

THE EARLY CUSTOMS AND CUSTOM HOUSES IN THE PORT OF LONDON

by

Rupert C. Jarvis, I.S.O., F.S.A.

The old Custom House site in Lower Thames Street was excavated in 1973 and an excavation report appeared in the last volume of these *Transactions*.¹ That report contained also a fully documented account of the site as a piece of real estate; this paper is a documented account of the *administration* associated with that site, with particular historical reference to those times that seem archaeologically significant.

In the early bronze age the Thames was a natural *export* route, for example, for Cornish tin and Welsh and Irish copper to the near Continent; in the middle bronze age it was the natural *import* route, for example, for the newer type of implement from the upper Rhine valley and Switzerland. Already before the Roman period Britain was also exporting cattle and grain, and although the export of grain may have ceased in Roman times—because of the maintenance of the Roman garrison—there were hunting dogs and slaves, against the imports of wine, oil, pottery, jewellery and other luxuries. Tacitus says that already by A.D. 60 the port of London was a great centre of commerce and crowded with merchants (*copia negotiatorum et commeatum maxime celebre*),² yet there was likely to have been an unfavourable balance of trade during the whole of the Roman period. Thus, although Rome may have been responsible for *Londinium*, it was not responsible for the Thames. In other words, London owed more to the port than it did to the City—a fact not usually emphasised by London's historians.

The 1973 excavation disclosed a Roman quay overlying a thick layer of sandy gravel above the natural clay. There is, however, neither evidence nor conjecture that this is the site of the administrative headquarters of the Roman *portorium*. Thus, although the fine—and very prompt—excavation report is of considerable interest on other accounts, it has provided no additional information about the Roman customs system in Britain nor much that is new about the river frontage. As regards the Roman customs, the 'incised slab' displayed in the Museum at Colchester depicting the custom house there (with a Mediterranean ship alongside—much reminding one of the Phoenician vessel on a sarcophagus at Tyre, now in the museum at Beirut) is, of course, simulated only. What *portorium* control was in fact exercised in Britain (or in the corresponding ports in Gaul) is not clear. As regards Roman taxation more generally, no trace of *curatores*, (with special reference to more direct taxation) has as yet been found in Britain. In London we seem still to be left with the alternatives of a continuous river frontage (e.g. of quays) itself forming an actual or potential defensive line, or a defensive wall along an alignment farther to the south than has yet been identified, overborne towards the close of the period (and destroyed by later flood water) by a general tidal rise (entirely overcoming the older shore-line) which can be evidenced in certain other coastal sites in Britain.³

The 1973 excavation report remarks upon the river erosion of the Roman levels and the hypothetical early Saxon levels, but notes 'a few small sherds of Saxo-Norman . . .

pottery'.⁴ If this is the only archaeological evidence for the period, the historical evidence is almost as scant. As regards the latter, it has to be realized that governmental procedures at that period did not rest upon a written basis. Although, in this respect, the Anglo-Saxon practice was in advance of the Norman—for example, Edward the Confessor has a seal; William the Conqueror had not—yet 'office copies' of outward missives were not as yet kept 'for the record'. Therefore, writs or charters of this early period cannot now be known except from the chance survivals at the receiving end, often in ecclesiastical repositories. That there was, however, a customs administration operating in London in the mid-eighth century is evidenced by a document the text of which survives among the fragmentary extracts of the Saxon charters of St. Pauls,⁵ the earliest evidence of English native customs. The cartulary text refers to an exemption from customs duties—*vectigal atque tributum* (it is not clear exactly what distinction between them, if any, was intended)—granted by Ethelbert, king of Mercia in A.D. 742, to the then Bishop of London in respect of cargoes unladen in the port, the exemption being granted on account of their being used or consumed in a religious house. The reference to customs *quae mihi antea jure competebant* clearly implies a continuing administration. The building, however, from which such an administration might have been directed seems to have had, by Mr. Tatton-Brown's estimates, a river frontage somewhat farther inshore than the earlier Roman waterfront, and now archaeologically inaccessible under the public roadway.

There are references in the excavation report to a little twelfth century pottery. Although there may be little archaeologically between the mid eighth and early thirteenth century levels, there is, certainly a very great deal historically. By about 1200 archives were springing up in England in very rich profusion. That remarkable series of administrative reforms, the re-scheme of the system of naval supplies, the reconstruction of the Royal Navy generally, the transfer from feudal levies to mercenary land forces, the organisation of certain ports for fiscal and naval needs, the control of castles (particularly the castles of the West), the rationalisation of the Cornish tin mines, the departmentalisation of the Exchequer, and most of all, the development of the Chancery, all almost certainly owed something to what V. H. Galbraith—a great archivist—has called 'the fierce energy of King John'. In any case, it is all of a piece that an entirely new structuring of the customs service was instituted at the turn of the century, for already before 1200, to Fitzstephen's London *ex omni natione quae sub coelo est, navalia gaudent institores habere commercia*.⁶ This customs system of John may very well have been the earliest completely national system in this country and hence the first to produce anything like a systematic archive.

A very detailed account of the administrative system in 1203 has survived in the Chancery,⁷ and the detailed figures of the yield from the ports (from the Border east-and-south-about to Cornwall) has survived in the Exchequer.⁸ From this it is clear that notwithstanding the importance of the ports of the Humber and the Wash, Norman London still retained something of the preponderance it had achieved in Roman days. The Cinque ports, for example, from Sandwich through Dover, Rye, Pevensey, Seaford and Shoreham, even as far as Chichester, except for Winchelsea (on account of the wine trade), were relatively unimportant, at least as regards commerce. Although Boston, Lincoln and Lynn closely approached London, yet one sixth of the total revenue of England was collected from the port of London.⁹ To see Norman London in perspective, however, one must realize that almost all the leading ports were situated on the East

coast—Lincoln being among the principal; all the ports on the south coast, except Southampton, were relatively insignificant; and no port whatsoever was returned for the west coast. But although London had established something of a superiority over other East coast ports it was not by any pronounced margin.¹⁰ The Thames did not command the main volume even of the near-continental trade; it had to share a considerable portion of it with Southampton. As regards the near-continental and northern trade, the Thames could claim only a relatively minor portion of the whole, nearly four-fifths of it passing through the ports of the Humber and the Wash.

A scheme of considerable administrative sophistication¹¹ was worked out in much detail for the assessment collection and accounting of the customs duties. This scheme provided not only the essential foundation for all medieval customs administration but it contained, furthermore, all the characteristic elements of assessing, collecting and accounting control today. Dutiable transactions were required to be enrolled and assessed for the *quindecima* (bonds being taken in respect of contingent liability); duties due were to be paid to the collector who was to enter the duty paid upon a roll and keep the proceeds under lock and key (*in una salva arca under tres claves vel quatuor*) until returned to the 'head collectors' (*donec redatur capitalibus custodibus per cirographa contra baillivos*). Another official was appointed to the port to keep a 'counter roll' (*rotulos contra eos facient*), an independent record of all moneys received, but should not himself receive any. The particular significance of this form of control was that London (in common with all other ports) was, at least for this purpose, taken out of the ambit of the sheriff, to account direct to the Exchequer. Thus the Crown, by its own officers, assumed a direct control of all the ports of England. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the systematic exaction of royal customs in England was established at least by 1203.¹²

It is commonly held that the *magna custuma* of 1275¹³ (variously referred to as *nova* or *antiqua*) was the first systematic and permanent system. Apart altogether, however, from John's *quindecima*, because the 'grant' of 1275 is recorded as having been instituted at the instance and request of the merchants in parliament, the inherent likelihood may very well be—unless the phrase were an idle formula—that even in 1275 what the merchants 'instanced and requested' was an existing system to be made more satisfactory—to the merchants. In 1275 John's administrative scheme was improved in certain details, for example, two halves of the cocket¹⁴ seal of the port were to be held by the collector and comptroller respectively, but in the case of London the Lord Mayor and sheriffs were bidden to 'elect by the oath of good and lawful men thereof two men of the City who shall keep one part of the seal' as joint-comptrollers, the other half of the port seal to be held by the merchants of Lucca, to whom Edward I had farmed the revenue. Richer de Refham and Hugh Porter were accordingly appointed to collect the customs in the port of London and the Lord Mayor was bidden to assist in the assessment and collection.¹⁵

In 1303, by the *carta mercatoria*, Edward I¹⁶ (operating through the Exchequer and not through Parliament) agreed with the alien merchants—who shipped, for example, about 65 per cent of the wool concerned—a *nova custuma*, a complete system of increased customs duties, to be charged upon commodities shipped by alien merchants into and out of the realm. It was, incidentally, a clause in this charter that extended the function of the troneurs in the sense of setting up the king's beam not only in every port, but also 'in each market town and fair of our realm'.¹⁷ One would naturally expect that

the general development of the customs service towards the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries would reflect in extended physical space. Certainly the 1973 excavation provided evidence in relation to the earlier medieval buildings on the site, pointing to an enclosure of the foreshore overlying well-washed Roman levels, the construction of an entirely new river frontage (east–west) and a timber north–south structure going out into the river ('that could only partly be examined') but was probably the main jetty—all 'some time in the fourteenth century (or possibly the late thirteenth)'.¹⁸ It would make a neat package if, with reasonable approximation in dating, these two sets of circumstances could be evidentially related. Mr. Tatton-Brown, however suggests, on the contrary, that the east–west structure (apart from the north–south jetty) may have been built in 1339 as part of a military defence rather than as a piece of harbour work.

Documentary references to the late fourteenth century custom house have been well milled over, if only on account of Geoffrey Chaucer who was appointed a comptroller in the port of London,¹⁹ and presumably worked there. That there was a custom house on the Wool Quay, however, before John Churchman acquired it in 1378, seems evidenced by a patent reference already in 1377 to 'the house appertaining to the Great Customs upon le Woole Key'.²⁰ Also, there has been confusion about Churchman's functions in connection with the tronage. The fact that in the house he built 'for the quiet of merchants', it was the Crown that took an easement for the balance and the weights, a compt for the comptroller's clerks and other officers of the tronage,²¹ indicates clearly that that tronage related to the Crown. The particular office that upon his death was made over to the Grocer's Company²² was not a Crown but a City function. The former related to the king's beam itself, the latter to 'the common beam, commonly known as "the king's beam".' The former related to weighing between the Crown and the subject for purposes of the king's customs; the latter related to weighing *versus mercatores et mercatores* in the common way of trade,²³ it being not at all uncommon for two such offices to be filled by a single person. Shortly afterwards, Churchman was granted, by patent (per privy seal), an additional rent for a small chamber 'for a latrene and a soller over the counting house (*computatorium*) containing two chambers and a garret'.²⁴ In the 1973 excavation the chalk and ragstone frontage of the fourteenth century custom house, going down to Roman timbers (although yielding few dateable objects) could be conjectured immediately below the modern basement floor.

In general, the assessment, collection and accounting of the customs duties was becoming more complicated. Certain classes of merchandise, wool, woolens and woolfels, leather, tin, wax, and wines were dutiable by description; all other dutiable commodities were liable *ad valorem*. In John's *quindecima* it is not quite clear how exactly the fifteenth was assessed, but a later effort to determine the relationship between price and value²⁵ appears to have failed owing to an inadequacy of commercial documentation. In the result, the *ad valorem* duty came to be based upon notional values only. Professor Gras discovered (and printed in 1918)²⁶ a table of notional values: 'A Rate made of the Pr[i]cys of all manner of warys' (issued in 1509 and re-issued in 1532). Because these prices had been fixed by the Council with the advice of the surveyors, comptrollers and the collector of the Port of London it is at least likely that they were valid in London only. A somewhat earlier (pre-1503) list of prices Gras declared to be a crudely edited 'Book of Rates' whose 'whole make-up is crudely indicative of a pioneer invention'.²⁷ (In this latter respect he was completely mistaken.) He therefore declared

'Books of Rates' to consist essentially of tables of notional values only and the 1509/32 document to be the earliest Book of Rates. This has gone unchallenged for well over half a century. I have, however, recently discovered, from an hitherto unrecognised recording of it in 'Arnold's Chronicle', an earlier true Book of Rates, 'The Rate of the Kynges Custum . . . regestred in the Escheker'.²⁸ In this, in modern parlance, the tariff categories and the tariff rates, without any notional values—are clearly laid down, for native, Hanseatic, Spanish and other merchants.

The combined effect of the *quindecima* of 1203 and the *antiqua custuma* of 1275 was to limit oversea trade to those places where proper officials had been appointed by patent. During the ensuing three centuries trade tended to fall away from certain ports (sometimes on account of silting and other physical features) and favour other places. Because oversea trade at such latter places was not, in strictness lawful, certain of the local patent officials would appoint their own 'deputies', by their own warrant, to control such trade. The practice, although not exactly *illegal*, was certainly *extra*-statutory. The local officials felt that in the interests of trade they were merely easing the law to meet the actual circumstances. They were not of their own authority *permitting* such trade; they were merely *suffering* it—without specifically authorising it.

By mid Tudor times it was desired to bring the system into a more orderly form and William Paulet (now created Earl of Winchester) took the organisation of the customs in hand. Although an able administrator, trained in the school of Thomas Cromwell, he was no financier. Being something of a politician, however, he introduced a package deal, the Crown would provide statutory support for those extra-statutory practices already countenanced, but would tighten up other procedures in the interest of the Crown.²⁹ For example, for the future it would not be lawful to lade or unlade any merchandise in the foreign trade save at such places where a patent or warranted official had, 'by the space of ten years last past, been customably resident' (even at fully authorised ports), except at such berths, quays or other places as the Crown should assign and appoint for that purpose, by virtue of a commission out of the Court of Exchequer.³⁰ The earlier places were now to be known as 'legal quays'; the newer places where oversea trade might be 'suffered' were to be known as 'sufferance wharves'; all other places were 'unapproved places'. These differences came to be very important in the port of London. All the legal quays were located on the north side of the Upper Pool, from the Tower westwards, that is, they were all within the limits of the City. All sufferances were either down-stream or on the Borough side. As trade on the Thames gradually moved downstream, particularly during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, unapproved places were continuously pressing for sufferance status, but all sorts of conditions could be imposed by the Customs upon sufferance wharves that could not be imposed upon legal quays. The jealousy of the City faction in this respect occasioned very considerable friction between the parties. In any case, it is not surprising in the general increase in maritime trade by the mid Tudor period, the greater reliance of the Crown upon the customs revenue, and the general restructuring of the Customs service in consequence, that the medieval custom house in London became altogether inadequate to current needs. As might be expected, it was Winchester of the 1558 reforms who was to 'forward the building of the new Custom House and wharves' in the port of London.³¹

Written sources for the Tudor custom house are extremely scarce and the graphic

sources are extremely confusing. The illustrations of Agas (1592?), Norden (1593), Visscher (1616), Gottfried of Frankfurt (1638), Hollar (1647) and Howlett (1663) cannot be reconciled. Ralph Agas—with or without George Vertue—and Norden are not very helpful. Visscher's custom house has a main range of uniform height but without any staircase-tower and with no clear arcading, but has flanking buildings east and west. Matthew Meriam's reproduction, published in the mid-seventeenth century, purports to derive from Gottfried's drawing of 1638. Here the custom house—not specifically designated,—shows a three storey main range with east and west ranges more or less at right angles and arcading in the centre range. The buildings stand round an open quay with vessels alongside. Wenceslaus Hollar's engraving of 1647 depicts a custom house with a main range with a western turret and an arch towards the west end, with an east wing one storey less and a flanking building to the east leading down to the river frontage. The view 'engraved from a scarce print' by Bartholomew Howlett shows a three-storey brick building with octagonal staircase-towers at the angles and at the mid front. In this south front the fenestration is regular, the eastern half being pierced by an archway and there is possibly an arcade in the centre range. To the east is a flanking building and presumably a warehouse. On the open quay are items of merchandise and a wagon and shipping alongside. All this is very confusing, but Bowles, relying on an early drawing of the general ruins on the site just after the Great Fire, shows three towers still standing—which inclines one towards Howlett's 'View'. It was, of course, this custom house that was destroyed in the Great Fire.

Notwithstanding such loss, however, the official business of the port, the report and clearance of ships and the collection of the revenue, had to be carried on. A 'house in Mark Lane heretofore called by the name of Lord Baunis House, [was] now appointed to be the Custom House'.³² This house, however, needed to be equipped and fitted as an office but, because the 'late ruin of howses in the Citty of London by the late conflagration gives so much imployment to carpenters bricklayers and masons', the necessary labour could not be procured 'but by some special warrant'. Because, however, the work at the custom house was seen as 'service for the publique trade of the citty and so consequently for the advantage of the whole body', the Crown authorised the 'press' of 'as many men as they have present occasion of' to bring the new building 'into that forme as may answer that use'.³³ The house in Mark Lane was later referred to, not as 'the Custom House', but as 'the present house where the Customs are managed'.

There appeared to have been moves by the Whitehall faction to take the opportunity of the Fire to remove the administrative headquarters of the customs service to some other site more convenient to the court than to trade and shipping, that is to say, nearer to Whitehall than to Billingsgate.³⁴ Nevertheless, common sense prevailed. It was decided eventually therefore to 'rebuild our Custome-house in the place where it formerly stood' and, furthermore, to enlarge it 'to the use of our merchants'.³⁵ In the result, an elaborate survey of all the legal quays between the Tower and London Bridge was undertaken and 'a draught or modell of a new Custom House was produced' and an order given 'to build it after Mr. Wrenn's Modell',³⁶ the commencement of the work being authorised in the June of 1669.³⁷ By the time the building was complete not all was well between the officers of the Crown and the King's farmers. Eventually it was settled that the new building should be divided 'to the convenience' of both, 'according to a copy of a certificate from Dr. Christopher Wren', the Crown officers to have the east end, the farmers the west, 'the Great Long Room to be in common'.³⁸ So far as is known, this is

the first use of the term 'Long Room' to designate that part of any custom house where the public business of the port is transacted. The term has spread from the port of London, not only all over the country, but all over the world. The building was completed in 1671, at a cost of £10,252 6s. 8¼d.—but by this time the Crown had become insolvent.³⁹

Already by the time of the Long Parliament the customs had become a constitutional issue between the Crown and Parliament. By ordinance of 21 January 1643 Parliament took the customs out of the control of the Crown, to administer them—together with the new excises—by a parliamentary commission.⁴⁰ Thus, the Customs at last came 'out of court' and was 'departmentalised', as the administrative historians say. At the general reaction of 1660, even the Cavalier Parliament laid it down that the customs were a statutory tax and not a prerogative impost—but returned them into farm, where all was not well. When, after the Great Fire, money was urgently required to rebuild London, the King was content that Parliament should slip away without making any provision. The City, however, proposed a customs duty upon coal brought coastwise into the port of London and insisted, furthermore, that the money yield should not be handled either by the King's Customs or the King's farmers. Even the royalist Parliament had perforce to agree that the customs duty should be paid into the hands of the City Chamberlain—which directly implied the severest criticism of the executive in the whole of Stuart history. The records, therefore, relating to the customs duty for the rebuilding of the City, St. Pauls and the City churches are now not to be found among the Customs or Treasury records in the Custom House or the Public Record Office, but among the City records in the Corporation Record Office.⁴¹ At the time of the opening of Wren's new Custom House negotiations for a new farm of the customs broke down and, in the result, the Crown and Parliament had to revert to the old Commonwealth method of parliamentary commission, the commission then appointed (by royal letter patent) being constitutionally the same as that in office today.⁴² Where earlier customs records had been returned into the Exchequer, from 1671 they now commenced to form a departmental archive and it is immensely to be regretted that the fire of 1715 destroyed the greater part of that early archive.

The Wren custom house of 1671 has been said to have been 'one of his most perfect buildings'.⁴³ On the contrary, it seems to have been a rather cobbled job. In January 1715 'the accidental blowing up of a house where gun-powder was sold' (presumably for the use of shipping) fired two houses next to it. The wind carried the fire to other houses and warehouses on both sides of Thames Street and, in the result, the west end of Wren's custom house was damaged beyond repair. It was now found that the ends of the timbers supporting the Long Room were rotten, that its windows were beyond repair, that the pilasters and stone ornaments would all have to come down and that the wall on the south front, which had been cased with rubbed and gauged brickwork, was only four inches thick. It seems likely, furthermore, that the frontage level had originally been raised with made earth merely, altogether inadequate for foundations—which would now require strengthening. In the 1973 excavation of the site Wren's foundations could be identified, but the excavation report provided no evidence as to their adequacy or otherwise. In any case, both Wren and Vanburgh concurred at the time that the building would now have to be completely rebuilt and that a further extension eastwards was now necessary. Thomas Ripley, master-carpenter to the Customs (and later Controller of the

Works and builder of the Admiralty, 1724–26), commenced a new custom house and completed it in 1725.

T. F. Reddaway observed, in relation to custom house space, that the Customs, apart from having to 'deal (*inter alios*) with many rogues', is 'plagued with the necessity to keep many records' and hence suffer 'the age-old need of administrators',⁴⁴ the need for more space. He might have added that the industrial revolution not only made England the principal industrial country in the world, it also made the port of London the world's principal port. The London Custom House administered not only the shipping of the port of London, but the shipping also of England, and after 1707 the shipping of Great Britain, and later the shipping of all the oversea territories. During the *eighty* years following the building of Wren's Custom House, England's imports (between 1670 and 1750) showed relatively modest fluctuations. In the *thirty* years between 1760 and 1790 imports doubled, and doubled again in the *twenty* years between then and 1810. Maitland looked at the port of London's eighteenth century shipping—and outstripped Fitzstephen's paean of praise six centuries earlier. This vast increase in shipping and the commerce and trade that issued from it made his London 'the most populous and opulent that is or . . . ever was, on Earth'.⁴⁵

All this quite vast increase in shipping and commodities could not be accommodated in the legal quays in the City or in the sufferance wharves in the other parts of the Upper Pool. In 1799 the West India Dock Company was statutorily authorised and the docks opened in 1802. In 1800 the London Dock Bill was produced and the docks opened in 1805. In 1803 the East India Dock Company was formed and the East India Docks opened in 1806. In 1801 the Grand Surrey Canal Company was formed and in 1807 Commercial Dock Company instituted. The London Custom House, altogether apart from the Reddaway/Parkinson factor, was inadequate by any standard. It had become 'for some time . . . inadequate to the accommodation of the trade of the port', to say nothing about the maritime and fiscal administration of the oversea territories in North America, the West and East Indies, Africa, India and (later) Australia. Furthermore, by 1810 it had become 'ruinous and dilapidated' beyond practical repair.⁴⁶

The problem now with any rebuilding was not only not to create 'a chasm in the despatch of commercial business which would be destructive to the merchants of Great Britain' but, having regard to the war, how to do so 'without creating an expense which could not be justified'. It was sensibly decided to acquire the site immediately westwards of the then present building, to build a new and enlarged structure, and to transfer the work from one building to the other on a convenient day. The Treasury agreed in the May of 1812 and on the 25th of the following October the first stone of the new building was laid. The later story of this 1813–17 Custom House, and its partial rebuilding in 1825–26, has already been told in these *Transactions*.⁴⁷ When the Customs again left the site, on account of another great fire—they were bombed out in 1940–41—they again migrated to Mark Lane. This time they named the building 'King's Beam House' after their historic weighing devise, referred to earlier in this paper.

NOTES

¹ Vol. 25, 1974, pp. 117–219.

² *Annals*, XIV, 33.

³ J. Wachter, *The Towns of Roman Britain*, 1975, pp. 95–7 and 176.

⁴ *Transactions*, vol. 25, p. 128.

⁵ M. Gibbs, *Early Charters of the Cathedral of St. Paul* (Camden Third Series, LVIII, 1939), p. 6.

⁶ '*Descriptio Nobilissimae Ciuitatis Londoniae*' (J. Stow, *Survey of London*, Kingsford edition [1908]), vol. II, p. 224.

- ⁷ *Rotuli Litterarum Patentium* . . . 1201–1216, pp. 42–3.
- ⁸ P.R.O. Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, pipe roll 50, mem. 16B.
- ⁹ Pipe Roll Society LIV (NS XII), pp. xliii–lx. Although there are a number of errors in the *amounts* at the ports, the ports themselves are briefly discussed.
- ¹⁰ Carson (*The Ancient and Rightful Customs* [1972], p. 16) much exaggerates the importance of London, merely by mistaking the latin 'D' (500) for a thousand ('M').
- ¹¹ R. C. Jarvis, 'The Archival History of the Customs Records', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. I (1959), pp. 240–1; and F. Ranger (ed.) *Prisca Munimenta* (1973), pp. 203–4.
- ¹² There have been variant translations of clause 41 of Magna Carta.
- ¹³ *Parliamentary Writs*, I, pp. 1–2.
- ¹⁴ Cocket = *quo quietus est*.
- ¹⁵ *Calendar Letter Book C*, p. 117.
- ¹⁶ It may be significant that this charter was not entered upon the charter roll of Edward I. It is usually quoted from the *confirmatio* of Edward III (2 Edw. III, mem. 11, no. 37). But see Rymer, *Foedera*, II, pp. 747–8 and *Munimenta Gildhallae*, II, *Liber Customarum*, i, p. 208.
- ¹⁷ R. C. Jarvis, 'The King's Beam', these *Transactions*, vol. 19, 1956–58, pp. 128–37.
- ¹⁸ These *Transactions*, vol. 25, p. 138.
- ¹⁹ Patent roll, C66/290 (48 Edw. III) mem. 13, and C66/296 (51 Edw. III) mem. 14; *Calendar Patent Rolls* (C.P.R. hereunder) 1370–4, p. 449. As to authority to appoint a deputy, see C.P.R. 1374–7, p. 462. As to Chaucer's 'control' of the customs accounts when John Philpot ('of Philpot Lane'—Lord Mayor) was collector, see P.R.O., L.T.R. enrolled accounts, customs, E 356/14, mem. 16(2).
- ²⁰ C.P.R. 1377–81, p. 36.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 1381–5, p. 149.
- ²² *Ibid.*, p. 299.
- ²³ These *Transactions*, 25, p. 131.
- ²⁴ C.P.R. 1381–85, p. 299.
- ²⁵ 1 Hen. VIII, cap. 20.
- ²⁶ *Early English Customs System* (Harvard), pp. 694–706.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 121.
- ²⁸ 'Arnold's Chronicle', . . . *The Names of the Bailiffs* (? 1503), lxxij^v–liij^v.
- ²⁹ i Eliz. I, cap. 11.
- ³⁰ Memoranda roll, 7 Eliz. I. Hilary, rot 319; printed in B.Y. *Modern Practice of the Court of Exchequer* (1730), pp. 431ff.
- ³¹ *Calendar State Papers, Domestic* (C.S.P.D. hereunder), vol. I, p. 105.
- ³² *Calendar Treasury Books* (C.T.B. hereunder), vol. I, 1660–67, p. 728.
- ³³ C.S.P.D., vol. VII, 1667, p. 138.
- ³⁴ Pepys, *Diary*, 7 September 1666.
- ³⁵ P.R.O. State papers domestic, 29, 171 (94).
- ³⁶ C.S.P.D., vol. VI, 1666–67, p. 56.
- ³⁷ P.R.O. Treasury Board minutes, T29, iii, p. 103.
- ³⁸ C.T.B., vol. III, 1669–72, ii, p. 797.
- ³⁹ P.R.O. Declared accounts, AO I, bundle 2492, rolls 397–8 and C.S.P.D., 1671–72, pp. 68 and 87.
- ⁴⁰ Grand Remonstrance, clauses 18–19; *Lords Journals* vol. V, p. 567; C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642–1660*, vol. I, p. 203.
- ⁴¹ 18–19 Car. II, cap. 8; P. E. Jones and R. Smith, *A Guide to the Records at Guildhall London*, 1950, pp. 73–6.
- ⁴² C. C. Crews, 'Last Period of the Great Farm of the English Customs' (unpublished thesis, University of London); P.R.O. Patent roll, 23 Car. II, p. 2, no. 1, dorsa (27 September 1671); T/51/15A, p. 219.
- ⁴³ *Survey of London*, vol. XV (1934), p. 40.
- ⁴⁴ T. F. Reddaway, 'The London Custom House 1666–1740', *London Topographical Record*, vol. XXI (1958), p. 25.
- ⁴⁵ *History of London* (1756), vol. II, p. 1258.
- ⁴⁶ 39–40 Geo. III, cap. xlvii and 52 Geo. III, cap. 49.
- ⁴⁷ These *Transactions*, vol. 20, pp. 198–213.