

XII.—SHIPPING AND TRADE IN NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE, 1294-1296

BY J. CONWAY DAVIES.

Among the *Miscellanea* of the Queen's Remembrancer's Department of the Exchequer is a small file of eleven membranes¹ relating to happenings at English ports during the years 1294 to 1296. The last two membranes have no strict relationship with the preceding nine, except that all relate to the arrest of ships and goods. One² is a return by Nicholas Fermbaud, Constable of Bristol, to an order delivered to him by Master John de Gloucester, on the king's behalf, about ships which were in the port of Bristol on 1 August, 1295; the other³ is a list of goods, mainly wool and pelts, with their value, taken in 1296. The remaining nine membranes⁴ all arise from writs under the Exchequer seal, issued on 13 November, 1294, to the Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne, Scarborough and Ravenspur.⁵

Since the Treaty of Amiens in 1279 there had been peace between England and France, but by the beginning of 1294 causes of friction had multiplied and the great fight of 1293

¹ P.R.O., E. 163, *Queen's Remembrancer Exchequer Miscellanea*, 2/1.

² m. 10.

³ m. 11.

⁴ mm. 1-9.

⁵ As these writs were under the Exchequer seal, they were not, of course, enrolled on the Chancery Roll, but the text is incorporated in the returns made by the Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne (m. 3), Scarborough (m. 8), and Ravenspur (m. 6). The writs were also enrolled on the *Queen's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll* (E. 159/68, mm. 64d, 77d), but not on the *Lord Treasurer's Memoranda Roll* (cf. E. 368/66). In this *Q.R. Memoranda Roll* for 23-4 Edward I the whole of the last section, mm. 77 to 88, are occupied with matters relating to shipping and foreign merchants; as was the whole of last section of the *Q.R. Memoranda Roll* for 24-5 Edward I (E. 159/69).

between Norman and Gascony sailors had exacerbated a situation which was already sufficiently serious.⁶ Edward I was summoned by Philip IV to appear at the Parlement of Paris in January 1294. On non-appearance he was declared contumacious and his duchy of Aquitaine was declared forfeited. The English king was not the man to have his honour attacked, his territories infringed, or his subjects stolen or subjected to loss and insult without reacting violently. The chronicler Walter de Hemingburgh reported that he informed a parliament of magnates in London in June 1294 when he asked for their advice and aid that, had he no better following than one boy and one horse, he would pursue his right even to death and avenge his injuries.⁷ He launched a full-scale diplomatic offensive and attempted to construct a grand alliance against France, which included Adolf of Nassau, the Emperor-Elect, the Counts of Flanders, Holland, Brabant, Bar and Savoy, the King of Aragon and the Archbishop of Cologne. France on its land frontiers was ringed round with Edward I's allies. On the military side, an expedition to Gascony was organized under the command of the king's nephew, John of Brittany, Earl of Richmond. The feudal levies were to meet at Southampton on 1 September, 1294,⁸ and sailed at Michaelmas;⁹ the Welsh levies were to meet at Shrewsbury on 30 September.¹⁰ On the economic side a whole series of orders were issued as sanctions and security.¹¹ Effective measures were taken to

⁶ A summary of the diplomatic and military aspects of the war will be found in *Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume VII (1932), pp. 401-5; a more extended account in *Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, Roles Gascons*, ed. Charles Bémont, Tome III, 1280-1307, Introduction pp. cxxiv-clxxxii; and some of the relative documents in *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, Les Olim ou Registres du Arrêts Rendus par la Cour du Roi*, Tome II, 1274-1318, pp. 3-21.

⁷ Walter de Hemingburgh, *Chronicon* (English Historical Society), Vol. II (1849), p. 45.

⁸ *Parliamentary Writs* (R.C.), Vol. I (1827), p. 259.

⁹ Nicholas Trivet, *Annales* (English Historical Society (1845), p. 332.

¹⁰ *Parl. Writs*, Vol. I, p. 203.

¹¹ Cf. *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 74, 81; *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, pp. 367, 375, 376-7, 439; *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, mm. 64, 78d, 79, 80, 82, 84.

prevent trading with the enemy¹² and strenuous efforts were made to interfere with his shipping and imports.¹³

These Exchequer writs of 13 November, 1294, were an offshoot of Edward I's policy of an economic blockade of France and her subjects and satellites. In the usual autumnal storms of 1294 many foreign ships engaged in the Frisian and Baltic trade had been driven to seek refuge in North of England ports, eleven at Newcastle upon Tyne,¹⁴ twelve at Scarborough,¹⁵ and thirty-two at Ravenspur.¹⁶ As soon as the news of the landing of these ships reached London prompt action was taken. John de Basing, who was clearly a man versed in commerce and finance,¹⁷ was dispatched northwards on 13 November, 1294, with writs addressed to the bailiffs of these ports. The news had reached London that many ships of Frisia and Germany, loaded with horses, boards, armaments and other merchandise, had been forced into port for shelter. The information was that the ships had purposed to proceed to Flanders and elsewhere in the realm of France, in aid of the king's enemies. The ships were to be unloaded by view of John de Basing. After unloading, the goods were to be sold to English subjects only. The ships themselves were to be attached and not allowed to depart without the king's further order. The Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer were to be informed precisely of what had been done. Following the execution of these writs to the bailiffs, by view of John de Basing,¹⁸ letters patent were issued under the Exchequer seal on 17 Decem-

¹² Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 100-1, 102, 106; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, pp. 371, 397, 405; *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, mm. 64, 78d, 82-8.

¹³ Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 99, 100-1, 102, 126; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, pp. 406-7; *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, mm. 67, 78d, 82-8.

¹⁴ *Q.R. Exch. Misc.* 2/1, mm. 3, 9.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, mm. 4, 8.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, mm. 5-7.

¹⁷ John de Basing was a clerk, used on Exchequer business (cf. *Calendar of Fine Rolls*, 1272-1307, p. 172), to whom a debt was acknowledged (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 254) and who acknowledged debts to Chancery officials (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1279-1288, p. 544; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1296-1302, p. 480).

¹⁸ *Q.R. Exch. Misc.*, 2/1, mm. 2-3, 6, 8.

ber, 1294,¹⁹ assigning Sir John de Meaux, knight,²⁰ to arrest all the ships at Ravenspur, Scarborough and Newcastle upon Tyne and to dispose of the goods and merchandise as he had been instructed by the Treasurer and Barons on the king's behalf. The bailiffs were to aid him in all ways in their power. These letters patent were duly executed at Ravenspur on 29 December, 1294,²¹ at Scarborough on 2 January²² and at Newcastle upon Tyne on 9 January, 1295.²³

The four records which are fully reproduced in translation below²⁴ are: (1) a letter from the Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne to the King's Treasurer enclosing a return which they had caused to be taken by the writ under the Exchequer seal of 13 November, 1294. This letter, which is reproduced in facsimile, is written in a Norman French which shows distinct traces of a Northumbrian accent and is an interesting and satisfying little document. (2) This writ was received at Newcastle upon Tyne on 6 December and had been fully executed by 11 December, and the return to it, the result of an inquisition constitutes the second item. (3) Original letters patent under the Exchequer seal appointing Sir John de Meaux to take further action on the same matter, dated 17 December, 1294. There is cause for considering that this further writ was issued after the last of the preliminary returns; that of Newcastle upon Tyne of 11 December²⁵ had been received at the Exchequer. For though a period of

¹⁹ Ibid., m. 1; enrolled *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, m. 79.

²⁰ Sir John de Meaux had been Sheriff of Yorkshire 1285 to 1293 (*P.R.O. List of Sheriffs* (1898) and a Justice of Gaol Delivery at York, 1292 (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 267) and performed the usual local duties of a local magnate (cf. *Knights of Edward I*; Harleian Society, Vol. III (1930), pp. 143-4).

²¹ *Q.R. Exch. Misc.*, 2/1, m. 5.

²² Ibid., m. 4.

²³ Ibid., m. 9.

²⁴ These four documents have been numbered below I to IV and references will henceforth be given to them by the appropriate number. No. II incorrectly gives the date of the Exchequer writ as 23 November instead of 13 November, the scribe probably being influenced by the next numeral, the 23rd regnal year. There can be no doubt that the correct date is 13 November, that given in the enrolment and in the Scarborough and Ravenspur returns.

²⁵ Nos. I and II.

fourteen days inclusive is covered between the day of the dating of the first writ and its arrival at Newcastle, it may be taken that John de Baring had executed the similar writs of 13 November to Ravenspur and Scarborough on his way to deliver the third writ to Newcastle. (4) The inquisition taken, by virtue of these letters patent, on 9 January, 1295. The intervention of Christmas does not alone explain the period of twenty-four days inclusive covered between the dating of the second writ and the taking of the inquisition at Newcastle upon Tyne. For in this case it is known from the other inquisitions that Sir John de Meaux had taken his inquisition at Ravenspur on 29 December, 1294,²⁶ and his inquisition at Scarborough on 2 January, 1295.²⁷ So it is reasonable to suppose that John de Basing had followed the same order of proceeding, though the first returns made at Ravenspur and Scarborough, at both of which he was present, are both undated. The period of eight days inclusive between the taking of the Scarborough inquisition and the Newcastle inquisition does not seem excessive for the journey from Scarborough to Newcastle and the impanelling of the Newcastle jury to take the inquisition.

The first return by the Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne, made on 11 December, 1294, gives merely a summary of the cargoes of the eleven ships which had landed there. All the eleven ships had come from Frisia and Germany. All the goods had been unloaded by 11 December. The only armaments on board were arms and armour for the personal use of the merchants and sailors in the ships.²⁸

The second return, made in pursuance of the letters patent of 17 December,²⁹ on 9 January, 1295,³⁰ was much more detailed and informative. The inquisition was made before Sir John de Meaux by twelve Newcastle jurors. The Exchequer desired precise information on eight points:

²⁶ *Q.R. Exch. Misc.*, 2/1, m. 5.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, m. 4.

²⁸ No. II. As the full details are contained below, it is unnecessary to repeat them here.

²⁹ No. III.

³⁰ No. IV.

(i) The nationality of the men of the eleven ships; (ii) The city or town of origin of the ships; (iii) Of whose power they were; (iv) Whether any Flemish merchant or merchant of any other place in the power of the French king had any part or proprietorship in any of the cargoes; (v) Of what goods the cargoes consisted; (vi) What treasure in gold or silver the ships contained; (vii) What armaments were on board; (viii) Whether, after the first arrest of the ships, any part of the cargoes had been carried away or disposed of. The findings on each of these points was recorded. The name of the owner of the ship, its port of origin; the name of the ship and the name of the merchant owning the cargo was given, with the home town of the master, the merchant and the crew. The cargo was described in detail in kind and quantity. The cargoes of the two ships from Lubeck were given separately; those of the six ships from Stralsund and the three ships from Stavoren were given in totals according to their port of origin. The jurors found that all those concerned with any one of the eleven ships were of the power of the king of Germany; no one whatsoever of the power of the king of France had any part or lot in any of the cargoes. The intention, which had been frustrated by the storm, had been to sell the cargoes in Flanders and Holland. An answer was given to the query about silver and gold. The ships had apparently contained none. Such armaments as had been on board were for the personal use of those in the ships only. As befitted good merchants and tradesmen from an important commercial town, the jurors of Newcastle upon Tyne found that "neither the said sailors nor merchants, nor the freightage of their ships were bought or bespoken by any persons of the power of the king of France to proceed to those ports, but on this occasion, as every year previously, as merchants and sailors, they had come faithfully and had purposed to proceed to the said ports". No part of the cargoes had been carried away or disposed of, except such goods as had been sold, lawfully by the king's writ, to native Englishmen, for the maintenance of those

on board. The residue of the cargoes was still at Newcastle awaiting sale.

A comparison of the totals of the goods detailed in the first and second returns is interesting. On the whole, they show a reasonable agreement. Of the fourteen totals given in the first return, the addition of the details in the second return agree completely in nine commodities: 20,060 boards, ten lasts nineteen dickers of hides, thirty-three lasts of white herrings, twenty-two lasts of grease and oil, forty-five barrels of butter, 2,800 hardfish, wax, the four falcons, and the five hundred pelts of hares. In four totals there is a discrepancy which may be due to earlier miscounting or to inaccurate recording. The ninety-nine barrels of pitch and tar of the first return appear as thirty-four casks and sixty-nine barrels in the second return; the 281 casks of ash as 301, the 300 bowstaves as 360; the nineteen barrels of flax as twenty-two. The greatest difference occurs in the total, which the first return gives as eighteen and a half bundles of popel and strandling, and which the second return gives as twenty-six pelts of strandling and sixteen and a half bundles of strandling. In addition the second return gives the following items which are not noted in the first return: twelve dickers of skins of horses and lambs, eight dickers of ox hides, twelve chaldron of rye and six hundred chevron of pine.

Similar discrepancies in totals and descriptions occur in the various returns from Scarborough and Ravenspur, which must be noticed briefly, in order to complete the picture. The first return from Scarborough, from its bailiffs, addressed as all the first returns to the King's Treasurer, is undated, but was probably made about the last week in November 1294. It returned that twelve ships had landed there and gives the port of origin and the name of each ship. The ports of origin were Kampen in Frisia, one; Riga, one; Stralsund, three; Stavoren, six; Ludingkerk in Frisia, one. In every case the name of the master and the name of the merchant or merchants or their port of origin is given and the

number of sailors and merchants in each ship. These last valuable details are unfortunately not given in any of the Newcastle upon Tyne or Ravenspur returns. Only two of the ships appear to have had merchants on board who were not also masters or owners. The Riga ship appears to have been the largest. It had seventeen sailors and two merchants. One of the Stralsund ships had fifteen sailors and a lay brother (*conversus*) on board. The smallest crew consisted of six sailors. The cargo of each ship was given in detail. The general run of the goods in the cargoes was similar to that given in the returns from Newcastle—boards, skins, ash, bowstaves, oil, wax, pitch and tar, rye, herrings. The boards were, however, classified: some were ships' boards, others chest boards; some were thick boards, others thin boards; some were described as logs, some as pine. There were, too, a number of commodities which had not been among the cargoes of the ships which had been driven into Newcastle. Among these, the most interesting are six barrels of furs, thirty-four frails of copper, fourteen barrels of lambskins, six lasts of fibre for ships' ropes, and half a hundred troughs. This return ended with the bald statement that the ships contained nothing more than the bailiffs had reported, but certain necessities which belonged to them, namely certain of the sailors and merchants had arms and armour which were for their own personal use only.³¹

The second Scarborough return³² was made on 2 January, 1295, and was the result of an inquisition taken before Sir John de Meaux at Scarborough by a jury of twelve. The terms of reference of the inquisition, which were recited, were as those for the Newcastle inquisition. In all important particulars the inquisition agrees with the previous return by the bailiffs. Occasionally a full description of the goods in the ships was given, or an extended description of the place of origin of the ship. Thus Riga was described as "near the land of the Saracens". The total cargoes of the six ships from Stavoren were grouped together. Brother Simon, the

³¹ *Q.A. Exch. Misc.*, 2/1, m. 8.

³² *Ibid.*, m. 4.

master of the ship from Ludingekerk, is now described as Brother Germanus and described as a lay brother (*conversus*) of that house. The inquisition ended by stating that the merchants had sold a certain part of the goods and merchandise to men of the realm of England, before the day of the inquisition, by the king's writ. The remainder of the goods were still at Scarborough waiting to be sold.

Whereas there were but two returns each from Newcastle upon Tyne and Scarborough, from Ravenspur there were three. The first³³ was made by the Bailiffs of Ravenspur, by virtue of the writ of 13 November, 1294. It is undated, but as it was made by view of John de Basing, it may safely be dated about the beginning of the last week in November, a few days before the first Scarborough return. It gives the name of the master or owner of thirty-two ships, their ports of origin, but not the names of the ships. The ports were: Stavoren, eight; six are described as of Frisia, of which the masters of three are described as of Ems in Frisia, of one as of Mariengarde, and of two as of Walcheren; Stralsund, nine; Greifswald, two; Kampen, three; Harderwijk, one; Lubeck, three. The cargoes were very much more diversified than those of the ships which put in to Newcastle or Scarborough. There was the usual predominance of such goods as boards, pitch, ash, white herrings, butter, flax, bowstaves. There were few skins or hides, though there were a few pelts of lambs and hares. In one ship the boards were described as chest boards; another had 2,700 fir-rafts. There were four falcons. Among the exceptional goods were a hundred and sixty lances, three pieces of blue cloth, three hundred ells of linen cloth, eleven measures four hundred yards of canvas, fifteen barrels full of iron, a hundred stones of iron and five hundred pieces of iron, three hundred troughs, seven barrels and four lasts of tallow, and four barrels of tallow and grease, three hundred "buckfel", two hundred "lambskin", two and a half bundles of "ruthskin", eighteen bundles of "blackwork", two barrels of

³³ Ibid., m. 6.

"greywork", eighteen bundles of "ruthware", a last of whetstones and three barrels full of maple wood.

The most general and interesting cargo was contained in the last ship mentioned in the return, the ship of Henry of Lubeck and John Bankehol of Rostock. This contained a hundred barrels of ash, ten lasts of skins of "ruskin", six lasts of seal blubber in barrels, four lasts of butter and tallow, six barrels of flax, four barrels of ruskin, and one barrel of otterskin. These goods were owned by men of Lubeck, Münster, Gotland and Cologne.

The bailiff's return concluded by stating that certain small arms for the bodies of certain of the sailors were found aboard, namely haketons, helmets, breast plates, arblasters, bows, swords. These arms the sailors had brought with them, but the bailiffs did not know their value. Neither of the subsequent Ravenspur returns made any mention of arms or armour. Of these later returns, the inquisition³⁴ taken at Ravenspur by Sir John de Meaux on 29 December, 1294, by a jury of twelve, is a comparatively short and meagre record. Only brief details are given of each of the thirty-two ships. The terms of reference are not recited. The brief details included the name of the owner and the port of origin of the ship, the nature but not the quantity of the goods on board, and a statement that the goods had been landed. One ship was described as only partly unloaded. Certain ships had goods as ballast, two ships being ballasted with ash and five with herrings. There are a few verbal changes in the description of the goods: the last of "Westanes" of the bailiffs' return became "*lapides acuti*". That ship of Lubeck, the cargo of which was detailed above, after being unloaded, was loaded again and sold, with its goods and merchandise, to merchants of Lynn. Two of the Stralsund ships and one of the Stavoren ships, with cargoes of boards and other merchandise, had their goods sold at Ravenspur and afterwards, by the king's order, on good security, they were delivered to Kingston-on-Hull.

³⁴ Ibid., m. 5.

Whether, because this inquisition was considered unsatisfactory when it reached the Exchequer, or for some other reason, a second inquisition³⁵ was held at Ravenspur and a third return was made. This second inquisition was taken before William de Thorntoft³⁶ and Thomas de Stodeley,³⁷ attorneys of Master Henry de Newerk, Dean of the Church of St. Peter's, York, in the presence of John de Basing, attorney of the King's Treasurer, William de Walcote³⁸ and others, by another Ravenspur jury of twelve. The findings follow closely those of the first, the bailiffs' return, though there are a few comparatively minor variations in the quantities of goods in the various ships and a few variations in the descriptions of the goods. The jurors found that all the ships were of the power of the King of Germany and the Count of Holland. They found further that before the ships and goods had been arrested, the sailors had sold to merchants of York and Barton in Lindsey a hundred pieces of wax and two barrels of greywork, but they were ignorant of the names of the merchants. These goods were apparently not included in either of the previous returns.

One or two of the variations in description are worthy of notice. The five falcons, *ostrici* of the earliest return, are now *houstoures*. The one thousand five hundred chest boards are described as boards suitable for chests. An item described as lasts of ash in the first return now becomes barrels of ash. In quantity the most serious discrepancy is that the six lasts of seal blubber of the first return becomes one last in the third. There are just two other variations which may be attributed to miscounting, otherwise the coincidence is truly remarkable. The owner of the two

³⁵ Ibid., m. 7.

³⁶ William de Thorntoft was a king's clerk who was, in 1295, appointed to requisition and make ready ships in the south-western counties (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 149, 557).

³⁷ Thomas de Stodeley was a Yorkshireman and apparently a citizen or merchant of York (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1281-1292, pp. 200, 206; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1301-7, p. 153).

³⁸ William de Walcote also belonged to the county of York and was on a commission of *oyer and terminer* in 1296 on a complaint concerning a German ship at Ravenspur (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1288-1296, pp. 216, 297).

thousand fir-raft and the last of whetstones in one of the Walcheren ships, described in the first return as "le Hercok de Noreweye", in the second as Hercof (Haakon), brother of the King of Norway, appears in the third return as "Frethrik" (Erik) King of Norway.

A careful study of these nine documents enable certain interesting conclusions to be reached. In the first place they give an impression of the speed and efficiency of Edward I's administration, central and local, an impression which is reinforced by the Newcastle upon Tyne, Scarborough and Ravenspur contemporary royal activities which are detailed below. Within six to eight weeks after the issue from Westminster of the first writs of 13 November, 1294, returns from three north-east coast ports had been received, checked in two cases and counter-checked in the third. Fifty-five ships had been unloaded and careful inventories of their cargoes had been taken. Most of the goods had been sold in the three ports of landing or disposed of to merchants of York, Barton in Lindsey or Kingston-on-Hull. The total quantity of goods to be unloaded had been very considerable. The seven principal commodities for the three ports totalled some 96,800 boards, 1,585 barrels of ash, 418 barrels of oil, butter and tallow, 379 lasts of herrings, 307 barrels of pitch and tar, 76 barrels or other measures of flax and some twenty thousand skins, hides and pelts. The nature of some scores of varieties of other goods has been sufficiently indicated above.

In the second place, prompt and effective as had been the action of the king and his officials, central and local, their original information must have been defective. None of the ships had carried any horses, or gold or silver. The few arms they carried were insignificant in quantity, and apart from some hundred and sixty lances and two thousand five hundred bowstaves, all were for the personal use of the sailors in defence of their vessels and cargoes only. None of the goods were the property of any of the subjects of the king's enemies, the King of France and his vassals. All the

ships and almost all the goods in them were the property of subjects of the king's allies, the King of Germany and his dependants. On the other hand, valuable cargoes of great importance to the economy of Flanders had been diverted from their usual place of sale and sold in England to the subjects of the King of England, to the great advantage of the commerce and industry of the kingdom and especially of its north-eastern parts.

In the third place, the returns throw a valuable and interesting light upon the organization and nature of the Frisian and Baltic³⁹ trade during the second half of the thirteenth century. Of the fifty-five ships, eighteen came from Stralsund, seventeen from Stavoren, five from Lubeck, four from Kampen, two from Greifswald, one from Harderwijk, one from Riga, and seven described as from Frisia as follows: Ems three, Mariengarde one, Walcheren two, Ludingkerk one. If the ships and the masters came from these ports, the merchants who had chartered them came from many other places also. In the Mariengarde ship the goods belonged to a merchant of Stralsund; one of the Stralsund ships had goods of a merchant of Arneswalde, another of a merchant of Stettin; another Stralsund ship had goods of a Stavoren merchant; one Greifswald ship, two Kampen ships, the Harderwijk ship and one Lubeck ship had goods of merchants of Deventer; another Kampen ship had goods of a Dortmund merchant; another, goods of a merchant of Goes; while another Lubeck ship had goods belonging to merchants from Lubeck, Münster, Gotland and Cologne. In the case of all the Newcastle ships and the twelve Scarborough ships, all the goods belonged to master or merchants of the port of origin. In twelve of the Ravenspur ships out of the thirty-two, the whole of the goods in the ship belonged to the master or owner solely or to him and his partners.

³⁹ For accounts of the Baltic trade with England, France and Flanders in the Middle Ages, see *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. VII, Chapter VIII. The Hansa, and the works given in the Bibliography, pp. 855-6.

As will have been appreciated already, the goods carried by the ships were all thoroughly representative of the Frisian and Baltic trade, timber and its by-products, herring with a single consignment of stockfish, skins of domestic and wild animals and other animal products such as butter, tallow, oil and grease; a few primary products, such as flax and fibre; still less manufactured goods, such as small quantities of linen cloth, canvas and bluecloth; some metal, mainly iron, but a little copper; and a few rarities such as falcons and otterskins. Though none of the ships and none of their cargoes had been originally destined for England, the normal Frisian and Baltic trade with England was generally of the same kind and quality, though it is unlikely that at this or any other period England would have imported into north-eastern ports herring in any considerable quantity. Contemporary English *Customs Accounts*⁴⁰ do not give such a detailed picture of the Frisian and Baltic trade as do these returns. If that trade with the south of England at this time and later was done through the merchants of the Hanse, with the north of England before the end of the thirteenth century and for some centuries afterwards it was run independently of such a close corporation.⁴¹ It was run by independent merchants and masters of the Frisian and Baltic ports and of the north-east coast ports or by small groups acting together. Merchants and masters from Newcastle upon Tyne, and Hartlepool, of Scarborough and Kingston-on-Hull, either singly or in association with their fellow townsmen, competed on more than equal terms with the powerful corporation in that trade when the corporations and the merchants of London dominated it in the south. The jurors of Newcastle and Scarborough were apt at such inquisitions. They knew the trade, they knew the com-

⁴⁰ See N. S. B. Gras, *The Early English Customs System* (1918) and E. 122, *Customs Accounts*, from Edward I and below, p. 195.

⁴¹ Work which has recently been done on the Obedientary and other *Account Rolls* among the muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, on which some preliminary results will be published shortly, will radically alter the hitherto accepted views of English trade, particularly north-east coast trade with the Baltic, Scandinavia and Low Countries.

modities, they knew the Frisian and Baltic masters and merchants.

So much for what is to be learnt from these returns alone. The question next arises whether it is possible to ascertain what happened to the ships and the men, masters and merchants, and their goods after they had been unloaded. Fortunately it is possible to learn a good deal. For the masters and merchants made complaints to the crown, writs were issued, inquisitions were held, even judicial proceedings eventuated. Unfortunately the information which has survived for Newcastle upon Tyne is less than that for Scarborough and Ravenspur. By considering the evidence for each port, however, the gaps in the narrative for the others can be fairly accurately sketched in to form a composite picture.

On 13 December, 1294, but two days after the bailiffs' return left Newcastle upon Tyne, two Letters Close under the great seal were addressed to the Mayor and Bailiffs to Newcastle, from Wrexham, Edward I⁴² being in North Wales quelling a revolt there.⁴³ John de Lubeck, a merchant of Germany, had complained to the king that he had arrived in the port of Newcastle with eleven ships, called cogs, laden with various goods and wares and that the mayor and bailiffs had arrested the ships and cargoes, taken a part of the cargoes for the king's use and detained the whole of the residue. The mayor and bailiffs were ordered to deliver the ships and all the goods and wares, except those which had been taken to the king's use, to the merchants to trade with within the realm, after taking from them security that they will not go elsewhere than within the king's realm with the ships, goods and wares.⁴⁴ The same day similar Letters Close were directed to the Bailiffs of Scarborough on complaints made by Andrew de Kampen and John de Gotland, merchants of Germany, regarding the twelve ships in that

⁴² *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 408.

⁴³ See J. E. Morris, *The Welsh Wars of Edward I* (1901), pp. 240-55.

⁴⁴ *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 408.

port.⁴⁵ No such letters seem to have been sent to Ravenspur at this time. John de Lubeck had made a further complaint to the king which caused the second Letters Close to be addressed to the Mayor and Bailiffs of Newcastle on the same day. He had complained that John Dutre, burgess of Newcastle upon Tyne, and keeper of the water there, had entered the ships he had taken there with force and arms and taken away five barrels of herrings, four barrels of ale, twenty shillings sterling and various other goods found in the ships against his will, and detained them from him. The king ordered the mayor and bailiffs to cause full restitution to be made of the goods and to cause full amends to be made for the trespass. If this were not done, on a further complaint, he would cause more drastic action to be taken.⁴⁶

From the remaining evidence, there is no means of ascertaining whether these writs were effective. On the whole series of episodes the next official action on which there is information is the issue of a commission of *oyer and terminer* on 23 January, 1296.⁴⁷ On the complaint of two merchants of Germany and one of the land of the Count of Holland⁴⁸ who had brought three ships laden with herring and other goods from Germany and Holland for trade to Ravenspur, William de Ormesby and Walter Gerberd were appointed to hear and determine their cause. The complaint stated that Ralph de Aldburgh and John de Romney, merchants of Lynn, with the sailors of their two ships assaulted them at Ravenspur, killed six of their men, seized their ships and the goods in them and took them by sea to Yarmouth. Of the three ships one was accidentally wrecked at Blakeney, the goods in her loaded in the other two ships and taken to Yarmouth, and were then at Barnmouth-by-Yarmouth, in the hands of some men of that town. If the justices

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 407. These letters disclose that payage had been taken from the merchants; this undue exaction was not to be demanded.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 408.

⁴⁷ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 215-16.

⁴⁸ Of these merchants only one is mentioned by name in the Ravenspur returns; the other must be among the unnamed merchants of Stralsund (cf. *Q.R. Exchequer Misc.*, mm. 6, 7).

decided that the ships and goods were to be restored to the complainants, they were to take security from the merchants that they would in no wise communicate with the subjects of the King of France.⁴⁹ This commission began the case, but did not determine it, for on 17 December, 1296, another commission was issued substituting another justice in place of William de Ormesby, now engaged on the king's affairs in Scotland.⁵⁰ Meanwhile, on the complaint of two merchants, one of Lubeck and the other of Dortmund, who had entrusted their goods to one of the ships taken, another commission had been issued to other justices on 16 September, 1296.⁵¹

Meanwhile, on 4 April, 1296, a writ of privy seal had been addressed to the Sheriff of York,⁵² by virtue of which John de Byron, as Sheriff, held two inquisitions, the first at Scarborough on 17 April⁵³ and the second at Ravenspur on 20 April.⁵⁴ At Scarborough there still remained on 17 April, 1296, four of the ships, two of which were now described as of Frisia, one as of Stavoren and one as of Stralsund. The jurors found that all had been driven into the port of Scarborough laden with boards, timber and other merchandise; that because the merchants and sailors of the ships had proposed to cross into Flanders and mortal war had previously arisen between the King of England and the King of France, the ships had been arrested lest they should in any way aid the king's enemies. The king had ratified the arrest by writ, but whether the ships were forfeited or not the jurors left to the king's discretion.⁵⁵ Three days later the Ravenspur jury made the same general findings.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 215-16.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 258.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

⁵² These documents are partially calendared in *Calendars of Inquisitions, Miscellaneous*, Vol. I, no. 1739, pp. 481-2. The documents are in C145/56, *Chancery Miscellaneous Inquisitions*, mm. 3, 4, 5.

⁵³ *Cal. Chan. Inq. Misc.*, Vol. I, pp. 481-2; *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 4.

⁵⁴ *Cal. Chan. Inq. Misc.*, Vol. I, p. 482; *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 5. For this inquisition the *Calendar* is almost worthless, so reference will have to be made to the original return.

⁵⁵ *Cal. Chan. Inq. Misc.*, Vol. I, pp. 411-12; *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 4.

⁵⁶ *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 5.

The Scarborough jury gave full details of the ships and their gear. All were cogs. One was an old and broken ship of Frisia of 60 tons burden, to which belonged a broken mast, a sail, a yard, a luff, four anchors, three cables and other small gear, with a boat and oars. All but two items were in the keeping of two men by commission of the bailiffs of Scarborough and Brother Simon of Frisia, the master of the ship. The value of the ship and gear was ten marks. The boat and oars were in the king's service in Scotland; the value was a mark. Another man had a cable of the value of ten shillings. The second Frisian ship was almost new; its burden forty tons; its value twenty pounds. It, too, had been committed to keeping by the bailiffs and its master. An anchor of the value of twenty shillings was in use in the king's service against Gascony; the boat and oars, of the value of ten shillings, in the king's service against Scotland. The Stavoren ship, too, was almost new; its burden 40 tons; its value ten marks; it had been committed to custody by like means. Its anchor, of the value of eight shillings and its boat of a like value, were in the king's Scottish service; its mast, of the value of forty shillings, in the king's Gascon service. The Stralsund ship was old and needed refitting. The burden was fifty tons; the value ten marks; its custody was similarly committed. The boat, without oars, of the value of five shillings, was likewise in the king's service.⁵⁷

At Ravenspur there still remained on 20 April, 1296, seventeen of the thirty-two ships, of which fifteen were cogs and two were scouts. The burden, gear and value of each ship was given, with its port of origin. Many of the ships were described as old. The burdens were one ship of a hundred tons, one of seventy, four of sixty, three of fifty, five of forty and three of thirty tons. The values ranged from six marks to twenty-five shillings. The jury returned that most of the gear which belonged to these ships when they had been arrested was in the king's service, by order

⁵⁷ *Cal. Chan. Inq. Misc.*, Vol. I, p. 482; *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 4.

of Sir Osbert de Spaldington,⁵⁸ Keeper of the Seas, namely eighteen anchors, thirteen cables and other small gear. Three Stralsund ships were in the king's Gascon service by a similar order. The York galley⁵⁹ had received from the gear a mast, sail, yard, luff, bowsprit, anchor, cable and other small gear of the value of £21 10s. 8d. by a similar order. The Grimsby galley had received from the gear a mast, two sails, a yard, luff, bowsprit, an anchor, six cables and other small gear of the value of twenty pounds by a similar order. In a ship which had been delivered to a Whitby man, by the king's order for his Scottish service, there were two anchors, three cables and other small gear of the value of sixty-three shillings.⁶⁰

There is unfortunately no such inquisition available for the disposal of the ships and their gear which had been arrested at Newcastle. It may, however, be safely assumed that in burden and value the Newcastle ships were similar to the Scarborough and Ravenspur ships, for the cargoes were generally similar in nature and bulk. It may also be safely assumed that the disposal of the vessels and gear was of a like nature, with perhaps this difference, that at Newcastle the requisitions were naturally directed to the king's Scottish service mainly, as Newcastle upon Tyne was a very important base for operations against Scotland, though during the year 1295 some things may have been devoted to the Gascon service. The naval use which was put to the arrested ships and their gear in all three ports is an interesting example of medieval improvisation under pressure of the necessity of war. When masters of a ship from Grimsby and of a ship from Scarborough lost their ships in the fleet under the command of Sir Osbert de Spaldington in a storm

⁵⁸ Sir Osbert de Spaldington was appointed Keeper of the Seas in 1294. Particulars concerning him will be found in *Knights of Edward I* (Harl. Soc.), Vol. IV, p. 268.

⁵⁹ On 16 November, 1294, Exchequer writs had been issued to many ports, including York, Scarborough, Grimsby and Newcastle upon Tyne to build galleys for the king's naval service. (*Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, m. 77.) For the building of the Newcastle galley, see below, pp. 197-9.

⁶⁰ *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 5.

when on the way to Scotland and when the master of a Dunwich ship lost his in a storm going to Winchelsea, by the king's command, they were compensated for the loss of their ships from the arrested ships.⁶¹

If Newcastle provides no precise information about the disposal of the ships, it does supply information about what happened to some of the merchants and masters, for on 5 October, 1296, the Sheriff of Northumberland was ordered by Letters Close to allow four merchants or masters of Stavoren, described as of the power of the King of Germany, who had been imprisoned at Newcastle upon Tyne to go freely whither they wished. Before being released, however, they were to take corporal oath that they would not go to the land of the king's enemies, that they would conduct themselves well towards the king and his realm and that they would not procure the doing of any damage to the king or his realm.⁶² This, however, did not complete the tribulations of the unfortunate men of Germany and Holland. As late as October 1297 John, Count of Holland, Zealand and Lord of Frisia, wrote to Edward I on behalf of his men who had been robbed by the king's men of their goods and of their ships and requesting restoration.⁶³

The years beginning in 1294 were important for Newcastle upon Tyne and the happenings of those years serve to emphasize its importance as a port and as a commercial centre. The landing of eleven foreign ships driven in by storm was purely fortuitous, but the information to be obtained from the returns upon the cargoes of those eleven ships alone throws most valuable light upon the nature of the trade between Frisia and the Baltic and England and Flanders and supply interesting and important data not available from other sources for this period. For Newcastle

⁶¹ *Cal. Chan. Inq. Misc.*, Vol. I, p. 483; *Chan. Misc. Inq.*, 56/m. 2, a report from Spaldington dated 9 September, 1296; *ibid.*, m. 1, a letter to the Chancellor enclosing the report and inquisitions, 2 November, 1296.

⁶² *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 493.

⁶³ S.C. 1, *Ancient Correspondence*, Vol. XVIII, no. 130, printed in *Bronnen Tot de Geschiedenis van den Handel met Engeland*, etc. H. S. Smit, 1150-1485 (1928), p. 77.

was not only one of the chief ports in the north of England engaged in this trade; it was, excluding London, one of the most important ports in the whole country. Its importance can be further illustrated by brief reference to three other groups of records; those relating to customs, those relating to emergency measures taken to seize enemy property in this country on the outbreak of the war with France in 1294 and, thirdly, those concerned with Edward I's naval construction programme to protect his kingdom, harass the enemy and transport his troops and supplies.

Shortly before the chance landing of these Frisian and German ships new collectors of customs,⁶⁴ which had been granted the king for the prosecution of the war with France, had been appointed at Newcastle and, fortunately, their accounts survive.⁶⁵ The Exchequer was in constant communication with the collectors and within a year no less than six further Exchequer writs⁶⁶ had been issued to them, with a seventh shortly afterwards.⁶⁷ The accounts and the Exchequer activity about their collection, especially during the autumn and winter months of 1294-5, prove the importance which the Exchequer attached to the Newcastle customs, however partial such returns may be to the total volume of trade done by any port, particularly those furthest away from London and therefore least under control and supervision.

Secondly, as early as 11 April, 1292, the Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne, with those of certain other ports, had been ordered to arrest all wool in their port which was to be

⁶⁴ The Exchequer writ of 19 July, 1294, is enrolled in *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, m. 82. Henry le Escot and Hugh of Carlisle, were appointed to receive and collect by view of Adam of York, clerk.

⁶⁵ E. 122, *Customs Accounts*, 22-25 Edward I, 105/3, a roll of six membranes, a record which deserves publication in full. Two earlier *Customs Accounts*, 105/2, 20-21 Edward I, 3 mm. and 105/3, 21-22 Edward I, 4 mm. (extracts from this relating to Holland are printed in H. S. Smit, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-40) fill this side of the story from 1291 to 1297.

⁶⁶ *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 64, m. 82d, 29 July, 1294, 5 November, 1294, 25 November, 1294; m. 85, 21 January, 1295; m. 86, 1295.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, m. 86d, 18 January, 1296.

taken to ports overseas.⁶⁸ On 12 June, 1294, writs were issued to all sheriffs, including the Sheriff of Northumberland to arrest all wool throughout the realm.⁶⁹ On 28 August, 1298, under the Exchequer seal, a writ was issued to all ministers and others in the counties of York and Northumberland to arrest and keep in the king's hand all the goods and merchandise and the debts due to merchants and men of the realm of France wherever found. With the sheriffs of those counties William of York and Richard Oysel were appointed to act.⁷⁰ A part of the results of the activities of these last-named are to be found in the *Pipe Roll*,⁷¹ which discloses that they held an inquiry at Newcastle upon Tyne into these matters. In Newcastle alone £270 2s. 8d., for 363½ quarters of woad of merchants belonging to the power of the King of France had been seized and sold, was due to the Exchequer. This had been sold to various local merchants by William of York and Richard Oysel and the details of the sale put into an indenture made between them and the Sheriff of Northumberland.⁷² The debts owed to various French merchants, including some from Amiens, had also been enquired into by them and in all, the sheriff was charged with nearly four hundred pounds for goods and debts, less than a quarter of which sum had been collected during the Exchequer year.

If the particulars of this account are not available, there is, happily another account⁷³ of woad and other goods of various French merchants taken into the king's hand by the

⁶⁸ *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 261.

⁶⁹ *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 64, m. 82. Though issued under the great seal, these writs are not enrolled in the *Chancery Rolls*.

⁷⁰ *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 64, m. 85d. Both William and Richard belonged to the county of York, the former a clerk (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 265), the latter a merchant (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, p. 299). Both were frequently employed in royal services connected with the war (cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, pp. 224, 351, 352, 487; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, pp. 351, 479).

⁷¹ E. 372, *Pipe Roll*, no. 141, dorse of Northumberland membrane.

⁷² This indenture has not so far been found among the national records at the Public Record Office.

⁷³ E. 101, *Q.R. Exchequer Accounts, Various*, 126/7, m. 6.

Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne and by Eustace de Malerbe on 25 August, 1294. This deals with the commercial affairs of ten French merchants, seven of whom came from Amiens, two from Bruges, and one from Caen. The totals involved were 338 quarters of woad, nine sacks twenty-one stones of wool, twenty-four dickers of hides, and the sum of £80 in debts due. The commodities clearly represented stocks held by the French merchants in Newcastle. One of the merchants held the goods on behalf of another French merchant not then in this country, as agent or representative. Another Amiens merchant had a burgess of Newcastle as his agent or representative. Five sacks of wool which had been bought by a Bruges merchant for £44 were in the custody of the Bailiffs of Newcastle and of this £44 a Newcastle merchant claimed £9 10s, clearly the balance of the purchase price unpaid. One of the Amiens merchants had his own granary or store house at Newcastle; another stored his woad in the Newcastle granary or store house of a Sandwich merchant, payment for which goods was due at Michaelmas 1295. Debts were due to two Amiens merchants and to the Caen merchant; but for what goods the debts were due is not disclosed. These few facts supply a valuable miniature picture of a section of Newcastle commerce with one foreign country, which was not the best situated for trade with that port. For the years before and after the few years under present review, a larger picture in bolder colours could be provided from records of a similar nature or references scattered in a great variety of sources.

Thirdly, Newcastle upon Tyne was one of the ports which was instructed by Exchequer writ of 16 November, 1294,⁷⁴ to provide a galley for the defence of the kingdom and the security of the sea. The galleys were to be of a hundred and twenty oars, and everything was to be made ready to commence construction before Christmas. The cost of the construction would be allowed the bailiffs from the issues of their office. The boards and timber required they were

⁷⁴ *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, m. 77. See above, p. 193.

to requisition wherever they could be found, within the town or without. The relative importance of the English ports, in capacity for construction, if not in commerce, can be partly gauged by the fact that of the writs issued on 16 November, Bristol and Winchelsea alone were to provide two galleys each; Newcastle, Southampton, London and Yarmouth one each; Ipswich was to provide one with the aid of Gosford; Dunwich and Orford one between them; Grimsby one with the aid of Ravenspur and Hull. By Exchequer writs a few days later, Romney was to provide one galley with the aid of Hythe; Shoreham one with the aid of Seaford; Dartmouth one with the aid of Plymouth; Sandwich one with the aid of Dover; and York and Scarborough were to provide one each.⁷⁵

The account⁷⁶ of the costs incurred on building the Newcastle galley still survive; and it details the proceedings of the bailiffs and burgesses, with minute particulars of the cost. The essential facts⁷⁷ are as follows: Acting on the writ of 16 November, 1294, on Sunday, 5 December, Hugh of Carlisle,⁷⁸ then Chief Bailiff of Newcastle, and other bailiffs, caused to be chosen by the oath of twelve lawful men, John de Burgo, Henry of Wearmouth, Andrew Skaket and Henry Maryman, to provide and purchase boards, timber and other necessities for the building of the galley. These four men

⁷⁵ *Q.R. Memoranda Roll*, no. 68, m. 77d. Writs dated 19. to 21 November, 1294.

⁷⁶ *Q.R. Exchequer Accounts, Various*, 5/20.

⁷⁷ The full and early publications of this account is an urgent desideratum and might usefully be considered as appropriate for this Society, as one of the most curious documents relating to the thirteenth-century history of Newcastle upon Tyne and of special local interest as the first available document relating to naval construction in the area. It is, also, of great importance to national history for its valuable information on shipbuilding.

⁷⁸ Hugh of Carlisle and Henry le Escot, who was associated with him as a collector of customs at Newcastle (see above, p. 195, n. 64), both came from established families of Newcastle burgesses. Hugh appears to have been associated in affairs with the baronial house of William de Latimer (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1288-1296, p. 150; *ibid.*, 1296-1302, p. 290); Henry had been a Bailiff of Newcastle before 1281 (*Cal. Inq. Misc.*, Vol. I, p. 366) and before that had suffered losses as a merchant from the Flemings (*Calendar of Fine Rolls*, 1292-1307, p. 12) and later was a collector of murage in Newcastle (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1292-1301, p. 427).

were sworn before the bailiffs. The jury then chose William of Wainfleet as master for the construction of the vessel, at a wage of two shillings a week until its completion, when he was to receive a robe of the value of twenty shillings. The account began on the day of the execution of the writ, 5 December, 1294, and ran on to Sunday, 24 June, 1296. It was rendered by the Chief Bailiff of Newcastle, the other bailiffs and the four surveyors chosen by the jury. The first entry in the costs, which are entered weekly, was for the preparation of the yard for laying the keel. The account covers forty-four weeks, and discloses a total expenditure of £205 2s. 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ d.

It is doubtful whether this galley was ever used against the French, for there was no fighting with France after October 1297 and before that date there had been lengthy intervals of truce and inactivity;⁷⁹ but there is little doubt that it was of immense service against the Scots. For one of the first diplomatic results of the outbreak of war between England and France had been the beginnings of the alliance between Scotland and France which was to become traditional throughout the medieval period and for a century beyond. Within a few weeks of the completion of the Newcastle galley, in March 1296, Edward I. invaded Scotland⁸⁰ and fighting between England and Scotland continued almost without cessation until the death of Edward I in 1307 at Burgh-on-Sands. Newcastle became a main base of operations in this war and the most important of the strategic ports concerned in its operations. As a base of operations, a strategic port concerned with transport and supply, the shipping which it could harbour, the commerce which it could maintain, the wealth which it had thereby accumulated, and its capacity for shipbuilding and repair, provided the crown with facilities which were to enhance its reputation and

⁷⁹ *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. VII, p. 403.

⁸⁰ Edward I crossed the Tweed on 28 March, 1296, and on 7 July John Baliol renounced his treaty with France (cf. *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, Vol. II (1870), pp. 25-77).

develop its resources. That story belongs to the years immediately succeeding the years 1294 to 1296, which have been dealt with here and must be based upon classes of records different from those which have enabled an outline of the history of shipping and trade in Newcastle upon Tyne for a little more than two years to be sketched lightly but it is hoped usefully.

I

A letter to W[alter Marsh], Bishop of Bath and Wells, the King's Treasurer, from his humble and devoted Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne, with all manner of reverence and honour. They informed the Treasurer that, according to the king's order which they had recently received concerning the goods and ships of Frisia and Germany, by their searches, and John de Basing present when he wished to be, and by good inquisition of men, denizen and foreign, they could find nothing further about the goods and merchandise in these ships than they were sending him in the return by the bearer of the present letter. They had asked John de Basing to take this return with him. They wished to say that he had received nothing whatsoever for this return by way of payment. They were obliged to him for making the indenture and he had wished to receive nothing for the same. They requested the Treasurer to make known to them his wishes concerning what they should do with the said goods and concerning the ships which they had attached, according to the writ which he had sent them. They would, in every way, carry out his wishes, according to their power. They wished him long life and health.

(M.2. Parchment, $2\frac{3}{4}'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$, with the seal tag torn away. French. No date, but clearly of the same date as the return—that is 11 December, 1294. Plate XXIII.)

II

An Indenture acknowledging the receipt of the king's mandate, on Monday, the Feast of St. Nicholas, 23 Edward I (6 December, 1294), in these words: Letters Close under the Exchequer seal of Edward I to the Bailiffs of Newcastle upon Tyne. The king understood that many ships of Frisia and Germany loaded with horses, boards, armaments and various other merchandise had been driven to their parts by tempest, which ships had purposed to proceed to

Flanders and elsewhere in the realm of France, in aid of the king's enemies. The bailiffs were, therefore, ordered to cause everything in the said ships to be unloaded, by view of John de Basing, the bearer of these letters, whom the king was sending to them for this purpose. After the goods had been unloaded, the bailiffs were to allow them to be sold and released by the merchant owners to men of the king's realm. Nevertheless, they were to attach the ships and not allow them to depart until they had further orders thereon from the king. What they did on the premises the bailiffs were to cause to be made known, clearly and openly, to the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer, by their letters and by the same John. Tested by W[alter March], Bishop of Bath and Wells, Treasurer, at Westminster, 23 November (correctly 13 November), 23 Edward I (1294).

According to the tenor of the said mandate we have caused to be unloaded from the eleven ships of Frisia and Germany, driven into our port by tempest, by view of the said John de Basing, when he wished to be present, twenty thousand and sixty boards, four score and nineteen barrels of pitch and tar, fourteen score and one casks of ash, three lasts, nineteen dickers of hides and pelts of oxen, horses, goats, seals, calves and lambs, thirty-three lasts of white herrings in barrels, twenty-two lasts of grease of seal and oil, forty-five barrels of butter, eighteen and a half bundles of popel and strandling, five hundred pelts of hares, nineteen fardels of flax, two thousand seven hundred hardfish, namely stockfish, one piece of wax, four sore falcons, three hundred bowstaves. All these goods were unloaded on Saturday, next after the Feast of St. Nicholas in the same year (11 December, 1294), together with certain armaments, namely swords, lances, shields, iron plates, bucklers, haketons, gorgets and helmets for the bodies of the said merchants and sailors only. On the above-mentioned day the said eleven ships were attached with all their gear. In testimony of which the seal of the bailiffs of the said town is attached to this return.

(M.3. Parchment, 6" \times 7 $\frac{5}{8}$ ", with the seal tag torn away. Latin.
Date 11 December, 1294.)

III

Letters Patent under the Exchequer seal of Edward I appointing John de Meaux to arrest certain ships of Germany, which recently, loaded with horses, boards, armaments and various other merchandise, had landed in the ports of Ravenspur, Scarborough and Newcastle upon Tyne, and had purposed to proceed to Flanders and elsewhere in the realm of France, in aid of the king's enemies,

and to dispose of the said goods and merchandise, as had been more fully enjoined on him, on the king's behalf. All bailiffs and other faithful subjects were enjoined to be intendant, respondent, counselling and aiding to the said John in everything which pertained to the premises, as he would make known to them on the king's behalf, and to do whatsoever was requested by him thereon. Tested by W[alter March], Bishop of Bath and Wells, Treasurer, at Westminster, 17 December 23 Edward I (1294).

(M.1. Parchment, $4\frac{3}{8}'' \times 9\frac{1}{8}''$, with an inch tag cut for the seal and still bearing traces of wax. Latin. Date 17 December, 1294.)

IV

Inquisition. The arrest, view and scrutiny made by John de Meaux, knight, at Newcastle upon Tyne, Saturday next after Epiphany, 23 Edward I (9 January, 1295), by the king's letters patent issued to John, concerning ships from Germany which had landed there; which day John found there eleven ships all unloaded. The inquisition made that day before John, by Adam Jarson, Peter Sampson, Henry de la Hay, Richard the son of Roger, Alexander de Gyseburn, Robert de Norton, William Porter, William de Dolfamby, John Lubald, Roger de Ponte, Adam del Redehogh and John de Burgo, concerning of what nation the men of the said ships were and of what cities or towns the said ships were, and of whose power, and if any merchant of Flanders, or of any other place of the power of the King of France, had or did have, at any time, part or proprietorship in the goods and merchandise found in the said ships, and what such goods and merchandise were, the day on which they were landed; And likewise concerning the treasure of gold or silver, and concerning armaments, if any such were found on landing, or afterwards; And if any of the goods and merchandise, after the first arrest made by the king, were alienated; Who say on their oath, that there is there a certain ship of John de Whytebergh, of Lubeck, which is called *le Welefare*, and whereof a certain Albrych is merchant, and the same John and Albrych and all their fellows are of the said town of Lubeck. In which ship were found, on the day of landing, thirty lasts of white herrings, a hundred and sixty boards, twenty-six pelts of strandling, two dickers of ox hides. Also they say that there is there another ship of the said town of Lubeck, which is called *Scherwind*, which is of a certain Albrych, of Lubeck, the merchants of the same ship being Arnald and Tiddeman, of the said town of Lubeck. In which there were found twenty-two lasts of oil and grease, six barrels of butter, three

lasts and nineteen dickers of hides of oxen, seals, calves, goats and lambs, five hundred pelts of hares, nine bundles of strandling, nineteen fardels of flax, two thousand eight hundred hardfish, one piece of wax, and all the fellows of the said ship are of the same town of Lubeck. They say, in addition, that there are there six ships of Stralsund, which are named the *Crucebergh*, *Cryland*, *Cruceberg*, *Hertheburgh*, *Stampenberg*, *Halber*, of which the masters are Tyddeman Calu, Martin de Mari, Henry Qualynck, Reginald, Geradd, and Wybrand, which masters and all their fellows are of the said town of Stralsund. In which ships there were found nine thousand seven hundred boards, six hundred chevron of pine, three hundred and sixty bowstaves, fifteen score and one casks of ash, three hundred lasts of white herrings, thirty-four casks of pitch and tar, thirty-nine kegs of butter, seven and a half bundles of strandling, six dickers of ox hides whereof three dickers were tanned, four falcons and tercils, and all these goods are of the said masters and their fellows. Also they say that there are three ships of Stavoren, which are called *Hathiler*, *Godeyere* and *Godeyere*, whereof the masters are Wyggeman, William and Simon and they and all their fellows are of the same town of Stavoren. And there were found in the same ships, ten thousand and two hundred boards, twelve chaldron of rye, sixty-nine barrels of pitch and tar, three fardels of flax, eleven dickers of hides of horses and lambs. Also they say that concerning the treasure of gold or silver nothing is or was found. And they say that all the governors, sailors and mariners of the said eleven ships were of the said towns and of the power of the King of Germany, as far as they could make out. They say also that no merchant or other person whatsoever of the lordship or power of the King of France was a partner or participated in the said goods with the above-mentioned merchants or sailors, according to what they could make out from them. Also they said that the said masters and sailors, with their ships and merchandise had proposed to proceed to the ports of Flanders and Holland to sell their things and merchandise there. Also they say that no armaments were found in the said ships, at the time at which they landed or afterwards, except only certain arms for the bodies of certain of the said mariners. Also they say that neither the said sailors or merchants nor the freightage of their ships were bought or bespoken by any persons of the power of the King of France, to proceed to those parts, but on this occasion, as every year previously, as merchants and sailors they had come faithfully and had purposed to proceed to the said parts. Also they say that nothing of the said goods was alienated but they say that such goods had been sold to men of the realm of England, by the king's writ, for the

maintenance of the said sailors, merchants and mariners only, before the day of this present inquisition. And the remainder of all the said goods remained in the said town of Newcastle on the day of this inquisition, to be sold. In testimony of all this the said Adam and his fellows had placed their seals to this inquisition. Given the above-named day and year.

(M.9. Parchment, $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 10\frac{1}{2}''$, with six slits for seal tags and the remains of four tags for the seals of the jurors. Latin. Daté 9 January, 1295.)

.L. tres noble sire en deu soit. par la grace de deu eueque de ba e de billes (proposer nore seigneur le roi Les pors amides
 e deuz en l'implor Les baillifs de nore chaucele eueque de baillifs ou nore manere de seigneur e de nore (sachant) soit de orde
 du mandement nore seigneur le roi Le n'ecumes ne sequeus pour Les biens et les meste de fress e de l'homme annos
 par nore seigneur eueque de baillifs pors quare de fress e par bone enqueste de seoir doreans efforeus pors
 de biens e maschandise en meste aneue doreans ne pors nule autre chose eueque de n'ne n'ecumes en seoir par
 Le port de l'este l'este. Nous pors n'ne de baillifs Le il pors one l'ne de seoir e n' d'ist Le il ne Le seoir
 pors pour ce Le seoir pors ala change de doreans Le n' pors l'ne condones de offir Le mandement e eueque ne
 Le seoir Le seoir. Nous sequeus a nore digne Le il n' pors mander n' nore seoir ce Le n' pors
 de biens aneue doreans e de meste Le n' annos seoir pors ce Le seoir n' annos seoir en
 nore seoir Le n' Les pors pors a nore seoir. Dou n' seoir nore seoir en seoir. 2

LETTER FROM THE BAILIFFS OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE TO THE KING'S TREASURER, 11 DECEMBER, 1294.

