

VI.—MEDIEVAL TRADING RESTRICTIONS IN THE NORTH EAST.

BY CONSTANCE M. FRASER.

The right to trade in a particular area was regarded during the Middle Ages in the light of a monopoly, to be enjoyed preferably by the guildsmen of the most considerable town of that area. According to the Laws of Newcastle upon Tyne, established by mid-twelfth century, no merchant who was not also a burgess of Newcastle might buy wool, hides or other wares outside the town, nor might he buy them inside the town except from burgesses. Burgesses of Newcastle could buy as much as they wished from ships anxious to discharge at the mouth of the Tyne, but such ships as made their way up the river must unload all their cargo at Newcastle alone, save for salt and herring which could be sold on board. While such regulations discriminated between, on the one hand, inhabitants of Newcastle and those of the surrounding countryside, and on the other between merchants of Newcastle and those of other boroughs, no distinction as yet was made between the inhabitants as opposed to the merchants of Newcastle itself. The first formal step in this direction came with the privilege granted by King John in his charter of 28 January 1216 authorizing the formation in Newcastle of a guild merchant whose members should be quit of all trading dues on their travels throughout English dominions. Further organization of the Newcastle guild merchant was left to internal arrangements and the earliest quoted reference to an alderman of guild within the town occurs in 1293 with the notice of Hugh of Carlial

acting as such "during the mayoralty of Henry le Escot".¹

If, however, the merchants of Newcastle had as yet only rudimentary organization with regard to differentiation of trades among themselves, they were fully equipped to express their commercial exclusiveness against the rights of neighbouring communities. In 1269 the mayor and burgesses of Newcastle were prosecuted for their attempt to suppress by main force trading activity at North Shields as contrary to their monopoly of the Tyne trade. By 1290 they had learned to gain their ends more subtly, and by prevailing on King Edward I to intervene to protect his own customs dues they were able to obtain judgment in the royal courts that the prior of Tynemouth remove all his quays at North Shields lying within the flood mark. The evidence produced in the case shows the burgesses of Newcastle relying on their status of a royal borough paying both an annual farm of £100 to the Exchequer and custom dues to the king on all wool, fells and hides exported from the town, hence any loss of trade down-stream would be detrimental to the capacity of Newcastle to pay its traditional dues to the Crown. The gradual decay of the borough was predicted as inevitable as a result of the establishment of a port at North Shields, where no customs dues were leviable. It was alleged that on Sundays and other festivals merchants congregated down the river, "ostensibly in honour of St. Oswin but really to supply refreshment and other goods to the people gathered there". There were four bakehouses at Tynemouth, retailing bread at Tynemouth and North Shields to the detriment of provision merchants in Newcastle; and as befitted a fishing port over 100 "quays" or landing stages were estimated in existence. Edward I readily paid heed to this appeal from a "decaying" royal borough to enable it to maintain its financial usefulness to him and appears to have pressed his advantage by raising a loan of 1,000 marks from the New-

¹ Public Record Office, London, Assize Roll 650, m. 72. Henry le Escot was mayor in 1277, 1282-5, 1288-9 and 1293 (AA⁴ XVIII, pp. 2-3). The reference in *Newcastle Merchant Adventurers* (Surtees Society 93, 1895) i, xvii note, erroneously gives Carlol's name as William.

castle burgesses at the same time. Some twelve years later, in 1304, the prior of Tynemouth attempted to gain royal permission for a market outside the priory, Queen Margaret being a guest of the monks at the time, but opposition from Newcastle was again so strong that the king recalled the privilege.²

Having thus disposed of their nearest trading rival the burgesses of Newcastle now prepared to regulate the volume of commerce of a much more formidable competitor, Berwick upon Tweed, newly brought within their range of interference by its capture from the Scots in 1296. The following year a panel of English burgesses, including John Scot and Peter Graper from Newcastle, was formed to advise Edward I on the best methods of stimulating trade in Berwick, as the existing body of local merchants had been largely scattered in the course of warfare. Previous to 1296 Berwick had been regarded as "a second Alexandria", with more foreign trade than any other Scottish port, and with a customs revenue estimated in 1286 at over £2,000 as compared with Newcastle's £323 3s. 9d. for 1282, the nearest year for which a total is available for the latter.³ As a result, presumably, of the panel's recommendations, a new charter was granted by Edward I to the burgesses of Berwick recognizing their rights and extending their privileges to encourage outside merchants to establish themselves in the town. This policy appears to have borne immediate fruit, as within a few years the burgesses of Berwick were complaining that the king by indiscriminate grants of vacant plots within the town to his followers was so reducing the available area for the setting up of booths that travelling merchants attracted to the town found difficulty in acquiring sites, while such a suburb was developing to the east of the town that they were hemmed in from the sea, the suburb bidding fair to rival in size

² P.R.O., Ancient Petitions 3212, 3761: *Coram Rege* Roll 130 (Hilary 1292) mm. 63-65; *History of Northumberland*, VIII, pp. 253, 286-8.

³ *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland* (1878) i, lxxxiii; *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1292-1301*, pp. 226-7; J. Conway Davies, "The Wool Customs Accounts for Newcastle upon Tyne for the reign of Edward I" in AA⁴ XXXII, 234.

Berwick itself.⁴ Furthermore, emboldened by continued prosperity under English rule the burgesses of Berwick petitioned Edward I for a revised charter of liberties which would prevent both strangers buying wool in Berwickshire except from burgesses of the town and any religious house owning a fulling mill either in the town or county of Berwick. They also sought the usual comprehensive privileges of the right to elect their own magistrates, freedom from outside jurisdiction, and freedom from outside tolls on trade, along with suppression of the market at Tweedmouth, on the opposite bank of the river, and an alteration in the permitted length of Berwick fair, which instead of lasting from Easter to Michaelmas was to be concentrated between 3 May and 24 June.⁵

During the latter years of the reign of Edward I and the first years of Edward II trade on the north-east coast proceeded briskly enough. Eleven hundred and seventy-two and a half sacks of wool left the port of Newcastle in 1308 and 232 sacks 7 stone of wool left Hartlepool in 1312, though the wave of Scottish depredations in the north was already breaking.⁶ Amid this activity we have a glimpse of the Newcastle guild merchants, struggling to secure power over their fellow burgesses, revealed in a plea in the Court of the Exchequer of Pleas heard at York at Midsummer 1305. In this action (hitherto unknown except for a cryptic reference in Madox's *History of the Exchequer* cited by Brand [ii, 220]) certain "poor burgesses" of Newcastle under the leadership of William the Saddler, William Dalton and Ivo the Baker sued Nicholas of Carliol, Peter Graper, John Torald and some thirty others, "rich burgesses" of Newcastle, for wrongful impediment of their trading privileges as burgesses of that town in accordance with the borough charters. They alleged that the "rich burgesses . . . by sinister collusion among themselves" prevented the poor burgesses from

⁴ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 1616.

⁵ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 1614-15, 1627; *Cal. Charter Rolls III*, 27-9 (4 Aug. 1302); J. Bain, *Cal. of Docs. Relating to Scotland* ii, 332-3.

⁶ P.R.O., Customs Accts. 49/2 m. 1; 105/4 m. 9.

selling retail any cloth they made in their homes under pain of heavy fine "in the guild of the said rich burgesses". They were not permitted to buy in excess of their own family requirements herring for curing. They were not permitted to sell a tun of wine by retail, nor any kind of grocery (*de quolibet genere averii pondere*). Should a poor burgess buy fresh hides to tan and sell he was fined unless the ears were longer than the horns, i.e. the hides of young animals. He might not buy sheepskins nor wool piecemeal by the stone unless to make cloth in his own house for his own use. To these charges Nicholas of Carliol and his associates retorted that the plaintiffs were of little status and condition in the town whereas they, the rich burgesses, enjoyed from ancient times a merchant guild in Newcastle wherein those who were members of the guild were privileged to buy and sell in the town without query. The remaining inhabitants of the town not being of the guild had no such privileges of buying and selling except on the limited scale admitted by the poor burgesses. Pressed by the royal lawyers, however, Nicholas of Carliol and his associates could not gainsay but that the poor burgesses were fellow inhabitants of their town and equally subject with them to pay the king's taxes, nor was there any special clause in their royal licence to form a guild to suggest that "guildsmen" had privileges over and above those enjoyed by "burgesses". Judgement therefore was given against the "rich burgesses" of the guild merchant to the effect that henceforth all burgesses of Newcastle might have an equal right to buy and sell, and the defendants were fined and ordered to pay £50 damages to the poor burgesses, which was done eventually some three years later, in 1308.⁷

This case is of particular interest as providing some of the earliest evidence of what the privileges of guild entailed in Newcastle. As yet there would appear to be no subdivision into trades. Some of the "rich burgesses" can be identified as exporters of wool from Newcastle, the most sub-

⁷ P.R.O., E. 13/27 m. 60: 32 m. 16. A biographical list of the *rich* and *poor* burgesses involved is given at the end of this article.

stantial traders of the time, including Peter Graper, Thomas of Carliol, John Torald, Walter Cougate, William Hering, Peter Sweyn, John Wodeman, Robert Morpath, Gilbert Ogle, Adam Bridock, Nicholas Ellerker, John Lobald, Thomas Silksworth, William del Burne, William of York, John Redcale and William of Benwell. Many of these can be traced in other documents as men of personal wealth and municipal distinction. Others can be identified as exporters of sheepskins, such as Robert of Burradon, or of hides, such as William Porter, Roger Peytevyne and Adam of Durham. Several have differentiating trades added to their names, such as William of Tynemouth the tanner, and William of Tynemouth the draper. There is also William Russel the baker. The remainder, whose names do not appear on surviving customs records, were presumably corn merchants, skinnners, saddlers, shoemakers, smiths, fullers, brewers, butchers and tailors, members of crafts which when next the poor burgesses were to assert their ancient liberties would be described as the twelve major guilds or mysteries.

Within a few years the burgesses of Newcastle had more pressing matters to consider than infringement of craft regulations. In a petition of this period "the people of the community of Newcastle" alleged that they had guarded their town at their own expense since the beginning of the war with Scotland and paid for the enclosure of most of the town with a wall and all of it with a ditch, nevertheless those with lands outside had been overrun by the enemy while those inside could give no time to trade by reason of their responsibilities in guarding the town—merchants shipping by sea were pillaged by Scottish and Flemish privateers, and artisans had no material on which to work.⁸ Berwick had been similarly affected, its burgesses seeking to ease their double expenses arising from military and municipal responsibilities by undertaking to hold the town for Edward II themselves. Hostages were taken from the chief townsmen to ensure their

⁸ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 8520. A translation of this letter with comments will be found below, pp. 381-3.

loyalty to England, but the inevitable result of this cheese-paring defence was the recapture of Berwick by the Scots in March 1318. Scottish wool once more found its natural outlet at Berwick; but to the grief of the English customs collectors and Newcastle wool exporters alike it was discovered that wool from much of Northumberland and even Durham was also finding its way to Berwick, because a better price could be obtained for it there.⁹ Indeed, just before the Treaty of Northampton of 1328 formally ended war between England and Scotland, when comparative revenues for the Scottish ports and Newcastle can be obtained, Berwick with its customs of £673 comfortably outstripped not only its nearest Scottish rival, Edinburgh (£439), but had nearly 57% greater trade in wool than Newcastle (£434).¹⁰

The advantages of shipping wool from Berwick remained even after 1333, when that town fell once more into English hands. This at least was what the burgesses of Newcastle were anxious to prove to Edward III in two petitions of about 1340, in the first of which they complained that wool from north Northumberland was being exported through Berwick because a customs due of only 6s. 8d. a sack was payable there as opposed to the standard English rate of 40s. a sack exacted at Newcastle. In the second they protested that the customs collectors at Newcastle were demanding the full English due from wool shipped at Berwick by Newcastle merchants anxious to gain the advantage of the difference in customs rate.¹¹ For the remainder of the fourteenth century the burgesses of Newcastle continued to mutter against the discrimination in customs tariffs between Berwick, technically in that part of Scotland owing allegiance to the English crown, and their own town which with its inferior native wool had to bear dues payable by the

⁹ J. Bain, *op. cit.* iii, 155; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1313-17*, pp. 257, 671; *Cal. Close Rolls 1313-18*, pp. 174, 363.

¹⁰ *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland* i, 79-82; P.R.O., Customs Accts. 105/9. The quantities involved were respectively for Berwick in 1327, 1587 sacks of wool, 19,319 sheepskins and 17 lasts of hides, against the export from Newcastle in 1325/6 of 911 sacks of wool, 3,200 sheepskins and 1 last of hides.

¹¹ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 3209, 14914.

better quality Lincolnshire and Herefordshire type fleeces.¹²

The wealthier merchants of Newcastle were preoccupied with the problem of exporting their wool at a competitive price in the face of hazards of war and those imposed by bureaucracy. The latter might include demands for double payment where a ship's master had inadvertently mislaid his customs receipt or a querying of the weight of the wool on discharge at Calais because the cargo during transit in ships with open holds had become saturated and thus weighed heavier than on lading—customs being payable on the lading weight.¹³ The artisans of Newcastle equally felt the pinch, with the Scots literally at their gates in 1341, and they resolved to turn to their own advantage the feud which broke out that autumn between two factions in the town council. The initial riots were on 1 October 1341, when the followers of Richard Acton seized command of the town gates and proclaimed Acton as mayor, although John of Denton had been duly elected by "the elders and more esteemed of the town". Edward III had intervened to restore order and during the abeyance of the usual magistracy the lesser tradesfolk were able to wrest from the discomfited "elders" a recognition of the rights of the burgesses in general to participate through their various guilds in the election of the mayor and council and to be informed annually as to the financial condition of the town. This concession, slight in practice as it was, was withdrawn in 1345 after the further disorders which marked the removal of Richard Galloway from the office of mayor following the judicial murder of John of Denton.¹⁴ Thereafter it became a rallying-cry used for party ends until the stranglehold exerted by the wealthier guilds on the machinery of election made the concession of no practical meaning.¹⁵

¹² Cf. *ibid.*, 10768, 10774; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1343-5*, pp. 174, 575.

¹³ P.R.O., Writs and Returns C. 47/125/2 item 22: *Anc. Pet.* 2253, 3219; *Cal. Close Rolls 1346-9*, pp. 471, 514.

¹⁴ C. M. Fraser, "The Life and Death of John of Denton" in AA⁴ XXXVII, 315-23.

¹⁵ *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1364-7*, pp. 18-19; *Cal. Charter Rolls V*, 244. Cf. *Finance and Trade under Edward III*, ed. G. Unwin (1918), pp. 235-6 and notes.

To the outside world of commerce, however, Newcastle presented a united front. Of the surrounding market towns North Shields had not yet recovered from the legal proceedings taken against it in 1290-2. Nearby Gateshead was watched with unflinching vigilance lest the bishop of Durham gain the benefits of a Tyne quayside without payment of dues to the commonalty of Newcastle. Here forces were more nearly matched than in the similar disputes with the prior of Tynemouth over North Shields or the prior of Durham over South Shields.¹⁶ The bishop of Durham was in a better position to state his case before the king and could offer the crown as much financial advantage as a grateful Newcastle magistracy. Hence we have a rebuke of 20 August 1314 from Edward II to the mayor and burgesses of Newcastle for hindering the bishop's men loading and unloading fish, flesh, wood, coals and all other commodities in any part of the water of Tyne and compelling them to conduct their trade at Newcastle.¹⁷ Nevertheless, in the course of an inquiry of 22 July 1336 into oppressions alleged to have been perpetrated contrary to the liberties of the church of Durham it was deposed that the burgesses of Newcastle were forcing the fishermen of Pipewellgate (Gateshead) and South Shields to bring their catch for sale in Newcastle alone, under pain of heavy fines. The prior of Durham was not allowed to land his own wool from Holy Island on the south bank of the Tyne. The Newcastle burgesses had attempted to monopolize the whole of the profits of the Tyne bridge although its southern end necessarily was built on the bishop's land, and even disputed the right of the bishop to hold an inquest on drowned persons found in the southern stretch of water adjacent to his lands.¹⁸ The burgesses, however, took little heed of these protests, for the bishop of Durham continued to

¹⁶ J. Brand, *History of Newcastle* (1789) ii, 8.

¹⁷ *Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense* (Rolls Series, 1874) ii, 1014-15. R. Welford in his *History of Newcastle and Gateshead in the 14th and 15th Centuries* inadvertently makes a double entry of this order under 1314 and 1334 (pp. 33, 85), deriving the latter from J. Brand, *op. cit.* ii, 11 note z.

¹⁸ J. Brand, *op. cit.*, ii, 10 note y; R. Welford, *op. cit.*, 96-97.

complain of their encroachments and on the occasion of the restoration of their liberties to the Newcastle burgesses in 1342 Edward III was careful to explain that this should not be held as prejudicial to the rights of the bishop.¹⁹

Another matter at issue was a definition of fishery rights in the Tyne. The claims of Newcastle to be the sole mart on Tyneside for all commodities except salt and herring were sanctioned by a tradition nearly two centuries old. For the sale of fish, normally sold on board ship, each Tyne quay tried to assert independence of action; and with what degree of accuracy we know not the burgesses of Newcastle protested indignantly that the shipping channel up the Tyne was almost blocked with fish traps stretching far into mid-stream, which also encouraged the deposit of silt round their timbers to the further hazard of shipping.²⁰ The burgesses were able normally to overcome such setbacks by appeals to the king's financial interest, as diminution of traffic spelt diminution of customs revenue. This was the chord struck when in the 1360s it seemed that the nascent coal trade of Newcastle was in danger of suppression. The alarm came when on 26 November 1362 Edward III ordered a general embargo throughout the country on the export of corn, lead, tin, worsted cloth, sea-coal, cheese, butter, mill-stones and the like.²¹ This was relaxed somewhat the following spring, when it would appear that certain burgesses under colour of the establishment of a religious fraternity proposed to form an association with various "strangers", with trade as its true object. The details are obscure, for the mayor of Newcastle soon had wind of the affair and successfully petitioned Edward III for its suppression as detrimental to the interests of the town. It is reasonable to conjecture that the proposed association of burgesses and strangers was not unconnected with the

¹⁹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1340-3*, p. 438.

²⁰ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 6251; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1343-5*, pp. 392-3; *Cal. Close Rolls 1343-6*, pp. 465, 554.

²¹ Cf. P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 6448, where the mayor and burgesses protest that apart from coal they have "no other common merchandise to maintain their estate and pay the king the farm of their town of Newcastle".

partnership of John Plummer, burgess of Newcastle, and Walter Hesilden, burgess of Gateshead, who about this date entered into a 24 years' agreement with the bishop of Durham to work coals in Gateshead. They were to begin paying their annual rent of £5 from the hour they sunk a pit from which they could work a daily stint of coals "as at Whickham". The mining was to be undertaken at the lessees' own cost, but the bishop would allow them sufficient timber in his park of Gateshead for propping their pits and building drainage, as well as for making their staithes on the river-bank for shipment. The bishop also granted them way-leaves to the mine and undertook to lease no other pits in the area during the 24 years.²²

This mining venture was viewed in Newcastle with mounting fury which broke into violent action before two years had elapsed. Plummer and Hesilden duly petitioned Edward III for redress and from this complaint we learn that the burgesses of Newcastle had tried to prevent their vending coal not only in the neighbourhood but also in Newcastle itself, so that the king to safeguard the customs due to him from the shipment of coal both coastwise and for export to Calais was obliged to take them and their colliers under his special protection. At the same time the partnership was enlarged to include Roger Fulthorpe and John Birtley, officers of the bishop of Durham, and a formal royal licence secured to cover their transshipment of coal from Gateshead to Newcastle for payment of customs dues.²³ No more is heard of this grievance until 1383 when Bishop Fordham of Durham entered an impassioned plea for the relaxation of Newcastle's monopoly of the Tyne trade in coal and other wares which, he claimed, deprived him of a substantial part of the traditional revenue of his see.²⁴

The advantages and disadvantages of restriction on trading facilities must have been the constant preoccupation

²² P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 10313; R. Welford, *op. cit.*, 162-5.

²³ R. Welford, *op. cit.*, 169-70.

²⁴ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 12493.

of the fourteenth-century merchant—liberty for himself and restriction for his rivals. For ease in collecting customs dues the kings of England sought to limit export trade to specified major ports, which normally gave Newcastle the status of sole *dépôt* for England north of York, although an alternative royal policy was to channel all English exports on Calais, then in English hands. The former policy worked to Newcastle's advantage, the latter had the objection that it tended to prevent direct trade with the Baltic, a natural market for the North East. Although precise details of this trade are hard to come by, references to it do exist;²⁵ and its desirability is manifest, since the Baltic could supply corn and timber (which were both in short supply in the North East) in exchange for the inferior local wool which was at a discount on the Flemish market, as also coal, similarly hard to dispose of in France.²⁶ The latter difficulty is neatly exemplified in a petition of about 1378 where a request was made to the king's council to authorize the direct export of coals and grindstones from Newcastle on due payment of customs, "as when ships come to Calais with coal and the same stones, the merchants find no one willing to buy them nor can they find workers to unload them, to the detriment of the king's customs and the shipping of Newcastle".²⁷

The commercial life of the ports of the North East, Hartlepool, Newcastle, North Shields and Berwick, rested on a most precarious base during the years when the English kings sought to manipulate the English wool trade to their own financial advantage, while climate and Scottish raids combined to frustrate the attempts of the North East to profit by this trade. Newcastle with its superior municipal organization was able to show most resilience to these difficulties, but

²⁵ Cf. P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 11348; *Cal. Close Rolls 1339-41*, pp. 29-30: 1364-8, p. 442; J. Brand, *op. cit.* ii, 222-4.

²⁶ Cf. the tariff of tolls imposed for a *murage* at Newcastle in 1327 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1327-30*, pp. 3-4), the comparative values of fleeces throughout England estimated in 1337 (*Ibid.* 1334-8, pp. 480-2) and various petitions complaining of the dangers of the decay of trade in Newcastle (P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 11248, 6483).

²⁷ P.R.O., Anc. Pet. 3210.

much of her later history bears the scars of the early battles with North Shields, Gateshead and Berwick, the internal dissensions between "rich" and "poor" burgesses, and the desperate need to export—be it coal, grindstones, or inferior wool—to secure the necessities of life.

RICH BURGESSES OF NEWCASTLE, 1305.

Authorities consulted include C. H. Hunter Blair, *Mayors and Sheriffs of Newcastle* (AA⁴ XVIII), F. Bradshaw, "The Lay Subsidy Roll of 1296" (AA³ XIII, 186-302), A. M. Oliver, *Early Deeds relating to Newcastle* (Surtees Society 137, 1924) (END), J. C. Davies, "The Wool Customs Accounts for Newcastle upon Tyne for the reign of Edward I" (AA⁴ XXXII, 220-308) and P.R.O., Customs Accounts 105/4-14 passim: 49/2.

NICHOLAS OF KARLIOL Bailiff of Newcastle 1299-1302, 1305; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1302; mayor, 1303-4 and 1309; collector of customs, 1304-09; alderman of guild, 1308; pardoned for aiding Thomas, earl of Lancaster, against Piers Gavaston, 1313.

PETER LE GRAPERIE Bailiff of Newcastle between 1287 and 1299; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1295-1305; mayor, 1300-02; assessed as worth £20 in personal effects in Newcastle and £4 15s. 4d. in Killingworth, 1296; exported in partnership with Peter Sampson 17 sacks of wool in 1295/6: 26 sacks of wool, 4 lasts 12 dickers hides and 200 sheepskins in 1296/7: and 22 sacks 10 stone of wool in 1308.

THOMAS CLERK, alias THOMAS DE FRISMARAYS Assessed at 35s., 1296; bailiff of Newcastle between 1300 and 1325; clerk of the town court, 1300; collector of customs on wine and wool, 1302; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1302 and 1305; exported 6 sacks of wool, 1308.

NICHOLAS SON OF JOHN SCOT Bailiff of Newcastle between 1300 and 1307; mayor of Newcastle, 1310 and 1321; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1307; sheriff of Northumberland, 1314.

JOHN SON OF HENRY SCOT Represented Newcastle in parliament, 1307; pardoned for aiding Thomas, earl of Lancaster, against Piers Gavaston, 1313; bailiff of Newcastle, 1314.

THOMAS OF KARLIOL Assessed at 70s., 1296; bailiff of Newcastle, 1304 and 1309-12; mayor, 1313; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1313.

GILBERT FLEMING Collector of the new custom on wine, 1302; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1306, 1307 and 1313; bailiff of Newcastle between 1308 and 1312.

JOHN TORALD Exporter of 2 sacks of wool, 5 dickers 4 hides and 100 sheepskins, 1297; assessed as worth £21, 1296; bailiff of Newcastle, 1302-3. (END, p. 209.)

WALTER OF COGEHAM, alias COUGATE Exporter of 4 sacks wool, 1296; 2 sacks of wool, 1½ lasts of hides and 400 sheepskins, 1297; assessed at £17 6s. 8d., 1296; bailiff of Newcastle, 1294. (END, 208.)

WILLIAM PORTER Exporter of 1 last of hides, 1297; assessed at £18, 1296.

WILLIAM HERYNG Exporter of 14 sacks 16 stone of wool and 1 last of hides, 1308; probably a burgess of Berwick also.

JOHN TROTAUND Assessed at £3 6s. 8d., 1296.

STEPHEN TROTAUND Assessed at 7s. 7d., 1296.

ROGER PEYTEVYN Bailiff of Newcastle, 1282-5 and 1290; exporter of 1 last of hides, 1297; assessed at £3 10s., 1296.

PETER SWEYN Exporter of 6 sacks of wool, 1308; succeeded Gilbert Haukyn as keeper of the tronage and King's clerk for the old and new customs at Newcastle, 1311. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1307-13*, p. 357.)

JOHN WODEMAN Nothing certain known.

JOHN CRAWE Assessed at 16s., 1296; acquired property in the Close, Newcastle, from his (?) brother-in-law, Thomas of Gosforth, a tanner, 1309; owned shares in a booth in Skinnergate, 1309. (END, 28, 149.)

ROBERT OF MORPATH Assessed at 34s., 1296; exporter of 4 sacks 4 stone of wool, 1308.

GILBERT OF FENNUNN Nothing certain known.

WILLIAM OF TYNEMUTH Nothing certain known, except he was a tanner.

THOMAS OF HERTEBURN Assessed at £4 12s., 1296.

WILLIAM OF OGGLE Bailiff of Newcastle between 1283 and 1306; one of the twelve assessors for the Newcastle subsidy of 1296, for which his own assessment was £3 6s.; commissioner to audit the accounts of the collectors of murage in Newcastle, 1311. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1307-13*, p. 361.)

GILBERT OF OGGLE Son of above; exporter of 7 sacks of wool, 1308; pardoned as an adherent of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, 1313. (END, 174; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1313-17*, p. 25.)

ROBERT OF BOROUDON Assessed at 17s. 6d., 1296; exporter of 130 sheepskins, 1308.

ADAM OF DUREME Assessed at £2 2s., 1296; exporter of 3½ dickers of hides, 1296/7; 28½ sacks 10 stone of wool, 200 sheepskins

and $\frac{1}{2}$ last of hides, 1308: and 13 sacks of wool, 1318; bailiff of Newcastle between 1307 and 1319.

ADAM BRIDOK Assessor of the lay subsidy at Newcastle, 1296, his own assessment being £14 13s. 4d.; exporter of $6\frac{1}{2}$ sacks of wool and 200 sheepskins, 1308.

WILLIAM TYNEMUTH Nothing certain known except he was a draper.

NICHOLAS OF ELLERKER A leading exporter from North East ports, whose cargoes from Newcastle included 26 sacks 8 stone of wool, 800 sheepskins and 4 lasts of hides in 1297: $55\frac{1}{2}$ sacks 13 stone of wool, 1,200 sheepskins and 5 lasts of hides in 1308: 17 sacks 5 stone of wool and 1,000 sheepskins in 1318: 52 sacks of wool and 740 sheepskins in 1325/6: 18 sacks of wool in 1326/7; and 10 sacks 9 pokes of wool in 1333/4. In addition he shipped from Hartlepool 108 sacks 14 stone of wool and 360 sheepskins between 1312 and 1314. He was a collector of the murage at Newcastle, 1311. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1307-13*, p. 359.)

JOHN LOBALD Exporter of 2 sacks of wool and 15 dickers of hides, 1297; assessed at £8 18s. 4d., 1296, being one of the assessors.

THOMAS OF SYLKESWRTH Assessed at £5 3s. 4d., 1296; exporter of 5 sacks of wool, 1308.

THOMAS DE LA BAILLY Nothing certain known.

HENRY OF NEUTON Bailiff of Newcastle, 1304 and 1312-13.

JOHN FLEMYNG Nothing certain known.

ROGER OF HECHAM Assessed at £1 8s. in Newcastle and at £4 1s. at Ovingham, 1296; bailiff of Newcastle, 1304.

WILLIAM DE[L] BURNE Assessed at 7s., 1296; exporter of 11 sacks 10 stone of wool, 160 sheepskins and 1 last of hides, 1308: and of 1 sack of wool and 400 sheepskins, 1318.

WILLIAM OF YORK Exporter of 8 sacks 9 stone of wool and 100 sheepskins, 1308; owned a booth in Skinnergate, 1309; one of 15 merchants of Newcastle who loaded 2 ships with 89 sacks of wool for Flanders which were seized off Scarborough by pirates, 1311. (END, 149; *Cal. Close Rolls 1307-13*, p. 436.)

JOHN OF REDDESDALE Assessed at 35s., 1296.

ADAM FYNK Assessed at 21s., 1296.

ADAM NEU OF BARNARD CASTLE Nothing certain known.

NICHOLAS OF FAUDON Assessed at £3 4s. 6d., 1296.

PETER OF HOUEDEN Nothing certain known.

ADAM OF BRINKELOWE Nothing certain known.

JOHN REDCALE Exporter of 16 sacks 16 stone of wool, 45 sheepskins and $6\frac{1}{2}$ dickers of hides, 1308.

WILLIAM RUSSEL A baker; assessed at £2 4s., 1296.

RICHARD DEL HOWES Nothing certain known.

WILLIAM OF BENWELL Assessed at 7s., 1296; exporter of 3 sacks 5 stone of wool, 1308.

GILBERT HAUKN Customs collector at Newcastle from 1304; represented Newcastle in parliament, 1309, 1324, and 1330; bailiff of Newcastle between 1317 and 1340.

HENRY PANDY Assessed at 7s., 1296.

ADAM ELWARD Assessed at £4 13s. 4d., 1296.

THOMAS PROUOUR Nothing certain known.

ADAM OF GALWAY Assessed at £5, 1296; bailiff of Newcastle, 1306; collector of murage at Newcastle, 1304; exporter of 30 sacks 20 stone of wool and 3 lasts 19½ dickers of hides, 1308: 6½ sacks of wool, 240 sheepskins and 25 dickers of hides, 1317/8: and 13 sacks of wool, 1325/6; owned a booth in Skinnergate, 1309 (END, 149); one of the 15 merchants of Newcastle who loaded 2 ships with 89 sacks of wool for Flanders, which were seized off Scarborough by pirates, 1311; pardoned as an adherent of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, 1313. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1307-13*, p. 219; *1313-17*, p. 24; *Cal. Close Rolls 1307-13*, p. 436.)

POOR BURGESSES OF NEWCASTLE, 1305.

WILLIAM LE SADLERE Assessed at 7s. for lay subsidy, 1296.

WILLIAM OF DALTON Assessed at 35s. for lay subsidy, 1296.

RICHARD OF LONDON (?) a weaver, 137. (END, 149.)

THOMAS OF LEYCESTRE

IVO LE PESTUR (?) an assessor of the lay subsidy, 1296, his own assessment being £6 11s. 6d.

THOMAS LAURENCE

RICHARD OF FENNUM

RICHARD OF EGERMUND Assessed at 7s. for lay subsidy, 1296.

WILLIAM SMALLEGH

WALTER SON OF RICHARD

THOMAS SON OF RICHARD

ADAM OF GUNTER Assessed at 14s. for lay subsidy, 1296; owned land in Pandon near the Carmelite friary. (*Cal. Close Rolls 1296-1302*, p. 290.)

