer the Sheriff of Kent from the Flete Prison (how he had come to be there is not clear) and beheaded

-
1. Gough London 10, p.156 states that Lord Say was brought from the Tower in the afternoon on the order of several Aldermen.
 2. James Fienes was born c.1395, became Lord Say and Sele in 1447. For his career see Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.322-33; article by Ronald Bayne, D.N.B., vol.VI, pp.1292-93. He became the King's Chamberlain in 1447, Treasurer of England 1449. He acquired many Kentish manors, was chosen to dispose of the goods of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and was an ally of Suffolk, C.F.R. 1446-54, pp.45, 79. He had been dismissed from the Treasurership by 22 June 1450. His unpopularity in Kent can be seen from the Kentish Indictments, Virgoe, op.cit., pp.225-26, 233, 234. His visits to the county were clearly expensive, see Account Books of Corporation of Rye, H.M.C. V (1876), p.490. His unpopularity is mentioned by Great Chron., p.182, Lambeth 306, p.67, Giles' Chronicle, p.40, William of Worcester, p.768, Cotton roll, op.cit., 'Dirge on the Duke of Suffolk', op.cit.
 3. Gregory, p.193.
 4. Bale, p.133.

him at Mile End.¹ Together with him there suffered a man named William/John/Thomas Bailly/Bale. He seems to have been someone particularly disliked by the Essex rebels.² These tasks accomplished Cade returned to the City where the trial of Lord Say was still in progress. Lord Say demanded to be tried by his peers but the blood-thirsty Kentishmen refused to allow this and dragged him off summarily to be beheaded at the Standard in Chepe, where Richard Lyons had met his fate at the hands of Wat Tyler's men eighty years before.³ A gruesome procession then ensued with the heads of the victims borne aloft on poles.⁴

-
1. Great Chron., p.184; Gough London 10, p.155; William of Worcester, p.765. William Crowmer was the son of the London Draper, Alderman and Mayor of the same name. He came of age in 1443. For his career see Wedgwood, Biographies, pp.242-43. He was twice Sheriff of Kent in 1444-45, 1449-50, and was M.P. for the county in 1449. There is little evidence that he built up an estate in Kent and his unpopularity may have been largely due to his having married Elizabeth, the daughter of Lord Say. She subsequently married her husband's avenger, Alexander Iden. Crowmer also had a personal quarrel with Lord Poynings, who was one of Cade's supporters, see R. Jeffs, 'The Poynings Percy Dispute', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XOCLV (1961), pp.148-64.
 2. Bale, p.133; Gregory, p.192; Vitellius F XII, p.173; William of Worcester, p.765 who says that he was a magician. Fabyan, p.624 embroiders upon the story by saying that Bayly was beheaded because he knew Cade's real identity.
 3. Great Chron., p.184; Bale, p.133. His body was subsequently mutilated, Gough London 10, p.156; Lambeth 306, p.68; Continuation G of Brut, Brie, p.518.
 4. Great Chron., p.184.

At different times during Cade's occupation of the City (3-4 July) some memorable exploits of plundering were carried out. The chronicles time these events differently but the fact of the robberies remains. Most notable was the plundering of Philip Malpas' house in Lime Street which was called the Green Gate.¹ This suggests not only that he was known to be wealthy but also that Malpas himself was absent. The loot was considerable.² Whereas Malpas' house was probably empty the other notable sufferer entertained Cade to a meal and was then plundered. This man has been variously described, to the puzzlement of later historians as Geerstis, Geste, Gherstis and he has not been identified.³ But he must surely be John Gest or Gist who is listed by the author of Bale's chronicle as one of the traitors and extortioners whom Cade wanted handed over to him.⁴ His house was in the parish of St. Margaret Patens which would be convenient for Cade since it was

-
1. Gregory, p.192. C.L. Kingsford, 'Historical Notes on Mediaeval London Houses', London Topographical Record, vol.X (1916), pp.131-33.
 2. When Cade's goods were collected up and brought to the Treasury, it was decided that those who had been robbed were to have the first option in buying back their goods, writ dated 15 July 1450, P.R.O. E28/80/58. Jewels worth £114 which belonged to the Duke of York were in Malpas's house at the time of the robbery. What appears to have happened is that by the end of August 1450, Malpas had bought the jewels back and considered them to be his, so the King paid the Duke of York £86 7s. in compensation, see Palgrave, Ancient Kalendars, vol.II, pp.217-20; Devon, Issues, pp.467-68.
 3. Great Chron., p.184; Rawlinson B 355, p.106; Fabian, p.624.
 4. Bale, p.132.

situated near the Bridge.¹ Just as Horne bought his life and Malpas disappeared, so John Gest hoped to preserve his by entertaining the Captain.² Others whose houses may also have been robbed while the rebels were in London were Lord Dudley and Sir Thomas Stanley.³

The disorder occasioned by Cade's presence in the City was also turned to advantage by private individuals. One of these was Laurence Stockwode a London salter. Richard Horne and John Judde later complained that they were arrested by Stockwode who called himself an Alderman of the traitor Jack Cade's marking. Judde's wife was then forced to pay Cade a ransom for fear that her house would be plundered. Clearly once

-
1. Stow, Survey, vol.I, p.133 describes the house as situated in a little turning to the north, at the west end of Tower Street.
 2. John Gest was not well-known in London. He was a citizen and a gentleman but not a merchant. He had a wife, Margaret, and was probably related to Mr. Robert Gyst, C.C.R. 1447-54, p.496 and Emden, Biographical Register, vol.II, pp.758-59. He was an executor of the will of Lord Fanhope, C.P.R. 1442-6, p.230. Stow, Survey, vol.I, p.339, describes the monument to him in the church of St. Margaret by Ludgate where he was buried in 1458.
 3. Giles' Chronicle, p.40. I have identified Giles' Thomas Starlawe with Sir Thomas Stanley. For Lord Dudley see p.516 above. Both these men were at this time in Kent pursuing the rebels, see Virgoe, op.cit., p.243. For the career of Sir Thomas Stanley see article by James Tait in D.N.B., vol.XVIII, p.963; Wedgwood, Biographies, p.800. Stanley was an ally of Suffolk, Controller of the household in 1443 and in this capacity he arrested the Duke of Gloucester. 1449 he was made Chamberlain of North Wales. He sat on many commissions and at least two of these concerned London, so it is likely that he had a house there. His unpopularity is attested by his mention in the 'Dirge on the Duke of Suffolk, op.cit., in the Cotton roll, op.cit., and in his inclusion amongst those whom the Commons in 1451 wished to see removed from the royal household, R.P. V, p.216.

Cade was in the City, Horne and Judde who had been in charge of the City's defending barges, would not be popular, but how much of their later complaints is true, it is difficult to tell.¹ Horne and Judde also affirmed in their accusation against Stockwode that there were others of Cade's affinity at this time who occupied themselves in ransoming their neighbours. They cited Simon Shipton, John Byllington, John Frensh and Henry Capron as the most notable of these. Billington and Capron were certainly Londoners and the others may have been.² But it seems likely that they were not so much supporters of Cade as opportunists, who used Cade's presence in the City, to pay off some old

-
1. P.R.O. ECP/19/134-5. Discussed by C.L. Kingsford, Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth Century England (1925), p.50; M.I. Peake, 'London and the Wars of the Roses' (Unpublished London M.A. thesis, 1925) Chapter II. Stockwode was Warden of his Company in 1446, Jour.IV f.111. The main quarrel seems to have been between him and Judde and the matter occupied the attention of the Court of Aldermen in October and December 1451, Jour.V f.63v., 64, 65, 66v. The Court finally decided in favour of Judde and it is clear that Stockwode was an unruly person. For Horne and Judde see p.45⁶ above.
 2. Simon Shipton may have been a Fishmonger, C.C.R. 1447-54, p.72. Someone of that name was sent to prison for questioning the authority of the Sheriff's servant in December 1453, Jour.V f.139v. A pardon was issued to a Simon Shipton 'yeoman of Woolwich, Kent' in July 1450, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.342. There is no trace of a quarrel with Horne or Judde but if he were a Fishmonger like Horne there may have been some rivalry. Henry Capron, or Caperoun, was a Skinner. In 1444 he made a gift of goods and chattels to Horne to whom he may have been indebted, C.C.R. 1441-47, p.342. John Billington is probably the London Grocer. March 1452 he was detained in prison for failing to answer an action for debt, Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.123. It was probably in connection with this that he was pardoned in April and August 1452, P.R.O. Pardon Roll C67/46. It may well have been the pressure of debt which led Billington to take advantage of Cade's activities. In 1455 Judde was forbidden to prosecute his case against Billington and Frensh outside the City Courts, which suggest that he may have tried to take this case also to Chancery, Jour.V f.235v., 236. John Frensh is the most difficult to identify. He may have been the London Goldsmith who

(continued at foot of next page)

scores against Judde. No doubt once the revolt was over, to suggest that a man had been of Cade's affinity, was a means of securing a judgment against him. There were probably many others who lost goods and money during these days, but if the losses were of small value the owners were neither recompensed by the Exchequer nor noticed by the chroniclers.¹

Cade returned to Southwark for the night of 4 July and he did not enter the City the next day. On that Sunday, 5 July, a notorious thief named Richard Hawardyn who had been dragged from the sanctuary at St. Martin's, was beheaded at the Tabard Inn.² Another man to suffer was Thomas Mayne of Colchester whom Cade beheaded to please the men from Essex.³ While Cade remained outside the City, the Mayor and Aldermen took the opportunity to rally their troops and resources to

-
1. Palgrave, Ancient Kalendars, vol.II, pp.217-20 lists the value of the various goods brought in to the Treasury as belonging to Cade, total value £274 8s.5d. Most of it was probably stolen. Agnes Nevill had three silver dishes stolen at the time when the house of Philip Malpas was robbed, ECP/19/30, transcribed by M.L. Peake, op.cit., Appendix VII.
 2. Julius B I, p.136; Rawlinson B 355, p.106; Gregory, p.193; William of Worcester, p.768, who gives the Christian name of William. If, however, the author of Rawlinson B 255 is correct in calling him Richard, it may be possible to identify this victim of Cade's with the Richard Hawardyn 'yeoman of Burton on Trent' whom the King's Serjeant at Arms was ordered to arrest in May 1450, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.385. T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.168v. records that Hawardyn had lived a long time in the sanctuary of St. Martin's.
 3. Rawlinson B 355, p.106; Bale, p.133; Gregory, p.193.

(footnote 2 continued from previous page)

obtained his majority in 1422, L.B.K., p.5; Cal.P. and M. 1413-37, pp.258-59. In 1442 there is record of a John Frensh, citizen and pouchmaker, E.R.O. Mayor's Court Files 3/133A. A John Frensh 'Labourer of Haukherst Kent' was pardoned in July 1450, C.P.R. 1447-52, p.341. Whichever of these men it was, he was still being pursued by Judde in 1455.

try to prevent Cade's re-entry. The news of these preparations must have been brought to Cade for he recalled all his men from the City, to join him in Southwark.¹ The Mayor and Aldermen were in touch with the royal troops in the Tower and the plan was mounted to launch an attack under cover of dark upon Cade's men who were holding the Bridge for him. Once the Bridge was regained, the rebels could be kept out of the City.

The battle of the Bridge began at about nine o'clock at night. The Londoners led by the Sheriff William Hulyn managed to shut the gates of the Bridge against the rebels, but they could not drive them off the Bridge completely. The Londoners - who included the Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs together with Lord Scales, Sir Matthew Gough and their troops from the Tower - were clearly better armed than the rebels and it says much for the tenacity and determination of the latter that the battle continued until dawn.² When the Captain saw that there was no hope of regaining the City, he fired the drawbridge and remained

1. Gough London 10, p.156.

2. The Londoners were equipped with arms from the Tower, see p.492 above. One Londoner who did not 'go armed to fight against the rebels' was the Baker, John Mabyowe, who received a royal pardon for his failure to help, on the grounds that some Londoners who mortally hated him would have taken the opportunity to kill him, 6 April 1453, C.P.R. 1452-61, p.63. Mabyowe was unwilling to pay pesage, i.e. a tax on the weighing of corn, and got into trouble with the civic authorities, L.B.K., pp.358-59, 368-69; Cal.P. and M. 1437-57, p.132; Jour.V f.101. 119v. See Chapter III p.241.

encamped in Southwark.¹ As one chronicler aptly points out, he had held the keys of the City for two days and two nights.²

Neither side had won the battle of the Bridge and its toughness was later to become proverbial.³ But at least the City could now be held against the rebels and the Captain was in a more compromising mood. But several prominent men had lost their lives: Matthew Gough a veteran of the French wars, John Sutton a London Goldsmith who had been an Alderman since 1436 and Roger Heysaunt a London Draper of some note. Conciliation was now both possible and necessary and a deputation was sent - presumably by boat - to the Captain. It consisted of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of Winchester. These held a conference with Cade in St. Margaret's Church 'on the hill' in Southwark.⁴ These men must have been in the Tower during Cade's occupation of the City. When they met Cade they received his petition - probably a copy of the second set of articles - and granted him two pardons in his name of John Mortimer, one of which was rather more specific than the other.⁵ Although the pardons to Cade's followers

-
1. Julius B I p.136; Rawlinson B 355, p.106; Gough London 10, p.156.
 2. English Chronicle, p.66.
 3. Paston Letters, vol.III, p.475, 3 January 1451, letter from William Wayte to John Paston in which he describes how the Bailiff of Swaffham told the Lord Chancellor that if Sir Thomas Tuddenham did not pay his taxes like the rest 'London should, within short time, have as much for to do as they had for to keep London Bridge when the Captain cam thither; for ... there was up in Norfolk ready to rise 5000 commons'. T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.169 states that 40 Londoners were killed and 200 Kentishmen.
 4. Gough London 10, p.156; Gregory, p.193; William of Worcester, p.768.
 5. Both pardons dated 6 July 1450, C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.328, 338.

must have been promised this day, they are all dated 7 July.¹ With this security, Cade's men began to leave their camps at Southwark, Blackheath and Mile End and to drift homewards with their pardons. Of the two thousand or so men who received pardons on 7 July a mere eight of these were Londoners; although in addition to this there were pardons to several men in Southwark. The London contribution to the revolt must, therefore, have been negligible.²

-
1. Pardons to Cade's followers to be found, ibid., pp.338-74.
 2. The Londoners who received pardons were:- (i) William Deraunt 'gentleman' and his wife Alice, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.341. He may be the citizen and Cordwainer who made a gift of goods and chattels in 1445, C.C.R. 1441-7, p.276; one of the recipients was (ii) Andrew Kebyll 'gentleman' of London who also received a pardon on 7 July 1450, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.340. Kebyll had been a Controller of Pipes at the Exchequer, C.P.R. 1441-6, p.355. (iii) William Agas described as Grocer, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.371. (iv) Thomas Besewyk, Weaver of the Parish of St. Katherine Coleman Street, ibid., p.352. (v) John Hole, ibid., p.347, described as 'citizen and Tailor' in 1452, C.C.R. 1447-54, p.366 and as 'gentleman' in 1471, L.B.L., p.94. (vi) John Horell a Dyer, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.343. He was a member of the mystery as early as 1433 and was a Master in 1445, L.B.K., p.173, Jour.IV f.229v. He was involved in several gifts of goods and chattels between 1443 and 1452. (vii) A Goldsmith named Arnald van Osenbrug, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.348. (viii) Thomas Rashford, citizen and Ostler, ibid., p.347. Thomas Andrewes, described as a labourer of London, was also associated with Cade, ibid., p.437.

Cade himself left Southwark on 7 or 8 July, having sent his goods and plunder by barge down the Thames and up the Medway to Rochester.¹ The Court of Aldermen met again on 8 July although the Mayor, Thomas Charlton, was absent. A committee of three was appointed to hold a discussion with the Lord Chancellor and other lords of the Council.² On 9 July Cade passed through Dartford on his way to Rochester.³ Here he seems to have set up his headquarters and, with the town as a base, launched an attack upon Queenborough Castle which was stoutly defended by its Captain Sir Robert Chamberlain, with the result that Cade had to fall back upon Rochester.⁴ It was, no doubt, the news that

-
1. Stow, Annales, p.390; Gough London 10, p.156 states that Cade left Southwark on 7 July. R.P. V p.224 states that Cade was still in Southwark on 8 July. Copies of the pardon to Mortimer, dated 7 July, are to be found in the records of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, H.M.C. V (1876) p.455, and in the records of the Corporation of New Romney, H.M.C. IV (1874) p.422. A pardon to the men of Faversham is also dated 7 July, H.M.C. VI Appendix (1877) p.509. John Senclyer, the Mayor of Faversham, seems to have been involved in the capture of Cade, P.R.O. Writ E404/67/31.
 2. The committee consisted of Frowyk, Eyre, and the Undersheriff Thomas Burgoyne, Jour.V f.39v. The Mayor, Thomas Charlton, continued to be absent until 12 September 1450.
 3. R.P. V p.224.
 4. Stow, Annales, p.390. A writ of 5 August 1450 granted Sir Roger 40 marks as a reward for his trouble in defending the castle and for taking prisoner two traitors, Geoffrey Kechen and the Captain's 'bouchez' who had been stirring up trouble, P.R.O. E404/66/202, Devon, Issues, pp.471-72. Kechen's goods were later granted to Edward Eschope of the King's Buttery, writ dated 27 May 1451, E404/67/165. Kechen was described as 'late of Dartford, servant' in January 1451, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.437. The man described as the 'bouchez' of Cade had been brought to Queenborough Castle by John Kyng and Richard Andrew of Sittingbourne, Kent and they subsequently received 5 marks reward, writ dated 14 October 1450, E404/67/54. Anyone who took one of Cade's followers was to be rewarded with 5 marks, E404/66/194. Although Rochester appears to have been Cade's H.Q. after he left London, the town was not punished. The Bailiff and citizens were granted £40 by the King, out of Cade's goods, for making the East Gate of the town, E28/80/71; P.P.C. VI p.101; E404/66/209.

Cade was still in arms in Kent which prompted the King's writ on 10 July which declared Cade a traitor and put a reward of 1000marks on his head. It may be that Cade remained in arms because he mistrusted his pardon. The writ is preserved only by Stow and in the manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.¹ Cade was accused, amongst other things, of killing a pregnant woman, being of the French party, using necromancy and remaining in arms without the authority of Parliament. One chronicler records that Cade's previous pardon was invalid because it was issued to him in the name of Mortimer when his real name was Cade.²

On 12 July Cade was taken at Heathfield in Sussex by Alexander Iden, assisted by John Davy. Iden was a gentleman of Kent who was appointed Sheriff to succeed Crowmer.³ After hearing of the proclamation for his arrest, Cade must have abandoned Rochester on the night of 10 July or during 11 July, for Heathfield is a good forty miles from Rochester. While the search for Cade was in progress

1. Stow, Annales, p.391; H.M.C. V (1876), p.455.

2. Lambeth 306, p.68.

3. 1 September 1450, described as Sheriff of Kent, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.401. He was granted the keeping of Rochester Castle. He subsequently married William Crowmer's widow, Elizabeth, the daughter of Lord Say. The chroniclers differ greatly about the place of Cade's arrest. John Davy was paid by writ dated 18 September 1450, £20 reward for taking Cade at 'Hefeld' Sussex. If this is not Heathfield it could be Hartfield, 5 miles west of Tonbridge.

a number of royal officials were sent to Rochester. The Archbishop of York was sent to 'appease our subjects there and to establish good rule amongst them'.¹ But he was also sent to see to the collection of Cade's goods and their despatch to the Treasury in London. The taking and disposal of Cade's loot and possessions seem to have been the chief concern of the government and, because this was largely the business of the Exchequer, the process is well-documented.²

-
1. P.R.O. Writ dated 9 September 1450, E404/67/16; paid £20 19 July 1451, Devon, Issues, pp.470-71.
 2. 12 July 1450 commission to the Treasurer, Sir Thomas Tyrell, Richard Waller Esq. to arrest Cade's goods and use to capture him and his adherents, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.387; P.P.C. VI, p.96; P.R.O. E28/80/62. Tyrell and Waller travelled to Rochester to seize these goods and were subsequently paid £5 13s.4d. for their expenses, Devon, Issues, p.466. Others went to Rochester also by virtue of the King's commission of 12 July and these also received payment for their expenses, 18 July 1450 P.P.C. VI, p.98; E28/80/57; E404/66/195. 14 July 1450 Treasurer was instructed to receive all Cade's goods which had recently been brought into Rochester, and to use them wisely, P.P.C. VI, p.97; E28/80/63. 14 July 1450 writ to Treasurer to use all diligence in taking Cade's goods brought to Rochester 'or any goods of his, be they gold, silver, coin or plate, cloths of gold, arras or anything whatsoever' E404/66/193. 18 July 1450 writ to Tyrell and Waller to deliver the goods which they had collected to the Treasurer, E101/515/13. 19 July 1450 Tyrell and Waller delivered the goods to the Treasurer and the indenture between the two parties is dated 21 July 1450. The indenture lists all the goods which had belonged to Cade including only £105 15s.0d. in cash, Palgrave, Ancient Kalendars, vol.II, pp.217-20. The two parts of the indenture still survive in P.R.O., E101/336/5 (two seals) and E101/515/13 (one seal). Stephen Knight, the King's Escheator in Kent and Middlesex, had been very active in collecting Cade's goods. The account of Tyrell and Waller was enrolled, Easter Term 1455, E364/89 m.lv.

It is not clear whether Cade was killed during the course of his capture by Davy and Iden, but certainly he was dead by the time his body was brought triumphantly to London. This gruesome procession reached the City on 13 July and, the body, having been displayed in an open cart in Southwark so that the hostess of the White Hart might identify her erstwhile guest, it was deposited in the Court of King's Bench.¹ There it remained until 15 July when it was duly beheaded and quartered.² With Cade thus safely identified and dead, the Treasurer was authorized to pay Iden the reward of 1000 marks which had been promised to the man who should bring Cade's body, alive or dead, to the King's Council.³ The different parts of Cade's body were sent to different parts of the country - the head was placed on London Bridge and the quarters went to Norwich, Salisbury, Blackheath and Gloucester. The disposal of Cade's body

-
1. Gregory, p.194; Gough London 10, p.156.
 2. Gough London 10, p.156; T.C.D. Ms. E.5.10 f.169.
 3. Writ dated 15 July 1450, E404/66/194. But Iden was to be paid out of Cade's confiscated goods, E28/80/58; Foedera V, part II, p.27. Iden received £266 13s.4d., see the endorsement on E404/66/194; Devon, Issues, p.464 (where payment dated 30 June 1450 which serves to emphasise the nominal nature of Exchequer dating). Iden had still not received the remaining 600 marks by 20 September 1450, when he represented to the King that he suffered greatly from his, as yet unpaid, assistants, P.R.O. E404/67/31. It is doubtful if Iden was ever fully paid since Cade's confiscated goods were not worth 1000 marks (see p.522 n. 1 and p.528 n. 2 above). Iden was, however, exempted from the Act of Resumption in 1455, R.P. V, p.313.

and the bodies of other traitors, was the responsibility of the Sheriffs of London and it was a task which they found to be both onerous and expensive.¹

In London, the Court of Aldermen was meeting again regularly in the absence of the Mayor for whom Thomas Catworth acted as deputy. William Hulyn, the Sheriff who had done good service during the battle of the Bridge was chosen as the new Alderman for Lime Street ward in place of Philip Malpas. Matthew Philip, another Goldsmith, took the place of John Sutton at Aldersgate ward. A committee was appointed, which included Thomas Cook senior, to deal with the necessary repairs to the City gates and to receive sums of money for this purpose from the Companies. The repair of the drawbridge came, no doubt, within the scope of this committee.² The heads of Lord Say, William Crowmer and Baily were removed from London Bridge and, united with their bodies, were decently buried in the Grey Friars Church.³ Matthew Gough was buried in the Chapel of the Virgin in the Carmelite Church and John Sutton was buried at St. John Zachary.⁴ The City did not mourn for long and the commerce by which it lived,

-
1. See P.P.C. VI, p.107, the Sheriffs petitioned to be allowed the costs of this operation. Bale, p.134 records that one of Cade's quarters was stolen from Dartford but this may well have been one of his supporters.
 2. Jour.V f.40, 40v.
 3. Gregory, pp.193-94. Bale, p.134 dates Lord Say's burial to 21 July 1450. See Stow, Survey, vol.I, p.320.
 4. Lambeth 448, p.150. For John Sutton's burial see Stow, Survey, vol.I, p.305 ; II, p.341.

quickly revived. On 18 July the Bridge House accounts begin again and the life of the City reverted to its normal tempo. Altogether the City Companies contributed at least £500 towards the repair of the gates and Bridge and by 10 September the accounts of those entrusted with this task, were ready to be audited.¹ On 28 July the Court of Aldermen sent a deputation to the Chancellor to discuss how the King should be received in the City. At least forty Companies were to be involved in the welcome and on 28 July the King returned to the City which he had left so hastily a month before.²

But the troubles and risings did not die down with the death of the Captain of Kent. The first measures of the government were conciliatory and on 1 August the King issued a commission which was to examine the Kentish grievances. As this commission was headed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of Winchester, who had formed the deputation to Cade on 6 July, it seems likely that the sending of such a commission formed one of the terms of the truce. The Duke of Buckingham, a 'neutral' figure, also served on the commission.³ Only one chronicler assess^{es} the purpose of this commission correctly: 'the King sent the Archbishop of York and the

1. Jour.V f.42, 45v.

2. Jour.V f.42v.; T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.169-169v.

3. C.P.R. 1446-52, p.388. Some of the indictments made before these commissioners have been edited by Virgoe, op.cit., pp.220-43. *Kingsford prints the Cotton MS list of indictments made at Rochester 10, 15 August, E.H.L. pp. 364-5.*

Duke of Buckingham to Rochester with instructions to punish extortioners so that there should be no rising¹. The commission also sat at Maidstone, Canterbury and Dartford but by the end of October the methods of conciliation had given way to those of suppression.²

William Parmenter who called himself the second captain of Kent assembled men at Ospringe on 31 August and on 8 September the Duke of Somerset was ordered to raise the King's lieges against the Kentish rebels.³ Parmenter was captured.⁴ Other Kentish leaders who fell into the King's hands in the autumn of 1450 were Robert Spenser 'sworn brother' of Cade and Simon Scryven from Hern.⁵ The

-
1. T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.169v. It is interesting that the chronicler mentions only the Archbishop of York and the Duke of Buckingham for these are the only members of the commission for whom payments for expenses have survived. For the Archbishop of York writs for payment on 15 August 1450 (E404/66/208), 10 October 1450 (E404/67/48), 12 October 1450 (E404/67/53); for the Duke of Buckingham writ for payment 15 August 1450 (E28/80/68 and E404/66/206).
 2. Sittings of the commission 20-22 August at Rochester; 16-19 September Maidstone; 22-24 September Canterbury; 22 October Dartford, Virgoe, *op.cit.*, p.215. 19 August 1450, James Cresham wrote to John Paston from London 'the Chief Justice is not here, ne noon other Justice, except Danyers is now made juge of the Comune Place, and is forth into Kent with the Lords', *Paston Letters*, vol.I, p.139.
 3. For Parmenter's rising see Virgoe, *op.cit.*, p.253 and Somerset's commission, *C.P.R. 1446-52*, p.431. 3 October 1450 writ to pay Somerset for his efforts, *P.P.C. VI*, pp.101-02; E404/67/38. He received the money 29 October 1450, Devon, *Issues*, p.468.
 4. Thomas Wareyn, an Esquire of the Duke of Somerset, had charge of Parmenter for 32 days and was to be paid for his trouble, writ for payment, dated 10 June 1451 E404/67/180. Payment made 5 August 1451, Devon, *Issues*, p.472.
 5. Alexander Iden brought Spenser to the King, writ for payment dated 20 September 1450, E404/67/30, although payment not made until 27 May 1451, Devon, *Issues*, p.469. Ten men were to receive a reward of £10 for bringing Scryven to the King, writ dated 26 November 1450, E404/67/94.

Duke of York headed a commission of oyer and terminer in early December and further repressive measures followed.¹ But it was the harvest of heads in January and February 1451 which sent a chill down the spines of the chroniclers. The King himself joined the commissioners who included the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, and the Earls of Arundel and Shrewesbury. They sat at Canterbury, Rochester and Tonbridge.² Twenty or thirty men were executed and one chronicler remarks with some horror that 'eight heads stood at once on London Bridge'.³ But the risings - for example that of Thomas Skinner in Brencley late in April - continued throughout the spring and the commission was renewed.⁴ For a year there was comparative peace in Kent and then it became necessary to send yet another commission headed by the Earl of Shrewesbury to suppress

-
1. 14 December 1450, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.435. Gervase Clifton was authorized to raise the King's lieges against the rebels, ibid., p.436.
 2. 13 January, 27 January 1451, C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.437, 442. See Virgoe, op.cit., p.217. While the King and the members of the commission were at Rochester they were visited by the Dean of St. Martin's the Grand who was sheltering in his sanctuary William Cayme of Sittingbourne, who had been one of Cade's petty Captains and had been indicted of treason. 16 February 1451 the King had sent a signet letter to the Dean requesting him to send Cayme to Rochester. The Dean managed to defend both Cayme and the Church's privileges before the King and the commissioners, and Cayme on 20 May 1451 received the King's pardon and became 'a cherished person with the said Duke of Somerset', G.R.O. Liber Fleetwood f.175v-176; C.P.R. 1446-52, p.424. Cayme had been associated with William Parmenter. On the question of the sanctuary of St. Martin's, see Chapter VI, pp.393-408
 3. Lambeth 306, p.68. See also Great Chron., p.185; Bale, p.134; Gough London 10, p.157; Gregory, p.195; T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 f.170v. states that 31 men were beheaded and 3000 pardoned.
 4. C.P.R. 1446-52, p.477. For Thomas Skinner see Virgoe, op.cit., pp.249, 250, 252. John Audeley Esq. was paid 40 marks for taking Skinner, writ dated 29 June 1451, E404/67/190.

the rising of John Wilkins.¹ The restless movement of discontents and disaffection remained a treacherous quicksand upon which the local government in Kent rested uneasily.

The other main areas of trouble in 1450 were Gloucestershire, Sussex, Norfolk, Essex and Wiltshire where the Bishop of Salisbury had been murdered on 29 June. The commission which was sent to Norfolk on 1 August 1450 was probably conciliatory like that of the same date sent to Kent, but the other slightly later commissions were repressive.² The King himself may have accompanied the commissions to Sussex and Wiltshire.³ Repression continued throughout 1451 and the Duke of Somerset headed a notable group of men who were sent to Suffolk, Surrey, Kent, Hampshire, Wiltshire and Sussex - where the rising was led by a man named Henry Hasildens.⁴ There was trouble also this year in Leicester, Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Suffolk and Essex.⁵ In 1452 the number of disaffected areas shrank

-
1. C.P.R. 1446-52, p.577; Virgoe, op.cit., pp.218- 256-65.
 2. C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.432-43, 435, 388, 431, 440, 434, 433. Sir Thomas Tyrell was paid £40 for taking rebels in Essex, writ dated 14 September 1450, E404/67/20. For some of the indictments made before the Norfolk commissioners see P.R.O. File KB9/272.
 3. Great Chron., p.185; Lambeth 306, p.68.
 4. 20 May 1451, C.P.R. 1446-52, p.477; Virgoe, op.cit., p.244 and n.2. 17 August 1451 writ for Thomas Croxton, clerk of the Bench, to be paid for attending sessions in five counties for 35 days at a daily wage of 3s.4d., E28/81/9. The judges were to be paid 20s. a day, see E28/81/4 and 17.
 5. C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.478, 440, 477, 436. No commission was appointed for Leicester but 11 April 1452 the town received a general pardon for all offences committed there before 7 April 1452, H.M.C. VIII Appendix, Part I Section 2 (1881), p.414.

again to Kent, Bristol, Norfolk and Suffolk although it was necessary to send a general commission to the South-west of England in July.¹

To say that the motives which led men to join Jack Cade's revolt were political does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the revolt was Yorkist. The revolt was inspired by bad government - both at the local level in Kent, Essex and Norfolk and at the upper level in the Council which advised the King. The death of Gloucester, the seeping away of the French lands, the retrospective unpopularity of the King's marriage and the dislike of Suffolk all contributed to the political unrest which lay behind the revolt. This was certainly not a peasant rising but rather that of a 'middle-class', surprisingly politically self-conscious, which felt itself to be cheated, robbed, betrayed and ignored. But it was still possible at this time to be anti-government without being pro-York. In the two sets of articles produced by the rebels, the second set does not mention York at all and the first set mentions him twice. On the first occasion the writers claimed that it is not their intention to replace the King with the Duke of York (the heir-apparent at the time), and on the second occasion they asked the King to put aside the 'progeny' of the Duke of Suffolk and to rule instead with the help of the Dukes of York, Exeter, Buckingham and Norfolk. To infer a Yorkist inspiration behind these

1. C.P.R. 1446-52, pp.577, 580-81, 539-40, General commission to investigate treasons in the south-west, ibid., p.500.

sentiments, would be to stretch the evidence. None of the contemporary chroniclers mentions the rising as being in any way connected with the Duke - who was in Ireland - and it seems more likely that the government later attributed the rising to 'Yorkist' plots because this helped to discredit the Duke in the eyes of those who feared lawlessness and warfare. In the submissive Lancastrian Parliament of 1459 the Commons in their petition against the Duke of York claimed that many of Cade's adherents, when they were about to die, said that they had intended to 'exalt the said Duke against all reason, law and truth, to the estate that God and nature hath ordained you and your succession to be born to'.¹ Thus ran Lancastrian propaganda but there is nothing in the indictments of 1450-51 to suggest that such schemes were current at the time. It is true that Cade took the name Mortimer, but only the author of the Great Chronicle followed by Fabian, states that he claimed to be a cousin of the Duke of York. This name could equally well be used by all the Bouchier family and it seems likely that by choosing it Cade was more conscious of its grandiose associations than its political affiliations.

It is, perhaps, as dangerous to try to detect the existence of parties in the wide political arena, as it is in London itself. There was what might be described as a political vacuum in England following the deaths first of the Duke of Gloucester and then the

1. R.P. V, p.346.

Duke of Suffolk. This vacuum was not filled until the Dukes of York and Somerset returned to England in the autumn of 1450 and defined their rivalry. But the growth of a Yorkist party, that is a party of men whose aim was to replace the King on the throne with the Duke of York, was a slow one. It began in the Parliament in the autumn of 1450 when Sir William Oldhall, the Duke's Chamberlain, was chosen Speaker and Thomas Young moved in the Lower House for the recognition of York as Henry's heir. The movement grew into an armed rising in the spring of 1452 and must have gained momentum from the birth of Prince Edward in 1453. But the revolt of 1450 was not the first battle of the Wars of the Roses and its significance does not lie in its supposedly Yorkist affiliations, but in its non-partisan character. The men of Kent rose, not against the King and not because they intended to replace him with the Duke of York, but they rose in spontaneous protest against a corrupt and vicious network of privilege and position which enmeshed the King. The Kentishmen shared, with the Yorkists, this opposition to the Court and their rising may have done something to accelerate the growth of a Yorkist faction, but their remedies were different.

An examination of this network reveals, perhaps, some interesting facts. From the rebel manifestos, the Kentish indictments, and the chronicles, it is possible to gather a list of twenty three men who, in some way or other, were attacked either verbally or physically by the rebels. Some of these men were attacked because of the positions which they held - for example the three Sheriffs of Kent,

but the links between these twenty three men were not of a solely official kind. Not only did they sit on commissions together but they were feoffees together, witnessed each others charters, held manors, offices and wardships jointly, were connected by marriage or entered into legal transactions together. It seems clear that there existed a privileged 'establishment' at which the rebels hit out- perhaps not so blindly.

It cannot be mere chance that the five Londoners whom we know to have suffered at the hands of the rebels, fit closely into this network. They were not, of course, the only ones who had connections with the court, but they serve to highlight an important truth; court venality, luxury and corruption served to line rather than to empty the pockets of Londoners. Bad government affected trade it is true, but at the local level their government was within their own control. It is, therefore, natural that Cade received little support from the City; there is no evidence of any assistance offered to Cade until he got into the City on 3 July. The belief that the Common Council was divided cannot be substantiated. It was not in the interests of the majority of the citizens that a rioting, plundering mob should be let loose in the City. Some, it is true, like Laurence Stokewood turned the occasion to their profit and there were always the poor and underprivileged who saw any disturbance as a time of self-help. But the negligible nature of London support for Cade is striking. Only eight Londoners felt the

need to acquire pardons, no commission of oyer and terminer was sent to the City when the revolt was over and there is no record that the Court of Aldermen saw the need to make out punishments: rather they held a puzzled enquiry as to how such a thing as Cade's entry into the guarded City could have come about. Their conclusion that Cade's success was an accident must be endorsed by historians. If Cade had enjoyed any significant support within the City itself, the Londoners who fought Cade on London Bridge during the night of July 5 would have been attacked from both sides: but of this there is no record. The citizens neither wished Cade to enter nor desired him to prolong his stay. For the accident of his admission they paid with their blood and their goods.

The City of London supported the crown during the rising of Jack Cade. It was not of the 'Lancastrian' party because there was, as yet, no 'Yorkist' party. The City stood for law and order and the peaceful conditions necessary to pursue the business of trade. In the decade which followed 1450 the Londoners continued to pursue these primary objectives in conditions of localized warfare, factious nobility and a weakened central government. London was not Yorkist during Cade's revolt, nor did it become Yorkist in the 1450s when that term came to have some precise meaning. As in the case of Henry Bolingbroke, so with the Dukes of York. London supported the reigning monarch until the success of the usurper or, more particularly, of his army, became inevitable. The City did not back losers out of

high-minded principle, but considered its allegiance to be a matter of finance and expediency. To say that London in 1450-61 was Yorkist means only that the City was not prepared to withstand a siege and to do battle for the cause of Henry VI.

Appendix 1AATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS AT COURT OF ALDERMEN, 1416-1462 *

* These figures represent the number of times a member attended the Court of Aldermen, given as a percentage of the number of meetings recorded as held in any given year. The gaps are due to the absence of Journals for these years. A figure surrounded by a square shows a year in which an Alderman served as Mayor. A figure surrounded by a circle shows a year in which an Alderman served as Sheriff.

I am most grateful to Mr. George Barron for mathematical help in compiling this table.

Appendix IWARD OFFICERSALDERSGATE

Constables:	William Belle Richard Fuller Stephen Cleant John Mason John Salter John Licton Alan Brette Richard Hersy Robert Walpole Henry Luke William Violet	12 January 1422 16 April 1454 4 July 1454 21 October 1455	Mem.Roll A.50. Jour.V f.161. Jour.V f.173 Jour.V f.268v.
Beadles:	John Leyghton	12 January 1422 4 December 1428	Mem.Roll A.50. Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	John Davy John Kene	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.

ALDGATE

Constables:	John Ketyng William Botiller John Kertill John Essex William Chamberlain Richard Stowe John Edward	12 January 1422 5 August 1445 8 August 1445	Mem.Roll A.50. Jour.IV f.88. <u>Cal.P.and M.</u> <u>1437-57</u> , p.54.
Beadles:	William Burbache	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
Scavengers:	Walter Petirton Henry Sparwe John Derneford Thomas White		

BASSISEAW

Constables:	John Philip John Wilkokkes	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
Beadles:	Stephen Drax	12 January 1422 4 December 1428	Mem.Roll A.50. Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	John Tribus John Rowland	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.

BISFOPSGATE

Constables:	Robert Wrayton		
	John Dauby		
	John Toky		
	Richard Marchall		
	John Fombir		
	Stephen Belle		
	Walter Browne		
	----- Malvery	26 September 1459	Jour.VI f.138v.
Beadles:	John Stokes	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
		12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
Scavengers:	Thomas Richer		
	William Laurens		
	William Edward		
	John Coplond		
	Richard Pollard		
	Richard Mayl		
	John Gylldford		

BILLINGSGATE

Constables:	Thomas Lyncoln		
	William Sampson		
	Richard Warbulton		
	Thomas Badby		
	Walter Rideler		
	Alexander Milis		
	William Gillham		
	Thomas Yooll		
	Henry Boxton		
	John Reynold	3 September 1445	Jour.IV f.92v.
	William Palmer	21 November 1446	Jour.IV f.149v.
Thomas Ruller	10 October 1455	Jour.V f.266v.	
John West	16 February 1459	Jour.VI f.149v.	
Beadles:	Walter Iremonger	12 January 1422	Mem. Roll A.50.
	William Iremonger	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
	William Mayle	2 May 1461	Jour.VI f.53v.
Scavengers:	John Bishop	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50
	Edward Cheyham		
	John Hoke		

BROAD STREET

Constables: Richard Holbeche
 William Kent
 Richard Reynald
 John Riche
 William Strannsell
 Richard Wydehale
 William Thede
 John Grene
 Richard Triplowe
 William Austyn
 Thomas Bernwell
 William Waleys
 Thomas Skot
 Ralph Hogman
 John Kyng
 John Botiller
 William Rose

19 February 1450
 17 June 1457

Jour.V f.31.
 Jour.VI f.126.

Beadles: Richard Swain

4 December 1428

Jour.II f.126v.

Scavengers: John Miles
 John Northwell
 William Carell
 John Gryme
 John Kirtelton
 John Hogeote
 Symon Smyth
 John Broke

12 January 1422

Mem.Roll A.50.

BRIDGE

Constables: William Downe
 Robert Crull
 Richard Coteler
 Thomas Leget
 John Westowe
 Thomas Wiche
 Stephen Barry
 Henry Martyn
 William Newbold
 Walter Cook
 Walter atte Watre
 John Russell
 Symond Seman
 William Lely
 John Parker
 John Boteler
 Robert Graunger
 John Mortimer
 John Bell
 — Fordham

12 January 1422

Mem.Roll A.50.

17 June 1456

Jour.VI f.113.

3 February 1457

Jour.VI f.92.

BRIDGE (Contd.)

Beadles:	Richard Haywode	23 March 1417	Jour.I f.16v.
		12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	William Aston	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Thomas Cronche		
	John Passelewe		

BROAD STREET

Constables:	John Bracy		
	John Godyn		
	John Yoo		
	Robert Stirop		
	Bartholomew Lathe		
	John Fulbroke		
	Thomas Babthorp		
	John Perye		
	John Volentyn		
	J. Whitfeld	15 July 1439	Jour.III f.18.
Beadles:	Thomas Wanton	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
Scavengers:	John Waghorn		
	William Egerden		
	William Colyn		
	Richard Hilton		
	Richard Whitbred		
	John Golyzt		
	John West		

CANDLEWICK STREET

Constables:	William Crane		
	Henry Wilford		
	William Knight		
	Thomas Hardyng		
Beadles:	Robert Sturmyrn	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	John Alfeld	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Cokerell		
	John Kent		
	Thomas Julyan		

CASTLE BAYNARD

Constables:	Guydo Try		
	Robert Derwyll		
	John Boston		
	Tybaud Hunt		
	John Horwold		
	Richard Howden	30 June 1450	Jour.V f.39.
Thomas Coventry			
John Malter	14 June 1460	Jour.VI f.217v.	
Peter Morys			
Beadles:	John Rowe		
		2 October 1426	Jour.II f.84v.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	Richard Couper	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Matheus Karlel		
	Robert Bristow		
	Laurence Yong		
	John Colwyk		

CEFE

Constables:	John Waltham	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Thomas Weddesbury		
	Martinus aleyn		
	Robert Brook		
	John Estmond		
	Thomas Shragger		
	John Waryn		
	Richard Coventry		
	John Clerk		
	William Eertshorn		
	John Notebron		
	John Tuple		
	William Pekke		
Beadles:	Thomas Macchyng		
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
	Robert ----	9 June 1456	Jour.VI f.32v.
Scavengers:	Robert Maundeville	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Fynche		
	John Spicer		
	Robert Capon		
	John Ledewik		
	Robert Maule		
	Richard Robert		
	Thomas Rede		
Gyles Warner			

COLMAN STREET

Constables: John Golyng
 Thomas Hacche
 Henry Wygwarr
 William Graunger

Beadles: John Organ 4 December 1428 Jour.II f.126v.

Scavengers: Robert Kyng 12 January 1422 Mem.Roll A.50.
 William Bole

CORDWAINER STREET

Constables: John Turnour 12 January 1422 Mem.Roll A.50.
 Roger Emory
 Robert Penescales
 William Milrede
 Thomas Selowe
 John Sturmour
 Peter Bayford

Beadles Richard Boner

Scavengers Nicholas Chinall
 Ralph Say
 Nicholas Houghton
 John Senard

CORNELL

Constables: John Lynge
 Thomas Baker
 Thomas Ledred
 John Gylle
 Dionysius Claymond 17 June 1457 Jour.VI f.126v.

Beadles: William Salle 12 January 1422 Mem.Roll A.50.
 4 December 1428 Jour.II f.126v.
 Richard Clerk 15 July 1439 Jour.III f.18.

Scavengers: John Thorp 12 January 1422 Mem.Roll A.50.
 John White
 James Shopman
 Robert Squier

CRIPPLEGATE WITH IN

Constables: William Hales
 Robert Ernewei
 John Olney
 Thomas Wilkyn
 John Pake
 Nicholas Birchell
 John Taterech
 John Hertwell

Beadles: John Kyngstede

Scavengers: Robert French
 John Brom
 William Boyt
 Richard Boteler
 Richard Caux
 John Weston
 William Hamond

12 January 1422

Mem.Roll A.50

CRIPPLEGATE WITH OUT

Constables: William Cheyne
 Ralph Palmere
 Symon Attewell
 Thomas Martyn

Beadles: John Haynes

Scavengers: William James
 Walter Gayton
 John Hery

CRIPPLEGATE (either)

Beadles: John Smith
 William London

15 April 1429
 8 April 1440

Jour.II f.132.
 Jour.III f.40v.

DOWGATE

Constables:	John Reyner	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	William Gps		
	John Arkall		
	John Bryt		
	John Mount		
	Richard Danyell		
	Thomas Lilbourne		
	Hugh Somerville		
	Nicholas Cambridge	6 May 1454	Jour.V f.163.
Beadles:	John Norwych	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Handby	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
	John Sendell	14 January 1450	Jour.V f.28v.
		15 September 1453	Jour.V f.120v.
Scavengers:	Thomas Witte	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	William Maund		
	Edmund Talworth		
	John Frensh		

FARRINGDON WITHIN

Constables:	John Parker	23 July 1417	Jour.I f.27v.
		12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	William Waldern	23 July 1417	Jour.I f.27v.
	William Deer	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Seyr		
	Richard Botelow		
	John Aschwell		
	John Ropeley		
	William Balton		
	Thomas Galyot		
	John Asche		
	John Leget		
	William Hune		
	Barnard Troye		
	Richard at Lee		
	John Len		
	William Bewerge		
	Thomas Knowell		
	John Hertforde		
	John Labilian		
	Nicholas Schulton		
	William Cowley		
	John Parker		
John Fulbourne			
Alexander Smith	18 June 1455	Jour.V f.24ov.	
John Alcock	2 February 1456	Jour.VI f.5v.	
John Sylvester	11 August 1458	Jour.VI f.229.	

FARRINGDON WITHIN (Contd.)

Beadles:	William Leyghton	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	Richard Snell	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Rich		
	John Brige		
	William Brasbrig'		
	Henry Aleyne		
	John Robert		
	Thomas Cokerton		
	Thomas Hunt		
	Thomas Grasse		
	John Bulñ		
	William Wodhouse		
	John Benet		
	William Burdon		

FARRINGDON WITHOUT

Constables:	William Crane		
	Ralph Hatfeld		
	John Selom		
	Robert Cooke		
	John Coly		
	William Pepir		
	John Herberd		
	Robert Hilton		
	John Layner		
	John Gardyner		
	John Bonham		
	John Sharp		
	Thomas Atwode		
	Walter Chapman	Nov./Dec.1427	Jour.II f.98v.
		13 February 1429	Cal.P. and M. <u>1413-37</u> , p.224.
	Richard Bury	10 August 1429	Jour.II f.137v.
	William Scotton	17 May 1459	Jour.VI f.159.
Beadles:	Roger Olyver	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	William Maysinor	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50
	Roger Kirk		
	John Taillour		
	William Preston		
	John Toke		
	John Lynwode		
	Henry Noble		
	William Fernham		
	William Martyn		

LANGBOURNE

Constables:	John Mouncell	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Randolph		
	John Chesham		
	John Fitzrobert		
	William Colston		
	John Polleye		
	William Bullock		
	John Pyggen		
	Robert Elkyn	16 November 1426	Jour.II f.87v.
	Michael Domy	27 May 1448	Jour.IV f.211v.
	Philip Selly		
	John Scribeyn		
	Thomas Derlington	17 November 1458	Jour.VI f.222v.
		12 January 1451	Jour.V f.52v.
Beadles:	Thomas Chirche	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Hert	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	Ralph Budlee	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Robert Baker		
	Thomas Spayne		
	Alan John		

LILE STREET

Constables:	Thomas Godyng	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Asgood		
	William Weddesburn		
	Richard Morgan		
	Henry Wixton	27 September 1424	Jour.II f.23.
	William Waren	8 May 1459	Jour.VI f.157v.
	William Seggesle	4 May 1419	Jour.I f.45v.
Beadles:		12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
	Alexander Haukyn		
Scavengers:	William Pekynham		

PORTSOKEN

Constables:	John Trewman	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Bray		
	Richard Lucas		
	John Edward		
	John Grace		
	John Turnour		
	Loses Gerveys	25 February 1441	Jour.III f.77v.

PORTSOKEN (Contd.)

Beadles:	Richard Malster	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	William Steperneks	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	John Greneгат	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Dodde		
	Robert Barnet		
	Walter Jæroun		

QUEENFYTHE

Constables:	John Atherle		
	John Bednale		
	John Kirkeby		
	William Attewelle		
	Thomas Attewode		
	John Lacy		
	John Tendale		
	Nicholas Knotford		
	John Willy		
	Thomas Sutton		
Thomas Basset	August 1451	Jour.V f.61v.	
Richard Clere			
Beadles:	John Wilde	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Richard Chapman	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
		5 February 1444	Jour.IV f.16v.
Scavengers:	Robert Attecok	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Nicholas Panter		
	John Yngram		
	Symon Franc'		

TOWER

Constables:	John Randolph	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Wockyne		
	Robert Cristmas		
	Thomas Cooke		
	William Preste		
	William Pynde		
	John Joye		
	Geoffrey Braybroke		
	John Herhalf		
	Stephen Roo		
	William Lunde	3 July 1427	Jour.II f.94.
	John Armour		
	William Lynne	16 April 1445	Jour.IV f.75v.
	William anneys		
	Henry Radcok	23 February 1454	Jour.V f.150v.
Robert Hardy	2 May 1461	Jour.VI f.53v.	

TOWER (Contd.)

Beadles:	John Parker	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Henry Sewardby	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
		8 May 1438	Jour.III f.173
Scavengers:	Richard Boteler	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	Robert Prowfote		
	Thomas Chaundeler		
	Thomas Trente		

VINTRY

Constables:	John Kyllyk		
	Richard Bawe		
	John Tryllowe		
	Robert Cony		
	Thomas Edmond		
	Richard Palmer		
	William Brysse		
	John Clerk		
Beadles:	Elyas Boston		
	John Hylton	6 May 1428	Jour.II f.139.
		4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	Thomas Gerard	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Catour		
	John Scarlet		
	Thomas Attewode		

WALBROOK

Constables:	Ralph Shoklache		
	John Leget		
	John Glynne		
	Thomas Thirlwynde		
	Alexander R Kyllyngham		
	Lodowycus Talgar		
Beadles:	Richard Weston		
	Robert Weston	4 December 1428	Jour.II f.126v.
Scavengers:	John Berdevile	12 January 1422	Mem.Roll A.50.
	John Langwyth		
	Thomas Paine		
	Roger Fydelhell		
	Nicholas Her'		
	John Buskaweve		

WARDENS OF LUDGATE

- 1 October 1409 WILLIAM KINGESCOTE, discharged as Keeper of the gate and gaol L.B.I., p.76.
- 16 July 1411 WILLIAM KINGESCOTE reinstated L.B.I., p.96.
- 1414 Gaolers of Newgate and Ludgate died Stow^{Survey}, I, p.36.
- 16 February 1414 JOHN SEINT GERMAYN, grocer, confirmed in his office as Keeper of the gate and gaol, because of his many expenses on the gate and houses. If the Sheriff should want to discharge him, he was to reimburse the Keeper for his expenses and Sheriff then to keep the gate at his own cost. L.B.I., p.123.
- 9 November 1416 JOHN SEINT GERMAYN sworn as 'custos' of Ludgate Jour.I f.1v.
John Wode sworn as his locumtenens " "
- 1 June 1419 Ludgate closed (? reopened) L.B.I., pp.215, 227.
- c.March 1431 Ludgate closed Cleop.C IV, p.133.
- 16 June 1431 Ludgate reopened Cont.C.Brut, Brie, p.456. Cleop.C.IV, p.133.
- 16 June 1431 HENRY DENE, tailor, Keeper of gaol Cont.C.Brut, Brie, p.456. Cleop.C.IV, p.133.
Richard Havy, locumtenens "
Richard Clye, porter "
- 13 October 1431 Henry Dene, keeper L.B.K., p.183.
- 4 April 1441 Common Council decide that if Henry Dene is moved from office within 10 years by the Common Council, through no fault of his own, his successor is to satisfy him for his expenses in constructing a privy for the prison. Jour.III f.82v. L.B.K., pp.254-55.
- 18 May 1454 John Porter 'custos' of Ludgate, probably the gate Jour.V f.208.
William Hoggekyns, 'custos velett' at Ludgate " "
- 10 October 1457 Richard Wode, 'sub custos' of Ludgate Jour.VI f.180.
23 April 1460 Henry Dene 'janitor' Jour.VI f.210v.
Richard Wode 'sub custos' " "

Appendix 3WARDENS OF NEWGATE

30 March 1386	DAVID ? acting	<u>Cal.P. and M.</u> <u>1381-1412</u> , p.62.
1414	Gaolers of Newgate and Ludgate died	<u>Stow</u> , I, p.36.
9 November 1416	ALEXANDER BONER sworn as 'custos'	Jour.I f.lv.
13 April 1431	JOHN KINGESCOTE	<u>Cont.F.Brut</u> , <u>Brie</u> , p.456.
13 October 1434	JOHN HOTTELE acting	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.183.
4 April 1441	WILLIAM WIKHAM 'janitor'	Jour.III f.82.
8 November 1441	? SHEFULD 'custos'	Jour.III f.102v.
27 October 1446	ALEXANDER MANNING 'custos' (his oath Jour.IV f.166v.)	Jour.IV f.145.
15 March 1447	JAMES MANNING 'custos'	Jour.IV f.172.
10 October 1449	WILLIAM ARNOLD 'nuper unus custos'	Jour.V f.16.
7 October 1450	ALEXANDER MANNING 'nuper custos'	Jour.V f.48.
5 November 1450	ALEXANDER MANNING 'nuper custos' not to be reappointed	Jour.V f.51.
19 June 1452	JOHN ARNOLD, Brewer, 'nuper custos'	Jour.V f.76.
8 July 1452	JOHN ARNOLD 'custos'	Jour.V f.77.
18 May 1454	Robert Cook, 'custos' of gate of Newgate	Jour.V f.208.
	John Meye, 'custos velett' at Newgate	" "
1 June 1456	JOHN ARNOLD 'custos'	Jour.VI f.59.

Appendix 4UNDERSHERIFFS

9 November 1416	John Fray	William Aston	Jour.I f.1v.
7 November 1417	John Fray	William Aston	Jour.I f.39v.
1423	Alexander Anne		<u>L.P.A.</u> , n100.
c. 1426	? John Fortescue		<u>L.P.A.</u> , p.105. Jour.II f.64.
1429/30	Holtoft		<u>L.P.A.</u> , p.107.
1431/32	John Wilton		<u>L.P.A.</u> , p.108, n.7.
1432/33	John Forster		<u>L.P.A.</u> , p.111.
1433/34	John Markham		<u>L.P.A.</u> , p.113, n.4.
1434/35	Thomas Burgoyne		<u>L.P.A.</u> , p.114, n.2.
15 October 1439	Robert Feyworth		Jour.III f.25.
9, 20 July 1441	Thomas Burgoyne	John Wilton	Jour.III f.88v., 89, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.257.
22/29 July 1449	" "	Thomas Billing	Jour.V f.13.
2 October 1450	" "	Roger Birkes	Jour.V f.47v.
26 September 1459	" "	Guy Fairfax *	Jour.VI f.138v.
21 August 1460	" "	Thomas Rigby	Jour.VI f.263.
25 September 1461	" "	" "	Jour.VI f.22v.
26 September 1463	" "	" "	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.35.

* Guy Fairfax ceased to be Common Serjeant on this date. It is presumed that he became Undersheriff, since Thomas Rigby was subsequently chosen 'loco Fairfax'.

Appendix 5RECORDERS

13 October 1398	MATTHEW de SOUTHWORTH, present at election of Mayor	<u>M.B.E.</u> , p.444.
21 September 1404	THOMAS THORNBURGH, present at election of Sheriffs	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.32.
13 October 1406	JOHN PRESTONE, present at election of Mayor	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.51.
21 September 1415	JOHN BARTON, present at election of Sheriffs	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.143.
12 November 1420	JOHN FRAY, present in full Husting and Common Council	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.248.
21 October 1426	JOHN SIMOND, elected	Jour.II f.86.
9 February 1430	ALEXANDER ANNE, acting	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.194.
27 October 1438	THOMAS COKAYNE, elected	Jour.III f.163v
13 July 1440	JOHN BOWYS, sworn	Jour.III f.46.
14 July 1442	ROBERT DANVERS, chosen	Jour.III f.141.
21 September 1450	THOMAS BILLING, elected	Jour.V f.46v.
3 October 1454	THOMAS URSWYK, chosen	Jour.V f.196.
2 December 1454	elected and sworn	Jour.V f.210v.

Appendix 6CHAMBERLAINS

29 September 1391	STEPHEN SHELMAN, Mercer, appointed	<u>L.B.H.</u> , p.390.
23 September 1404	JOHN PROFFYT, Fishmonger, appointed	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.34.
22 February 1416	JOHN HILL, Fishmonger, appointed	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.147.
21 September 1420	JOHN BEDIRENDEN, Draper, appointed	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.245.
21 September 1434	JOHN CHICHELE, Grocer, appointed	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.183.
21 September 1449	JOHN MIDDLETON, Mercer, appointed	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.329.
21 September 1450	elected Sheriff	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.332.
March 1456	elected Alderman of Farringdon Without	<u>Beaven, II</u> , p.10.
21 September 1450	JOHN STURGEON, Mercer, appointed	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.332.
21 September 1454	THOMAS THORNTON, Draper, appointed	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.366.
21 September 1463	ROBERT COLWYCH, Tailor, appointed	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.35.
26 August 1474	elected Alderman of Farringdon Without	<u>Beaven, II</u> , p.15.
21 September 1475	elected Sheriff	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.133.

Appendix 7CLERKS/CONTROLLERS TO THE CHAMBERLAIN

11 March 1400	RICHARD OSBARN, acting	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.6.
21 September 1437	WILLIAM CEDWORTH appointed	Jour.III f.191.
24 September 1450	ROBERT LANGFORD appointed	Jour.V f.47.
28 September 1454	" " sworn as Controller and clerk to Chamberlain	Jour.V f.194v.
23 September 1478	JOHN HERT, appointed .	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.160.

Appendix 8COMMON CLERKS

8 August 1375	HENRY PEROT elected	<u>L.B.H.</u> , p.8.
by 23 November 1402	JOHN MARCHEAUNT actin	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.19.
20 April 1417	JOHN CARPENTER elected	<u>L.B.I.</u> , pp.179-80
4 October 1438	RICHARD BARNET elected	Jour.III f.164- 164v.
18 November 1446	ROGER SPICER (alias Tonge) elected	Jour.IV f.149.
5 August 1461	Spicer dismissed	Jour.VI f.46.
2 October 1461	WILLIAM DUNTHORNE elected	Jour.VI f.7v.

Appendix 9COMMON SERJEANT AT LAW OR COMMON PLEADER

? by 18 June 1390	ROBERT PEEK acting	<u>L.B.F.</u> , p.273.
by 23 November 1402	JOHN WESTON acting	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.19.
by 26 June 1421	JOHN FRAY acting	<u>Cal.P. and M.1413-1437</u> , pp.99-102.
20 February 1423	ALEXANDER ANNE sworn	Jour.II f.4.
by December 1436	JOHN METTELE acting	Jour.III f.127v.
11 November 1437	JOHN WILTON elected	Jour.III f.188
11 October 1441	ROBERT DANVERS elected	Jour.III f.97.
23 July 1442	RICHARD MOYLE elected	Jour.III f.142v.
5 October 1443	THOMAS BILLING elected	Jour.IV f.9.
7 August 1449	JOHN NEDHAM elected	Jour.V f.13v.
28 June 1453	THOMAS URSEWYK elected	Jour.V f.113v.
2 December 1454	ROBERT INGLETON elected	Jour.V f.210v.
26 April 1456	GUY FAIRFAX elected	Jour.VI f.65v.
26 September 1459	THOMAS RIGBY elected	Jour.VI f.138v.
21 August 1460	THOMAS BRAIN elected	Jour.VI f.263.
26 September 1463	JOHN BALDWIN elected	Jour.VII f.40v.

Appendix 10

COMMON SERJEANT AT ARMS OR COMMON CLERK

by 23 May 1392	HUGH BATISFORD	<u>L.B.H.</u> , p.375.
14 December 1395	Hugh Batisford acting	<u>Cal.P.and M., 1381-1412,</u> p.233.
after 2 April 1407	JOHN PYCHARD	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.54.
19 August 1417	JOHN COMBE appointed	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.189.
27 February 1460	JOHN ASSE appointed	Jour.VI f.203, <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.401.

Appendix 11WATERBALIFFS

4 July 1405	ALEXANDER BONER acting	<u>Cal.P. and L., 1381-1412,</u> p.273.
by 4 December 1413	WILLIAM TALWORTH appointed	<u>L.B.I.,</u> pp.120-21.
17 August 1424	Petition from Common Council for his removal. Agreed	Jour.II f.21v.
29 October 1424	Talworth still in office	Jour.II f.25v.
14 December 1431	JOHN BOUGHTON appointed	<u>L.B.K.,</u> p.133.
21 January 1445	WILLIAM VEYSE appointed	<u>L.B.K.,</u> pp.302-03, Jour.IV f.59v.
December 1457	JOHN GOODE appointed and sworn	Jour.VI f.188.

Appendix 12

SWORDBEARER OR ESQUIRE TO THE MAYOR

c.1394	JOHN CREDY appointed	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.66.
21 September 1419	John Credy still in occupation of office	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.226.
by 8 October 1421	JOHN HASTINGS acting	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.259.
9 July 1426	JOHN HENCRICHE appointed	Jour.II f.78v.
29 May 1442	RICHARD POWER appointed	Jour.III f.136.
by 13 October 1466	JOHN MORLEY acting	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.68.

Appendix 13COMMON HUNTSLEN

28 October 1392	JAMES ORAESBY appointed NICHOLAS BRINCHELEE	<u>L.B.H.</u> , p.388.
20 April 1417	JOHN COURTENAY appointed	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.179.
13 September 1423	JOHN RUSSELL appointed	Jour.II f.8v.
5 April 1448	JOHN TYLER appointed	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.321.
1 April 1457	JOHN GRENE appointed	Jour.VI f.118.
5 December 1459	WILLIAM SUDBURY appointed	Jour.VI f.223.
26 September 1463	JOHN STOKKER appointed	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.36.

Appendix 14SERGEANTS OF THE CHANNEL

10 January 1418	HENRY WALEYS admitted	Jour.I f.14.
11 November 1422	WILLIAM HORN admitted and sworn	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.5, Jour.II f.1.
after 23 March 1444	JOHN HOLDEN	<u>Cal.P. and l. 1437-</u> 57, p.59.
December 1457	John Holden exonerated from office	Jour.VI f.188.
December 1457	JOHN HORNC-ASTLE elected and sworn	Jour.VI f.188.

Appendix 15PERMANENT SERJEANTS AT LAKE ATTENDING THE MAYOR

12 October 1436 <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.203	EUGE ASSEE	THOMAS HOLGRAVE	RALPH VERNON
18 January 1446 <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.312 Jour.IV f.112v.	JOHN RUSSELL	"	JOHN ASSEE
7 July 1448 Jour.IV f.222v.	"	ROBERT WESTELL	"
19 July 1451 Jour.V f.60v.	"	JOHN WEST	"
17 February 1457 <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.383 Jour.VI f.92v.	LAURENCE MOYNE	"	"
December 1457 Jour.VI f.188	JOHN PERCIVAL	"	"
28 February 1460 Jour.VI f.204	" }	" }	THOMAS DOUNEAL
10 March 1460 <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.403			

Appendix 16.

THE ASSIZE OF BREAD IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY*

	<u>Foreign Bakers</u>	<u>City Bakers</u>	
17 June 1417		7s.6d.	Jour.I f.23v.
27 April 1428	6s.6d.		Jour.II f.111v.
22 Sept. 1439	13s.4d.	13s.4d.	Jour.III f.22v.
3 June 1454	7s. 6s.		Jour.V f.169v.
5 June 1454		8s.	Jour.V f.170.
18 Sept. 1454	5s.	7s.	Jour.V f.191.
22 Oct. 1454		7s.6d.	Jour.V f.201v.
29 March 1455	5s.	7s.	Jour.V f.243.
17 Sept. 1455		6s.	Jour.V f.261v.
Dec. 1457		7s.6d.	Jour.VI f.187v.
20 Feb. 1458		8s.6d.	Jour.VI f.193.

* It was advantageous for the Bakers to have the Assize (i.e. the price of corn per quarter) set high since this enabled them to put less corn into a half-penny loaf, i.e. the weight of the loaf would vary according to the current assize.

Appendix 17

FIFTEENTH CENTURY PROSECUTIONS OF BAKERS

13 Dec. 1428	John Tonard	Spared the hurdle	<u>L.B.K.</u> p.56.
24 Dec. 1428	" "	Condemned to hurdle	" "
13 Dec. 1428	Richard Chamber	Spared hurdle, fine 6s.8d.	Jour.II f.128
4 May 1429	Richard Solas	Condemned to hurdle	Jour.II f.133
18 Sept. 1437	John Middleton	Escaped	Jour.III f.192
Sept. 1437	John Frost	Condemned to hurdle, English proclamation of offences hung round neck	Jour.III f.191v.
24 July 1439	John Grey	Prison, fine 40s.	Jour.III f.18v.
12 March 1442	Richard Lewlyn	Fine 6s.8d.	Jour.III f.113v.
12 Sept. 1446	John More	Fine, bread to prisoners of Newgate and Ludgate	Jour.IV f.138
12 April 1453	John Hall	Mainpernored	Jour.V f.108-9.
28 May 1453	Wm. Ellesmere	Prison, fine	Jour.V f.111.
5 July 1453	Thomas Hert	Mainpernored	Jour.V f.114.
" "	John Barkeby	"	" "
17 May 1454	" "	Fine 100s.	Jour.V f.166.
23 Oct. 1453	John atte Water	Mainpernored	Jour.V f.126v.
13 Nov. 1453	John Bird		Jour.V f.130v.
21 Nov. 1453	John Mabewe		Jour.V f.133, 136.
15 Dec. 1453	Henry Norburgh		Jour.V f.138.
9 Aug. 1454	William Potros	Fine 33s.4d.	Jour.V f.183v.
4 Dec. 1456	4 Stratford Bakers	Mainpernored, fines £5,£2,£2,£2.	Jour.VI f.89-89v.
March 1458	John Barkeby (3rd time)		Jour.VI f.201.
11,12 April 1458	John Tathewell	Condemned to hurdle	Jour.VI f.195v.
Nov. 1459	William Pynson	Condemned to hurdle	Jour.VI f.168v.-169.
22 Oct. 1460	Walter Symond	Mainpernored	Jour.VI f.273.

Appendix 18.

PRICES OF WINE IN THE CITY PER GALLON

	<u>Malvezie</u>	<u>Romeney</u>	<u>Bastard</u>	<u>Gascony</u>	<u>La Rochelle</u>	<u>Oseye</u>
27 Feb.1409, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.71	12d.	12d.	12d.	6d.	6d.	8d.
30 Aug.1410, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.87	12d.	12d.	12d.			
14 June 1414, <u>L.B.I.</u> f.133	12d.	12d.	12d.	6d.	6d.	10d.
21 May 1416, <u>L.B.I.</u> f.166		8d.		8d.	6d.	
1 July 1419, Jour.I f.56v.		6d.				
30 Dec.1419, Jour.I f.67				8d.		
1423/4, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.16				6d.	6d.	12d.
* 17 Jan.1439, Jour.III f.5	12d.	12d.	12d.	10d.		10d.
19 Feb.1440, Jour.III f.36v.						8d.
22 May 1441, Jour.III f.85v.				6d.		
2 Feb.1456, Jour.V f.5v.				8d.		
25 Feb.1458, Jour.VI f.193v.						12d.
1 Dec.1458, Jour.VI f.134				8d.		
March 1462*, Jour.VI f.16				10d.		

For descriptions of the different types of wine see A.L. Simon, History of the Wine Trade in England (1907), vol.1, ch.11, vol.11, ch.7. Other types which are mentioned in the City records at this time include 17 January 1439, Caperick at 8d. and Tyr at 12d., Jour.III f.5; 7 December 1452, Rhine wine at 8d., Jour.V f.96v.

* 19 June 1459, it was decided that wine (Gascon?) should be sold at 10d. a gallon because of the dearth, Jour.VI f.95v.

x The author of Continuation F of the Bmt records that in 1437/8 red wine sold for 10d a gallon & Malvezie, Romeney & other sweet wines at 16d a gallon, Dne p 472.

Appendix 19.

SEARCHERS OF WINE

	<u>In the East</u>	<u>In the West</u>	<u>Report</u>
			7 Dec.1416, Jour.I f.5.
12 Nov.1422 Jour.II f.1v.	Bernardus Roy John Westyerd John Towker John Maylet Laurence atte Gate John Waryn	Peter Ayrell John Halle Richard Banastre Nicholas Kent Gilbert Stonham John Savage	
28 Mar.1424 Jour.II f.28	No names	No names	Dec.1424, Jour.II f.29v.
15 Nov.1425 Jour.II f.57	No names	No names	
Nov.1436 Jour.III f.130	No names	No names	
19 Mar.1437 Jour.III f.187	No names	No names	
Oct./Nov.1439 Jour.III f.26v.	John Wokking Hewe a Dene Nicholas Kent John Pecok Robert Clebury	Thomas Style William Stafforthe John Aleyn Bartholomew Sainz Thomas Reynold	
16 Nov.1440 Jour.III f.67	Hugh Dene Nicholas Kent Richard Staphill Robert Kyngisson Robert Clebury Henry Budde	William Abraham Thomas Style Richard Appleton John Stapil Bertram Sanz Edmund Sheffield	
4 Nov.1441 Jour.III f.101	Nicholas Kent Henry Budde John Pecok Robert Clebury Richard Hervy Thomas Upton	Thomas Style William Hawkesworth John Penberton Bertram Sanz William Newton John Legge	9 Dec.1441 Jour.III f.107

SEARCHERS OF WINE (contd.)

	<u>In the East</u>	<u>In the West</u>	<u>Report</u>
10 Nov.1442 Jour.III f.156v.	Robert Kyngisson Nicholas Kent John Sirche Robert Clebury Thomas Upton Thomas Biggyn	Thomas Style William Stafford Bertram Sanz William Newton Thomas Thorneton John Legge	
12 Nov.1444 Jour.IV f.50v.	William Hawksworth John Sirche Richard Stapil John Waynflete Henry Budde Richard Lyon	John Pemberton William Newton Bertram Sanz John Gedge Robert Wolverton Andrew Body	
22 Nov.1445 Jour.IV f.108	Richard Stapil John Flexemer John Pemberton John Waynflete Richard Lyon		
15 Nov.1446 Jour.IV f.148v.	Robert Kyngisson John Flexemer Richard Stapil John Waynflete Thomas Gye Thomas Upton	William Newton Andrew Body John Gegge Robert Wolverton William Neell John Legge	
6 Nov.1447 Jour.IV f.200	Robert Kyngisson Robert Clebery John Flexemer Thomas Upton Thomas Gye Thomas Pope	John Gegge Thomas Biggyng Andrew Body Richard Chelmesford William Neell John Waynflete	Jour.IV f.200
11 Nov.1448 Jour.V f.1.	Robert Kyngisson John Flexemer William Haukesworth Richard Stapill Thomas Upton Thomas Gye	John Pemberton John Gegge Andrew Body William Neell Thomas Biggyng Richard Chelmesford	

SEARCHERS OF WINE (contd)

	<u>In the East</u>	<u>In the West</u>	<u>Report</u>
1 Dec.1451 Jour.V f.66v.	Robert Clebury Laurence Willynson John Hornesdale Thomas Gye Thomas Pope John Childe	John Pemberton William Neell John Rudby John Humberton Thomas Biggyng John Legge	
? 1452			9 Dec.1452, Jour.V f.97
19 Nov.1453 Jour.V f. 132v.	Robert Kyngisson John Gedge John Humberton John Horndale Robert Stowell John Sprot	Richard Rowe William Neell John Child William Butler John Copts John Cotton	
19 Nov.1454 Jour.V f.208v.	Robert Kyngisson John Gedge John Humberton John Hornysdale Robert Donyngton John Quenson	Andrew Body John Rudby Thomas Biggyng John Child John Cotton William Butler	Jour.V f.208v.
Nov.1456 Jour.VI f.86v.	Andrew Body John Gegge Laurence Wilkinson John Humberton John Quenson Stephen Lambert		Jour.VI f.86v.
21 Nov.1457 Jour. VI f.185	John Pemberton Robert Clebury John Gegge Laurence Wilkinson John Quenson Stephen Lambert	Richard Robbe John Blakbourn John White John Cotton William Butler John Maynewe	Dec.1457 Jour.VI f.186v.
20 Nov.1458	John Pemberton Robert Clebury John Gedge John Quenson Stephen Lamborn Thomas Hiltoft	Andrew Body John Bowey William Neell John White John Cotton William Butler	

SEARCHERS OF WINE (contd.)

	<u>In the East</u>	<u>In the West</u>	<u>Report</u>
Nov.1459 Jour.VI f.168	John Pemberton Robert Clebury Laurence Wilkinson John Quenson Stephen Lamborn Thomas Hiltoft	William Neell John White William Butler Peter Sylver Thomas Graunt John Manewe	
Nov.1461 Jour.VI f.80v.	John Pemberton Robert Clebury Laurence Wilkinson John Quenson Thomas Hiltoft John ----	John Body William Neell John Rudby Robert Baret William Butler Henry Castillak	3 Dec.1461 Jour.VI f.69

Appendix 20 .

REPORTS OF WINE SEARCHERS*

		<u>Total Amounts</u>		<u>Defective Wine</u>
7 Dec.1416, Jour.I f.5	Red and White (Gascon) Sweet wines	276 dol. 690 butts		
9 Dec.1441, Jour.III f.107	Red and White Sweet wines	488 dol. 697 dol 256 butts	Red and White Sweet wines	20 dol, 2 pipes 6 butts
1447, Jour.IV f.200	Red and White Sweet wines	116 tuns 1 pipe 236 tuns 7 pipes	Red and White	1 pipe
9 Dec.1452, Jour.V f.97	Red and White Sweet wines	319 dol 1 hogshead 1 pipe 297 dol 2 pipes		
1454, Jour.V f.208v.	Red and White Sweet wines Rhine wine	865 tuns 559 tuns 8 vats	Red and White	9 tuns
1456, Jour.VI f.86v.	Red and White Sweet wines ?	211 tuns 456 tuns 142 barrels	Red and White	2 tuns
Dec.1457 Jour.VI f.186v.	Red and White Sweet wines	158 tuns 193 tuns	Red and White Sweet wines	3 tuns, 1 hogshead 1 butt
3 Dec.1461 Jour.VI f.69	Red and White Sweet wines	27 tuns 1 quarter 388 tuns 1 hogshead	Red and White	2 butts, 2 hogsheads

* For helpful explanations of some of these fluctuating totals see E.M. Carus-Wilson, 'The Effects of the Acquisition and Loss of Gascony on the English Wine Trade' in Medieval Merchant Ventures (1954) pp.265-78.

Appendix 21

FISH PRICES IN THE CITY

	<u>Eels</u>	<u>Tench</u>	<u>Oysters and Mussels</u>	<u>Herrings</u>
18 Feb.1412, <u>L.B.I.</u> pp.101-2	Large:2d.lb. Middle:1½d.lb. Small:1d.lb.			
22 Nov.1416, Jour.I f.4v.		Large:10s.(per 100) Small:2s.6d.(per 100)		
3 Nov.1418, Jour.I f.51 <u>Memorials</u> , p.666.			Bushel:4d. ½ Bushel:2d. Peck:1d. ½ Peck:2½d.	
11 Dec.1425, Jour.II f.60				6 White:1d. 6 Red:1d.
7 Mar.1426, Jour.II f.64	Large:2d.lb. Middle:1½d.lb. Small:1d.lb.			
13 Feb.1428, <u>L.B.K.</u> pp.69-70	Large:2d.lb. Middle:1½d.lb. Small:1d.lb.			
28 Jan.1439, Jour.III f.5				6 Red:1d. 1 Cad:6s.8d. 1 Barrel best White:11s. 1 Barrel White: 10s.6d.
12,18 Jan.1446, Jour.IV f.111, 112v.				6 Red/White:1d. 13 Red/White:2d.
23 Feb.1447, Jour.IV f.168				6 Red/White:1d. 13 Red/White:2d.
22 Jan.1460, Jour.VI f.226				1 Barrel:10s.
20 Feb.1462, Jour.VI f.52v.				1 Cad:6s. 1 Cad 'shotyng' herrings:4s.6d.* (Spratts 17d.)

* Not more than 4 cads were to be sold at once.

Appendix 22.

KEEPERS OF THE COMMON SEAL/COMMON CHEST

	<u>Mayor</u>	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
12 Nov. 1425	John Coventry	Henry Barton	John Estfield (Richard) Barry John Higham	Jour.III f.56v. and 57.
Oct. 1427	John Reynwell	William Estfeld John Coventry	William Milreth John Higham Richard Barry	Jour.II f.102.
18 Mar. 1440	Robert Large	William Milreth John Wells	Walter Chertesey Richard Riche Thomas Knolles	Jour.III f.39v.
1 June 1442	Robert Clopton	William Milreth John Pattesley	Walter Chertesey Richard Riche Nicholas Wyfold	Jour.III f.137
10 Jan. 1444			Robert Bertyn (loco Chertesey)	Jour.IV f.13.
29 Jan. 1445		Thomas Catworth (2 keys) William Milreth Nicholas Wyfold John Pattesley	Richard Riche	Jour.IV f.61.
22 Nov. 1445		Thomas Catworth Nicholas Wyfold		Jour.IV f.108.
6 Sept. 1448		Simon Eyre		Jour.IV f.226v.
22 Nov. 1451	William Milreth	Simon Eyre Geoffrey Feldyng	John Felde Richard Lee Stephen Green	Jour.V f.65v.

KEEPERS OF THE COMMON SEAL/COMMON CHEST (contd.)

	<u>Mayor</u>	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
17 Oct. 1452	William Gregory	Simon Eyre	John Harowe John Felde John Maldon Stephen Green	Jour.V f.90v.
20 Feb. 1455	Stephen Foster	William Gregory	John Felde John Harowe John Maldon William Taylor	Jour.V f.223v.
Aug./Sept.1458	Geoffrey Boleyn	William Gregory	John Harowe Richard Nedeham John Maldon John Walshawe	Jour.VI f. 229v.
13 Jan. 1460	William Hulyn (from Boleyn)			Jour.VI f.229v.
20 Dec. 1460	Richard Lee (from Hulyn)			Jour.VI f.229v.
26 Jan. 1461	Richard Lee	John Norman	Richard Nedeham John Steward William Edward John Mardon	Jour.VI f.288v.
16 Jan. 1462	Hugh Wyche (from Lee)			Jour.VI f.72v.

Appendix 23

KEEPERS OF THE GREAT BEAM

18 Feb. 1376	JOHN LOKES, chosen by Pepperers	<u>L.B.H.</u> , p.22.
16 Oct. 1411	JOHN BROUN, acting	<u>Cal.P.and M. 1381-1412</u> , p.316.
12 Nov. 1420	RICHARD BURSTONE, Grocer, promised office	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.248 ¹
20 June 1426	Richard Burtone appointed	Jour.II f.77v.
28 June 1426	Richard Burtone sworn	Jour.II f.78.
19 Nov. 1438	SIMON STRETE, Grocer, appointed	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.221, Jour.III f.161.
31 Oct. 1441	Simon Strete and William Chedworth to hold office jointly	Jour.III f.101.
3 Nov. 1441	Simon Strete and William Chedworth sworn	Jour.III f.101v.
15 Jan. 1442	William Chedworth resigns	Jour.III f.108v.
4 July 1458	EDMUND KERVILE, Grocer, chosen	Jour.VI f.246v.
August 1458	Edmund Kervile admitted	Jour.VI f.249v.

Appendix 24

BAILIFFS OF QUEENHYTHE AND BILLINGSGATE

	<u>Queenhythe</u>	<u>Billingsgate</u>	
9 Nov. 1416	JOHN WILDE, sworn	RICHARD POUNTFREIT, sworn John Poynard, his servant	Jour.I f.lv. "
4 Nov. 1419	JOHN HYHELME, sworn	JOHN FISSHLAKE, sworn	Jour.I f.63
29 Nov. 1424		WILLIAM RIDER, sworn	Jour.II f.28v
10 Mar. 1427	WILLIAM COLYN, acting	William Rider, acting	Jour.II f.91.
28 Jan. 1439	JOHN LUK, acting	ROBERT PERRY, acting	Jour.III f.6.
6 Nov. 1439	SIMON WHITHED, sworn	Robert Perry, sworn	Jour.III f.28v

Appendix 25. SALTMETERS AT QUEENHYTHE AND BILLINGSGATE

8 Jan. 1427	WALTER GALIAN, probably at Queenhythe	Jour.II f.88
13 Aug. 1437	JOHN COK sworn JOHN HERVY sworn	Jour.III f.194
1 Sept. 1442	WILLIAM KEMP admitted	Jour.III f.150v.
3 Sept. 1442	William Kemp sworn Oath of Saltmeter	Jour.III f.150v. Jour.III f.128.
17 Nov. 1449	WILLIAM TAYNTON sworn	Jour.IV f.149
20 Sept. 1455	William Kemp sworn and admitted	Jour.V f.262v.
29 Aug. 1459	HENRY QUYK sworn	Jour.VI f.137v.

Appendix 26. CORNMETERS AT QUEENHYTHE AND BILLINGSGATE

23 Oct. 1428	NICHOLAS FLEMING elected and sworn	<u>L.B.K.</u> p.97; Jour.II f.139v.
28 Jan. 1439	MAURICE KENT sworn JOHN WELLYS sworn MAURICE WHAY sworn	Jour.III f.6.
2 June 1439	RICHARD SALE admitted and sworn	Jour.III f.17, <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.227.
7 Aug. 1439	WILLIAM BARET admitted and sworn for Billingsgate	Jour.III f.19v.
9 Nov. 1444	HENRY RUSSELL sworn for Billingsgate	Jour.IV f.49
7 Sept. 1445	JOHN COOK sworn for Queenhythe	Jour.IV f.160
9 Sept. 1449	JOHN TOBY sworn	Jour.V f.14v.
5 Feb. 1454	HENRY JANYVER, Ironmonger, admitted	Jour.V f.147.
1 Sept. 1456	THOMAS SMITH in office	Jour.VI f.104v.
26 July 1457	WILLIAM ATTE WOOD sworn, loco Smith	Jour.VI f.131
27 Jan. 1458	William atte Wood sworn, loco Smith	Jour.VI f.190v.

Appendix 27

COALMETERS AT QUEENHYTHE AND BILLINGSGATE

11 Sept. 1427	THOMAS ASSH sworn for Billingsgate	Jour.II f.99v.
30 July 1428	THOMAS WHITE sworn	<u>L.B.K.</u> p.78, Jour.II f.139
13 June 1444	PATRICK THOBYN admitted and sworn for Billingsgate	Jour.IV f.28v.
Nov.1448	JOHN STEDE in office at Queenhythe DIONISIUS POWER in office at Queenhythe PATRICK DEVYN in office at Queenhythe JOHN YONGE in office at Queenhythe	Jour.V f.1. " " "
6 Nov.1453	RICHARD SYLK, labourer, admitted and sworn	Jour.V f.129.
23 July 1454	Richard Sylk admitted loco THOMAS GRACE who is going overseas with Lord Treasurer	Jour.V f.180.
23 Feb.1460	PETER BREKENOKE admitted for Queenhythe loco John Yonge	Jour.VI f.200v.

Appendix 28 ASSAYERS OF OYSTERS AT QUEENHYTHE AND BILLINGSGATE

28 Oct. 1409	WILLIAM BENHAM admitted for Queenhythe	<u>L.B.I.</u> p.79
19 Sept. 1419	JOHN ELY to take the assize	Jour.I f.60v.
22 May 1439	SIMON FYNCH in office	Jour.III f.17
22 May 1439	JOHN LEDE admitted for Billingsgate and Queenhythe	<u>L.B.K.</u> p.227
4 Mar. 1445	WILLIAM WILCOK admitted loco John Lede, to value 13s.4d. p.a.; at Queenhythe	<u>L.B.I.</u> p.231.
4 Mar. 1445	3 Mayor's valets (Thomas Lapwing, John Smith, Thomas Worth) to have assay of oysters at Billingsgate to value 20s.p.a.	Jour.IV f.67v.
12 Mar. 1449	3 Valets (Thomas Lapwing, John Smith, Thomas Worth) to have assay of oysters at Queenhythe after death of William Wilcok	Jour.V f.25v.

Appendix 29

OYSTERMETERS AT QUEENHYTHE AND BILLINGSGATE

30 Oct. 1407	JOHN CLERK admitted for Queenhythe	<u>L.B.I.</u> p.68.
2 Sept. 1420	WILLIAM WILCOK admitted for Queenhythe	<u>L.B.I.</u> p.231.
6 Nov. 1439	William Wilcok sworn	Jour.III f.28v.
4 March 1445	William Wilcok at Queenhythe	Jour.IV f.67v.
4 March 1445	3 Mayor's Valets at Billingsgate (ass Assay)	Jour.IV f.67v.

Appendix 30

KEEPERS OF BLACKWELL HALL

27 March 1405	HENRY HERT, Draper, admitted and sworn by Mayor and Aldermen	<u>L.B.I.</u> pp.41, 42.
13 Oct.1424	WILLIAM BRIGGE 'custos' to have 10m. p.a.	Jour.II f.24v.
5 July 1425	JOHN BRIGES 'custos' in office	Jour.II f.30v.
5 Feb.1462	RICHARD NORMAN, Draper, to pay 40m. p.a. for the office	<u>L.B.L.</u> pp.15-16
1472	Richard Norman still in office	Johnson, <u>Drapers' Accounts</u> , p.103, n.3.

Appendix B1

COLLECTORS OF BRIDGE RENTS

by 1404/5	WILLIAM APPLEBY	B.H.R. I f.13v.
c.5 Jan. 1409	William Appleby arrested	B.H.R. I f.33v.
by 2 March 1409	RALPH STOKE	B.H.R. I f.34v.
by 9 Nov. 1415	WILLIAM AUNGER	B.H.R. I f.61v.
by 24 June 1424	JOHN BERSTON	B.H.R. II f.1.
by 2 Oct. 1434	ROBERT PENY	B.H.R. II f.42.
by 30 May 1439	ANDREW TYE	B.H.R. II f.69.
by 5 Nov. 1440	ROBERT BLOME	B.H.R. II f.75.
by 3 Nov. 1442	JOHN PARKER	B.H.R. II f.85v.
by 11 Sept. 1445	JOHN DEY	B.H.R. II f.94.
by 21 Sept. 1461	WILLIAM GREVY	B.H.R. III f.19.

Appendix B2

COLLECTORS OF BRIDGE QUIT-RENTS AND FEES AT STOCKS

by 30 Sept. 1424	JOHN OSGOOD	B.H.R. II f.2.
by 6 Oct. 1436	HUGH DUNNE	B.H.R. II f.54
by 3 Oct. 1439	ROBERT WATTESON	B.H.R. II f.71v.
13 May 1440	Royal Letters Patent on behalf of Robert Watson as Bridge Renter	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.238.
by 16 Oct. 1456	JOHN CROSSE	B.H.R. II f.126
21 Sept. 1461	John Crosse still in office	B.H.R. III f.19.

Appendix 33

BAILIFFS OF LONDON BRIDGE

by 1404/5	NICHOLAS HOLFORD	B.H.R. I f.13v.
c. 2 Oct. 1434	Nicholas Holford dies	B.H.R. II f.42
by 9 Oct. 1434	ALICE HOLFORD, widow of Nicholas Holford	B.H.R. II f.42
by 10 May 1455	THOMAS EBMEDE	B.H.R. II f.121v.
21 Sept. 1461	Thomas Ebmede still in office	B.H.R. III f.19

Appendix 34

JANITORS AND KEEPERS OF THE GATE OF BRIDGE HOUSE

29 May 1424	JOHN BOTTESHAM in office	Jour.II f.28v.
18 Nov. 1454	ROGER BALL in office	Jour.V f.208.
21 Sept. 1461	WILLIAM CRAMOND in office	B.H.R. III f.19.

Appendix 35

CLERKS OF THE WORKS AT LONDON BRIDGE

c. 21 Sept. 1440	? Robert Blome appointed	Jour.III f.59v.
4 Oct. 1441	ROBERT BLOME (?) in office	Jour.III f.96.
21 Sept. 1461	WILLIAM BOUCHIER in office	B.H.R. III f.19.

AUDITORS OF THE BRIDGEWARDENS' ACCOUNTS

	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
1409	Walter Cotton William Crowmer	Philip Bangor John Reynwell William Sevenoke John Creek	<u>L.B.I.</u> , pp.75-76.
1410	Walter Cotton William Crowmer	Walter Gawtron John Reynwell William Sevenoke John Creek	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.88.
1411	Stephen Speleman William Chichele	Alan Everard William Burton William FitzHugh William Weston	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.94.
1412	Stephen Speleman William Chichele	Alan Everard William Burton William FitzHugh William Westn	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.107.
1413	Thomas Pyke William Norton	John Michell Thomas Mayneld Walter Gawtron John Coventry	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.117.
1414	Stephen Speleman William Sevenoke	John Reynwell Robert FitzRobert Robert Tatersall William FitzHugh	<u>L.B.I.</u> , pp.127-8.
1415			
1416			
1417	John Reynwell John Perneys	William Burton Nicholas James Richard Style John Boteler	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.189.
1418	Robert Wydington Robert Whittingham	William Burton John Boteler John Chertesey Richard Meryvale	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.204.

AUDITORS OF THE BRIDGEWARDENS' ACCOUNTS (contd.)

	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
1419	John Reynwell John Gedney	John Beterenden Thomas Duffhous John Tredewy John Sadeller	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.226.
1420	John Coventry Robert Tatersall	John Abbot William Milreth John Higham William Mitchell	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.245.
1421	John Boteler John Wells	Thomas Duffhous Henry Frowyk John Brokle John Melbourne	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.261.
1422	John Boteler John Wells	Thomas Duffhous Henry Frowyk John Brokle John Melbourn	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.1.
1423	John Coventry John Wells	Henry Frowyk John Brokle John Bacon Thomas Boteler	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.13.
1424	John Coventry Robert Whittingham	John Bacon Thomas Boteler John Higham William Milreth	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.32.
1425	Robert Whittingham John Wells	John Bacon John Higham William Weston John Olney	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.44.
1426	John Wells Robert Tatersall	William Weston John Olney Everard Flete John Femell	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.54.
1427	Robert Tatersall William Estfeld	Everard Flete John Femell Walter Chertesey Ralph Srynnard	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.63.

AUDITORS OF THE BRIDGEWARDENS' ACCOUNTS (contd.)

	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
1428	William Estfeld John Brokle	Walter Chertesey Ralph Skynnard Robert Large John Pake	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.79.
1429	John Brokle Henry Frowyk	Walter Chertesey John Pake John Olney William Gregory	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.102.
1430	Henry Frowyk Robert Otley	John Olney William Gregory Robert Bambrough Richard Nordon	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.112.
1431	Robert Otley Robert Large	Robert Bambrough Richard Nordon Philip Malpas Thomas Bernewell	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.123.
1432			
1433			
1434	John Pattesley Thomas Chalton	Ralph Holland John Olney William Chapman John Sutton	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.183.
1435			
1436	Thomas Bernewell John Olney	Hugh Wyche John Heust John Wythiale Clement Lyffyn	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.207.
1437	John Olney Robert Clopton	John Wythiale Clement Lyffyn Simon Eyre Robert Horne	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.218.
1438	Robert Clopton William Combes	Simon Eyre Robert Horne John Norman John Sturgeon	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.219.

AUDITORS OF THE BRIDGEWARDENS' ACCOUNTS (contd.)

	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
1439	William Combes Nicholas Yeo	John Norman John Sturgeon Stephen Foster Geoffrey Feldyng	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.229.
1440	Nicholas Yeo William Combes	John Norman John Sturgeon Geoffrey Feldyng Stephen Foster	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.248.
1441	Thomas Chalton William Combes	John Norman John Sturgeon Geoffrey Feldyng Stephen Foster	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.261.
1442	John Norman Nicholas Wyfold	Geoffrey Feldyng Stephen Foster William Cottesbroke John Milborne	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.274.
1443	Nicholas Wyfold John Olney	William Cottesbroke John Milborne John Derby Thomas Davy	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.287.
1444	John Olney Robert Horne	Richard Alley William Marowe John Derby Thomas Davy	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.299.
1445	Robert Horne Geoffrey Feldyng	Richard Alley William Marowe Thomas Cook, junior Thomas Haukyns	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.309.
1446	Stephen Foster Thomas Canynges	Thomas Cook Thomas Haukyns Alan Johnson Richard Lee	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.315.
1447	John Norman Thomas Canynges	Alan Johnson Richard Lee John Stokker John Harowe	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.323.

AUDITORS OF THE BRIDGEWARDENS' ACCOUNTS (contd.)

	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
1448	John Norman Geoffrey Feldyng	John Stokker John Harowe John Walden Thomas Oulegrave	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.326.
1449	Geoffrey Feldyng John Derby	John Walden Thomas Wolgrave John Middleton John Yonge	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.329.
1450	John Derby William Cantelowe	John Yonge William Gregory, Junior Thomas Gay John Feld	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.332.
1451	William Cantelowe William Marowe	William Gregory, Junior William Taylor John Feld Thomas Gay	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.340.
1452	Thomas Scot William Marowe	William Taylor William Gregory, Junior John Maldon William Latoner	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.348.
1453	Richard Lee Thomas Scot	Ralph Verney William Chattok John Maldon William Latoner	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.361.
1454	William Hulyn Richard Lee	Ralph Verney William Chattok Thomas Synslowe John Plummer	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.366.
1455	Matthew Philip William Hulyn	John Dok Richard Nedeham Thomas Wynslowe John Plummer	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.370.
1456	Matthew Philip Richard Alley	John Lok Richard Nedeham Robert Drope William Norborough	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.381.

AUDITORS OF THE BRIDGEWARDENS' ACCOUNTS (contd.)

	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>Commoners</u>	
1457	Richard Alley John Walden	Robert Drope William Norborough William Porter John Bernewell	
1458	John Walden John Middleton	William Porter John Bernewell John Walshawe John Harowe	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.395.
1459	John Middleton Hugh Wyche	John Walshawe John Harowe - exonerated 15 March 1460 Robert Basset loco Harowe John Lambart Henry Waver	Jour.VI f.207v. " <u>L.B.K.</u> , p.399
1460			
1461	Thomas Oulegrave William Taylor	William Corbet Robert Scraynham William Hampton Nicholas Marchall	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.9.
1462	Thomas Oulegrave John Stokker	William Redknap Thomas Danyell William Corbet Robert Scraynham	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.20.

BRIDGEWARDENS

1404	JOHN WHATELE	WILLIAM SEVENOKE	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.34.
1405	"		
1406	"	HENRY JULYAN	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.35.
1407	"	"	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.59.
1408	"	"	B.H.R. I f.33v.
1409	"	"	B.H.R. I f.37v.
1410	"	"	B.H.R. I. f.41v.
1411	"	"	B.H.R. I f.45v.
1412	"	"	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.107.
1413	"	"	B.H.R. I f.53v.
1414	"	"	B.H.R. I f.57v.
1415	"	"	B.H.R. I f.61v.
1416	"	"	B.H.R. I f.65v.
1417	"	WILLIAM (JOHN) WESTON	B.H.R. I f.70v.
1418	NICHOLAS JAMES	"	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.204.
1419	"	"	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.226.
1420	RICHARD STYLE	"	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.245.
1421	ROBERT COLBROOK	JOHN TRYMEL	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.261.
1422	"	"	<u>L.B.I.</u> , p.273.
1423	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.13.
1424	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.32.
1425	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.44.
1426	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.54.
1427	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.63.
1428	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.79.
1429	"	WILLIAM TRYMPELL	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.102.
1430	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.112.
1431	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.123.
1432			(not in <u>L.B.K.</u> and gar
1433			in B.H.R. II)
1434	WILLIAM WETNALE	THOMAS BADBY	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.183.
1435	"	"	B.H.R. II f.49.
1436	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.207.
1437	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.218.
1438	RICHARD LOVELAS	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.219.
1439	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.229.
1440	THOMAS COOK	JOHN HERST	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.248.
1441	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.261.
1442	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.274.
1443	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.287.
1444	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.299.
1445	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.309.
1446	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.315.
1447	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.323.
1448	"	"	
24 January 1449		JOHN STURGEON	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.326. Jour.V f.4v.

BRIDGEWARDENS (contd.)

1449	THOMAS COOK	THOMAS DAVY	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.329.
1450	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.332.
1451	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.340.
1452	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.348.
1453	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.361.
1454	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.366.
1455	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.370.
1456	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.381.
1457	PETER ALFOLD	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.391.
1458	"	"	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.395.
1459	"	PETER CALCOT	<u>L.B.K.</u> , p.399.
1460	"	"	B.H.R. III f.6.
1461	"	"	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.9.
1462	"	"	<u>L.B.L.</u> , p.20.

COSTS OF BUILDING THE NEW CITY CONDUIT

(up to 28 October 1453 when the work was taken over by the executors of William Estfeld)

<u>Civic Funds</u>	£500 00. 00	20 January 1439, Jour.III f.6v.
	£666 13. 4	7 September 1440, Jour.III f.57
	£833 6. 8	20 August 1445, Jour.IV f.90v.
	£ 66 13. 4	12 September 1446, Jour.IV f.138.
	<u>£2066 13. 4</u> ¹	

1. For at least 2 years the quarter fifteenth was not collected (see note J , p.275) and so £333 6.8. should be subtracted from this total leaving civic expenditure at £1733 6.8.

<u>Private Funds</u>	£100 00. 00	Robert Chichele, 1439, Jour.IV f.153.
	£500 00. 00	Stephen Speleman, 1439, Jour.III f.8.
	£ 1 6. 8	John Pope, 1440, Jour.III f.69.
	£ 43 6. 8	65 people, 1442, Jour.III f.138-138v.
	£ 2 0. 0	John Paddesley, 1442, Jour.III f.138-138v.
	£ 1 0. 0	John Church, 1442, Jour.III f.138-138v.
	£266 13. 4	William Estfeld, 1445, Jour.IV f.91.
	£133 6. 8	John Gedney, 1445, Jour.IV f.91.
	£ 10 0. 0	William Combes, Stow, <u>Survey</u> , i, p.18.
	<u>£1057 13. 4</u> ⁴	

2. 24 of these contributors are recorded as not having paid, so £16 should be subtracted, see note I , p.271.
3. Gedney may have given double this sum, see note 2 , p.273.
4. To add to this total are the unspecified sums from Henry Brounfield and John Costyn, see note 3 , p.269.

Appendix 39

Table I: Numbers of Electors present at London elections 1407-1455.

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Aldermen</u>	<u>on-aldermen</u>	<u>Total</u>
	1407	-	40	40
*	1413	6	13	19
	1414	7	12	19
	1415	10	12	22
*	1416	8	8	16
	1417	13	12	25
	1419	10	29	39
	1420	12	13	25
	1421 Feb.	16	17	33
	1421 Oct.	14	12	26
	1422	14	13	27
	1423	15	14	29
*	1425	9	10	19
	1426	16	26	42
	1427	9	21	30
	1429	8	24	32
	1430	10	23	33
	1432	11	20	31
	1433	12	33	45
	1435	10	26	36
	1436	16	36	52
	1441/2	17	65	82
	1447	19	56	75
	1449 Feb.	18	55	73
	1449 Nov.	16	44	60
	1450	20	42	62
*	1453	8	29	37
	1455	20	30	50

* Damaged therefore numbers incomplete.

Appendix 40

Table II: Numbers of Common Councilmen present at Elections.

<u>Date of Indenture</u>	<u>Number of known Common Councilmen present</u>	<u>Number of others present</u>	<u>Total</u>
15 January 1442	45	20	65
c. February 1453	12	9	21 *
9 June 1455	19	11	30

* This total is different from that given in Table I because seven of the names of the electors are illegible.

Appendix 41

Table III: Voting Frequency of Non-Aldermen at Parliamentary
Elections, 1407-1455.

Those voting at elections who subsequently became Aldermen	71
Those who voted for the first time in 1455 and therefore omitted from calculation	17
Those who voted only once at elections	184
" " " " twice "	63
" " " " three times at elections	25
" " " " four "	9
" " " " five "	7
" " " " six "	3
" " " " seven "	5
" " " " eight "	5
" " " " nine "	1
	<hr/>
Total	390

Table IV: Non-alderman London L.Ps. 1400-1450

		M.P.	1414 Assessment (London only)	1436 Assessment (all lands)	Deeds in Hustings	First mention as Common Councilman	Sheriff	Candidate as Alderman	Master of Company	No. of times voted in Parliamentary elections
ABBOT John	Mercer	1431		£47		1420	1428-9	1442		8
BOTTLER Thomas	Fishmonger	1423				1423				
BRIAN John	Fishmonger	1407	£17				1418			
BURTON William	Grocer	1414 1421	18s.4d.	£12		1411			1404 1411 1420 1431	9
COTTISBROKE William	Grocer	1442				1441				
ELSTE Everard	Mercer	1425 1426		£30		1426				7
GAWRON walter	Draper	1410 1413 1427 1429	£14			1410				
FAROME John	Mercer	1449 1450 1455				1444				2
FAXTON Robert		1404	15s.4d.							1
FIGEAM John	Draper	1420 1426 1431		£6		1420	1426-7	1438		6
LEVING John	Ironmonger	1432		£55		1440				3
MARCHEFORD william	Mercer	1403 1407 1413				1395				
MAYNELD Thomas	Grocer	1422				1413			1401 1408 1421	
MERYVAL Richard	Vintner	1419				1418				
MITCHELL William	Grocer	1415	£15			1420			1412 1418	2

(Table 4 continued)

		L.P.	1414 Assessment (London only)	1436 Assessment (all lands)	Deeds in Hustings	First mention as Common Councilman	Sheriff	Candidate as Alderman	Master of Company	No. of times voted in Parliamentary elections
NEDEMAN Richard ¹	Mercer	1460				1452	1458-9	1461	1457-61	3
OLIVER William	Grocer	1414	£0.4s.						1407 1411	
OXEYE Salamon	Goldsmith	1420							1403 1409	6
RYEBREDE Hugh		1406	£6.8s.							1
SEWALE Simon	Saddler	1419	£24			1422				7
SUDBURY John	Grocer	1406	£4.13s.4d.							
WESTON William	Draper	1410	£5.3s.			1411	1421-2	1429		8
WEATLE John ²	Mercer	1421				1411				2

1. Started life as M.P. elsewhere, see Wedgwood, op.cit., vol.II, pp. 624-25.

2. He was a Bridgemaster 1404-1412/14.

Appendix 43

Table V: Incidence of Aldermen M.Ps. attending meetings of
the Court of Aldermen during sessions of Parliament.

<u>Parliamentary Session</u>	<u>Meeting-place</u>	<u>Alderman M.P.</u>	<u>Date of attendance at Court of Aldermen</u>
14 Jan. - c.14 Feb.1440	Reading	Robert Clopton	1 Feb.1440
25 Jan. - 27 Mar.1442	Westminster	William Estfeld	2 Mar.1442
29 Apr. - 4 June 1445	Westminster	John Reynwell Thos. Catworth	21 May 1445 11,21,22 May 1445
20 Oct. - 15 Dec.1445	Westminster	Thos. Catworth	11 Nov. & 2 Dec.1445
24 Jan. - 9 Apr. 1446	Westminster	Thos. Catworth	25 Feb.1446
14 Feb. - 17 Apr.1454	Westminster	Wm. Cantelowe	20 Feb., 8,12,19, 21,25 Mar.1454
9 July - 31 July 1455	Westminster	Wm. Cantelowe	10,21 July 1455
14 Jan. - 12 Mar.1456	Westminster	Wm. Cantelowe Geof.Feldyng	3,4 Feb.1456 3,4 Feb.1456
7 Oct. - 1 Dec.1460	Westminster	Wm. Marowe Thomas Cook	13,17,28 Oct.1460 13,17 Oct., 7 Nov. 1460

Appendix 44

List of Indentured Returns for the Elections of London M.Ps. between 1406 and 1460, surviving in the P.R.O.

<u>P.R.O. Reference</u>	<u>Date of Writ</u>	<u>Date of Election</u>	<u>Date of Summons</u>
C219/10/4	26 Aug. 1407	21 Sept. 1407	20 Oct. 1407
* C219/11/ 1 & 2	22 March 1413	27 March 1413	14 May 1413
C219/11/4 & 5	26 Sept. 1414	15 Oct. 1414	19 Nov. 1414
C219/11/7	29 Sept. 1415	14 Oct. 1415	4 Nov. 1415
* C219/11/8	21 Jan. 1416	16 Feb. 1416	16 March 1416
C219/12/2	5 Oct. 1417	28 Oct. 1417	16 Nov. 1417
C219/12/3	24 Aug. 1419	9 Oct. 1419	16 Oct. 1419
C219/12/4	21 Oct. 1420	11 Nov. 1420	12 Nov. 1420
C219/12/5	26 Feb. 1421	14 April 1421	2 May 1421
C219/12/6	20 Oct. 1421	3 Nov. 1421	1 Dec. 1421
C219/13/1	29 Sept. 1422	19 Oct. 1422	9 Nov. 1422
C219/13/2 pts.1 & 2	1 Sept. 1423	18 Oct. 1423	20 Oct. 1423
* C219/13/3 pts.1 & 2	24 Feb. 1425	19 March 1425	30 April 1425
C219/13/4	7 Jan. 1426	14 Jan. 1426	18 Feb. 1426
C219/13/5 pts.1 & 2	15 July 1427	6 Oct. 1427	13 Oct. 1427
C219/14/1 pts.1 & 2	3 Aug. 1429	5 Sept. 1429	13 Oct. 1429
C219/14/2 pts.1 & 2	27 Nov. 1430	18 Dec. 1430	12 Jan. 1431
C219/14/3 pts.1 & 2	25 Feb. 1432	10 March 1432	12 May 1432
C219/14/4 pts.1 & 2	24 May 1433	22 June 1433	8 July 1433
C219/14/5 pts.1 & 2	5 July 1435	29 Aug. 1435	10 Oct. 1435
C219/15/1 pts.1,2&3	29 Oct. 1436	19 Nov. 1436	1 Jan. 1437
C219/15/2 pts.1 & 2	3 Dec. 1441	15 Jan. 1442	25 Jan. 1442
C219/15/4 pts.1 & 2	14 Dec. 1446	16 Jan. 1447	10 Feb. 1447
C219/15/5	20 Jan. 1447		Writ proroguing Pm. to Bury St.Edmunds
C219/15/6	2 Jan. 1449	27 Jan. 1449	12 Feb. 1449
C 219/15/7 pts.1 & 2	23 Sept. 1449	6 Oct. 1449	6 Nov. 1449
C 219/16/1 pts. 1 & 2	5 Sept. 1450	19 Oct. 1450	6 Nov. 1450
* C219/16/2 pts.1 & 2	21 Jan. 1453	-	6 March 1453
C219/16/3 pts.1 & 2	26 May 1455	9 June 1455	9 July 1455
* <u>Unaged.</u>			

Appendix 45

Note to Appendix on All London Loans to the Crown 1400-1460.

The dates in the first column run from Michaelmas to Michaelmas thus following the Exchequer year. The numbers in brackets after the loans by individual Londoners represent the number of individual loans (not necessarily the same thing as the number of individual lenders). In the Summer of 1426 44 individual Londoners lent small sums ranging from £5 to £100 (lent by the Mayor, John Coventry) which were recorded as received in the Exchequer on 26 July and 8 August (E401/713). But this sort of lending of small sums by a great number of Londoners appears to have been unusual).

The figures in the column headed Corporate Loans are as complete as it has been possible to make them. They include all money lent regardless of whether this comprised repaid cash or unpaid tallies. Patent and Close Rolls, Exchequer Receipt and Issue rolls, warrants for issues, Exchequer deeds, the Letter Books and Journals of the City of London and the Council proceedings have all been used. The figures in the first two columns headed Loans by individual Londoners and Loans by Calais Merchants may not be so complete. For these totals only the Receipt and Issue rolls and the warrants for issues have been used. The sums may be larger but they will not have been smaller. For the first twenty years of this period the loans from the Calais merchants were not always distinguished as such in the Exchequer records and part of the totals recorded in the first column during this period, may more properly belong to the second.

Appendix 45 ALL LONDON LOANS TO THE CROWN 1400-1460

	<u>Loans by individual Londoners</u>	<u>Loans by Calais merchants</u>	<u>Corporate loans</u>	<u>Total</u>
1399-1400	1707 12.0. (6)		2000 00.0	3707 12.0.
1400-1401	3753 7.8. (16)			3753 7.8.
1401-1402	9905 19.0. (27)		1333 6.8	11239 5.8.
1402-1403	5503 6.8. (22)			5503 6.8.
1403-1404	1780 0.0. (10)		2000 0.0.	3780 0.0.
1404-1405	6760 11.0. (13)		2000 0.0.	8760 11.0.
1405-1406	5346 13.4. (5)	(1333 6.8.	6680 0.0.
1406-1407	5383 6.8. (9)	8000 0.0.		13383 6.8.
1407-1408	1626 13.4. (9)			1626 13.4.
1408-1409	6236 13.4. (6)			6236 13.4.
1409-1410	3169 17.8. (10)		4666 13.4.	7836 11.0.
1410-1411*	786 11.0. (3)			786 11.0.
1411-1412*			6666 13.4.	6666 13.4.
1412-1413	5000 0.0. (5)		2000 0.0.	7000 0.0.
1413-1414				
1414-1415	2666 13.4. (3)		666 13.4.	333 6.8.
1415-1416	66 13.4. (1)			66 13.4.
1416-1417	1666 13.4. (2)		11860 0.0.	13526 13.4.
1417-1418	666 13.4. (2)			666 13.4.
1418-1419			1500 0.0.	1500 0.0.
1419-1420	866 13.4. (3)		1333 6.8.	2200 0.0.
1420-1421	2000 0.0. (3)		2666 13.4.	4666 13.4.
1421-1422	1663 6.8. (5)			1663 6.8.
1422-1423		4000 0.0.		4000 0.0.
1423-1424			333 6.8.	333 6.8.
1424-1425			1000 0.0.	1000 0.0.
1425-1426	810 0.0. (44)		1333 13.4.	2143 13.4.
1426-1427				
1427-1428			4000 0.0.	4000 0.0.
1428-1429*	666 13.4. (1)		5333 6.8.	6000 0.0.
1429-1430	533 6.8. (7)		7400 0.0.	7933 6.8.
1430-1431	2972 6.8. (12)	2333 6.8.	3333 6.8.	8639 0.0.
1431-1432			1000 0.0.	1000 0.0.
1432-1433	200 0.0. (3)		1000 0.0.	1200 0.0.
1433-1444	800 0.0. (3)	1000 0.0.	1333 6.8.	3133 6.8.
1434-1435	100 0.0. (1)		2666 13.4.	2766 13.4.
1435-1436	5866 13.4. (10)	5393 6.8.	4333 6.8.	15593 6.8.
1436-1437	470 0.0. (6)	13733 6.8.		14203 6.8.
1437-1438	623 0.0. (3)	8150 13.4.	1000 0.0.	9773 13.4.
1438-1439	1366 13.4. (7)	2000 0.0.	1000 0.0.	4366 13.4.
1439-1440	3661 13.4. (3)		1333 6.8.	1700 0.0.

* for these Exchequer years, one of the two Receipt Rolls is missing.

	<u>Loans by individual Londoners</u>	<u>Loans by Calais merchants</u>	<u>Corporate loans</u>	<u>Total</u>
1440-1441	1333 6.8. (2)		1333 6.8.	2666 13.4.
1441-1442	1070 13.8. (11)	10000 0.0.	2000 0.0.	13070 13.8.
1442-1443	1100 0.0. (1)		2656 13.4.	3756 13.4.
1443-1444		666 13.4.	2266 6.2½.	2932 19.6½.
1444-1445	6493 6.8. (14)		1100 0.0.	7593 6.8.
1445-1446		2266 13.4.	1333 6.8.	3600 0.0.
1446-1447	300 0.0. (1)			
1447-1448	3333 6.8. (2)	6666 13.4.		10000 0.0.
1448-1449	1350 13.4. (5)		666 13.4.	2017 6.8.
1449-1450	3115 5.11. (26)	4666 13.4.*	1876 2.0.	9658 1.3.
1450-1451	3407 13.0. (7)	12000 0.0.	1000 0.0.+	16407 13.0.+
1451-1452	1586 13.4. (7)		+	1586 13.4.+
1452-1453	2171 9.4. (16)		1666 13.4.	3838 2.8.
1453-1454	4913 9.4. (6)	6666 13.4.	300 0.0.	11880 2.8.
1454-1456	563 6.8. (5)	1000 0.0.		1563 6.8.
1455-1456	280 0.0. (2)	1742 2.4.		2022 2.4.
1456-1457	80 0.0. (2)	1600 0.0.	c.2000 0.0.	c.3680 0.0.
1457-1458	500 0.0. (1)	843 6.8.		1343 6.8.
1458-1459		2000 0.0.		2000 0.0.
1459-1460	173 6.8. (4)		733 6.8.+	906 13.4.+

+ Plus an unspecified sum.

* For a discussion of the political manoeuvres which lay behind these loans see Winifred I. Howard 'The Financial Transactions between the Lancastrian government & the merchants of the Staple from 1449-1461' in Studies in English Trade in the Fifteenth Century ed. M. Postan & E. Power (London, 1933) pp. 293-320.

Note to Appendix on Corporate London Loans to the Crown 1400-1460

All references to unpublished sources in this table (apart from the Journals) are to Exchequer records to be found in the Public Record Office. E401 references are to the Receipt Rolls; E403 references are to the Issue Rolls; E40 references are to Exchequer Deeds; E404 references are to royal warrants to the Treasurer and Chamberlains to authorize payments out of the Exchequer. These warrants were usually issued under the Privy Seal.

The exchequer year was divided into two terms: Michaelmas (to March) and Easter (c. April to September). There were Receipt rolls for each term although they have not all survived.

The date on which a loan was recorded as received at the Exchequer may well be a book-keeping record entered some time after the loan was actually made. As the fifteenth century progressed it became increasingly common for the loan to be recorded as received in the Receipt Roll, the tallies to be recorded as issued in the Issue Roll and these tallies of assignment to be recorded as received back into the Exchequer, having been honoured by the collectors of royal revenue on whom they were drawn, very close together in date (e.g. loans nos. 7, 9, 11, 18). Although this last entry in the Receipt Roll is drafted in such a way as to suggest that the tallies of assignment have been cashed by the revenue collectors on whom they were drawn, this is not necessarily, or indeed usually, the case (see Chapter VII, pp. 44-45). But the phrase 'tallies cashed' has, for convenience, been retained for use in this table to describe these Receipt Roll entries. For an explanation of the term 'fictitious loan' see Chapter VII, pp.

All sums in marks have been converted into pounds.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
1.	£666 13s.4d. GIFT	6 July 1400 E401/619	
2.	£1333 6s.8d.	6 July 1400 E401/619	Tallies on the London wool subsidy cashed 13 May 1401, E401/622. Fictitious loan, new tallies on London wool subsidy 18 June 1401, E401/622. Loan still not repaid 11 April 1402, see no.3.
3.	£1333 6s.8d.	11 May 1402 E401/626	<p>(i) 11 April 1402 Letts.Pat. for re-payment of this loan and no.2, i.e. 4000m. from London wool subsidy, <u>C.P.R.1401-5</u>, p.89.</p> <p>(ii) 12 April 1402, Recog. of Bp. Exeter and others assuring repayment before Xmas 1402, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.18. Bond itself E43/W.S.660 ref. <u>Palgrave</u> ii p.66.</p> <p>(iii) Half cocket seal given to London as security, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.18.</p> <p>(iv) 1 Mar. 1403 Repaid by assignment, E403/574.</p> <p>(v) 1 Mar. 1403 Tallies on London customs cashed E401/627.</p> <p>(vi) 1 June 1403 Note in margin of Issue Roll suggesting a payment by assignment 'civibus Londoniensibus pro denario mutuato £2671 6s.8d.' E403/576.</p> <p>(vii) N.D. Acquittance by Mayor & Co. for 4000m. and surrender of Cocket Seal, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.18.</p>
4.	£2000 (for putting down rebellion in Wales)	15 Oct. 1403 E401/631	<p>(i) 25 Oct. 1403. Repaid by assignment E403/578.</p> <p>(ii) 25 Oct. 1403 Tallies on 10th for 2000 cashed E401/631.</p> <p>(iii) 26 Oct. 1403 Letts.Pat. for repayment from 10th <u>C.P.R.1401-5</u>, p.313, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.29.</p>

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
4.(contd.)			<p>(iv) 2 May 1404 Letts.Pat. for repayment from Pm. subsidy, <u>C.P.R.1401-5</u>, p.387, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.29.</p> <p>(v) 6 May 1404 Writ of p.s. to War Treasurers to repay loan in accor.with (iv) <u>L.B.I.</u> p.29.</p>
5.	£2000 (for raising siege of Castle of Coity)	Presumably paid direct to Prince Henry in Wales, see <u>P.E.C.</u> 1, pp.265-66.	18 Nov. 1404 Letts.Pat. for repayment of £733 6s.8d. from Pm. grant made at Coventry <u>C.P.R.1401-5</u> p.470. 8/15 June 1405 list of loans made to King since Coventry Pm. on security of Pm. grant, includes £2000 from London for which assignment had been made, <u>P.P.C.</u> 1, p.267. See also <u>ibid.</u> p.248.
6.	£1333 6s.8d.	28 July 1406 E401/638	
7.	£4666 13s.4d. (for Welsh campaign)	22 Nov. 1409 E401/650	<p>(i) 30 Nov. 1409 repaid £2666 13s.4d. by assignment, E403/602.</p> <p>(ii) 30 Nov. 1409 Tallies for £2666 13s.4d. on London wool subsidy, and S'hampton and Ipswich cashed, E401/650. Became fict.loan with note 'p.s.29 Nov. 1410'.</p> <p>(iii) 12 Dec. 1409, Mayor wrote to King assuring him that 7000m. had been paid over to King's officers, <u>L.B.I.</u> pp.82-3.</p> <p>(iv) July 1410 Council decided London to be repaid from 1½ 10th granted by clergy, <u>P.P.C.</u> 1, p.342 cf. <u>ibid.</u> ii, p.16.</p> <p>(v) 28 Nov. 1410 warrant to Treas. to make assignment 7000m. to London from 10th in diocese Canterbury, E404/26/208.</p> <p>(vi) 29 Nov. 1410 repaid by 2 assignments total £4666 13s.4d. E403/606.</p> <p>(vii) 29 Nov. 1410 tallies total £4666 13s. 4d. on cashed 10th, E401/655.</p> <p>(viii) 2 small tallies £33 6s.8d. & £2 12s. 10½d.) converted into fict.loans with note 'p.s. 6 June 1412'. No Rec.Roll for Easter</p>

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
8.	£6666 13s.4d. (for King's expenses in Aquitaine)	(no roll extant)	9 June 1412 Letts.Pat. for repayment from Pm. subsidy payable Mich.1412, <u>C.P.R.1408-13</u> , p.403. 9 July 1412 Council records receipt of loan, <u>P.P.C.</u> 11 p.32.
9.	£2000	17 July 1413 E401/658	24 July 1413 Repaid by assignment E403/612. 24 July 1413 Tallies on wine and wool subsidy cashed, E401/658.
10. 10 March 1415 Mayor & Aldermen summoned to Tower to hear of King's plans to reconquer his French possessions, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.135. 14 March 1415 Archbp. Canterbury, Bp. Winchester, Dukes of Bedford & Gloucester & others to Guildhall to consider the matter, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.135.	£666 13s.4d. (for French campaign)	8 July 1415 E401/667	(i) 16 June 1415 Security of a great collar of gold delivered by Treas. to Mayor & Co. Co. To be redeemed by 1 Jan. 1417, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.143. (ii) 1 Aug. 1415 Letts.Pat. for repayment from London wool subsidy by Xmas 1416, collar as security, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.142, <u>C.P.R. 1413-16</u> , p.367. (iii) Oct.1415-Oct.1416 Mayor appointed attorneys to receive wool subsidy in London, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.158. (iv) 23 Oct. 1416 warrant to Treas. to continue to pay London from London wool subsidy after Xmas 1416. Assignment on wool subsidy to be made, E404/32/182. (v) 29 Oct. 1416 repaid by assignment on London wool subsidy, E401/675. (vi) 6 Nov. 1416 collar returned although sum not yet fully repaid, <u>C.P.R.1416-22</u> , p.47, presumably because tallies had been assigned.
11. 26 Nov. 1416 Co.Co. agree to lend £5000, Jour.I f.4v. 3 Dec. 1416 Each Ald. to lent ½ what he lent for loan no.10, Jour.I f.5. 7 Jan. 141 precepts to Ald. to levy £6666 13s.4d., <u>L.B.I.</u> p.170.	£3333 6s.8d. £3333 6s.8d.	8 Jan. 1417 E401/675 8 March 1417 E401/675	9 Jan. 1417 repaid by assignment, E403/629. 9 Jan. 1417 tallies on Pm. 15th cashed, E410/675. 18 March 1417 repaid by assignment E403/629. 18 March 1417 tallies on Pm. 15th cashed, E401/675.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
12.	£3333 6s.8d. (for safe-keeping realm and war in France)	8 March 1417 E401/675	(i) 3 Mar. 1417 Letts.Pat. for repayment from London wool subsidy, London to have half the Cocket seal, <u>C.P.R. 1416-22</u> , p.67. (ii) 12 Mar. 1417 Roger Salvayn, Treas. of Calais to have half Cocket seal granted to City 'equaliter participandum' Jour.I f.15. (iii) 4 Oct. 1417 tallies on London wool subsidy cashed E401/680. ?(iv) 3 Dec. 1418 Colls. to bring in 5000m. in cash or securities by following Monday s.p. imprisonment.
13.	c.£1860*	12 June 1417 (£1860) E401/677	(i) 16/24 June 1417 indenture between King and 43 Londoners who had lent total of £2160, whereby Spanish sword [†] worth £2160 was pledged to them. It is not to be sold before Mich.1418, <u>L.B.I.</u> pp.202-3. (ii) 2 Oct. 1417 Mayor delivers to Chamberlain indenture between him & Thomas Chittern, clerk to Treasurer, concerning the Spanish sword pledged to the Commonalty of London for £1960. Jour.I f.35. (iii) 18 May 1419 repaid by assignment £1860, E403/640. (iv) 18 May 1419 tallies on London wool subsidy cashed, £1860, E401/687. (v) 19 May 1419, Letts.Pat. granting Londoners repayment from London wool subsidy in lieu of Spanish sword, <u>C.P.R. 1416-22</u> , pp.234-5, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.214.

* This is not really a corporate loan but a corporate effort on the part of certain Londoners. In the Receipt Roll the loan is recorded as made by the Mayor, Aldermen and citizens of London rather than the usual Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty. This may explain the varying totals. Although £2160 was promised, the Exchequer only acknowledged £1860.

† c.1400 the Spanish sword was listed among the Royal regalia, Palgrave, iii, pp.309, 313.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>14. 29 July 1419 Co.Co. decide to send King 500 archers for 6 weeks, Jour.I f.58v. 31 July 1419 precepts to Ald. to collect 2 15ths by 6 Aug. 1419, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.222, Jour.I f.58v.</p>	<p>c.£1500 GIFT (for the French war)</p>		<p>17 Aug., 19 Sept. 1419 2 letters of thanks from King in France, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.225.</p>
<p>15. 11 Jan. 1420 Co.Co. decide to lend £1000 on cond. that they are given a day for repayment before 24 Aug. (?1420), Jour.I f.68. 24 Jan. 1420, Co.Co. grant £1333 6s.8d., Jour.I f.69v. Sum to be raised by 2 15ths. 4 May 1420 men to be deprived of their freedom if they refuse to pay, Jour.I f.76, cf. <u>Cal.P. and M.</u> 1413-37, p.79, <u>L.B.I.</u> p.245.</p>	<p>£1333 6s.8d. (for Duke of Bedford)</p>		
<p>16. 7 Feb. 1421 Court of Ald. decide upon a gift, Jour.I f.88.</p>	<p>£666 13s.4d. & 2 gilt basins GIFT (for Queen Katherine)</p>		
<p>17. 20 May 1421, money to be raised by 3 15ths, objections, Jour.I f.91v.</p>	<p>£2000</p>	<p>13 May 1421 E401/696</p>	<p>(i) 14 May 1421 tally on London wool subsidy cashed, E401/696. (ii) 22 Dec. 1421, Co.Co. ask for repayment of £2000, Jour.II f.2. (iii) 21 Oct. 1423, Council decided that London should have new tallies for repayment of £2000 since the old ones had expired because of death of King, <u>P.P.C.</u> iii, p.117. (iv) 15 Feb. 1424 Council decided London should have assignment, <u>P.P.C.</u> iii, p.142. (v) 15 Feb. 1424 warrant to Treas. to make assignment to London, E404/40/176. (vi) 13 June 1425 warrant to Treas. to make new assignment to London in lieu of tally of 14 May 1421, or pay cash, E404/41/337. (vii) 13 June 1425, paid cash E403/671 and note to this effect E401/696 BUT no.20.</p>

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
18.	£333 6s.8d.	1 March 1424 E401/707	2 March 1424 repaid by assignment, E403/664. 2 March 1424 tally on London wool subsidy cashed, E401/707.
19. 14 April 1424 Co.Co. agree to lend King's Council 500m. on provision of suff. security, Jour.II f.17v. 16 Aug. 1424 Court of Ald. decide that their part of 500m. lately lent to Kind, to be given to Duke of Glou- cester, Jour.II f.21. 17 Aug. 1424 Co.Co. agree to let Duke of Glou- cester have the 500m. Jour.II f.21v.	£333 6s.8d. (for Duke of Gloucester)		
20. 5 June 1425 Duke of Gloucester to Guildhall to negotiate loan, Jour.II f.44.	£3000 (incorporating £2000 of no.17) (for defence of realm)	13 June 1425 E401/711	(i) 10 June 1425 Letts.Pat. for repayment of £3000 from London wool subsidy & Ipswich <u>C.P.R. 1422-29</u> , p.293. (ii) 10 June 1425 warrant to Treas. in acc. with (i) E404/41/333. (iii) 13 June 1425 Alex. Anne (Common Ser- jeant at Law) came to Excheq. & was paid £2000 cash & returned it immediately into Excheq. as part of the new loan, E403/671, see no.17. (iv) 5 Sept. 1425 Co.Co. acknowledge receipt of £700, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.47. (v) 15 Oct. 1425 repaid £1500 by assignment, E403/673. (vi) 15 Oct. 1425 tallies for £1500 on London wool subsidy cashed, E401/712. (vii) 12 Nov. 1425 Co.Co. acknowledge receipt of £900, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.47. (viii) 10 Dec. 1425 repaid £1400 by assignment, E403/673. (ix) 10 Dec. 1425 tallies on London wool subsidy & Ipswich for £1400 cashed, E401/712.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
20.(contd.)			<p>(x) 14 April 1426 warrant to Treas. to issue new tallies for that part of London loan of £3000 which remained unpaid, on wool subsidy London since colls. have changed and tallies were no longer valid, E404/42/190.</p> <p>(xi) 28 June 1428 1 tally from assignment (v) (vi) & 3 tallies from assignment (viii) (ix) for £1000 converted into fict. loans. Repaid by new assignment for £1200, E403/675.</p> <p>(xii) 28 June 1426 4 tallies for £1200 on London wool subsidy cashed, E401/713.</p> <p>(xiii) 29 Aug. 1426 repaid £100 by assignment E403/675.</p> <p>(xiv) 29 Aug. 1426 1 tally £100 on Ipswich wool subsidy cashed, E401/713.</p> <p>(xv) 7 Dec. 1426, Co.Co. acknowledges receipt £500, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.47.</p> <p>(xvi) 7 April 1427 Co.Co. acknowledges receipt £200, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.47.</p> <p>(xvii) 19 May 1427 Co.Co. acknowledges receipt £200, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.47.</p> <p>In total Co.Co. acknowledged receipt of £2500 out of the £3000.</p>
21.3 Dec. 1425 Co.Co.agree that money should be raised by a 15th, Jour.II f.59v. 10 Dec. 1425 Wm. Reygate objects, Jour.II f.59v.	£666 13s.0d. ? GIFT (for Duke of Bedford)		
22.6 April 1426 Co.Co.agree to loan on suff.security being provided by Gloucester himself. Money to be raised by voluntary subscription in wards, Jour.II f.65v. 13 April 1426 sum fell short of required amount so men of substance to be induced to lend more, Jour.II f.66v.	£666 13s.4d. (for Duke of Gloucester)		

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>23.* 27 March 1428 Co.Co. agree to lend £2000 on provision of suff.security, Jour.II f.109v. 13 April 1428 Court of Ald. decide to ask for repayment from taxation of City Churches, & those of Norfolk, Suffolk, Kent, Essex, Middx, Receivers apptd. to collect money, Jour.II f.110v. 5 May 1428 City Churches assessed, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.71.</p>	£2000	25 March 1428 E401/717	15 April 1428 repaid by assignment, E403/686. 15 April 1428 tallies on parish subsidy (London, Middx, Hertford, Essex, Kent, Norfolk, West Riding) cashed, E401/719.
24.	£2000	18 June 1428 E401/719	<p>(i) 22 June 1428 repaid by assignment E403/686. (ii) 22 June 1428 tallies on wool, wine & small customs London cashed, E401/719. (iii) 16 Jan. 1429 Court of Ald. appointed 2 Londoners to receive repayment, Cocket seal delivered to them, Jour.II f.136. (iv) 12 Feb. 1429 1 tally for £700 on London wool subsidy converted into fict.loan new tally on same source issued to Alex. Anne (Recorder), E401/721.</p>
<p>25. 12 April Co.Co. agreed to lend 5000m. to King, <u>L.B.K.</u> f.72. 14 April 1429 Ald. to raise 5000m. in their wards which Co.Co.had lately granted to King, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.107. 11 May Ralph Holland complains in Co.Co. that King's necessity not as great as Ald. made out, Jour.II f.133v. 1 June 1429 Wm. Prest objects, Jour.II f.134.</p>	£2000 or £333 6s.8d. (for King's journey to France)	<i>(12 May 1429 Receipt Roll missing so date from E403/689)</i>	<p>(i) To be repaid out of 15th, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.107. (ii) 8 May 1429 Letts.Pat. for repayment of £2000 from 10th, London to have Excheq. tallies accordingly, <u>C.P.R.1422-29</u>, pp.534-5 (iii) 28 May 1429 repaid by assignment, E403/689. (iv) Presume fict.loan, Receipt Roll missing (v) 18 Dec. 1429 repaid £2000 by assignment E403/691. (vi) 18 Dec. 1429 tallies on 10th & 15th cashed, E401/723, see no.27.</p>

* 16 July 1426 Co.Co. discussed making a 'chevaunce' to the King and decided that they were unable to do so, Jour.II f.80v.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
26. 30 June 1429 Co.Co. decide to lend 5000m. on suff. security Jour.II f.135v.	£3333 6s.8d. (to resist malice of French rebels)	(9 July 1429 Receipt Roll m missing so date from E403/689)	(i) 6 July 1429 Letts.Pat. for repayment from whole wool subsidy, Calais & household only excepted. London to have Cocket seal until satisfied, <u>C.P.R.1422-9</u> , p.518. (ii) 6 July writ to Coll. London wool subsidy to effect (i) <u>L.B.K.</u> p.99. (iii) 14 July 1429 repaid by assignment, E403/689. (iv) Receipt Roll missing so no record of tallies cashed. (v) By 24 April 1430, £1486 12s.6d. repaid. See no.28.
27.*No Journal	£733 6s.8d.	(12 December 1429 not entered in Receipt Roll which has gaps, date from E403/691)	18 Dec. 1429 repaid by assignment E403/691. 18 Dec. 1429 tallies on lay 10th in London cashed, E401/723.
28. No Journal	£6666 13s.4d. (incorporating 2 tallies for £1846 13s.2d. still unpaid from no.26)	24 April 1430 (£4820 0s.2d.) E401/724	(i) 26 April 1430 repaid £6666 13s.4d. by assignment, E403/694. (ii) 28 April 1430 tallies for £6666 13s.4d on 10th and 15th cashed, E401/724. (iii) 19 May 1430 Letts.Pat. for repayment of £6666 13s.4½d. from 10th and 15th, <u>C.P.R.1429-36</u> , p.66, <u>L.B.K.</u> pp.110-11.
29. No Journal 10 Nov. 1430 letter from King at Rouen to Mayor, Ald. & Commune asking for a loan of £6666 13s.4d., <u>L.B.K.</u> p.116.	£3333 6s.8d.	6 March 1431 E401/725	(i) 16 March 1431 rppaid by assignment E403/696. (ii) 16 March 1431 tallies on 15th and 10th cashed, E401/725. (iii) 24 April 1431 Letts.Pat. for repayment of £3323 6s.8d. from 10th & 15th. <u>C.P.R.1429-36</u> , p.115. (iv) 24 March 1442 new loan (no.41) incorporating £666 13s.4d. worth of old tallies from this loan.

* This loan was perhaps made in order to achieve an assignment for repayment of loan no.25.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
30. No Journal 21 Jan. 1432 John Bederenden (Chamberlain) advanced money, to be re- paid out of profits of Common Beam, <u>L.B.K.</u> pp.129-30.	£1000 GIFT (for the King on his return from France)		23 February 1432, King given money, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.138.
31. No Journal	£1666 13s.4d.	15 July 1432 E401/731	19 July 1432 repaid by assignment E403/703 19 July 1432 tallies on 10th & 15th & Colls small customs in various counties cashed, E401/731. 16 July 1435 new tally for £286 13s.4d. on London wool subsidy issued in lieu of one on Colls. of 10th & 15th in Essex, E403/719. 16 July 1435 new tally cashed, E401/743.
32. No Journal	£1000	26 Feb. 1433	27 Feb. 1433 repaid by assignment E403/706. 27 Feb. 1433 tallies on Colls. 10th & 15th cashed E401/732.
33. No Journal	£1333 6s.8d.	22 Feb. 1434 E401/736	25 Feb. 1434 repaid by assignment E403/712 25 Feb. 1434 tallies on Colls. 10th & 15th cashed E401/736. 21 July 1435 1 tally converted into fict.loan for £119 3s.10½d. This tally returned into Excheq. & paid in cash, E403/720 and note in E401/736.
34. No Journal 27 June 1435, letter from Calais asking for help, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.190.	£2666 13s.4d. (for defence of realm)	3 June 1435 (£1666 13s.4d. 7 July 1435 (£1000) E401/742*	(i) 9 July 1435 Letts.Pat. for repayment from all sources Royal rev. <u>C.P.R.1429-36</u> , p.467. (ii) 11 July 1436 repaid by assignment with note that London has received Letts.Pat. under Great Seal for better security, E403/723. (iii) 11 July 1436 tallies on temps.Bp. London & on Receiver-General of Duchy Lancaster cashed E401/742+ (iv) by Feb. 1439 some of this money still not repaid, Jour.III f.9v. (v) by 23 Jan.1440 £1333 6s.8d. still not repaid, Jour.III f.35. See no.39.
* In Receipt Roll where the loans are recorded there are notes that the Letters Patent were not restored.			
+ A note in the margin of this Receipt Roll states that the loans were £1000 and £1547 9s.6d.			

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
34.(contd.)			(vi) 28 Feb. 1440 tallies for £1333 6s.8d. converted into fict.loan & new assignment made, E403/736 & E401/765, see loan no.39 (vii) 11 June 1442 1 other tally of original assignment for £20 10s.8d. converted into fict.loan & new assignment made on Colls. small customs London, E401/778.
35. No Journal †	£3333 6s.8d. (for defence of realm)	15 Feb. 1436 E401/744	(i) 1 March 1436 repaid by assignment E403/721. (ii) 1 March 1436 tallies on Colls.10th & 15th cashed, E401/744. (iii) Letts.Pat. for repayment from 10th and 15th, <u>C.P.R.1429-36</u> , p.588.
36. No Journal †	£1000 GIFT	26 Aug. 1436 E401/747	
37. Nov.1437 discussion in Council about raising loan from London, <u>P.P.C.</u> v, p.72. 26 March 1438 Co.Co. decided to lend £1000 then in the Chamber on prov. suff.security, Jour.III f.160v. 28 March 1438 £1000 to be delivered to 5 Ald. & sent to Excheq. by hand of John Wilton, Jour.III f.160v.	£1000 (for relief Calais & Guienne & for armies of Earl of Dorset & Earl of Mortain)	26 March 1438 E401/754	(i) 28 March 1438 warrant to Treas. to make assignment on London & Ipswich wool subsidy, E404/59/182. (ii) 28 May 1438 repaid by assignment E403/731. (iii) 28 May 1438 tallies on Colls. of wool subsidy in London & Suffolk cashed, E401/756. (iv) see loan no.38.

†. See Hanley 565 p.121; Lambeth 306 p.61; Cont.F. Brut, Bre p.468.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>38. 27 Feb. 1439 Co.Co. claim King owes City £2666 13s.4d. (this must include £1000 from no.37, £1333 6s.8d. from no.34, at least £333 6s.8d. from no.29). Co.Co. demand new assignments, Jour.III f.9v. 26 March 1439 Co.Co. agree to lend £1000 in order to get sufficient security for old loans, Jour.III f.12v. 30 March 1439 Co.Co. appoint committee to examine security King has offered. Committee appointed to receive money to be levied in wards, Jour.III f.12v-13. Assessment Jour.III f.13v. 31 March 1439, money to be collected by 4 April 1439, Jour.III f.13v.</p>	£1000	<p>(27 March 1439 not entered on Receipt Roll but date from later entry E401/760)</p>	<p>(i) 28 March 1439 repaid by assignment, E403/733. (ii) 28 March 1439 tallies on London & Suffolk wool subsidy cashed, E401/760. (iii) 12 June 1439 Letts.Pat. for repayment of £2000 (i.e. nos.37 & 38) from wool subsidy London & Ipswich, <u>C.P.R.1436-41</u>, p.257. (iv) 18 April 1440 5 tallies of 28 March 1438 on Ipswich wool subsidy (£333 6s.8d) converted into fict.loan. New assignment of 10 tallies on same source and cashed. E401/768. (v) 24 March 1442 5 tallies on Ipswich wool subsidy (£333 6s.8d. still unpaid, see no.41, Jour.III f.114v. (vi) 11 June 1442 5 tallies of 18 April 1440 converted into fict.loan. New assignment of 5 tallies on same source, and cashed, E401/778. (vii) 18 July 1447 1 tally for 28 of 11 June 1442 converted into fict.loan & new assignment made and cashed E401/799.</p>
<p>39. 9 Nov.1439 Co.Co. refuse to make loan to King, Jour.III f.29. 16 Nov. 1439 meeting of Mayor, Ald. & suff. men of wards to discuss loan for King, Jour.III f.29v. 28 Nov. 1439 Commission to Chancellor to raise loans in London, <u>C.P.R.1436-41</u>, p.504. 23 Jan. 1440 Co.Co. agree to lend £1333 6s.8d. but money to remain in wards until Mayor has obtained suff.security for this sum & for other £1333 6s.8d. (no.34) still unpaid, Jour.III f.35.</p>	£1333 6s.8d.	26 Feb. 1440	<p>28 Feb. 1440 repaid £2666 13s.4d. by assignment (i.e. for this loan and no. 34) E403/736. 28 Feb. 1440 tallies on 10th and 15th total £2666 13s.4d. cashed E401/765. 11 June 1442 1 tally for £26 8s.1½d. converted into fict. loan with note that it was paid on this date, E401/765.</p>

1 25 tallies of 28 March 1439 on Ipswich wool subsidy (£333:6:8)

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>39.(contd.) 1 Feb. 1440 money to be raised in wards, Jour.III f.35v. & assessment Jour.III f.131v. 8 Feb. 1440 8 Commoners appointed to pay money to King, receive royal security & work for repayment, Jour.III f.36. 28 Feb. 1440 Co.Co. agree to the security offered viz. £1333 6s.8d. to be repaid Martinmas 1440 & £1333 6s.8d. to be repaid by Martinmas 1441 from 10th Jour.III f.37v.</p>			
<p>40.*4 Feb. 1441, royal letter asking for loan read out in Co.Co. Mayor, Ald..advise Co. Co. to make loan, Jour.III f.74v. 7 Feb. 1441 King to have £1333 6s.8d. but part of this to be made up of obligations on customs now in poss. Chamberlain. Loan to be repaid Martinmas 1441 from 15th, Jour.III f.74v. 9 Feb. 1441 Co.Co. decided King to have £666 13s.4d. in tallies now in poss. Chamberlain (not clear to which earlier loan these belong) in return for suff. security, to be repaid as above. Jour.III f.75.</p>	<p>£2000 (incorporating £633 13s.4d. of old tallies)</p>	<p>20 Feb. 1441 E401/770</p>	<p>21 Feb. 1441 repaid by assignment E403/740. 21 Feb. 1441 tallies on Colls. 10th & 15th cashed, E401/770.</p>

* In return to this loan the City tried to achieve concessions from the King about the Royal Monopoly patents in the City, see Chapter VI, pp.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>41. 23 March 1442 Co.Co.told of King's request for loan of £666 13s.4d. Jour.III f.114v. 24 March 1442 Co.Co. agree to loan of £1333 6s.8d. cash & £666 13s.4d. in old tallies from Mayoralty of Wotton (i.e. no.29) on condition of security for repayment on authority of Pm. from next 15th & 10th. Co.Co. also require security for repayment of Ipswich wool subsidy tallies worth £333 6s.8d. (no.38), Jour.III f.114v. Money to be raised in wards & no-one to pay more than 6s.8d. Jour.III f.114v. 29 March 1442 precept for levying money, to be collected by 9 April 1442, Jour.III f.116. Assessment Jour.III f.115v. 12 April 1442 3 Ald. appointed to examine security offered by King, Jour.III f.90. 25 May 1442, Ald. to raise £353 which was lacking from loan to King in order to obtain security for the £1000 already lent & for the Ipswich tallies, Jour.III f.135v. 1 June 1442 Ald. seal obligations to lend £3000 to King, Jour.III f.136v. 5 June 1442 list of 24 £20 obligations from Ald. (total £480) Jour.III f.137. Ald. appear finally to have lent £353 14s. Jour.III f.116v.*</p>	<p>£2000 (incorporating £666 13s.4d. of old tallies) (for guarding the seas)</p>	<p>28 March 1442 (£1894 16s.1½d.) E401/775</p>	<p>(i) 14 April 1442 repaid by assignment E403/745. (ii) 14 April 1442 tallies on 10th & 15th totalling £1894 16s.1½d. cashed, E401/778. (List of 6 tallies offered to London which total £2000, to cover £1333 6s.8d. cash loan & £666 13s.4d. in old tallies from no.29 are listed in Jour.III f.116v. These are not exactly the same as the Excheq.list) (iii) Dec. 1443 list of London loans to King, against this cash loan of £1333 6s.8d. is note that it has been repaid, Jour.III f.114v. (iv) 2 March 1444 new loan to King comprising the remaining £666 13s.4d. in tallies, see no.45. (v) 28 Nov.1444 1 tally for £29 3s.3d. converted into fict.loan, repaid cash, E401/788 and E403/755.</p>

* In this loan the City lent the King £1333 6s.8d. and £666 13s.4d. in old tallies from loan no.29 on condition that the King provided good security as well as a new assignment for the Ipswich wool tallies (see loan no.38). The City had some difficulty in raising the full £1333 6s.8d. although the sum by which it fell short of this amount differs in the Exchequer and civic records. Only when the full sum was paid could the citizens obtain a new assignment for the Ipswich tallies. This they finally achieved 11 June 1442, see loan no.38.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>42. 26 July 1442 letter from King & town of Bayonne, also embassy from King, merchants summoned to lend to King, Jour.III f.142v. 27 July 1442 Co.Co. agrees to lend King £666 13s.4d. Jour.III f.143. Assessment Jour.III f.143v. Money to be raised in wards & assessed by 4 men in each ward. No-one to pay if assessed at less than 3s.4d. Others to pay for them. 2 Ald. & 4 Commoners appointed as receivers, Jour.III f.143.</p>	<p>£666 13s.4d. (for relief of Duchy of Guienne)</p>	<p>18 July 1442 E401/778</p>	<p>See loan no.43. 31 July 1442 King granted Mr. Richard Morgan £40 from the ready money lent by London for Guienne, E404/58/183.</p>
<p>43. 24 Aug. 1442 Council decided to send letter to London asking for loan, <u>P.P.C.</u> V, p.202. 27 Aug. 1442 King asked for £6666 13s.4d. for relief Bayonne. This refused, Jour.III f.150. 29 Aug. 1442 Co.Co. agreed to loan of £1333 6s.8d. for Aquitaine, Jour.III f.150. To be raised in wards, Jour.III f.150.</p>	<p>£1333 6s.8d. (for the relief of Bayonne & defence of Duchy of Aquitaine)</p>	<p>30 Nov. 1442 E401/780</p>	<p>(i) 2 Nov. 1442 warrant to Treas. to make assignment to London for loan £2000 (i.e. loans nos.42 & 43) which was made through royal commissioners, on 10th & 15th E 404/59/92. (ii) 1 Dec. 1442 repaid by assignment, E403/747. (iii) 1 Dec. 1442 tallies for £2000 on 10th & 15th cashed, E401/780. These tallies listed as in Excheq. Jour.III f.156. (iv) Dec.1443, £333 6s.8d. collected by London, Jour.V f.227-28v. (v) 23 March 1444 Chamberlain handed to Mayor & Ald. 6 tallies for £1000 on half (10th or 15th?), Jour.IV f.20v. (prob. this loan. (vi) April/May 1444 £766 6s.2½d. collected by London, Jour.V f.227-28v. (vii) between 20 July 1444 & March 1450 £102 14s.3½d. collected by Wm. Chedworth, Controller for London, Jour.V f.227-28v. (viii) March 1450 £130 19s.6d. still unpaid Jour.V f.227-28v. No further details about loan no.42. For later history of vi,vii,viii see loan no 46</p>

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
44. Assessment for this, Jour.III f.155v.	£1323 6s.8d. GIFT (? bribe for new London charter, see Chapter IV)	7 June 1443 E401/781	
45. 2 March 1444 Co.Co. decide to lend King £500 cash & £166 13s.4d. in tallies in possession Feldyng & Derby which were royal repayments of part of original loan of £666 13s.4d., (see loan no.29 incorporated into loan no.41), Jour.IV f.18v. 23 March 1442 receivers appointment for repayment, Jour.IV f.20v.	£666 13s.4d. (£500 cash & £166 13s.4d. in tallies) (for Earl of Suffolk's journey for King's marriage)	22 Feb. 1444 (£333 6s.8d.) E401/784 25 May 1444 (£333 6s.8d.) E401/786	(i) (11 March 1444 all Issue rolls deficient) (ii) 11 March 1444 1 tally for £333 6s.8d. on London wool subsidy cashed, E401/784. (iii) 23 March 1444 1 tally on London wool subsidy for £333 6s.8d. delivered to Chamberlain, Jour.IV f.20v. (iv) 26 May 1444 £333 6s.8d. repaid by assignment, E403/754. (v) 26 May 1444 tallies for £333 6s.8d. on wine subsidy of London & Sandwich cashed, E401/786. (vi) 27 Feb. 1448 money still unpaid from this loan, Jour.IV f.209. (vii) March 1450 3 tallies on wool & wine customs London & Sandwich still unpaid, totalling £666 13s.4d., in hands of Chamberlain, Jour.V f.227-28v.
46. 14 July 1444 Suffolk to City to ask for loan, Jour.IV f.33v. 15 July 1444 Co.Co. agreed to lend £666 13s.4d. on provision of suff.security. This sum was not accepted (note in margin) Jour.IV f.34). 17 July 1444 this decision to be conveyed to Chancellor at Chiswick, Jour. IV f.34v. 20 July 1444 Co. Co. agreed to lend £2000 to be made up of £1000 newly levied, £766:5:2½ recently repaid by king for loan no 43, £233:13:9½ in unpaid tallies from loan no 43. Council refused the tallies so loan amounted to £1766:6:2½. 19 Aug. 1444, £1000 to be levied in ward & committee appointed to receive money Jour. IV f.38v. Assessment Jour IV f.35v.	£1766 6s.2½d. (original offer of £2000 to include £233 13s.9½d. in old tallies) (for fetching home the Queen and making peace between England and France)	(It appears that since the Excheq. had no hope of making an assignment to repay this loan, it was not even acknowledged as received on the Receipt Roll)	(i) 21 Aug. 1444 Ald. ask for written promise from Treas. or Receivers or Keeper of Wardrobe for repayment of £2000 from next Pm. subsidy. Money was not to be handed over without this written promise, BUT see (iv), Jour.IV f.39. (ii) 8 Feb. 1447 to be enquiry into all loans made to King, Jour.IV f.162v. (iii) 17 June 1447, Mayor & Ald. decide to suspend efforts to get repayment of royal loans for certain reasons. Jour.IV f.181v. (iv) March 1450, there had been no assignment for repayment of this loan only a 'ball of the hands of Poutrell, made after the use of the King's receipt of the receiving to the behove of the King' for £1766 6s.2½d., Jour.V f.227.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>47. 26 Aug. 1444 Co.Co. request delay when asked for £1333 6s.8d. for gift to King & civic welcome, Jour.IV f.39v. 27 Aug.1444 Co.Co. decided King to have gift £1000; also vote £333 6s.8d. for decoration of City (see Chapter VIII), Jour.IV f.40. 11 Nov.1444 Co.Co. reaffirm decision of 27 Aug. Jour.IV f.49v. For details of raising this money see Chapter VIII.</p>	£1000 GIFT		<p>7 Feb.1447. Chamberlain to render separate account for expenses of Queen's arrival, Jour.IV f.162.</p>
<p>48. 28 Aug. 1445 Mayor & Ald. decided to lend on provision of suff. security for repayment by June/Aug.1446, Jour.IV f.91v. Mayor & Gedney each provide £10 & other Ald. £5 each, Jour.IV f.96v.</p>	£100		<p>23 Sept. 1445 18 Ald. who contributed to be repaid by June/August 1446 on security of Mr. Wm. Cliff, Jour.IV f.96v. 13 Oct. 1446 note in margin that Simon Eyre (Mayor 1445-6) had received £71 10s. from Colls. 10th in archdeaconries of Suffolk & Sudbury, Jour.IV f.96v.</p>
<p>49.*9 July 1446 Co.Co. asked for delay in replying to royal request for loan of £666 13s.4d. Jour.IV f.132. 12 July 1446 Co.Co. agree to loan of £1333 6s.8d. but no precept for raising this money to be sent out until suff.security offered for this & earlier loans, Jour.IV f.132v.</p>	£1333 6s.8d. (for making final peace with France)		

* It is possible that this loan was never made although its absence from the Receipt Roll indicates nothing, cf. loan no.48.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
50.*2 Sept.1449 Co.Co.agreed to lend £666 13s.4d. on provision of suff. security, Jour.V f.14. 6 Oct.1449 Common Clerk to write precept for levying sum, Jour.V f.16. Assessment, Jour.V f.17v. To be raised in wards & no-one to pay if assessed at less than 3s.4d. Jour.V f.14.	£666 13s.4d.	16 Oct. 1449 E401/813	(i) 28 Oct.1449 repaid by assignment E403/777. (ii) 28 Oct.1449 5 tallies on 15th cashed E401/813. (iii) Oct.1449 Co.Co. decide that 5 tallies payable 1451 to be handed to Young & Edward receivers appointed by Co.Co. for safe-keeping, Jour.V f.18. (iv) c.1450 Mayor orders 5 tallies to be delivered to Chamberlain, Jour.V f.18. (v) March 1450 5 tallies still in hands of Chamberlain, Jour.V f.227-28v. (vi) 20 Nov.1451 Chamberlain delivered tallies to Colls. of 15th. in London (only 1 for £140 drawn on them), Jour.V f.18.
51. Oct./Nov. 1449 list of contributions from individual Londoners, Jour.V f.20-24v.	£192 15s.4d. GIFT? (for relief of Rouen)		Money repaid to individuals because town fell before help could be sent, Jour.V f.24v.
52.+26 Nov.1449 Co.Co. agreed to gift for King of $\frac{1}{2}$ 15th, Jour.V f.26v. 22 Dec.1449 Co.Co. decided this sum to be levied, Jour.V f.27. 4 March 1450 each Ald. to bring in his ward's assessment by 14 March if he had not already done so, Jour.V f.31v.	c.£350 GIFT (for defence of Calais)		

* 27 Feb. 1448 Co.Co. considered lending money to King but did not do so since money was still owing from loan no.29 incorporated into loans nos.41 and 45), Jour.IV f.209. Between February and June 1447 there had been an enquiry into all loans made to the King, Jour.IV f.162v., 181v.

+ This gift may have been paid directly to Calais. In the Grocers' accounts for Nov.1448-Aug.1450 the Company collected £40 12s.10d. 'for soldiers going to Calais'. In the accounts for Aug.1450-Aug.1451 the Company paid 10s. for a subsidy to the King and 25s.8d. to an 'imposition'. These sums may apply to nos.52, 53, 54 or 55, Kingdon, Grocers' Accounts, pp. 301, 313, 314.

Negotiations and raising of loan

Amount

Recorded at the
Exchequer

Repayment

53. 31 July 1450 Co.Co. agreed to loan of £1333 6s.8d. on provision of suff. security. Co.Co. demand security from 4 Colls. (Walter Lucy, James Strangeways, Thomas Tyrell, Richard Waller) appointed to collect subsidy granted to King in last Pm. Co.Co. ask for written obligation to 3 Ald. Jour.V f.43. Money to be raised as no.50. Collectors appointed, Jour.V f.43. 1 Aug.1450 money to be collected by 10 Aug. Jour.V f.44. Assessment Jour.V f.44. 12 Aug.1450 Lucy & other Colls. gave written security for repayment from first money coming to them. This attested by Ald. Jour.V f.43v.

£1333 6s.8d. (for the defence of Calais, the sea & the kingdom)

2 Oct.1450 Co.Co. deputation sent to Council to obtain repayment of debts, Jour.V f.47v. Decided that all tallies, securities & bills which Wm. Chedworth, Controller, had received should be given to Chamberlain & all future tallies etc. to be in his possession. 23 Oct. 1450 deputation to Council to obtain repayment of £1333 6s.8d. lent to King for which Waller & Beaufitz (Coll.subsidy Middx) provided obligations in writing. Deputation to obtain better security, Jour.V f.49. 11 June 1451 2 obligations of Beaufitz & Waller to Thomas Catworth (acting Mayor July/Aug.1450) for £1333 6s.8d. to be returned to Waller, Jour.V f.57.

54. 10 Sept.1450, Co.Co. asked to lend a notable sum for the defence of Aquitaine. Refused on grounds of insufficiency, Jour.V f.45v. 20 March 1451 King asked for loan of £8000, Co.Co. 'respons est...' King offers security of massa plate & jewels. London to be given Pm. authority to sell these if not repaid on time. Plate engraved with royal arms, Jour.V f.55. 22 March 1451 matter again discussed, Jour.V f.55.

Unknown (for Lord Rivers' expedition to Aquitaine)

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>55. 15 July 1451 letter from Calais read & help granted, Jour.V f.58v. 15 July 1451 money to be collected as 1½ 15th. Foreigners to contribute. Money to be collected by 19 July & committee of receivers chosen. Captain appointed & mercenaries organised, Jour.V f.58v., 59. Assessment Jour.V f.59.*</p>	<p>c.£1000 GIFT (for the defence of Calais)</p>		
<p>56. 7 Jan.1452 Co.Co. granted help to King for royal expedition, Jour.V f.69. 12 Jan.1452 Ald. decided that richer wards should help the poorer, in spite of some opposition to this, Jour.V f.69.</p>	<p>Unknown (for royal expedition)</p>		
<p>57. 2 Dec.1452 Co.Co. decided to give £1333 6s.8d. on seeing copy of letter written to King from Earl of Shrewsbury, Jour.V f.94v. 11 Jan.1453 4 Colls, appointed, Jour.V f.95v-96. Assessment Jour.V f.95v.-96. 16 Jan. 1453 letter of Earl of Shrewsbury to Mayor, Ald. & citizens read out in Co.Co. Jour.V f.100v.†</p>	<p>£1333 6s.8d. GIFT (for Earl of Shrewsbury in Aquitaine)</p>	<p>31 Jan. 1453 E401/829</p>	
<p>* 4/5 Aug.1451 Letters Patent appointing commissioners to take muster of men provided by Mayor and Commonalty of London for the defence of Calais, <u>C.P.R.1446-52</u>, p.480.</p>			
<p>+ T.C.D. Ms.E.5.10 records that after Christmas 1452 the King collected much money from the cities and towns of the whole kingdom and even from Abbeys and London gave him 2000m. Jour. f.173v. 1452-3, the Cutlers paid 2s.8d. 'for the gift' of £2000 (?)' Cutlers' Accounts, Roll no.6.</p>			

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
58. 1 March 1453 Mayor & Ald. agreed to lend to King. 2Ald. appointed to assess each Ald.'s contribution, Jour.V f.105. 5 March 1453 letter from King read in Co.Co. asking for loan for expedition to be sent to Aquitaine. Reply? Jour.V f.105v.	£333 6s.8d. (for defence of Aquitaine)		(i) 8 March 1453 Mayor & Ald. demand that John Wode, Under-Treasurer* & others (listed) should give written obligation for repayment by 8 Aug. 1453, to Feldyng (Mayor) and Thomas Bylling (Recorder) Jour.V f.105. (ii) 20 March 1454 £15 14s.4d. collected from foreigners for King, which was assigned by King to Mayor & Ald. in repayment of their loan to be brought into Court by Colls. Jour.V f.154.
59.†5 June 1454 Ald.decided to hold Co.Co. on 7 June to discuss £300 loan to be made to King on authority of Pm. (<u>R.P.</u> V pp.245-46) Jour.V. f.170. 7 June 1454 Co.Co. agreed to loan. No-one assessed at less than 6d. to contribute. 4 Colls. appointed, Jour.V f.171. Assessment Jour.V f.174.	£300 (for guarding seas)		16 Dec.1454 Richard Spicer, Common Clerk, delivered to Common Serjeant a tally for £300 on Joynour & Beaufitz, Colls of London customs, together with a commission for this sum, Jour.V f.212v.

* Treasurer's Clerk in Receipt of Exchequer, A. Steel, The Receipt of the Exchequer 1377-1485 (Cambridge 1954) p.335n.

+ The King had made several requests for loans before this date. 2 May 1453, King requested loan for Calais which was refused, Jour.V f.110; 16 July 1453 King requested loan of £10,000 for Duchy of Aquitaine and Earl of Shrewsbury. Co.Co. delayed giving reply on grounds that there were too few of them present, no reply recorded, Jour.V f.115; 1 August 1453 Co.Co. refused to make loan to King on grounds of insufficiency, Jour.V f.116v.; 8 August 1453 Co.Co. refused to make loan of 4000 m. to King on same grounds, Jour.V f.117, see P.P.C. VI pp.152-58; 7 December 1453 Co.Co. decided not to send help to Calais on grounds of insufficiency, Jour.V f.136; 18 April 1454, no outcome recorded of Co.Co. discussion of Lords request for loan of £2000 to King for the defence of Calais, Jour.V f.161.

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>60.*31 Aug.1457 news of French invasion, Jour.VI f.173v. 1 Sept.1457 money to be quickly raised, Jour.VI f.174v. 2 Sept.1457 money to be collected in wards by 3 15ths. Jour.VI f.175v. Assessment Jour.VI f.175. 3 Sept. 1457 letter to King about equipping ships & 2000 men, <u>L.B.K.</u> p.382. 5 Sept.1457 royal commission to Mayor Ald. Sheriffs & Co.Co. to muster men at their own expense, <u>C.P.R.1452-61</u>, p.405. 7 Sept.1457 list of ships pressed into service, Jour.VI f.176v. 24 Sept. 1457 money to be paid to men as soon as possible. Lord Fauconbridge appointed Captain, Jour.VI f.178⁺. 27 Sept.1457 London to take securities from mercenaries, Jour.VI f.179.</p>	<p>c.£2000 GIFT (to provide against invasion since French had taken Sandwich)</p>		<p>By 7 Oct.1457 expedition returned & masters of ships rewarded, Jour.VI f.180.</p>
<p>61. 13 Oct.1459 Co.Co. agreed to gift for King. To be levied by 15th and help from Chamber, Jour.VI f.163.⁺</p>	<p>£666 13s.4d. GIFT (to relieve King's need after recent disturbances)</p>		
<p>* 17 July 1454 King asked Co.Co. for loan of £3000 on security of 10th. Since Duke of York had refused to be Captain of Calais unless he had sufficient money, Jour.V f.178; 7, 8 August 1454 matter discussed by Co.Co. Jour.V f.183; 9 August 1454 loan finally refused, Jour.V f.184. 13 May 1455 London refused royal request for loan for Calais, Jour.V f.242.</p>			
<p>+ 1 August 1458 warrant to Treasurer to repay John, Earl of Shrewsbury, £66 13s.4d. which he advanced to Lord Fauconbridge with which to buy artillery etc. when he commanded the soldiers provided by London, E404/71(2)/79.</p>			
<p>∧ The Cutlers' Company paid 5d. for their hall towards the 15th of 1000m. in 1459-60, Cutlers' Accounts, Roll no.10.</p>			

<u>Negotiations and raising of loan</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Recorded at the</u> <u>Exchequer</u>	<u>Repayment</u>
<p>62. 8 Nov.1459 Co.Co. grant loan on provision of suff.security, Jour.VI f.166v. 19 Nov.1459 individual Londoners advance sums of money Jour.VI f.168v. 20 Nov.1459 Roger Emery objects, Jour.VI f.169v. 5 Dec.1459 Colls.appointed to victual ships, Jour.VI f.223.</p>	<p>Unknown (for relief of Calais & defence of realm)</p>		
<p>63. 14 Jan.1460 royal commission to Mayor, Ald. & Sheriffs to raise force to oppose Duke of York and late Eads of Warwick & Rutland, Jour.VI f.224v. 18 Jan.1460 Mayor, Ald. & Sheriffs agreed to gift of £33 6s.8d., Jour.VI f.225v. 2 Feb.1460 King thanked London for help & promised no breach of privileges & help against the London curates, Jour.VI f.196v. <u>L.B.K.</u> p.402-3.</p>	<p>£33 6s.8d. GIFT (for wages of soldiers going with Earl of Wiltshire to Sandwich)</p>		

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

London, Public Record Office

- C 47 Chancery Miscellanea
C 49 Parliament and Council Proceedings
C 54 Close Rolls
C 66 Patent Rolls
C 67 Supplementary Patent Rolls (includes Pardon Rolls)
C 81 Chancery warrants
C 143 Inquisitions ad quod damnum
C 146 Ancient Deeds
C 219 Writs and returns of Members of Parliament
- E 28 Council and Privy Seal writs for payments
E 40 Ancient Deeds in the Exchequer
E 42 " " " "
E 43 " " " "
E 101 Various Accounts in the Exchequer
E 122 Customs Accounts
E 135 Ecclesiastical Documents in the Exchequer
E 159 King's Remembrancer Rolls
E 179 King's Remembrancer Subsidy Rolls
E 199 Sheriffs' Accounts
E 210 Exchequer K.R. Deeds
E 212 " " "
E 326 Ancient Deeds in Exchequer Augmentations Office
E 364 Enrolled Foreign Accounts
E 368 Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer Rolls
E 401 Receipt Rolls
E 403 Issue Rolls
E 404 Warrants for Issues
- E.C.P. Early Chancery Proceedings
- K.B.9 King's Bench Indictments
K.B. 27 King's Bench Plea Rolls
- P.S.O.1 Warrants addressed to the Keeper of the Privy Seal
- S.C.1 Ancient Correspondence
S.C.8 Ancient Petitions

London, Guildhall Record Office

Liber de Assisa Paris
 Liber Albus
 Liber Dunthorne
 Liber Fleetwood

Charters

Journals of Common Council and Court of Aldermen I - VI
 Letter Books I, K.

Sheriffs' Court Rolls 1406-08.
 Sheriffs' Register 1458-59, Ms.205 C

Mayor's Court Plea and Memoranda Rolls
 Mayor's Court Files of Original Bills

Hustings Rolls of Deeds and Wills
 Hustings Pleas of Land
 Hustings Common Pleas
 Hustings Roll of Outlawries 1415-16, Misc.Roll KK
 Hustings Book vol.I 1448-1484

Chamberlain's Accounts 1536-37, Ms.35 B
 Recognizance Rolls 1437-97, nos.13-25

Portsoken Ward Presentments, reign of Edward IV, Ms.242 A

Bridgewardens' Account Rolls 1381-1406
 Bridge House Rentals vol.I 1404-21; vol.II 1423-60
 Bridge House Weekly Payment Books vols.I-IV 1404-45.
 Bridge House combined volume of rentals and weekly accounts 1460-84
 Bridge House Deeds, 10 portfolios A-K; 4 boxes miscellaneous deeds

London, Guildhall Library.

Register of Bishop Braybrook 1381-1404, Ms.9531/1

Brewers' Account Book 1418-1440, Ms.5440
 Cutlers' Account Rolls 1-12, 1442-63, Ms.7146
 Grocers' Account Books 2 vols., 1454-71, Ms.11571/1 and 2
 Pewterers' Account Book 1451-1530, Ms.7086/1

Parish Clerks' Company Record Book 1448-1523, Ms.4889

St. Botolph without Aldersgate, Churchwardens' Accounts ? 1466-82,
 rolls 1-3, Ms.1454 (Roll 2, 8-10 Edward IV transcribed by E.A. Ashby,
 'Some Aspects of Parish Life in the City of London 1429-1529',
 unpublished London M.A. thesis, Appendix no.V pp.488-89)

St. Dunstan in the East, Churchwardens' Accounts and Vestry Minutes
 1494-1651, Ms.4887

London, Guildhall Library (contd.)

St. Margaret Pattens, Inventory Book beginning 1470, Ms.4569

St. Peter upon Cornhill, Guild Book, Ms.4158 (described H.M.C.
Sixth Report Appendix (London, 1877) pp.407-18).

St. Peter Westcheap, Churchwardens' Accounts 1438-49, inter alia,
Ms.645/1

Miscellaneous Deeds

London, Goldsmiths' Hall

Memoranda Book 1372-1446, Ms.1519 B 39

Memoranda Book 1444-1516, Ms.1520 B 39

London, Ironmongers' Hall

Company Register 1454-1533

London, Mercers' Hall

Wardens' Accounts 1347-1464

Renter Wardens' Accounts 1442-1500

Laws and Ancient Ordinances of the Company (comp. 2nd half 15th century)

London, Merchant Taylors' Hall

Wardens' Accounts 1397-1445, Ms.A 4

Wardens' Accounts 1453-1470, Ms.A 4/2

Miscellaneous Documents

Calendar of Company Charters, Ms.A/2

Ancient Ms. Book no.2 (comp. late 16th century)

Notes on members of the company, Ms.B/2 (comp. 20th century)

London, Westminster Abbey Muniment Room

Deeds, Indentures and Miscellaneous documents

Register of the College of St. Martin's, Book no.5

Cambridge, Trinity College

Ms.0.3.11, a collection of London customs

Dublin, Trinity College

Ms.E.5.6

Ms.E.5.9

Ms.E.5.10

Oxford, Bodleian Library

Ms. Gough London 10

Ms. Digby Roll 2

Ms. Rawlinson Liturg. f.3

Oxford, Magdalen College

Miscellaneous Ms. 306

Oxford, St. John's College

Ms.57

II. PRINTED SOURCES

(i) Records of the City of London

Calendar of Early Mayors' Court Rolls 1298-1307, ed. A.H. Thomas
(London, 1924)

Calendar of London Possessory Assizes, ed. H.M. Chew (London Record
Society, 1965)

Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls 1324-1482, 6 vols., ed.
A.H. Thomas (i-iv) and P.E. Jones (v-vi), (Cambridge, 1926-61)

Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London A-L, 11 vols.,
ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1899-1912)

Calendar of Wills proved and enrolled in the Court of Husting,
London 1258-1688, 2 vols., ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1889-90)

The Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents of the City of
London, ed. W. de G. Birch (London, rev.edn. 1887)

Memorials of London and London Life in XIII, XIV and XV Centuries,
1276-1419, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1868)

Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber Albus, Liber Customarum et
Liber Horn, ed. H.T. Riley, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1859-1862)

(ii) Records of Royal Government

The Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of his Majesty's
Exchequer, ed. Sir Francis Palgrave, 3 vols. (London, 1836)

Calendar of Charter Rolls 1226 --> (1903 -->)

Calendar of Close Rolls 1227 --> (1902 -->)

Calendar of the Feet of Fines for London and Middlesex, ed. W.J. Hardy
and W. Page, 2 vols. (London, 1892-3)

Calendar of Fine Rolls 1272 --> (1911 -->)

Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous 1219 --> (1916-->)

Calendar of Patent Rolls 1216 --> (1901 -->)

Foedera, comp. Thomas Rymer, 6 vols. (3rd edn. 1739-45)

Issues of the Exchequer Henry III - Henry VI, ed. F. Devon (London, 1837)

(ii) Records of Royal Government (contd.)

Inquisitions and Assessments relating to Feudal Aids, 6 vols.
(London, 1899-1920)

'Lay Subsidy temp. Henry IV', ed. J.C.L. Stahl Schmidt, Archaeological Journal, vol.XLIV (1887), pp.56-82

Rolls of Parliament 1278-1503, 5 vols. and Index (London, 1832)

Select Cases in Chancery 1364-1471, ed. W.P. Baildon (Seldon Society London, 1896)

Select Cases before the King's Council 1243-1482 (Seldon Society Cambridge Mass., 1918)

Select Cases in the Exchequer Chamber before all the Justices of England 1377-1461, ed. M. Hemmant, 2 vols. (Seldon Society London, 1933, 1948)

Select Cases concerning the Law Merchant 1239-1633, ed. H. Hall, vol.II, Central Courts (Seldon Society London, 1930)

Select Cases concerning the Law Merchant 1251-1779, ed. H. Hall, vol.III, Central Courts (Supplementary) (Seldon Society London, 1932)

Statutes of the Realm, ed. T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby, J. Caley and W. Elliott, 9 vols. (London, 1810-1822)

Year Books of Edward II, vol.XXVI (part i), Eyre of London 14 Edward II A.D. 1321, ed. H.M. Cam (Seldon Society London, 1968)

(iii) Miscellaneous Records

'Some Ancient Indictments in the King's Bench referring to Kent 1450-52', ed. R. Virgoe in Documents Illustrative of Medieval Kentish Society, ed. F.R.H. du Boulay (Kent Archaeological Society vol.XVIII, 1964)

A Book of London English 1384-1425, ed. R.W. Chambers and M. Daunt (London, 1931)

A Book of Margery Kemp, ed. S.B. Meech and H.E. Allen (E.E.T.S. no.212, 1940)

Accounts of the Churchwardens of St. Michael Cornhill 1456-1608, ed. W.H. Overall (London, 1869)

'Accounts of St. Andrew Hubbard 1454-1578', ed. J.C. Crosthwaite British Magazine, vols.XXXI-XXXVI (London, 1847-49)

Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company 1453-1527, ed. L. Lyell and F.D. Watney (Cambridge, 1936)

'Acts and Papers of St. Margaret's Southwark 1445-1468', ed. J.P. Collier in British Magazine vols. XXXII and XXXIII (London, 1847)

Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions, ed. M.D. Legge (Anglo-Norman Text Society Oxford, 1941)

Calendar of Papal Registers: Petitions 1342-1419 (London, 1896)

Calendar of Papal Registers: Letters 1198 -> (London, 1893 ->)

Calendar of State Papers and Mss. existing in the Archives of Milan, vol. I 1385-1618, ed. A.B. Hinds (London, 1912)

Calendar of State Papers and Mss. relating to English affairs...in Venice, vol. I 1202-1509, ed. Rawdon Brown (London, 1864)

The Cely Papers, ed. H.E. Malden (Camden Society, 1900)

Charters of the Merchant Tailors' Company, ed. F.M. Fry and R.T.D. Sayle (London, 1937)

The Churchwardens' Accounts of the Parish of All Hallows London Wall 1455-1536, ed. C. Welch (London, 1912)

English Gilds: Ordinances of a hundred early English Gilds, ed. L. Toulmin Smith and L. Brentano (E.E.T.S. no. 40, 1870)

Epistolae Academicae Oxon., ed. H. Anstey (Oxford Historical Society, 1898)

Facsimile of the First Volume of the Ms. Archives of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London 1345-1463, ed. J.A. Kingdon, 2 vols. (London, 1886)

The Fifty Earliest English Wills in the Court of Probate 1387-1439, ed. F.J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S. no. 78, 1882)

The Governance of England, by Sir John Fortescue, ed. C. Plummer (London, 1885)

The Historical Collections of a London Citizen, ed. J. Gairdner (Camden Society N.S. vol. XVII, 1876)

Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, esp. vol. IV (1874), vol. V (1876), vol. VI (1877), vol. VIII (1881), vol. IX (1883).

'Inventory of the Vestments, Plate and Books belonging to the Church of St. Peter Cheap, London', ed. W.S. Simpson, Journal of the British Archaeological Association, vol. XXIV (1868) pp. 150-60.

- Itineraries of William of Worcestre, ed. John H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969)
- A Journal by one of the Suite of Thomas Beckington, ed. H.N. Nicolas (London, 1828)
- Letter Book of Christ Church Canterbury, ed. J.B. Sheppard, vol.III (Rolls Series, 1889)
- Letters of the Kings of England, ed. J.O. Halliwell, 2 vols. (London, 1848)
- Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France, ed. J. Stevenson, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1861-4)
- Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington and others, ed. C. Monro (Camden Soc., 1863)
- Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, ed. M.A.E. Wood, vol.I (London, 1846)
- The Medieval Records of a London City Church: St. Mary at Hill 1420-1559, ed. H. Littlehales (London, 1905)
- The Official Correspondence of Thomas Bekynton, ed. G. Williams, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1872)
- Original Letters, ed. Sir H. Ellis, 1st series, 3 vols. (London, 1824); 2nd series, 4 vols. (London, 1827); 3rd series, 4 vols. (London, 1846).
- The Paston Letters, ed. J. Gairdner, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1910)
- Plumpton Correspondence, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Society, 1839)
- 'Political Poems of the reigns of Henry VI and Edward IV', ed. F. Maddon, Archaeologia, vol.XXIX (1842), pp.318-47.
- Political Poems and Songs, ed. T.E. Wright, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1859, 1861)
- Political, Religious and Love Poems, ed. F.J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S. no.15, 1866; new edn. 1903)
- Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, ed. Sir H. Nicolas, vol.I-VI (London, 1834-37)
- The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincolns Inn, Admissions 1420-1893, 2 vols. (London, 1896); The Black Books 1422-1914, 5 vols. (London, 1897-1968)
- The Records of St. Bartholomew's Priory and of the Church and Parish of St. Bartholomew the Great, ed. E.A. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1921)

- Records of the Skinners' Company, ed. J.J. Lambert (London, 1933)
- Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters, ed. Bower Marsh, vol.II
wardens' Account Book 1438-1516 (Oxford, 1914)
- The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury 1414-43,
ed. E.F. Jacob, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1937-47)
- Royal and Historical Letters of the reign of Henry IV, ed. F.C.
Hingeston, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1860, 1965)
- Scriveners' Company Common Paper 1357-1628, ed. F.W. Steer (London
Record Society, 1968)
- A Series of Precedents and Proceedings in criminal cases extending from
the year 1475 to 1640 extracted from the Act Books of Ecclesiastical
Courts in the Diocese of London, ed. W.H. Hale (London, 1847)
- The Stonor Letters and Papers 1290-1483, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Camden
Society, 1919)
- 'Supplementary Stonor Letters and Papers', ed. C.L. Kingsford,
Camden Miscellany, vol.XIII (1924)
- Trevelyan Papers prior to A.D.1558, ed. J. Payne Collier (Camden
Society, 1857)
- 'A Yorkist Collection 1447-52', from Cotton Roll ii 23, ed. C.L.
Kingsford, E.H.L., pp.358-68.

(iv) Chronicles

a) London Group

- Annales or A General Chronicle of England, by John Stow (edn. London,
1631)
- The Brut, or the Chronicles of England, (Continuations in English),
ed. F.W. Brie, 2 vols. (E.E.T.S. 1906). For this study Continuations
C to K are relevant, pp.335-604.
- A Chronicle of London 1089-1483, ed. H. Nicolas (London, 1827)
Contains: Harley 565 complete
Julius B I extracts
- Chronicles of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1905)
Contains: Julius B II pp.1-116
Cleopatra C IV pp.117-52
Vitellius A XVI pp.153-263

- The Customs of London, otherwise called Arnold's Chronicle (London, 1811)
- An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, ed. J.S. Davies (Camden Society, 1855)
- C.L. Kingsford, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1913)
 Contains: Harley 3775 (extracts) pp.292-95
 Harley 540 (extracts) pp.295-96
 Arundel Ms. 19 at College of Arms (extracts) pp.296-98
 Galba E VIII (extracts) pp.299-309
- The Great Chronicle of London (Guildhall Library Ms.3313), ed. A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London, 1938)
- Grey Friars Chronicle, ed. (i) J.G. Nichols (Camden Society, 1852);
 (ii) R. Howlett, Monumenta Franciscana vol.II (Rolls Series, 1882)
- The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London, ed. J. Gairdner (Camden Society, 1875). Contains Gregory's Chronicle (Egerton 1995) pp.1-239.
- 'A London Chronicle of 1460' (Rawlinson D.913, originally part of Rawlinson B.355) ed. G. Baskerville, E.H.R., vol.XXVIII (1913) pp.124-27.
- Robert Fabyan, The New Chronicles of England and France, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1811)
- Six Town Chronicles of England, ed. R. Flenley (Oxford, 1911)
 Contains: Longleat Ms. pp.99-101
 Rawlinson B 355 pp.101-13
 T.C.D. Ms.E.5.9. (Robert Bale's Chronicle), pp.144-53
 Gough London 10, pp.153-66
- Songs, Carols and other Miscellaneous Poems, from Balliol Ms.354 (Richard Hill's Commonplace book), ed. R. Dyboski (E.E.T.S. 1907).
 Contains a London Chronicle 1413-1536, pp.142-67.
- Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles, ed. J. Gairdner (Camden Society, 1880). Contains: Lambeth 306 (A short English Chronicle) pp.1-80
 Lambeth 448 (Brief Notes 1422-62 from Ely) pp.148-63.

b) Other Chronicles

Annales Monasterii Sancti Albani a Johanne Amundesham Monacho (1421-1440), ed. H.T. Riley, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1870, 1871)

Annales Rerum Anglicanum, by William of Worcester, in Letters & Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France, ed. J. Stevenson, vol.II pt.2 (Rolls Series, 1864) pp.743-93

Chronica et Annales Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneforde, ed. H.T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1866)

Chronicle of Christ Church Canterbury (1415-71), by J. Stone, ed. W.G. Searle (Cambridge Antiquarian Society vol.XXXIV, 1902)

'Chronicle of Dieulacres Abbey 1381-1403' (Grays Inn Ms. no.9), ed. M.V. Clarke and V.H. Galbraith, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol.XIV (1930), pp.164-81.

'The Chronicle of John Strecche for the reign of Henry V (1414-1422)', ed. John Taylor, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol.XVI (1932), pp.3-53

Chronicon Adae de Usk 1377-1421, ed. E.M. Thompson (2nd edn. London, 1904)

Chronicon Angliae Temporibus Ricardi II, Henrici IV, Henrici V et Henrici VI, ed. J.A. Giles (London, 1848)

Chronique de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy D'Engleterre, ed. B. Williams (English Historical Society, 1846)

Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denys contenant le regne de Charles VI 1380-1422, ed. M.L. Bellaguet, vol.II (Paris, 1840)

Chroniques de Froissart, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, vol.XVI (Brussels, 1872)

C.L. Kingsford, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1913)

- Contains: A Southern Chronicle 1399-1422 B.M.Add.Ms.11714, pp.275-78.
 A Northern Chronicle 1399-1430 B.M.Harley 3600, pp.279-91.
 Two versions of the Latin Brut 1399-1437, pp.310-37.
 Royal Ms.13 C 1 (extracts) pp.338-41.
 Harley 3884 (extracts) pp.342-45.
 Sherborne Annals (Harley 3906) (extracts) pp.346-49.
 Waltham Annals 1422-47 (Cotton Titus D XV) (extracts) pp.350-54.
 Gloucester Annals 1449-69 (Cotton Domitian A IV) (extracts) pp.355-57.

- Eulogium Historiarum, ed. F.S. Haydon, vol.III (Rolls Series, 1863)
- 'A French Metrical History of the reign of Richard II' by Jean Creton,
ed. and transld. by J. Webb, Archaeologia, vol.XX (1824) pp.1-423.
- Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland (and continuations), ed.
and transld. by H.T. Riley (London, 1854).
- The Kirkstall Chronicle, ed. and transld. by J. Taylor (Thoresby
Society, vol.XLIII (1952)
- Historia Anglicana, by Thomas Walsingham, ed. H.T. Riley, 2 vols.
(Rolls Series, 1863, 1864)
- Historia Rerum Angliae, by John Rous of Warwick, ed. T. Hearne
(Oxford 1716 and 1744)
- The Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi (The Monk of Evesham),
ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1729)
- Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, vol.IX, ed. J.R. Lumby (Rolls Series,
1886)
- Registrum Abbatiae Johannis Whethamstede, ed. H.T. Riley, 2 vols.
(Rolls Series, 1872, 1873)
- Saint Alban's Chronicle 1406-1420 (Bodley Ms.462), ed. V.H. Galbraith
(Oxford, 1937)

III. SECONDARY WORKS

- Alford, B.W.E. and Barker, T.C., History of the Carpenters' Company (London, 1969).
- Ashby, E.C., Some Aspects of Parish Life in the City of London 1429-1529 (Unpublished London M.A. thesis, 1950).
- Baker, R.L., 'The English Customs Service 1307-1343', Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S. vol.LI pt.vi (Philadelphia, 1961).
- Baldwin, J.F., The King's Council during the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1913).
- Barron, C.M., 'The Tyranny of Richard II', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XLI (1968) pp.1-18.
- Basset, M., 'Newgate Prison in the Middle Ages', Speculum, vol.XVIII (1943) pp.233-46.
- Beard, C.A., The Office of Justice of the Peace in England (New York, 1904).
- Benton, J.F., Town Origins: The evidence from Medieval England (Boston, 1968).
- Bird, R., The Turbulent London of Richard II (London, 1949).
- Brewer, T., Memoir of the Life and Times of John Carpenter (London, 1856).
- Bridbury, A.R., England and the Salt Trade in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1955).
- Cambridge Economic History of Europe, vol.i 'The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages', ed. E. Power and J.H. Clapham; vol.ii 'Trade and Industry in the Middle Ages', ed. M.M. Postan and E.E. Rich (Cambridge, 1952); vol.iii 'Economic Organization and Policies in the Middle Ages', ed. M.M. Postan, E.E. Rich and E. Miller (Cambridge, 1963).
- Carus-Wilson, E.M., Medieval Merchant Venturers: Collected Studies (London, 1954).
 " ed. Essays in Economic History, vol.s i & ii (London, 1952, 1962).
 " and Coleman, O., England's Export Trade 1275-1547 (Oxford, 1963).
- Chew, H.M., 'The Office of Escheator in the City of London during the Middle Ages', E.H.R., vol.LVIII (1943), pp.319-30.
- " 'Mortmain in Medieval London', E.H.R., vol.LX (1945), pp.1-15.
- Clarke, M.V. and Galbraith, V.H., 'The Deposition of Richard II', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol.XIV (1930), pp.125-81.

- Clode, C.M., The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Tailors (London, 1888)
- Cohen, H., A History of the English Bar and Attornatus to 1450 (London, 1929).
- Collett, T.K., 'The Swordbearer', Transactions of the Guildhall Association, vol.III (1965), pp.39-45.
- Consitt, F., The London Weavers' Company (Oxford, 1933).
- Crump, C.G. and Johnson, C., 'The Powers of Justices of the Peace', E.H.R., vol.XXVII (1912), pp.226-38.
- Dale, M.K., 'The London Silkwomen of the Fifteenth Century', Econ.H.R., vol.IV (1932-34) pp.324-35.
- Douglas-Smith, A.E., The City of London School (2nd edn. Oxford, 1965).
- Dowell, S., A History of Taxation and Taxes in England, vol.i (2nd edn. 1888).
- Edwards, J.G., 'Majority rule in Parliament', T.R.H.S. 5th series, vol.XIV (1964), pp.175-96.
- Ekwall, E., Early London Personal Names (Lund, 1947).
 " Street Names of the City of London (Oxford, 1954).
 " Studies on the Population of Medieval London (Stockholm, 1956).
- Flenley, R., 'London and Foreign Merchants in the reign of Henry VI', E.H.R., vol.XXV (1910), pp.644-55.
- Fryde, E.B., 'Materials for the study of Edward III's credit operations 1327-48', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XXII (1949), pp.105-38, vol.XXIII (1950), pp.1-30.
- Galbraith, V.H., 'John Seward and his circle: some London Scholars of the early fifteenth century', Medieval and Renaissance Studies vol.I (1941-43) pp.85-104.
- Gairdner, J., 'Jack Cade', article in D.N.B. vol.III (1908).
- Galway, M., 'Froissart in England', Birmingham Historical Journal vol.VII (1959-60) pp.18-35.
- Giuseppi, M.S., 'Alien Merchants in England in the Fifteenth Century', T.R.H.S., N.S.vol.IX (1895) pp.75-98.
- Gras, N.S.B., The Evolution of the English Corn Market (Cambridge Mass., 1926).
- Green, A., Town Life in the Fifteenth Century 2 vols. (London, 1894).

- Hannam, U.A., The Administration of the See of London under Bishops Roger Walden (1405-1406) and Nicholas Bubwith (1406-1407) with a transcript of their Registers (Unpublished London M.A. thesis, 1951).
- " 'The Episcopal Registers of Roger Walden and Nicholas Bubwith', Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society n.s. vol.XI (1954) pp.123-36, 214-26.
- Harriss, G.L., 'Fictitious Loans', Econ.H.R., 2nd series, vol.VIII (1955-56) pp.187-99.
- " 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XXX (1957) pp.17-40.
- " 'Aids, Loans and Benevolences', Historical Journal vol.IV (1963) pp.1-19.
- Harvey, J.H., 'Four Fifteenth Century London Plans', London Topographical Record vol.XX (1962) pp.1-18.
- Hastings, M., The Court of Common Pleas in Fifteenth Century England (Ithaca, 1947).
- Haward, W.I., The Transactions between the Merchants of the Staple and the Lancastrian Government 1449-1461 (Unpublished London Ph.D. thesis, 1931).
- Herbert, W., History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London, 2 vols. (London, 1836-7).
- Holdsworth, W.S., History of English Law, vols.I-XVI (7th edn. rev. 1956-66).
- Hollaender, A. and Kellaway, W., ed., Studies in London History Presented to Philip Edmund Jones (London, 1969).
- Holt, J.C., Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1965).
- Honeybourne, M.B., 'The Fleet and its Neighbourhood in Early and Medieval times', London Topographical Record, vol.XIX (1947) pp.13-87.
- " 'The Leper Hospitals of the London Area', Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, vol.XX pt.1 (1963) pp.1-61.
- " 'The Reconstructed Map of London under Richard II', London Topographical Record, vol.XXII (1965) pp.29-76.
- Hope, W.H.St.J., 'The London Charterhouse and its old water supply', Archaeologia, vol.LVIII (1902) pp.293-312.
- Hopkinson, H.L., The History of Merchant Tailors' Hall (London, 1931).
- Horne, G., Old London Bridge (London, 1931).

- Houghton, K.N., 'Theory and practice in Borough Elections to Parliament in the later fifteenth century', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XXXIX (1966) pp.130-40.
- Imray, J., The Charity of Richard Whittington: a history of the trust administered by the Mercers' Company 1424-1966 (London, 1968).
- Jacob, E.F., The Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1961).
- James, M.K., 'A London Merchant of the Fourteenth century', Econ.H.R., 2nd series vol.VIII (1955-56) pp.364-76.
- Jamison, C., The History of the Royal Hospital of St. Katherine (Oxford, 1952).
- Jarvis, R.C., 'The King's Beam', Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society vol.XIX (1958) pp.128-37.
- Jeffs, R., 'The Poynings Percy Dispute', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XXXLV (1961), pp.148-64.
- Jeffries Davies, E. and Peake, M.I., 'Loans from the City of London to Henry VI 1431-1449', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.IV (1926-7), pp.165-72.
- Johnson, A.H., The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London, vols.I-V (Oxford, 1914022).
- Johnson, D.J., Southwark and the City (Oxford, 1969).
- Jones, P.E., 'The Court of Hustings', The Law Journal, vol.XCIII (1943) pp.285-86.
- " 'The City's Courts of Law: Mayor's and Sheriffs' Courts', ibid., pp.301-02.
- " 'The Court of Orphans', ibid., pp.357-58.
- " 'Some Bridge House Properties', Journal of the British Archaeological Association 3rd series, vol.XVI (1953), pp.59-73.
- " The Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London (2nd edn. London, 1965)
- Jordan, W.K., The Charities of London 1480-1660 (London, 1960).
- Kempe, A.J., Historical Notices of the Collegiate Church of St. Martin-le-Grand (London, 1825).
- Kerling, N.J.M., 'Note on Newgate Prison', Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society vol.XXII (1968), pp.21-22.
- Kingsford, C.L., The Greyfriars of London (Aberdeen, 1915).
- " 'Additional Material for the History of the Greyfriars, London', Collectanea Franciscana II (British Franciscan Studies vol.X).

- Kingsford, C.L. (contd.), 'Historical Notes on Medieval London Houses', London Topographical Record vol.X (1916), pp.44-144; vol.XI (1917), pp.28-81; vol.XII (1920), pp.1-66.
- " 'On some London Houses of the Early Tudor Period', Archaeologia vol.LXXI (1921), pp.17-54.
 - " 'A London Merchant's House and its owners 1360-1614', Archaeologia vol.LXXIV (1925), pp.137-58.
 - " Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth Century England (Oxford, 1925).
- Kirby, J.L., 'Issues of the Lancastrian Exchequer and Lord Cromwell's Estimate of 1433', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XXIV (1951), pp.121-51.
- Kramer, S., The English Craft Guilds: studies in their progress and decline (New York, 1927).
- Kriehn, G., The English Rising in 1450 (Strasbourg, 1892).
- Lyle, H.M., The Rebellion of Jack Cade (Historical Association Pamphlet, 1950).
- McFarlane, K.B., 'England: the Lancastrian Kings 1399-1461', Cambridge Medieval History, vol.VIII (Cambridge, 1936), pp.362-417.
- " 'Loans to the Lancastrian kings: the problem of Inducement', Cambridge Historical Journal, vol.IX (1947), pp.51-61.
- McKisack, M., 'London and the Succession to the Crown during the Middle Ages', in Studies in Medieval History presented to F.M. Powicke, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, R.W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp.76-89.
- " The Fourteenth Century (Oxford, 1959).
 - " The Parliamentary Representation of the English Boroughs during the Middle Ages (London, 1932).
- Masters, B.R., 'The Common Serjeant', The Guildhall Miscellany, vol.II, no.9, (1967), pp.379-89.
- " 'The Secondary', ibid., vol.II, no.10 (1968), pp.425-33.
 - " 'The Town Clerk', ibid., vol.III, no.1 (1969), pp.55-74.
- Mills, H.M., 'The Collectors of Customs', in English Government at Work 1327-1336, vol.II, ed. W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (Cambridge Pass., 1947), pp.168-200.
- Moore, N., The History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, 2 vols. (London, 1918).

- Myres, A.R., 'Parliamentary Petitions in the Fifteenth Century', E.F.R., vol.LII (1937), pp.385-404, 590-613.
- " England in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1953).
- Nicholas, F., 'The Assize of Bread in London during the Sixteenth Century', Economic History, vol.II (1930-33), pp.323-47.
- Norman, P., 'On an Ancient Conduit-head in Queen Square, Bloomsbury', Archaeologia, vol.LVI (1899), pp.251-66.
- " 'Abstracts of Documents relating to London from Early Chancery Proceedings and from Court of Requests, with explanatory notes', London Topographical Record, vol.VI (1909), pp.65-89.
- Norton, G., Commentaries on the History, Constitution and Chartered Franchises of the City of London (3rd edn., London, 1869).
- Orridge, B.B., Illustrations of Jack Cade's Revolt (London, 1869).
- Otway-Ruthven, J., The King's Secretary and the Signet Office in the Fifteenth Century (Cambridge, 1939).
- Peake, M.I., London and the Wars of the Roses 1445-1461 (Unpublished London M.A. thesis, 1925).
- " 'London and the Wars of the Roses, summarized', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.IV (1926-27), pp.45-47.
- Perroy, E., L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme D'Occident (Paris, 1933).
- Postan, M.M., 'Credit in Medieval Trade', Econ.H.R., vol.I (1927-8), pp.234-61.
- " 'Some Economic evidence of declining population in the Later Middle Ages', ibid., 2nd series, vol.II (1950), pp.221-46.
- " 'Italy and the Economic Development of England in the Middle Ages', Journal of Economic History, vol.XI (1951), pp.339-46.
- " and Power, E., ed., Studies in the History of English Trade in the Fifteenth Century (London, 1933).
- Power, E.E., 'English Craft Guilds of the Middle Ages', History, vol.IV (1919-20), pp.211-14.
- " The Wool Trade in English Medieval History (Oxford, 1941).
- Prideaux, W.S., Memorials of the Goldsmiths' Company, 2 vols. (London, 1896-7)
- Pugh, R.B., Imprisonment in Medieval England (Cambridge, 1968).

- Putnam, B.H., Early Treatises on the Practice of J.P. in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, ed. Sir Paul Vinogradoff) (Oxford, 1924).
- " 'Transformation of Keepers of the Peace into Justices of the Peace', T.R.H.S., 4th series, vol.XII (1929), pp.19-48.
- " Select Proceedings before Justices in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: Edward III - Richard II, with commentary by T.F. Plucknett (London, 1938).
- Ramsey, J.H., Lancaster and York, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892).
- Rich, E.E., 'The Mayors of the Staples', Cambridge Historical Journal, vol.IV (1933), pp.120-42, 192-93.
- Roskell, J.S., The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments 1376-1523 (Manchester, 1965).
- Round, J.H., The Commune of London and other Studies (London, 1899).
- Roxburgh, R., The Origins of Lincoln's Inn (Cambridge, 1963).
- Russell, J.C., British Medieval Population (Albuquerque, 1948).
- Sabine, E.L., 'Butchering in Medieval London', Speculum, vol.VIII (1933), pp.335-53.
- " 'City Cleaning in Medieval London', ibid., vol.XII (1937), pp.19-43.
- Salzman, L.F., English Industries of the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1923).
- Schäffeld, R.S., 'The Geographical Distribution of Wealth in England 1334-1649', Econ.H.R., 2nd series, vol.XVIII (1965), pp.483-510.
- Scofield, C.L., The Life and Reign of Edward IV (London, 1923).
- Sharpe, R.R., London and the Kingdom, 3 vols. (London, 1895).
- Sillen, R., 'Commissions of the Peace 1380-1485', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.X (1933), pp.81-104.
- Simon, A.L., History of the Wire Trade in England, 3 vols. (London, 1907).
- Smith, R., 'The Library at Guildhall', Guildhall Miscellany, vol.I, no.1 (1952), pp.3-9; no.6 (1956), pp.2-6.
- Steel, A., Richard II (Cambridge, 1941).
- " The Receipts of the Exchequer 1377-1485 (Cambridge, 1954)
- Stenton, F.M., Norman London (Historical Association pamphlet, London, 1934).

- Storey, R.L., The End of the House of Lancaster (London, 1966).
- Stow, J., A Survey of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1908).
- Suggett, H., 'A letter describing Richard II's reconciliation with the City of London in 1392', E.H.R., vol.LXII (1947), pp.209-13.
- Tait, J., 'The origin of Town Councils in England', E.H.R., vol.XLIV (1929), pp.177-202, 399.
- " 'The Common Council of the Borough', E.H.R., vol.XLVI (1931), pp.1-29.
- " The Medieval English Borough (Manchester, 1936).
- Thacker, F.S., The Thames Highway, 2 vols. (London, 1914, 1920).
- Thomas, A.H., 'The Medieval Municipal History of London', T.R.H.S. 4th series, vol.IV (1921), pp.81-102.
- " 'Notes on the History of Leadenhall 1195-1488', London Topographical Record, vol.XIII (1923), pp.1-22.
- " ^{'Some Recent Contributions to the Early History of London', History vol IX (1922) pp 92-102.}
- " 'Life in Medieval London', Journal of the British Archaeological Association, new series vol.XXXV (1929-30), pp.122-47.
- Thomson, J.A.F., 'Tithe disputes in Later Medieval London', E.H.R., vol.LXXVIII (1963), pp.1-17.
- " The Later Lollards (Oxford, 1965).
- " 'Piety and Charity in Later Medieval London', Journal of the Ecclesiastical History, vol.XVI (1965), pp.175-95.
- Thrupp, S., A Short History of the Worshipful Company of Bakers of London (London, 1933).
- " 'Medieval Guilds Reconsidered', Journal of Economic History, vol.II (1942), pp.164-73.
- " 'The Problem of Conservatism in Fifteenth Century England', Speculum, vol.XVIII (1943), pp.363-68.
- " The Merchant Class of Medieval London (Michigan, 1948).
- " 'A Survey of the Alien Population in England in 1440', Speculum, vol.XXXII (1957), pp.262-73.
- Tout, T.F., 'The Beginnings of a Modern Capital', in Collected Papers, vol.III (University of Manchester Historical Series, vol.LXVI, 1934).
- Unwin, G., Finance and Trade under Edward III (University of Manchester Historical Series vol.XXXII, 1918).
- " The Guilds and Companies of London (London, 1938).
- Veale, E., The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1966).

- Victoria History of the Counties of England: London, vol.I, ed. W. Page (London, 1909); Middlesex, vol.I, ed. J.S. Cockburn, H.P.F. King and K.G.T. McDonnell (Oxford, 1969).
- Virgoe, R., The Parliament of 1449-50 (Unpublished London Ph.D. thesis, 1964).
 " 'The Death of the Duk of Suffolk in 1450', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol.XLVII (1964-5), pp.489-502.
- Wedgwood, J.C., History of Parliament 1439-1509, 2 vols. (London, 1938).
- Welch, C., History of the Worshipful Company of Pewterers (London, 1902).
 " History of the Cutlers' Company of London (London, 1916).
- Westlake, H.F., The Parish Guilds of Medieval England (London, 1919).
- Wheatley, H.B., and Cunningham, P., London Past and Present, 3 vols. (London, 1891).
- Williams, E., Early Holborn and the Legal Quarter of London, 2 vols. (London, 1927).
- Williams, G., Medieval London (London, 1963).
- Wolffe, B.P., 'Acts of Resumption in Lancastrian Parliaments 1399-1456', E.H.R., vol.LXXIII (1958), pp.583-613.
- Wylie, J.H., History of England under Henry IV, 4 vols. (London, 1884-98).
 " The Reign of Henry V, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1914-29).
- Young, S., The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London (London, 1890).

IV. CATALOGUES AND WORKS OF REFERENCE

- Abbott, T.K., Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin (Dublin, 1900).
- Beaven, A.B., The Aldermen of the City of London, 2 vols. (London, 1908, 1913)
- Black, W.H., Catalogue of the Manuscripts bequeathed to the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole (Oxford, 1847).
- Cheney, C.R., ed., Handbook of dates for Students of English History (London, 1961).
- Emden, A.B., A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D.1500, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1957-59).
- " A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500, (Cambridge, 1963).
- Fitch, M., ed., Index to Testamentary Records in the Commissary Court of London (London division) now in Guildhall Library, vol.I 1374-1488 (British Record Society Publications, no.82, London, 1969).
- Galbraith, V.H., An Introduction to the use of the Public Records (Oxford, 1934).
- Giuseppi, M.S., Guide to the Contents of the Public Record Office, 2 vols. (new edn. London, 1963).
- Harben, H.A., A Dictionary of London (London, 1918).
- Harriss, G.L., 'A Fifteenth Century Chronicle at Trinity College, Dublin', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol.XXXVIII (1965), pp.212-18.
- Hennessy, G., Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense (London, 1898).
- James, M.R., The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1900).
- " and Jenkins, C., A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace (Cambridge, 1930).
- Madan, F. and others, Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, 6 vols. and Index (Oxford, 1922-53).
- Mynors, R.A.E., Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford, (Oxford, 1963).

- Jones, P.E. and Smith, R., A Guide to the Records of the Corporation of London Records Office and Guildhall Library Muniment Room (London, 1951).
- Ker, N.R., Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, vol.i, London (Oxford, 1969).
- Kingsford, C.L., English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century, (Oxford, 1913).
- Robinson, J.R. and James, M.R., The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey (Cambridge, 1909).
- Stephenson, M., A List of Monumental Brasses in the British Isles and Appendix (reprinted, London, 1964).
- Tanner, L.E., 'Nature and use of the Westminster Abbey Muniments', T.R.H.S., 4th series, vol.XIX (1936), pp.43-80.