**England’s Trade with the Continent in the Early Thirteenth Century: Customs and the Port of Dover**

150-word abstract: This article identifies and prints the earliest detailed customs list from northern Europe, which was prepared for the port of Dover in 1233 or soon after, and it gives fuller and more detailed information about trade than for any other northern European port at this early date. The list shows a remarkable diversity of trade, including some of the earliest references to goods in English documents, and widespread sources of trade including Flanders, Germany and Italy. The depiction of such trading links prompts questions about the ‘commercial revolution’ thesis about the development of European trade, for it shows how diversified trade and consumption could be in the era of the fairs of the Champagne towns, before the establishment of direct maritime links from the Italian cities to northern Europe. The appearance of commodities and trading links in the Dover list suggests that commercial development was earlier and more evolutionary.
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The[[1]](#footnote-1) overall pattern of the European economy in the thirteenth century has generally been represented through the theory of the ‘commercial revolution’. This concept, patterned on the idea of the later ‘industrial revolution’, holds that agricultural improvements and demographic expansion from the tenth century onwards provided the basis for the transformation and commercialisation of the European economy, so that not only did volumes of trade multiply, but also the means of carrying out trade were transformed.[[2]](#footnote-2) A wider variety of goods was traded, including commodities of relatively low value; towns expanded considerably through trade and manufacturing; large-scale artisan activity came to depend on the importation of goods over long distances; knowledge and contacts disseminated across long distances; trade came to be embodied in permanent towns rather than seasonal fairs; banking and finance developed to support many of these activities. These developments accumulated over time, and came together to their fullest extent in the later thirteenth century. Nor did they affect all parts of Europe equally. There were clear centres of change, in the cities of northern Italy and the towns of Flanders, which developed substantial trading networks and forms of economic production that depended on them. Development elsewhere was much more variable, for some centres attained to participation in the ‘commercial revolution’, while elsewhere whole regions took part only insofar as they provided raw materials for the use of industries in other locations. Overall, the period between the tenth and thirteenth centuries saw a marked decline in the proportion of the European population which took part in agriculture as its principal form of economic activity.

The prominence of the Italian cities and the Mediterranean more generally in modern interpretations of the ‘commercial revolution’ is grounded in the rich archives of commercial and fiscal, and to some extent literary, sources which allow their trade to be assessed and evaluated.[[3]](#footnote-3) The correspondence and financial records reflect the activities of a highly literate and well-resourced society, and show in some detail how commercial contracts developed and how a system for providing banking services came into being. Elsewhere, these rich archives generally do not survive, and this has marked consequences for how the roles of other regions of Europe in the ‘commercial revolution’ are understood. Without records generated by merchants or by those who dealt with and levied tariffs on merchants, it is hard to see how far particular regions participated in the ‘commercial revolution’, or how far the timelines of those participations might have reflected or diverged from the timelines of the Italian cities; it is also hard to see the nature and timescales of what came before.

In the case of England, the pattern of documentation allows only a partial assessment of the extent to which that kingdom participated in the ‘commercial revolution’. Manorial documents starting with the Winchester Pipe Rolls allow the growth in population and prices during the thirteenth century to be understood to some extent, and other financial sources allow changes in prices to be assessed. There are abundant references to merchants, production and economic activity in narratives and, indeed, sources of many kinds. Other categories are absent from the English record at early dates, however, including mercantile records, and most of those were prepared by overseas merchants.[[4]](#footnote-4) Detailed evidence for trade and exchange depends on the survival of customs records from the later thirteenth century. From 1275, and with further elaborations in the fourteenth century, English kings levied customs on certain goods, and created an administration to ensure that those customs were collected efficiently and consistently.[[5]](#footnote-5) The king’s officers gathered much information as part of this task; they noted the size or capacity of ships, their destinations and cargoes, and their shipmasters and ports of origin. These records have been used to reconstruct networks of trade from across Europe and north-western Europe in particular, and to show how these were structured and operated.[[6]](#footnote-6) The data from 1275 onwards is rich and has been used to good effect, but it suffers from some notable limitations. It covered those items, mostly wool and wine, which were directly taxed by the Crown, but not other kinds of goods; it covered trade external to the kingdom and so excluded the extensive coastal traffic and inland trade; it omitted some privileged trade nodes of particular importance, such as the Cinque Ports federation of south-eastern England which lay outside direct royal supervision;[[7]](#footnote-7) and, obviously, it omitted trade before 1275.

The post-1275 system of customs and their administration was not the totality of English royal exploitation of trade, however. There were also the local customs, which were much older and wider-ranging than the royal customs. These also went to the king, but were collected through local functionaries who had wider responsibilities for royal revenue;[[8]](#footnote-8) when kings put towns at farm, so that their townsmen could manage them, these tolls were usually included in such grants. Local customs were not consistent in the levels at which tolls were charged, and nor on the articles on which they were levied. These local customs are not documented well from the period before 1275, because there was no central archive for their records; preservation depends on local archives rather than central ones.[[9]](#footnote-9) There are some lists of customs,[[10]](#footnote-10) and mentions in other sources,[[11]](#footnote-11) but coverage is limited and often it does not survive from the most significant ports. The local customs, the main focus of this paper, will be called tolls in the following discussion.

**The Dover List and Trade: Imports, Exports and their Classification**

This essay is based around a source which has not hitherto been printed or discussed in detail, and which supplements the known sources for trade in north-western Europe. It is a list of local tolls from the port of Dover,[[12]](#footnote-12) which, though undated, can securely be attributed to some point between 1217 and 1241, and was very probably produced in 1233.[[13]](#footnote-13) It is of particular importance that this list comes from Dover, because of that port’s location and role. It lies at the north-western edge of the Straits of Dover, and is the nearest point in the British Isles to mainland continental Europe. It developed as a major centre for shipping in Roman times, and the second-century lighthouse still stands,[[14]](#footnote-14) and the port became of commercial and strategic significance. Its position on the shortest crossing of the English Channel meant that it developed as a major port for that crossing and one of the key locations for cross-Channel trade, a status still held by the modern port. Evidence from Dover thus has special significance in assessing the nature and scope of trade in north-western Europe, because of its status as a major node for trade passing into and out of the British Isles. More broadly, the list of tolls is the earliest one from north-western Europe, and so offers a unique opportunity for examining the nature and scope of the ‘commercial revolution’ in its northern aspect, and of assessing how far trade had developed outside the core zones of the ‘commercial revolution’ by a point early in that revolution.

The list is included in Appendix 1 to this article, with full notes to identify the commodities, persons and locations named in the text. It is organised through classification into four sections. The first is called the Great Toll, but that itself is divided into two separate parts, one for goods being exported from England **[a]**, and the other for goods being brought into England **[b]**, even though the latter breaks down at the end through the inclusion of exports **[b51, b54]**. The second is called the Small Toll **[c]**,[[15]](#footnote-15) which is miscellaneous in nature; it covers charges for facilities and shipping, but also charges on transactions made in Dover by outsiders who could not partake in the town’s commercial privileges. This seems to have been assessed on the merchants rather than on the goods themselves, so that traders were in essence buying a licence to transact certain kinds of business. Finally, there is a section on special exemptions from the Small Toll **[d]**. Within the four sections, the list mostly comprises statements beginning ‘Item, ...’, and these have been numbered consecutively for ease of use. Thus, references to the Dover tolls list in this essay are made in the form **[c5]** or similar, which should be both economical and unambiguous. Appendix 2 consists of a shorter and less specific statement concerning the Dover tolls, which survives separately through the records of the king’s exchequer; citations to that are in the form **[25]** or similar. The lack of letters in the citation to Appendix 2 means that there should be no scope for ambiguity in these citations.

***Exports: part* [a]**

The list of exports from Dover is the shortest of the four parts that make up the list of Dover tolls. More than half of the list comprises wool, cloth and hides, and these items are described much more fully than any others. The list starts with the toll on sacks of wool **[a2]**, and this is emphasised by the opening statement ‘In the first place …’. This should probably be taken as an indication of the importance of wool as a commodity.[[16]](#footnote-16) It is possible that this part of the list should be read as though the goods are listed in order of bulk, value or importance, for the penultimate item **[a13]** brings together different kinds of goods and closes with a blanket reference to ‘all other lesser items exported from England’.

Perhaps the most important point about the list of exports is how far it shows that the port of Dover was a channel through which many kinds of exports passed, and that those commodities arose from different parts of England. Implicit in all this is the idea that Dover was a focus for diverse networks that spread across many parts of England, and which produced goods for export through Dover and presumably other ports. Goods were mined, grown or manufactured across a range of regions and industries (presumably) with the intention that they should be exported, which indicates that the producers saw economic opportunities in the production and marketing of their goods. The list also implies the transport routes that linked those producers through Dover and the overseas markets it served, that there was awareness over long distances of the commercial potential in transporting commodities. There are specific mentions of tolls on carts and on packhorses **[c10, c 11]**, and some commodities were tolled by the cartload **[a6, a7, b47]**. Overland transport is mentioned or implied in the list in a number of places, but this need not exclude the likelihood that some goods were moved to Dover by coastal shipping. Overall, the list of exports shows how commercial contacts, the recognition of commercial opportunities, and participation in commercial practices was quite widespread across England as early as 1233, even though England was clearly peripheral to the European ‘commercial revolution’ as a whole.

The most common item for export on the list is cloth, and it is described and categorised much more fully than any other article, for its nature and place of origin were both covered. Scarlet cloth—a high-quality cloth—from Lincoln **[a4]** was distinguished from bolts of cloth in other colours **[a5]**, and from bolts of cloth from Stamford and Northampton **[a6]**; there was also say cloth from Louth **[a13]**, and rougher woollen cloth and caps **[a10]**. The cloth industries of the midlands towns were important in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, but had declined to insignificance by the end; their inclusion here is a confirmation of the early date of the list.[[17]](#footnote-17) The descriptions of cloth point to how the makers of the list understood the kinds of goods and the trading, transport and distribution networks that lay behind them. Dover may have had a role as an aggregator of goods, for a narrative source from the later twelfth century suggests that producers might go to Dover to market their goods.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Leather **[a3]** and some furs **[a13]** were exported, as well as lead **[a7]** and tin **[a8]**. Neither lead nor tin can be mined within the region around Dover; that these commodities were exported through the port of Dover indicates that they had already been transported long distances, probably from Cornwall in the case of tin, and from the Peak District or the Mendips in the case of lead.[[19]](#footnote-19) These were seemingly exported as unworked metal for use elsewhere rather than as manufactured articles. Horses were exported for sale **[a11]**, and this was seemingly a matter of concern because arrangements for this, and extra tolls for services linked to the export of horses, were noted among the Small Tolls **[b62, b64]**. As the Small Tolls were principally levied on those who were not members of Dover or its allied ports, this entry indicates that parts of the trade of Dover was carried out by people from outside the town. The latter indicates that Dover was a centre for the marketing and sale of horses. The extra stages that had to be completed to export horses might be linked with pre-Conquest limitations on the export of horses from England.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Overall, the list of items exported through Dover to mainland Europe suggests that commercial awareness and commercial habits were quite widely disseminated in England in the earlier decades of the thirteenth century, and that such knowledge and practices had already spread far beyond the well-known wool trade. The list shows aspects of trade from England to the European mainland, and shows how knowledge spread out from Dover, into the clothmaking towns of the east Midlands, into even more distant mining concerns, and so forth. The list of exports omits one category of information which is of the greatest importance; the destination of these commodities. Perhaps it was not necessary to know where the ultimate recipient lay (spice producers in what is now Indonesia could presumably have had only limited knowledge of how far their produce was traded) but faith in the presence of such markets underpinned the activities named in the list. Two obvious destinations suggest themselves, though. The fairs of Champagne were at the peak of their activities in the earlier thirteenth century, and could have provided a means by which these exports could have been traded widely, including to the Mediterranean world. The towns of Flanders provided a large and more permanent market, and had demands for food and for materials for manufacturing that could not be met from Flemish resources.[[21]](#footnote-21) Either or both of these destinations could be implied here, but either way the presence of these goods in the Dover tolls list shows how English producers could participate in long-range commercial links even at this early date.

***Imports: part* [b]**

The list of goods imported and liable for toll at Dover is much longer than the list of exports, and includes a greater diversity of articles. Given the range of goods described, the list is hard to characterise. Much of it could be described as luxury goods, including items such as spices, lavish and expensive cloth, and high-status furs. This part of the list has important implications for an understanding of the ‘commercial revolution’, for it shows how far trade was diversified in the early thirteenth century, and how it could incorporate many different locations and kinds of commodity. It suggests that commerce was varied and voluminous even at the earlier stages of that process. It also shows how the role of even a peripheral economy such as that of England could be complex. England exported much wool, presumably for the clothworking industries of Italy and Flanders, and it imported high-quality finished textiles; but it also shows how England was an importer of quite humble foodstuffs and manufacturing materials, and was not merely a contributor of raw materials for use elsewhere.

The list of imports is also more complex than the list of exports, and it seems to be divided into themed sections. These sections are not identified by rubrics, but only through the ways in which goods are grouped in the list, so these groupings are somewhat informal and ill-defined. Of the five sections distinguished here, sections one, two and four are coherent, but sections three and five are more varied or more complex; the latter in particular seems to be a catch-all for various miscellaneous categories of goods.

The first section covers wine, which was one of the commonest imports into medieval England.[[22]](#footnote-22) Wine was classified in terms of the containers in which it travelled, and its point of origin. Rhenish wine was charged at 2s. per *doleum* or 12d. per pipe **[b2, b3]**,[[23]](#footnote-23) while Gascon or La Rochelle wine was charged at the lower rate of 12d. per *doleum* **[b4]**. The reason for the differential in toll is not stated, but it may have been linked to privileges; Cologne merchants were given the right to trade wine at a preferential rate, but seemingly only at their guildhall in London.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The second section covers cloth, and includes the more common kinds of cloth which were also produced within England. Thus, overseas scarlet cloth on being imported **[b5]** was charged at the same rate as Lincoln scarlet cloth being exported **[a4]**. Bolts of cloth from Flanders were charged at the same rate as English cloth **[b6, a5]**. The imports included rays, which were lower-cost and striped fabrics, showing that imported fabrics were not serving only a luxury market **[b7]**. The pattern here, in which scarlets were most expensive and rays least, matches that in Continental sources.[[25]](#footnote-25)

The third section describes imported luxury goods. It includes squirrel fur **[b9, b10, b11]** and rabbit fur **[b12]**,[[26]](#footnote-26) which were mostly used for lining garments, and hides that had been worked in some way **[b13]**. The next two entries, of tawed leather and (maybe) sheep’s leather **[b14, b15]** should probably be linked with these. The theme of luxury goods continues with foodstuffs, which comprised items that could not ordinarily have been grown in northern Europe, and which were imported from the Mediterranean: almonds, rice, figs and raisins **[b16, b17]**. The presence of these again points to long and complicated trading networks.

The fourth section is the lengthiest of all among the list of exports, and covers luxury cloth of various kinds, mostly imported from Italy **[b18**–**b36]**.[[27]](#footnote-27) The places of origin are recorded for these items where they were not for the luxury foodstuffs imported from Mediterranean countries; presumably the locations were in some sense a brand identity. These included fabrics worked with precious metals **[b21, b22]**, so these items were clearly of high value, but the quantities involved were probably never that great. Silk was imported by the pound **[b29, b30]**,[[28]](#footnote-28) but cotton by the hundredweight **[b31]**, so that the latter may have been traded in some quantities.[[29]](#footnote-29) The theme of luxury goods was continued by pearls **[b37]**, gold **[b38, b39]**, and spices **[b40**–**b42]**, among which was sugar **[b41]**, another Mediterranean product.

The fifth and final section includes various goods; wax **[b43]**, different kinds of dye for clothworking **[b44**–**b46]**, and potash **[b48**–**b50]**, also for clothworking. Liquorice is listed here **[b47]**, though it seems out of place, and might find a more natural home among the luxury foodstuffs. **[b51]** includes Rhenish cloth, oats, beans and so forth.[[30]](#footnote-30) The later clauses of the section on imports **[b53**–**b66]** seem out of place, in that they do not follow the agenda set by the rubric to section **[b]**. It covers how some humans had to pay toll at Dover **[b54]**, fish **[b60, b61]**, and detailed arrangements for the sale of horses in Dover itself **[b53, b62, b63, b64]**, among other matters. Overall, the list of imports points to how demand was diversified and varied.

Some of the words and items named in the Dover list appear there for the first time in English sources. Thus, the earliest cited occurrence of the *millenarius* as a unit for measuring tin is 1407,[[31]](#footnote-31) later than both the list and the manuscript through which it has been transmitted **[a8]**. The Dover list also has earlier references than those otherwise known for strandling and popellus **[b10]** as terms for squirrel fur.[[32]](#footnote-32) In other places, words appear here at an unusually early date, comparable to the earliest occurrences known elsewhere, such as sugar **[b41]**.[[33]](#footnote-33)

***Small Toll: part* [c]**

The Small Toll (*Parvus theoloneus*) forms a section by itself, and it was assessed very differently from the Great Toll which covered the imports and exports discussed above. The Small Toll was not levied on goods but on the people or ships who moved them. Thus, for instance, **[c2]** states that anyone who took bacon or pork beyond the seas without the liberty or right to do so should pay 1d. Section **[d]** lists those who were of the liberty and so were not tolled for these functions, and these included many who had been granted exemptions by kings, or who held exemption through their participation in the Cinque Ports confederation.

This toll on the person who took the bacon or pork was presumably in addition to the levy on the exported bacon or pork itself which appeared under the Great Toll **[a12]**. The Small Toll also included levies on mooring ships and boats **[c8, c9]** and on anchoring **[c24]**, and on merchants themselves **[c12]**. The Small Toll was paid on buying maritime goods, including nets if they were to be taken overseas **[c9]** and ships and boats themselves **[c22]**. The Small Toll or Petty Toll of the Dover list should not be confused with the later Petty Custom which was imposed across the realm from 1303 and was levied on all goods except wine, wool, woolfells and hides.[[34]](#footnote-34)

***Exemptions: part* [d]**[[35]](#footnote-35)

The final section comprises a list of those who were exempted from the Small Toll.[[36]](#footnote-36) This exemption applied to those sums which were destined for the king as well to those which were destined for Dover Priory. There is no mention of exemption with regard to the Great Toll, so it might be assumed that those named in this list were still liable for it. Those included in the list of exemptions mostly had strong links to south-eastern England, and especially to Kent. They included the archbishop and archdeacon of Canterbury **[d4, d6]**, many landholders with interests in or near to Dover **[d9, d12, d13, d15]**, the abbot of Battle in Sussex **[d10]**, the Cinque Ports **[d16]** and Canterbury and Faversham **[d17, d18]**. There were also powerful individuals from the western edge of Flanders who had come to hold lands and other assets in Kent, the lords of Guines **[d7]**, Merck **[d8]** and Fiennes **[d9]**. These exemptions must give some sense of the contacts of the monks of Dover Priory, for presumably only they could have granted exemptions from that part of the toll charged in their name. Many of the beneficiaries named in the exemption list were probably not engaged in large-scale trade, and so their exemptions may have applied instead to the supply of goods for their own use.

The Dover list shows much about the trade of thirteenth-century England. It shows that some classes of merchandise passed through the port of Dover, and that tolls were levied upon them; but there are some kinds of information that it does not show. Most significantly, it does not contain any indication as to quantity, so that the relative proportions of the goods described are not addressed at all. Some of the luxury imports were probably rare items that passed through the port infrequently, such as gilded Italian cloth, while some of the others were bulk items which might have been traded daily, such as wool and wine. The list provides no indications as to how much revenue was generated by each of the detailed tolls in the list. The other way in which the list might hide information is that it only describes some kinds of trade. Other items must have passed through the port, because traces of their presence can be found; these included items such as books and glass. Seemingly, they were not charged toll, or, if they were, it was not mentioned. It is possible that some items not named might have been significant commodities traded through the port. Yet, despite these limitations, there are some clear trends that emerge from the list. Imports were more varied than exports, and included a wide range of items which could not have been produced within northern Europe due to the limitations of the climate, as well as specialist and luxury manufactured goods of high value, especially cloth. Exports, in contrast, included items which had not been processed to any great extent, such as wool for making into cloth, or metals for working into finished products.

**Locations and Trade**

The list of tolls includes some references to the sources of trade through Dover. These comments do not occur in relation to most of the commodities named. Many of those which are named are those which were linked to higher status goods, including some of the luxury cloth named in the list. These were named in accordance with the places where they were made, and that link with the place of manufacture formed something akin to a brand.[[37]](#footnote-37) This means that the list gives much information about where the goods originated, but not necessarily about how the goods were traded and transported so that they passed through Dover.

The first section of the list consists of goods exported from England, and the places named here were mostly associated by the makers of the list with cloth production in various forms. Lincoln **[a4]**, Stamford and Northampton **[a6]**, and probably Louth **[a13]** were all linked with cloth, while Lindsey in Lincolnshire was linked with fur **[a13]**. These may have arrived in Dover by sea, or possibly on packhorses **[c11]**. The next section is much the more important, and shows the trade that fed into Dover. There are many places in the regions facing Dover across the Channel, and which reflect close links based on the cloth trade. These are the Rhineland **[b2]**, Douai, Ypres, Ghent and Cambrai **[b6]**, Gistel in Western Flanders **[b51]**, some of the great Flemish cloth towns, Reims **[b51]**, and Provins,the home of the great Champagne fair and cloth workshops **[b6]**.[[38]](#footnote-38) These places were in some sense a brand, and they were known for manufacturing quality and specialisation. Wine is not prominent in the list, but it was imported from the Rhineland **[b2, b3]** and from Gascony, Saint-Jean-de-Luz and La Rochelle **[b4]**.

The more distant locations catch the eye more, however. A significant part of the traffic through Dover originated in Italy. Luxury cloth was imported from Genoa **[b20, b21]**, probably Alessandria **[b20]**, Venice **[b20]**, Lucca **[b20, b23]** and Assisi **[b26]**.[[39]](#footnote-39) These represented the main outer limits of the knowledge of the Dover merchants, but they were aware that some of the networks in which they participated went beyond these points. Worked leather was sourced beyond the Spanish Sea (*ultra mare Ispanie*) **[b13]**, which could be interpreted in many ways but might mean North Africa; and some cloth was sourced in other lands beyond the Greek Sea (*aliis terris ultra mare Grecum*) **[b20]**, which might refer to many places in the eastern Mediterranean or even the Black Sea, of which many were Islamic. The furthest location named as a source of trade is probably Tripoli in Syria, which acted as a port for the Crusader territories **[b25]**, though Bukhara in Uzbekistan is referred to in the name of a kind of cloth **[b62]**. Presumably those who passed through Dover had only limited knowledge of these places, and may have chosen to gloss over trade contacts that extended into such spaces. Such references, it might be assumed, came from conversations rather than experience.

The evidence for transport is mixed. Some can be inferred; the wine from the Rhineland **[b2, b3]** and from Gascony, Saint-Jean-de-Luz and La Rochelle **[b4]** must have travelled by ship because wine was so heavy and bulky that overland trade was much more expensive. Clearly shipping from Dover was not restricted to the short cross-Channel route that dominates the port today, but rather went much longer distances towards the east and south-west. The contacts that brought the other goods through Dover are not referred to within the list, but can be inferred contextually. Early thirteenth-century trade used the fairs of Champagne as one of the most significant points of exchange, where goods from the Mediterranean and further afield were brought northwards in caravans by Italian merchants.[[40]](#footnote-40) Goods from the southern parts of Europe were then traded for goods from the north; before a reliable sea route from the Mediterranean was opened in the 1270s, the overland route was the dominant one. Rich Italian cloth, spices from Asia and so forth would have been disseminated across the north via these fairs, and Flemish cloth, furs and so forth would be taken southwards in exchange. The Champagne fairs are probably the unstated channel used for many of the goods named in the Dover list, for these alone would have given access to the wide range of goods named there. Dover was well-placed to take trade coming northward from the fairs as these had to go by land or river to the coast of northern France; the role of Dover probably only declined once Italian shipping could make the journey to northern Europe around Iberia.

**The making and the survival of the Dover tolls list**

The list of tolls at Dover does not survive through records of the port or of the exchequer’s oversight of the customs, but rather through a local source from Dover itself, the cartulary of the Benedictine Priory of St Mary and St Martin adjacent to the town, and which is now Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241. This is not by chance; the link to Dover Priory expresses something important about how the tolls in Dover worked, for half of the revenue of the Dover tolls was channelled towards its monks rather than towards the king, who was the more usual recipient. The toll was also a large part of the income of the priory; when warfare in 1347 disrupted trade and the toll, the priory was exempted from taxation on the grounds of poverty.[[41]](#footnote-41)

The priory’s claim to a share in the tolls went back to a time before the priory even existed. It was established as a Benedictine house by Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury (1139-1161), as a means of resolving a long-running dispute over the status and character of St Martin’s church. It claimed origins in the early kingdom of Kent, when a church of St Mary was established by King Eadbald in about 619;[[42]](#footnote-42) that church was moved and augmented in the name of St Martin by King Wihtred (*c.* 691–725).[[43]](#footnote-43)

It is not known when the church’s interest in the Dover tolls began, but it had clearly started before the Norman Conquest, and perhaps well before 1066. The interest is mentioned in Domesday Book, and is described in these terms:

Dover in the time of King Edward rendered £18, of which money King Edward had 2 parts and Earl Godwine the third. Besides this, the canons of St Martin had the other half.[[44]](#footnote-44)

The half-share of Dover Priory in the Dover tolls was thus of some antiquity. There is no indication as to the date at which this claim on the tolls began, but some indication can be taken from the way in which the claim was structured. The church received half the tolls, and the other half was divided between the king and the earl in the proportion of two thirds and one third. It was conventional in the eleventh century that the earl would receive a third of the king’s revenues in those shires where the earl held authority (‘the third penny’), but this conventional division only applied to half of the Dover tolls. This could be taken as an indication that the priory’s claim antedated any interest acquired by an earl, and so was in place before the early eleventh century when earls first appeared; if, as seems possible, ealdormen claimed similar dues as the precursors of earls, it is possible that it was established before the advent of ealdormen.[[45]](#footnote-45) This would suggest that the interest started in or before the tenth century, and might go back to the era of the Kentish kingdom.

The ancient minster survived the Conquest, though it lost many assets as part of those events; these depredations are set out in Domesday Book.[[46]](#footnote-46) Many pre-Conquest minsters disappeared after the Norman Conquest, as religious ideals and organisation changed. At Dover, the minster was turned into a priory of Augustinian canons by William of Corbeil, archbishop of Canterbury (1123–1136), after it was transferred to dependence on Canterbury by King Henry I.[[47]](#footnote-47) Henry’s grant was recorded in a charter which is not without problems, and which transferred to the Augustinian foundation ‘the church of the blessed Martin of Dover with all things which belong to it on land and sea, in toll and all its other belongings’.[[48]](#footnote-48) After his death, the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, claimed the church for themselves, and were able to seize it for a while.[[49]](#footnote-49) This complex situation was ended by the next archbishop, Theobald of Bec, who refounded the church as a Benedictine priory linked to Christ Church Priory, Canterbury, and which persisted to the Reformation.[[50]](#footnote-50)

The history of the church and priory in the twelfth century was turbulent, and the monks may have received only limited evidences from the earlier phases of the history of their church. The priory’s archive was further damaged in 1295, when French wartime raids on the town and church meant that records were destroyed or stolen.[[51]](#footnote-51) This became a problem when the monks were required to prove their claim to their stake in the Dover tolls to the satisfaction of the barons of the exchequer in 1306, for the barons had ordered the warden of the Cinque Ports to send all the tolls to the king’s treasury rather than allow the monks to claim a half share.[[52]](#footnote-52) The king ordered the barons of the exchequer to search their records first, and they found a statement in the Red Book of the Exchequer which confirmed the monks’ claim in general terms.[[53]](#footnote-53) The barons, however, deemed this statement insufficient as proof, and so an inquest jury was set up to provide evidence on the question. The jurors stated that the monks once had a charter of Henry I which granted the tolls to them, and which the jurors had seen before its loss during the French raid, and so the monks were allowed to keep their interest in the toll. There are indications that further challenges were raised, for they obtained a confirmation of the 1306 decision from Edward III in 1338, which included an exemplification of the exchequer proceedings and the inquest.[[54]](#footnote-54)

The monks’ efforts to protect their interest in the tolls were documented in a sequence of texts. These survive as a group in the fourteenth-century Dover cartulary, and in a second copy in a fourteenth-century booklet that survives separately and which probably also originates in Dover.[[55]](#footnote-55) The two manuscripts present the same items in the same order. First is a transcript of the 1306 proceedings in full, including all stages thereof;[[56]](#footnote-56) second is a testimonial letter from the mayor and barons of Dover confirming the monks’ possession of the toll;[[57]](#footnote-57) third is the 1338 confirmation of Edward III;[[58]](#footnote-58) then a charter of Henry II,[[59]](#footnote-59) one of John,[[60]](#footnote-60) a confirmation by Henry III,[[61]](#footnote-61) and a writ of Henry III;[[62]](#footnote-62) then an inquest before the sheriff of Kent;[[63]](#footnote-63) and a writ of Edward III.[[64]](#footnote-64) In the cartulary though not in the booklet, the sequence of evidence is followed by the list of Dover tolls.[[65]](#footnote-65)

Much the most important for understanding how the tolls were managed is the writ of Henry II.[[66]](#footnote-66) It shows that though the priory received the income, it did not collect it; this duty belonged to the reeve of Dover, who collected the tolls and handed half each to the priory and to the king. The reeve was directly accountable to the king, for Dover was not in this period let to its townsfolk at farm.[[67]](#footnote-67) It explains to the reeve how he should interpret the many grants of exemption from toll that Henry II had given, and presumably how similar grants from earlier kings should likewise be interpreted. The king ordered that the exemption should be observed, but that it applied only to the king’s part of the Dover tolls. The monks’ portion of the tolls should not be affected by Henry’s grants of exemptions from toll. Henry states that this was because he did not wish to diminish the alms of the priory. The writ was presumably obtained by the prior and his monks to guide the behaviour of the borough reeve; it might be inferred that the reeve had been allowing holders of exemptions to pass without paying any part of the tolls, and that the priory’s income had been damaged by this practice.

The role of the reeve or bailiff in the collection and allocation of the Dover tolls was fundamental in the later twelfth century, but into the thirteenth the role changed in ways that may have disadvantaged the priory. In 1215 Hubert de Burgh, one of King John’s main supporters and later justiciar, was appointed as constable of Dover Castle, and the post was enlarged for him, so that it included control over the bailiff of Dover.[[68]](#footnote-68) This meant that he controlled the tolls and their collection. The money raised could have been used for work on Dover Castle, for much was spent on it during de Burgh’s tenure as constable.[[69]](#footnote-69) How de Burgh managed the Dover tolls is apparent only from sources after he was expelled from his role as justiciar and surrendered his interests in Dover to Bertram de Criol in 1232.[[70]](#footnote-70) Soon after, Henry III ordered the bailiff of the port of Dover that he should no longer levy the ‘paagium’ on horses crossing the Channel at any level higher than it had been charged during the reign of King John, and that the surcharge known as the ‘malam toltam’ which had been levied during the time of Hubert de Burgh should no longer be collected.[[71]](#footnote-71)

In the aftermath of the fall of Hubert de Burgh, there seem to have been various initiatives to try to return the tolls to their former level, and to ensure that exemptions and other rights were observed. Thus, Count Baldwin of Guines obtained writs from Henry III so that his claim to exemption from toll would be documented and observed.[[72]](#footnote-72) A more wide-ranging analysis of the Dover tolls was copied into the Red Book of the Exchequer before the middle of the thirteenth century.[[73]](#footnote-73) It must date to the period immediately after the fall of Hubert de Burgh because he is named in it as earl of Kent, and because it includes references to his foundation of the Maison Dieu and other donations.

There are very strong parallels between this text from the Red Book of the Exchequer and the list of tolls from the Dover Priory Cartulary. The Red Book text must be of 1232 or soon after, and clearly before de Burgh’s death in 1243; the list of tolls between 1232 and 1244. Both describe how the Dover tolls should be divided and allocated among different parties. Both include detailed coverage of exemptions from those tolls, and distinguish carefully between those who were exempt from the king’s portion of the toll, and those who were exempt from the monks’ portion. The king’s portion included many more exemptions, and many which concerned parts of the realm distant from Dover, and more Continental beneficiaries. Yet, among the beneficiaries of exemptions who were linked to Kent, there is very considerable overlap. The Red Book list includes Hamo Peche **[40]**, the lord of Chilham (otherwise Richard, illegitimate son of King John) **[41]**, the countess of Eu **[42]**, the count of Guines **[43]**, William de Fiennes **[44]**, and Engelram de Merke **[45]**, all of whom benefitted from exemptions from the monks’ portion of toll **[d13, d14, d11, d7, d9, d8]**. The list of Dover tolls in Appendix 1 and the Red Book document in Appendix 2 can only be dated certainly between the fall of Hubert de Burgh in 1232 and his death in 1243, but they must very probably date from the start of that period, and most probably in 1233, when the exemption of the count of Guines was investigated and recognised,[[74]](#footnote-74) for that exemption was included in the tolls list **[d7]**.

The list of Dover tolls was thus produced not out of a desire to define the tolls as a service to merchants, but as a means of documenting particular privileges in relation to the levying and distribution of the tolls. Thus, it has parallels to the few other documents which define tolls from England before the middle of the thirteenth century. The earliest, that from London and probably from the reign of Æthelred the Unready (978–1016), notes some rates and some exemptions, but is organised around where the toll was levied rather than the kind of levy or where the goods were meant to travel.[[75]](#footnote-75) Two later twelfth-century documents report tolls in terms of local privileges and rights, and describe privileges in terms of who granted them and when they were held. That from Newcastle[[76]](#footnote-76) reports tolls and other rights of the townsmen of Newcastle quite widely, and is organised in sections on rights held in the time of a King Henry, then in the times of Bishops Ranulf (1099–1128), Geoffrey (1133–1141) and William (1143–1152) of Durham, and then it closes with a section on rights granted to the townsmen by another King Henry. There are no references to or obvious quotations from specific texts; the whole might be the product of an inquest from a later date. A similar pattern can be seen in the list of tolls at Cardiff;[[77]](#footnote-77) the tolls are only a section of a much longer text which records the rights of the men of the towns and hundreds of Cardiff and Tewkesbury, and again seems to be a retrospective summary. It notes grants by Earls Robert (died 1147) and William (died 1183) of Gloucester, but these make up only a small part of the text as a whole.[[78]](#footnote-78) In all these cases tolls on overseas trade are mixed with tolls on inland trade; there is no sense of customs as a distinct category.

The Dover document is the earliest list which focusses on tolls and customs to the exclusion of other rights. The nearest parallel to it is the list of tolls levied at Torksey in Lincolnshire, which is dated to 1238, and likewise restricts its coverage to tolls on transport and trade.[[79]](#footnote-79) The Torksey tolls belonged to the lord of that place, and the list there was concerned with restricting trading at other places on the River Trent, with levying toll on river traffic, and finally with levying tolls on overland trade from the town. The list of articles covered is much more limited than that at Dover, in that it lacks the extensive trade in bulk commodities and luxury goods that passed through Dover.

**Conclusion**

The Dover list of tolls is a remarkable document which presents a fuller picture of trade than can be found elsewhere in northern Europe from the 1230s. It does not cover one of the great centres of population, politics and prestige, but rather a provincial port, albeit one which was of particular prominence because of its position. Despite this, the list of tolls covers a remarkably wide range of goods, from food and wine to bulk commodities such as wool, and even up to luxury cloth and spices from distant centres of trade and manufacturing. The demand for all this could not have come from Dover itself, but reflects how far it drew on complex trade connections that brought trade to it but also distributed goods beyond. Even as early as the 1230s, when the ‘commercial revolution’ was still beginning, the range of goods traded through Dover seems little different from what might have been available a century later. The list also includes many ordinary foodstuffs, including beans and onions, which suggests how demand and consumption at less elite levels might also be depend on long-distance exchange, and how far neighbouring territories might have integrated economies.

Dover was a conduit through which goods passed from across large areas of southern and midland England, and from Flanders, northern France, the Rhineland and Gascony. Much of the trade that originated in more distant places passed through the fairs of the Champagne towns, which have usually been seen as a preliminary to the establishment of direct trade contacts between northern Europe and the Mediterranean in the 1270s. Yet the list of commodities in the Dover tolls list suggests that the range of goods traded to northern Europe in the age of the Champagne fairs was not lesser than that which was possible in the later era of direct maritime trade. The establishment of direct maritime trade may have developed existing patterns of trade and consumption, but seemingly did not create them.

The list of tolls is only one document and reflects the perspectives generated in only one place, and so there are limitations on how far it can be used to change broader understandings of the development of trade and commerce across Europe. Nonetheless, it points to how the ‘commercial revolution’ from the 1270s was tied intimately to what came before, and that it represented an evolution rather than a revolution.

**APPENDIX 1: THE DOVER TOLLS LIST**

The text of the list of tolls follows this paragraph, and has been taken from the later fourteenth-century cartulary of St Martin’s Priory, Dover, which was started by the monks in 1372 or 1373, and which is now Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241.[[80]](#footnote-80) The cartulary is carefully organised into discrete sections, most of which relate to the wards of the town of Dover in which the monks held land, or to their interests in rural locations in Kent. Folios 1–56, though, cover more general themes; these include sections on the privileges of the monastery and its relationship to the archbishops of Canterbury and Christ Church Priory, Canterbury; on the monks’ interest in the Dover tolls; on their tithe of fish landed at Dover; on their relationship to the Maison Dieu founded in Dover by Hubert de Burgh; and sections on pensions and indulgences. The organisation alone testifies to the importance of the tolls to the monks of Dover; the tolls formed a whole section of their own and it was the second section in the cartulary, coming after only the section on general privileges.

The content of the cartulary section on toll is described above. The list of tolls runs on from the end of this section. It seems to be an addition to the main section on toll because, where the rest of the section is written in one hand which runs through many of the early sections of the cartulary, the list of toll is written in two different hands. One wrote the opening rubric and the entries **[a2]** to the first half of **[b1]**; the second added the rubric **[a1]** and the rest of the document from **[b2]** to the end. The two scribes organised their sections in somewhat different ways. The first scribe started each entry with a new line, and placed the sums of money in the margins at the right. The second scribe, in contrast, wrote the entries as a block of text and did not separate out the sums of money. Given this arrangement, the second scribe added paraph markers (¶) at the start of each entry so that each was distinct.

It is possible to speculate about the form of the source manuscript from which the cartulary list was copied. The rubrics articulate the list clearly structure the list, but are not presented consistently in the cartulary. Rubric **[b1]** runs on into entry **[b2]** without any break or punctuation, and maybe the recognition of the error prompted the first scribe to stop. Meanwhile, the second scribe added rubric **[a1]** in red to the text in the space left after the end of the overall rubric ‘Hee sunt consuetudines ...’, for there had been no dedicated line for it; yet the second scribe probably added the rubric ‘Parvus theoloneus’ in red **[b52]** on its own line, but then had second thoughts and removed it, before adding the same rubric as **[c1]**, yet jammed in at the end of a line as an obvious later addition. Rubric **[b1]** suggests that the rubrics were part of the underlying manuscript, but the relocation of the ‘Parvus theoloneus’ rubric suggests that they may have been an addition.

Nonetheless, it is clear that this source must have been prepared at an early date, and that most or all of it has been transmitted as it was written in the 1230s. The references to the cloth towns of the east Midlands **[a4, a6, a13]** matches patterns of production of cloth in the first half of the thirteenth century, but even by the end of that century their predominance among centres of English cloth production had been lost. Likewise, the list consistently calls the charges tolls rather than customs, except in the initial rubric; this reflects the usual pattern in the uses of words before Edward I’s creation of the new royal customs in the 1270s. On the basis of this usage, the overall rubric alone might be a later addition.

The text is presented in the manuscript as a rubric and four paragraphs, and this arrangement has been preserved here; capitals and punctuation have been modernised, but spellings in the manuscript have been preserved. Suspended forms are extended where the full form is not ambiguous; extensions in place names use italic.

Hee sunt consuetudines pertinentes domino regi et prioratui sancte Marie et sancti Martini Dovorrie.[[81]](#footnote-81)

**[a1]** Magnus theoloneus.

**[a2]** In primis de quolibet sacco[[82]](#footnote-82) lane exeunte de Anglia – ii s.

**[a3]** Item de quolibet lasto corei[[83]](#footnote-83) – v s.

**[a4]** Item de qualibet scarleta[[84]](#footnote-84) Lincoln'[[85]](#footnote-85) – xviii d.

**[a5]** Item de quolibet panno[[86]](#footnote-86) alius coloris – vi d.

**[a6]** Item de qualibet carectat*a*[[87]](#footnote-87) panni de Stanford'[[88]](#footnote-88) seu de Norhamton'[[89]](#footnote-89) – x s.

**[a7]** Item de qualibet carectat*a* plumbi – iiii d.

**[a8]** Item de quolibet mill*enario*[[90]](#footnote-90) stagni[[91]](#footnote-91) – viii d.

**[a9]** Item de quolibet doleo[[92]](#footnote-92) mellis – ii s.

**[a10]** Item de qualibet duodena[[93]](#footnote-93) burorum[[94]](#footnote-94) et capellorum[[95]](#footnote-95) – ob. qua.

**[a11]** Item de omnibus equis exeuntibus de Angl' ad vendend*um* de valor*e* xx s. – ii d.

**[a12]** Item de uncto,[[96]](#footnote-96) bacone,[[97]](#footnote-97) butiro, caseo, frumento,[[98]](#footnote-98) avena, serusia,[[99]](#footnote-99) carbone et aliis mercandisis que nominare nescimus precii xx s. – ii d.[[100]](#footnote-100)

**[a13]** Item de pellur*is* de Lindes'[[101]](#footnote-101) et furur*is*[[102]](#footnote-102) de Lindes' et aliunde[[103]](#footnote-103) et say[[104]](#footnote-104) de Loue[[105]](#footnote-105) et omnibus aliis minutis exeuntibus de Anglia precii xx s. – ii. d.

**[a14]** Item de pannis de castreys[[106]](#footnote-106) ad vesturas monachorum precii xx s. – ii d.

**[b1]** Item de mercandisis venientibus in Angl*ia*.

**[b2]** De quolibet doleo vini de Reneys[[107]](#footnote-107) – ii s.

**[b3]** Item de qualibet pipa[[108]](#footnote-108) eiusdem vini – xii d.

**[b4]** Item de quolibet doleo vini de Vascon' vel de sancto Ioh*ann*e[[109]](#footnote-109) vel de Ripella[[110]](#footnote-110) seu de aliis locis – xii d.

**[b5]** Item de qualibet scarleta transmarina – xviii d.

**[b6]** Item de quolibet panno de Duaco,[[111]](#footnote-111) de Ipra,[[112]](#footnote-112) de Gant,[[113]](#footnote-113) de Cambiaco,[[114]](#footnote-114) de Provino[[115]](#footnote-115) et de aliis locis transmarinis unius coloris – vi d.[[116]](#footnote-116)

**[b7]** Item de quolibet panno reforciato[[117]](#footnote-117) – iiii d.

**[b8]** Item de quolibet panno transmarino ad modum stantford[[118]](#footnote-118) confecto – iiii d.

**[b9]** Item de quolibet mill*enario* grisorum[[119]](#footnote-119) – xl d.

**[b10]** Item de quolibet mill*enario* stranlingorum[[120]](#footnote-120) et popel*orum*[[121]](#footnote-121) – ii s.

**[b11]** Item de quolibet mill*enario* scurellorum[[122]](#footnote-122) – xii d.

**[b12]** Item de quolibet mill*enario* cuniculorum[[123]](#footnote-123) – iiii d.

**[b13]** Item de omnibus pellur*is* operat*is* ultra mare Ispanie prec' xx s. – ii d.

**[b14]** Item de duodena allucti[[124]](#footnote-124) – i d.

**[b15]** Item duodena bazeygn'[[125]](#footnote-125) – ob.

**[b16]** Item de centena[[126]](#footnote-126) amigdal'[[127]](#footnote-127) et ris[[128]](#footnote-128) – i d.

**[b17]** Item de quolibet fratello[[129]](#footnote-129) ficun'[[130]](#footnote-130) [*sic*] et reysinorum[[131]](#footnote-131) – ob.

**[b18]** Item de qualibet pecia sandalli[[132]](#footnote-132) de lege[[133]](#footnote-133) – ob.

**[b19]** Item de qualibet pecia sandalli reforciati – i d.

**[b20]** Item de qualibet pecia pannorum de Genue[[134]](#footnote-134) et Alestr'[[135]](#footnote-135) et aliis terris ultra mare Grecum – ob. qua.

**[b21]** Item de qualibet pecia panni deaurati de Genua et Venisia[[136]](#footnote-136) et de Luca[[137]](#footnote-137) – iiii d.

**[b22]** Item de qualibet pecia samitti[[138]](#footnote-138) – xi d.

**[b23]** Item de (fo. 33v) qualibet pecia de samitti de Luca – viii d.

**[b24]** Item de qualibet pecia gaudiorum[[139]](#footnote-139) accobin'[[140]](#footnote-140) et aliorum pannorum de seta[[141]](#footnote-141) – vi d.

**[b25]** Item de qualibet pecia cameloti[[142]](#footnote-142) de Tripa[[143]](#footnote-143) – ii d.

**[b26]** Item de qualibet pecia cameloti de Assisa[[144]](#footnote-144) – i d.

**[b27]** Item de qualibet duodena bokera*m*[[145]](#footnote-145) – iiii d.

**[b28]** Item de qualibet duodena de fustyan'[[146]](#footnote-146) – iii d.

**[b29]** Item de qualibet libra[[147]](#footnote-147) cete[[148]](#footnote-148) crude[[149]](#footnote-149) – ob.

**[b30]** Item de qualibet libra cete tincte – i d.

**[b31]** Item de qualibet centena coton'[[150]](#footnote-150) – iii d.

**[b32]** Item de qualibet centena de cadaz[[151]](#footnote-151) – xii d.

**[b33]** Item de qualibet centena ulnarum[[152]](#footnote-152) tele[[153]](#footnote-153) tincte – iii d.

**[b34]** Item de qualibet centena de canevas'[[154]](#footnote-154) – ii d.

**[b35]** Item qualibet tela alba de valore xx s. – ii d.

**[b36]** Item de velaminibus[[155]](#footnote-155) peplis[[156]](#footnote-156) et aliis subtilibus[[157]](#footnote-157) mercandisis precii xx s. – ii d.

**[b37]** Item de qualibet marca albarum perlarum[[158]](#footnote-158) – x d.

**[b38]** Item de qualibet marca auri de pailol'[[159]](#footnote-159) – x d.

**[b39]** Item de qualibet marca auri fini[[160]](#footnote-160) – xii d.

**[b40]** Item de qualibet libra croci[[161]](#footnote-161) – ob.

**[b41]** Item de qualibet centena piperis,[[162]](#footnote-162) zinziberis,[[163]](#footnote-163) canell'[[164]](#footnote-164) et zedewall'[[165]](#footnote-165) et zucr'[[166]](#footnote-166) – vi d.

**[b42]** Item de qualibet centena galenga[[167]](#footnote-167) – viii d.

**[b43]** Item de qualibet centena cer*e* – iiii d.

**[b44]** Item de quolibet quarterio[[168]](#footnote-168) de wayde[[169]](#footnote-169) – ii d.

**[b45]** Item de qualibet centena grans[[170]](#footnote-170) – xii d.

**[b46]** Item de qualibet centena de br*a*sil[[171]](#footnote-171) – vi d.

**[b47]** Item de qualibet carectat*a* de almu licorise[[172]](#footnote-172) – iiii d.

**[b48]** Item de magno doleo cinerum[[173]](#footnote-173) – ii d.

**[b49]** Item de mediocri doleo cinerum – i d.

**[b50]** Item de parvo doleo cinerum – ob.

**[b51]** Item[[174]](#footnote-174) de pannis de Reyns,[[175]](#footnote-175) camelot' de Reyns, palotis,[[176]](#footnote-176) buletell',[[177]](#footnote-177) stamina, say[[178]](#footnote-178) de Gestell',[[179]](#footnote-179) oleo,[[180]](#footnote-180) frumento,[[181]](#footnote-181) pisis,[[182]](#footnote-182) avena,[[183]](#footnote-183) fabis,[[184]](#footnote-184) et singulis bladis,[[185]](#footnote-185) piscibus salsatis, alleis,[[186]](#footnote-186) sepe,[[187]](#footnote-187) sale, cord',[[188]](#footnote-188) filo,[[189]](#footnote-189) canabo,[[190]](#footnote-190) ferro, carbone merina,[[191]](#footnote-191) acerro,[[192]](#footnote-192) cupro,[[193]](#footnote-193) ere[[194]](#footnote-194) et omnibus aliis metallibus[[195]](#footnote-195) et mercandisis venientibus in Anglia*m* et exeuntibus de Anglia semper de valore xx s. – ii d.

**[b52]** *Here there is a rubric in red that has been expunged; under ultra-violet light, it seems to read* Parvus theoloneus.

**[b53]** Item si mercator habuit plures equos quam homines debet pro equo ii d. si adducatur ultra mare ad vendend*um*.

**[b54]** Item de quolibet homine qui mare transit vel de ultra mare venit nisi libertate habeat – ii d.

**[b55]** Item de quolibet trussello[[196]](#footnote-196) cordato – iiii d.

**[b56]** Item de quolibet spiteling[[197]](#footnote-197) – i d. et non cordato – ii d.

**[b57]** Item de quolibet sacco lanato ductur*o* ultra mare – iiii d.

**[b58]** Item de pisa[[198]](#footnote-198) uncti[[199]](#footnote-199) ductur' ultra mare – iiii d.

**[b59]** Item de pisa cepi[[200]](#footnote-200) – iiii d.

**[b60]** Item de lasto harang'[[201]](#footnote-201) – iiii d.

**[b61]** Item de millenar*io* makerelli[[202]](#footnote-202) – iiii d.

**[b62]** Item de equo empto in villa Dovorr' de emptore ii d. et de venditore ii d.

**[b63]** Si tamen per plateas vel vicos vel supra ripam maris adductus fuit ad probandum nisi libertatem habuit emptor vel venditor.

**[b64]** Si quis vero in domo alicuius baronis Dovorr' equum suum vendiderit ipse baro de venditore recipiet ii d. et de emptore similiter ii d. nisi libertatem habeat.

**[b65]** Item de equo excambiato capud ad capud nisi libertatem habeat de uno iiii d. et de altero iiii d.

**[b66]** Item qui adducit correa et nominet deker's[[203]](#footnote-203) quod est decem correis de quolibet deker ii d.

**[c1]** Parvus theoloneus.[[204]](#footnote-204)

**[c2]** Omnis qui ducit bacones ultra mare nisi libertatem habeat de quolibet bacone – i d.

**[c3]** Item de quolibet vivo porco – i d. ductur*o* ultra mare.

**[c4]** Item de quolibet boue – ii d.

**[c5]** Item de bidente[[205]](#footnote-205) – ob.

**[c6]** Item de flica[[206]](#footnote-206) – ob.

**[c7]** Item de qualibet nave veniente de ultra mare pro sede – i d.

**[c8]** Item de quolibet batello[[207]](#footnote-207) pro sede i d. nisi navis vel batell*um* sit de libertate.

**[c9]** Item de quolibet reti vendito et ductur*o* ultra mare – ob.[[208]](#footnote-208)

**[c10]** Item de qualibet biga[[209]](#footnote-209) que emit piscem i d. nisi libertatem habeat.

**[c11]** Item de quolibet summario[[210]](#footnote-210) – ob.

**[c12]** Item de quolibet mercatore die sabbati nisi libertatem habeat – ob.

**[c13]** Item de quolibet mercatore qui affeyt[[211]](#footnote-211) correum bovis ad vendend*um* nisi libertatem habeat – ob.

**[c14]** Item si mercator adducit sabelinas[[212]](#footnote-212) et nominat sabelinum de quolibet iiii d.

**[c15]** Item si nominat tymbr'[[213]](#footnote-213) iiii d.

**[c16]** Item de martrina[[214]](#footnote-214) iiii d.

**[c17]** Item de verr'[[215]](#footnote-215) et griso et tymbr' iiii d.

**[c18]** Item de mercatore cum pellis[[216]](#footnote-216) ovium vel agnorum et nominat centum de centena iiii d.

**[c19]** Si nominat pelles et sint in sacco iiii d.

**[c20]** Item qui emit caseum per centenam debit pro centena iiii d., nisi lib*e*r*tatis* sit.

**[c21]** Item qui emit pro pisam de pisa iiii d.

**[c22]** Item qui emit navem vel batellum nisi lib*e*r*tatis* sit iiii d.

**[c23]** Item de omni panno de serico[[217]](#footnote-217) de qualibet cornerea[[218]](#footnote-218) iiii d.

**[c24]** Item de anchozagio i d.[[219]](#footnote-219)

**[d1]** Isti subscripti quieti sunt de parvo theolonio versus dominum regem et versus prioratum sancti Martini novi operis Dovorr'.

**[d2]** Omnes Templarii et Hospitalarii cum famulis suis.

**[d3]** Omnes de sancto Lasero et Ierosolima.

**[d4]** Dominus archiepiscopus Cant'.

**[d5]** Item marescallus Anglie.

**[d6]** Item archidiaconus Cant'.

**[d7]** Item comes de Gisens.[[220]](#footnote-220)

**[d8]** Engera*m*m*us* de Merk'.[[221]](#footnote-221)

**[d9]** Dominus de Fyenes.[[222]](#footnote-222)

**[d10]** Abbas de Bello et omnes tenentes sui.[[223]](#footnote-223)

**[d11]** Comitissa de Eu et omnes tenentes sui.[[224]](#footnote-224)

**[d12]** Hamo Cr*e*vequer.[[225]](#footnote-225)

**[d13]** Hamo Pecche,[[226]](#footnote-226)

**[d14]** Ricardus filius regis.[[227]](#footnote-227)

**[d15]** Henr' de Sandwico.[[228]](#footnote-228)

**[d16]** Quinque portus et omnes de triginta duobus havenes.[[229]](#footnote-229)

**[d17]** Cantuaria.

**[d18]** Fav'sham.

**[d19]** [name excised; under ultra-violet light the first part seems to read et Joh*annis*. The next word is not legible.]

**[d20]** et prior de War'.[[230]](#footnote-230)

**[d21]** heredes de sancto Legerio.[[231]](#footnote-231)

**APPENDIX 2: THE EXCHEQUER SUMMARY OF TOLLS**

This document survives through the volume of transcripts known as the Red Book of the Exchequer, and is included here for convenience so that it may readily be compared with the list of Dover tolls printed in Appendix 1.[[232]](#footnote-232) Though undated, it survives in the thirteenth-century part of the Red Book, and so was presumably copied before the death of its maker, Alexander of Swerford, in 1246;[[233]](#footnote-233) it can further be dated before 1243, because it acknowledges Hubert de Burgh as earl of Kent, and so must have been written before his death. It must have been written after Hubert de Burgh had founded the Maison Dieu in Dover, for this is mentioned in the text, and after his fall from power in 1232, for the ‘time of the earl of Kent’ is noted here as in the past.

This statement is clearly concerned with the aftermath of Hubert de Burgh’s rule at Dover. It notes that the tolls were allocated to Dover Castle in the time of the earl of Kent, which in this context must be Hubert de Burgh; it also notes the ‘malam toltam’ charged by de Burgh,[[234]](#footnote-234) and describes it as though it were no longer levied, which suggests that the document was drawn up after 1233 when the king ordered that this no longer be collected. The key distinction in the document is between those items which legitimately belonged to the king, and those which should be allocated elsewhere. It might be suggested that both the Red Book document and the Cartulary document were created as part of the same process, and that involved the accounting and investigation that arose after the end of Hubert de Burgh’s time as constable of Dover Castle. Elsewhere, demands were made that he should account for his activities,[[235]](#footnote-235) but these were mostly within the standard framework of the king’s courts and Common Law. As a Cinque Port, Dover stood somewhat outside this system, and so it is only through local sources or the unusual Red Book that evidence for investigations survive from there.

This document was consulted by the barons of the exchequer in 1306, when Edward I ordered that they use it to establish the rights of the monks of Dover to their portion of the Dover tolls. The barons of the exchequer thought that it did not conclusively establish the rights of the monks, and so inquisitions were held to reinforce it.[[236]](#footnote-236) The copy in the Red Book is the only one surviving, but there must have been an original document lying behind it. It is possible that it survived into the fourteenth century and that it was preserved within the archive at Dover Castle. The inventory of the contents of the castle made on 20 December 1344 notes the presence of *Item, j. compositionem passagii Dovorr’ et diversa filacia brevium et rotulos curie*.[[237]](#footnote-237) The description is vague, but it is possible that it refers to this text and maybe that in Appendix 1 because it is not clear what else might have been referred to under this name.

[1] Certificatio portus Dovore et quid et quantum domino regi debetur et quid ab eodem alienatum et quo modo.

[2] De teloneo transfretantium et applicantium Dovora, prior sancti Martini recepit dimidium.

[3] Et de dimidio telloneo de foro die sabbati, idem prior recipit tertiam partem, et dominus rex duas partes.

[4] Et de parte domini regis, magister hospitalis sancte Marie recipit decimum denarium de dono domini regis.[[238]](#footnote-238)

[5] Et iterum de novem partibus domini regis, idem prior recipit xxii l. x s. de dono eiusdem regis preter malam toltam que valet singulis annis ix l.[[239]](#footnote-239)

[6] Et manerium de La Rivere quod valere solet annuatim xxviii l. aut plus, quod idem magister habet de dono domini regis,[[240]](#footnote-240) et prisa vinorum apud Sanwicum que valere solet singulis annis xx l. aut plus.

[7] Et omnia ista integra pertinebant ad castrum Dovore tempore comitis Kancie,[[241]](#footnote-241) que modo alienantur ut patet infra.

[8] Isti sunt qui habent transitum sine telloneo apud Dovoram cum tota eorum familia.

[9] Quinque portus cum ipsorum membris omnibus.[[242]](#footnote-242)

[10] Londonia.[[243]](#footnote-243)

[11] Cantuaria.[[244]](#footnote-244)

[12] Wyntonia.[[245]](#footnote-245)

[13] Norwicus.[[246]](#footnote-246)

[14] Roffa.[[247]](#footnote-247)

[15] Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis et omnes de ecclesia sua.[[248]](#footnote-248)

[16] Abbas sancti Augustini Cantuarie.[[249]](#footnote-249)

[17] Episcopus Londoniensis et omnes de ecclesia sua.

[18] Et omnes prioratus Londonie.[[250]](#footnote-250)

[19] Episcopus Wintoniensis et omnes prioratus Wintonie.[[251]](#footnote-251)

[20] Episcopus Exoniensis.[[252]](#footnote-252)

[21] Episcopus Karleolensis.[[253]](#footnote-253)

[22] Episcopus Roffensis.

[23] Magister militie Templi.[[254]](#footnote-254)

[24] Prior hospitalis Ierusalem.[[255]](#footnote-255)

[25] Prior sancti Lazari.[[256]](#footnote-256)

[26] Prior sancti Sulpicii.[[257]](#footnote-257)

[27] Omnes Cisterciensis ordinis.

[28] Omnes fere Premonstratensis ordinis.

[29] Omnes Cloyniacensis ordinis.[[258]](#footnote-258)

[30] Omnes ordinis Chartusie.

[31] Omnes ordinis de Simplingham.[[259]](#footnote-259)

[32] Abbas Westmonasterii et omnes scelle sue.[[260]](#footnote-260)

[33] Abbas de Bello et omnes residentes super tenementum suum.[[261]](#footnote-261)

[34] Abbas de Becco Herlewin cum scellis suis.[[262]](#footnote-262)

[35] Abbas de Fiscampo et omnes prioratus suis.[[263]](#footnote-263)

[36] Abbas de Fronte [*sic*] Ebroldi cum scellis suis.[[264]](#footnote-264)

[37] Abbas de Ebroicis cum scellis suis.[[265]](#footnote-265)

[38] Item comes marescallus.[[266]](#footnote-266)

[39] Comes Kancie.

[40] Hamo Peche.[[267]](#footnote-267)

[41] Dominus de Chilham.[[268]](#footnote-268)

[42] Comitissa Augi.[[269]](#footnote-269)

[43] Comes de Gisnes.[[270]](#footnote-270)

[44] Willelmus de Fesnes.[[271]](#footnote-271)

[45] Engelramus de Merke.[[272]](#footnote-272)

[46] Sciendum quod omnes prenominati sunt quieti de tello apud Dovoram penes dominum regem, cum tota familia sua in transfretatione et applicatione.
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57. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 30v; E41/377, fo. 4r. The burgesses of Dover were called barons from an early date. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fos. 30v–31v; E41/377, fos. 4v–6r. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 31v; E41/377, fo. 6r; printed from the enrolment of inspeximus by Henry III in *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 228. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fos. 31v–32r; E41/377, fo. 6r–v. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 32r; E41/377, fo. 6v; calendared in *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 228, though there dated 19 May. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 32r; E41/377, fo. 7r. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 32v; E41/377, fo. 7r–v. This inquest includes a valuation of the tolls; the jurors thought that they were worth £140 annually. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fos. 32v–33r; E41/377, fos. 7v–8r. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 33r–v. It is included as Appendix 1 to this essay. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 228. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. This can be seen from John’s charters to the town, which are restrictive compared to others granted; see *Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi asservati, ab anno 1199 ad annum 1216*, ed. Thomas Duffus Hardy (London: Record Commission, 1837), 83, 159; K. M. E. Murray, *The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935), 5–6. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. On de Burgh see F. J. West, ‘Burgh, Hubert de, Earl of Kent (*c.* 1170–1243), *ODNB*, and Clarence Ellis, *Hubert de Burgh: A Study in Constancy* (London: Phoenix House, 1952); Michael Weiss, ‘The Castellan: The Early Career of Hubert de Burgh’, *Viator* 5 (1974), 235–52 surveys de Burgh’s early career to 1215. The grant of Dover Castle to him is *Rotuli Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londinensi asservati, ab anno MCCI ad annum MCCXVI*, ed. Thomas Duffus Hardy (London: Record Commission, 1835), 145, of 25 June 1215. On his later career see David Carpenter, ‘The Fall of Hubert de Burgh’, *Journal of British Studies* 19 (1980), 1–17. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. *History of the King’s Works*: 2, *The Middle Ages*, ed. R. Allen Brown, H. A. Colvin and A. J. Taylor (London: HMSO, 1963), 929–41; *Building Accounts of King Henry III*, ed. H. M. Colvin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 20–87. Building was partly prompted by the need to reconstruct parts of the castle after the siege of 1216; on this see John Goodall, ‘Dover Castle and the Great Siege of 1216’, *Château Gaillard* 19 (2000), 91–101. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1231*–*1234*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1905), 113. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1231*–*1234*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1905), 167. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1231*–*1234*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1905), 184; *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1234*–*1237*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1908), 171, 335. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. See Appendix 2 below. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1231*–*1234*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1905), 184. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Gras, *Early English Customs*, 154–5; thence noted in James Masschaele, ‘Tolls and Trade in Medieval England’, in *Money, Markets and Trade in Late Medieval Europe: Essays in Honour of John H. A. Munro*, ed. Lawrin Armstrong, Ivana Elbl and Martin Elbl (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 146–83, at 179, where dated to the later eleventh century. The text is actually an extract from a law circulated in the name of Æthelred the Unready, and known as IV Æthelred (ed. Felix Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (3 volumes, Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1903–1916), i. 232–4; Joseph P. Huffman, *Family,* *Commerce and Religion in London and Cologne: Anglo-German Emigrants,* c. *1000*–c. *1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 9). It is probably a compendium of texts rather than an actual royal decree (Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 320–30). It is possible that it actually dates from the time of Cnut (1016–35) (Neil Middleton, ‘Early Medieval Port Customs, Tolls and Controls on Foreign Trade’, *Early Medieval Europe* 13 (2005), 313–58, at 333). [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. *The Percy Chartulary*, ed. M. T. Martin, Surtees Society 117 (1911), 333–6, from a fourteenth-century Percy family cartulary. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. *Earldom of Gloucester Charters: The Charters and Scribes of the Earls and Countesses of Gloucester to AD 1217*, ed. Robert B. Patterson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 60–2, no. 46, from London, British Library ms. Cotton Cleopatra A VII, the thirteenth-century cartulary of Tewkesbury Abbey. An extract from it is printed in *British Borough Charters, 1042*–*1216*, ed. Adolphus Ballard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), 177–78. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. There is also a statement of the tolls levied at the market in Yaxley in Huntingdonshire in 1201, because the obligation to pay toll was questioned by the townsmen of Northampton; *Curia Regis Rolls … Preserved in the Public Record Office*, ed. The Deputy Keeper of the Records and others (19 vols. so far, London and Woodbridge: HMSO and the Boydell Press, 1922–2002), i. 449–450. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Gras, *Early English Customs*, 155–8. Gras dated this to 1228, but it is a mistake; the inquest was carried out in 1238 after Torksey had been granted to John and Dervorguilla de Balliol by Henry III, as a means of ascertaining what rights belonged to the lord of Torksey. On John and Dervorguilla see G. P. Stell, ‘Balliol [Baliol], John de (b. before 1208, d. 1268)’, *ODNB*, and G. P. Stell, ‘Balliol, Dervorguilla de, lady of Galloway (d. 1290)’, *ODNB*; for the grant of Torksey to them see *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1232*–*1247*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1906), 206 of 11 December 1237, 209–10 of 6 February 1238, and *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1237*–*1242*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1911), 12 of 10 December 1237, for an instruction to put them into seisin. The inquest proceedings survives through a roll (now British Library ms. Cotton Roll II. 14) made in 1345 for John, lord Darcy, which includes Henry III’s grant and his instruction that the inquest should be made, and then its lengthy conclusions. For a summary of the whole rather than just the extract printed by Gras see R. E. G. Cole, ‘The Royal Burgh of Torksey’, *Reports and Papers read at the Meetings of the Architectural Societies of the County of Lincoln, County of York, Archdeaconries of Northampton and Oakham, County of Bedford, Diocese of Worcester and County of Leicester* 28 (1906), 451–530, at 471–83. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. On the cartulary see Jane Sayers, ‘An Important Source for Kentish History: The Cartulary of St Martin’s Priory, Dover’, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 136 (2015), 245–9, at 245–9. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. Text from the Dover Priory Cartulary, now Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 33r–v. There is a copy taken from the cartulary in British Library ms. Stowe 347, fo. 26, an unattributed set of seventeenth-century transcripts from various sources. A translation of this later copy was printed in Haines, *Dover Priory*, 429–33, but he believed that the list was of 1360 (Haines, *Dover Priory*, 405), and some items were omitted. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. A sack, a unit of measurement: *DMLBS*, saccus, 2d. 2884. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. A last or load, a traditional measurement used in relation to leather: *DMLBS*, lastus 1a. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Scarlet, a rich woollen cloth: *DMLBS*, scarlatus 1a; while there is no statement here that it is coloured red, it is implied by the next entry. On the kinds of cloth see Chorley, ‘Cloth Exports of Flanders’, 350–1 and 359, which notes the division between coloured cloth and the cheaper stanforts and others. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. On the prominence of Lincoln in cloth-making see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 32; and Paul D. A. Harvey, ‘The English Trade in Wool and Cloth, 1150–1250: Some Problems and Suggestions’, in *Produzione, Commercio e Consumo dei Panni di Lana (nei Secoli XII*–*XVIII)*, ed. Marco Spallanzani (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1976), 369–75. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. A unit of cloth: *DMLBS*, pannus 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. A cartload, used here as a unit of measurement: *DMLBS*, carrettata. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. On the prominence of Stamford in cloth-making see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 32. This must refer to the town because it is paired with Northampton, but there is scope for confusion with a stanfort, a kind of cloth; Chorley, ‘Cloth Exports of Flanders’, 350–1, 359. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. On the prominence of Northampton in cloth-making see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 32. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. A traditional unit for measuring tin: *DMLBS*, millenarius 7b. The earliest reference cited is from 1407, much later than this text or the cartulary in which it is transmitted. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. Ms. stangni; corrected to stagni by the first scribe: tin: *DMLBS*, stagnum 2a. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. A tun or cask: *DMLBS*, dolium 2a. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. A unit of twelve: *DMLBS*, duodenus 1b. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. This is probably from for *burellorum*, from *burellus*, a coarse woollen cloth: *DMLBS*, burellus; *AND*, burel. *Burellus* was not conventionally organised into *panni*, according to the examples cited. On *burellus* see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 34. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. Possibly from capella, hat or cap: *DMLBS*, capella 2.1; *AND*, capel. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. Grease: *DMLBS*, unctus. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. A pig carcass, preserved: *DMLBS*, baco 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. Grain, probably wheat: *DMBLS*, frumentum 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. Ale: *AND*, servise2. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. In the manuscript, the first scribe laid out these entries on one line each, with the numbers separated at the right. In this case, the scribe included both numbers at the right as though they were a levy, even though this would suggest a particularly grievous levy. This also applies to **[a13]**. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. Lindsey, one of the parts of Lincolnshire. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
102. Fur, probably sheepskin and lambskin: *DMLBS*, furrura 1b. See also C. M. Woolgar, ed., *Testamentary Records of the English and Welsh Episcopate, 1200*–*1413: Wills, Executors’ Accounts and Inventories, and the Probate Process*, Canterbury and York Society 102 (2011), 210. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
103. Ms. reads clearly a’l’uinde, with a suspension mark above the a and a horizontal stroke across the l. It might be conjectured that the suspension marks are a mistake, and that it should read *aliunde*, elsewhere. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
104. Probably *saia*, say cloth: *DMLBS*, saia 2a; Chorley, ‘Cloth Exports of Flanders’, 349, 359. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
105. This is probably for Louth, Lincolnshire. *DMLBS*, saia 2 includes a quotation from the Institutes of Sempringham which links the production of say cloth with Louth (*tunicas subtiles de sayo lude*); Charles Trice Martin, *The Record Interpreter: A Collection of Latin Words, Latin Words and Names* (London: Reeves and Turner, 1892), 288–9 lists *Luda* and *Luia* for Louth. *Luda* for Louth occus in R. E. Glasscock, ed., *The Lay Subsidy of 1334*, Records of Social and Economic History, new series 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1975), 183. [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
106. Perhaps from Anglo-Norman *chastri*, *chastré*, wether; see <http://www.anglo-norman.net/gate/>, under *chastri*. This would then refer to the wool of wethers. [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
107. This almost certainly refers to the Rhineland. For similar forms see Gras, *Early English Customs*, 608, 626, 649, 651, 652, 706, 755; Gervase of Tilbury, *Otia Imperialia/Recreation for an Emperor*, ed. S. E. Banks and J. W. Binns (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 286–7. [↑](#footnote-ref-107)
108. A pipe is a large cask: *DMLBS*, pipa 4a. [↑](#footnote-ref-108)
109. Now Saint-Jean-de-Luz, France. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
110. Probably Rupella, now La Rochelle, France. [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
111. Now Douai, France. [↑](#footnote-ref-111)
112. Now Ypres, Belgium. [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
113. Now Ghent, Belgium. [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
114. Now Cambrai, France. [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
115. Now Provins, France. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
116. On Flemish cloth and its varieties see Chorley, ‘Cloth Exports of Flanders’. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
117. This, usually known as a ray, seems to have been regarded as an intermediate quality of cloth in the thirteenth century; see Chorley, ‘Cloth Exports of Flanders’, at 359–60. Ypres was a centre for its production. Rays were usually striped cloth. [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
118. Stanford was a kind of cloth and need not have originated in Stamford, Lincolnshire: see *MED* stanford n. [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
119. Grisus is grey or grey fur, perhaps from Russian grey squirrel: *DMLBS*, grisus 2; Elspeth M. Veale, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, second edition, London Record Society 38 (2003), 218, 219. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
120. Strangling is squirrel fur: *DMLBS*, strandlingum (the earliest reference cited is 1252); Elspeth M. Veale, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, second edition, London Record Society 38 (2003), 222, 228. [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
121. Squirrel fur in summer: *DMLBS*, popellus 2 (the earliest reference cited is 1301); Elspeth M. Veale, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, second edition, London Record Society 38 (2003), 221, 228. [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
122. Squirrel fur: *DMLBS*, sciurellus 2; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 758; R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources* (London: British Academy, 1980), 427; Elspeth M. Veale, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, second edition, London Record Society 38 (2003), 222. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
123. Rabbit fur: *DMLBS*, cuniculus 2b; Elspeth M. Veale, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, second edition, London Record Society 38 (2003), 218. [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
124. Tawed leather: *DMLBS*, aluta; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 725. [↑](#footnote-ref-124)
125. Perhaps *basanum*, sheep’s leather, to judge by the nearby entries: *DMLBS*, basanum; *The Oak Book at Southampton of* c. *1300*, ed. P. Studer, Southampton Records Society 11 (1911), ii. 5, defines it as calf leather. [↑](#footnote-ref-125)
126. A hundredweight, though the exact weight may have varied: *DMLBS*, centenus 4a and 4b. [↑](#footnote-ref-126)
127. Almonds: *DMLBS*, amygdala 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-127)
128. Rice: *AND*, ris2; *DMLBS*, risa. [↑](#footnote-ref-128)
129. Frail or basket, a unit of measurement: *DMLBS*, fraellus; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 739. [↑](#footnote-ref-129)
130. Figs, probably dried: *DMLBS*, ficus 3b. [↑](#footnote-ref-130)
131. Raisins: *AND*, raisin; *DMLBS*, racemus 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
132. Silk fabric: *DMLBS*, cendalum. Lisa Monnas *Merchants, Princes and Painters: Silk Fabrics in Italian and Northern Paintings 1300*–*1550* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 302. [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
133. It is not clear what this signifies. It may indicate that the cloth was produced or sized in accordance with a law. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
134. Genoa, Italy. [↑](#footnote-ref-134)
135. Possibly Alessandria, Italy. [↑](#footnote-ref-135)
136. Venice, Italy. [↑](#footnote-ref-136)
137. Lucca, Italy. [↑](#footnote-ref-137)
138. *Samitum*, a rich silk fabric made with silver or gold: *DMLBS*, samitum. See Anna Muthesius, ‘Silk in the Medieval World’, in *The Cambridge History of Western Textiles*, ed. David Jenkins (2 volumes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 325–54. [↑](#footnote-ref-138)
139. Not joy but weld, a yellow dye, and most likely cloth dyed with weld: *DMLBS*, 2 gaudium. [↑](#footnote-ref-139)
140. It is not clear what this means. There might be a link to acton, a padded jacket (*AND*, aketon), itself from *DMLBS*, alcoto. One of the examples cited there fore 1235 notes that such a garment could be covered in silk, as here. Alternatively, Lisa Monnas *Merchants, Princes and Painters: Silk Fabrics in Italian and Northern Paintings 1300*–*1550* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 301 notes attabi, actabi as terms for silk textile from Italy. [↑](#footnote-ref-140)
141. Silk: *DMLBS*, saeta, seta 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-141)
142. *Camelettum*, camlet cloth: *DMLBS*, camelotus. Chorley, ‘Cloth Exports of Flanders’, 361, associates camlet with Lille. [↑](#footnote-ref-142)
143. This is probably Tripoli, one of the Crusader ports; for another instance see *Testamentary Records of the English and Welsh Episcopate, 1200–1413: Wills, Executors’ Accounts and Inventories, and the Probate Process*, ed. C. M. Woolgar, Canterbury and York Society 102 (2011), 210, 337. *DMLBS*, camelotus, first quotation notes the importation of black camlet cloth from Tripoli. [↑](#footnote-ref-143)
144. Assisi, Italy. [↑](#footnote-ref-144)
145. Buckram, fine linen or cotton cloth, original linked to Bukhara; *DMLBS*, bukaramus. [↑](#footnote-ref-145)
146. Fustian cloth: *DMLBS*, fustianum. [↑](#footnote-ref-146)
147. A pound weight: *DMLBS*, libra 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-147)
148. Probably for seta, silk: *DMLBS*, saeta 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-148)
149. *Crudus* means raw or uncooked, and in this case probably undyed: *DMLBS*, crudus 3b. [↑](#footnote-ref-149)
150. Cotton: *DMLBS*, coto. The *centena* indicates that the cotton was transported in quantities of a hundred, perhaps as a hundred cloths, though exactly what was meant is not stated here. [↑](#footnote-ref-150)
151. Cotton wool: *AND*, cadace, *OED* caddis sb.1. Also *Cadas*, a coarse cloth: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 730. [↑](#footnote-ref-151)
152. Ell, a measure of length: *DMLBS*, ulna 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-152)
153. Cloth: *DMLBS*, tela 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-153)
154. Canvas; *AND*, canevas; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 730; *DMLBS*, canevacius 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-154)
155. Garment: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 764; fine head covering or veil: *DMLBS*, velamen 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-155)
156. *Peplus*, veil or kerchief: *DMLBS*, peplus 3a. [↑](#footnote-ref-156)
157. Finely woven textile: *DMLBS*, subtilis 2.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-157)
158. Pearls: *DMLBS*, perla. [↑](#footnote-ref-158)
159. Gold dust or flakes: *DMLBS*, paleola. [↑](#footnote-ref-159)
160. Refined or of good quality: *DMLBS*, finus. [↑](#footnote-ref-160)
161. Saffron: *DMLBS*, crocus 1. This was a flavouring but also a dye; on its use in cloth-making in this period see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 38. [↑](#footnote-ref-161)
162. Pepper: *DMLBS*, piper 1. The *centena* here is presumably lbs. [↑](#footnote-ref-162)
163. Ginger: *DMLBS*, zingiber 1; *AND*, gingembre. [↑](#footnote-ref-163)
164. Cinnamon: *DMLBS*, canella 4; *AND*, canel2. [↑](#footnote-ref-164)
165. Zeodary, a spice: *DMLBS*, zedoaria; *AND*, sedewale; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 758. [↑](#footnote-ref-165)
166. Sugar: *DMLBS*, succarum 1; *AND*, sucre. This is an early occurrence of this word. [↑](#footnote-ref-166)
167. Galingale, mild ginger: *DMLBS*, galanga a; *AND*, galingal. [↑](#footnote-ref-167)
168. A quarter, a unit of measurement: *DMLBS*, quartarius 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-168)
169. Waida or woad: *DMLBS*, waida; *AND*, weide. On its use in cloth-making in this period see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 35–7. [↑](#footnote-ref-169)
170. This is grain, a red dye; see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 37, 38; *AND*, grain1 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-170)
171. Brazil-wood, a dye: *DMLBS*, brasillum; *AND*, brasil. On its use in cloth-making in this period see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 37–8. It was imported from south-east Asia. [↑](#footnote-ref-171)
172. Liquorice: *DMLBS*, liquiritia; *AND*, licoris. [↑](#footnote-ref-172)
173. Potash, used in cloth dyeing: *DMLBS*, cinis 3a. On its use in cloth-making in this period see Carus-Wilson, ‘English Cloth Industry’, 39. [↑](#footnote-ref-173)
174. The word ‘Nota’ occurs in the margin next to this entry. [↑](#footnote-ref-174)
175. Reims, France, a centre for linen production. [↑](#footnote-ref-175)
176. It is not clear what this means; perhaps it represents an early version of paltok, a tunic or doublet: *AND* paltok; *MED* paltok. [↑](#footnote-ref-176)
177. Bolting cloth’, or sieve: *DMLBS*, buletarium; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 729. [↑](#footnote-ref-177)
178. *Stamen* means thread: *DMLBS*, stamen 2, but also a coarse cloth and garments from it worn by monks; *DMLBS*, stamen 3 and 4: *say* may be from *saia*, silk: *DMLBS*, saia 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-178)
179. Probably Gistel, in Western Flanders, Belgium. [↑](#footnote-ref-179)
180. Oil, often olive oil: *DMLBS*, oleum 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-180)
181. Wheat: *DMLBS*, 2 frumentum. [↑](#footnote-ref-181)
182. Peas: *DMLBS*, 2 pisum 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-182)
183. Oats, unusually here as a singular: *DMLBS*, avena 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-183)
184. Maybe beans: *DMLBS*, fabaria 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-184)
185. Grain or corn: *DMLBS*, bladum. This probably means some kind of grain other than the wheat, beans and oats noted separately. [↑](#footnote-ref-185)
186. Garlic: *DMLBS*, alium; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 725. [↑](#footnote-ref-186)
187. Onions: *DMLBS*, caepa; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 758. [↑](#footnote-ref-187)
188. Rope: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 733. [↑](#footnote-ref-188)
189. Thread: *DMLBS*, filum; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 738. [↑](#footnote-ref-189)
190. Hemp, perhaps for rope: *DMLBS*, cannabis 2; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 730. [↑](#footnote-ref-190)
191. Sea coal. [↑](#footnote-ref-191)
192. Steel: *DMLBS*, acer 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-192)
193. Copper: *DMLBS*, cuprum. [↑](#footnote-ref-193)
194. Copper or brass, but probably brass as copper has already been named: *DMLBS*, aes 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-194)
195. Ms. *metall' talibus*, but the context suggests that this may be an error in which one word was divided into two. *Et omnibus aliis metallibus* seems more fitting as the end to a list of metals. [↑](#footnote-ref-195)
196. A bundle or pack: *DMLBS*, trussellus 1; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 763. This term was used for consignments of Flemish cloth, see Oksanen, *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World*, 154. [↑](#footnote-ref-196)
197. It is not clear what this means. [↑](#footnote-ref-197)
198. A wey or weigh, a unit of measurement: *DMLBS*, peisa 3; Gras, *Early English Customs*, 752. [↑](#footnote-ref-198)
199. Oil: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 763; *DMLBS*, unctum. [↑](#footnote-ref-199)
200. Onion: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 731; *DMLBS*, caepa. [↑](#footnote-ref-200)
201. Herring: *DMLBS*, harengus. A last of herring was later a precise number: *DMLBS*, lastus 1c, *MED* last n.2. Herring fishing was probably very important at Dover from an early date. Domesday Book, fo. 1r: *Domesday* *Book: Text and Translation*, ed. J. Morris (38 vols, Chichester, 1975–86) Kent D4 states that the king’s peace applied to the town from Michaelmas to St Andrew’s day each year. This coincides with the later part of the herring season, and dates around this time often had significance in the Cinque Ports (Sheila Sweetinburgh, ‘Kentish Towns: Urban Culture and the Church in the Later Middle Ages’, in *Later Medieval Kent, 1220*–*1540*, ed. Sheila Sweetinburgh (Woodbridge: Boydell Press and Kent County Council, 2010), 137–65, at 155). The use of the special king’s peace might indicate that the town drew in many fishermen from overseas, who were outside the usual bonds that guaranteed safety, and so fell under the special protection of the king (Oksanen, *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World*, 171–2 discusses this problem). When fleeing England in cross-dressed disguise in October 1191, William de Longchamp, bishop of Ely, was mistreated by fishermen at Dover (in a letter of Hugh de Nonant, bishop of Coventry, *English Episcopal Acta* 17: *Coventry and Lichfield, 1183*–*1208*, ed. M. J. Franklin (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1998), 124–31, appendix II, esp. p. 128). [↑](#footnote-ref-201)
202. Mackerel: *DMLBS*, makerellus 1. The *millenarius* here is a customary measure, a mease of herring: *DMLBS*, millenarius 6b. [↑](#footnote-ref-202)
203. Dicker, a unit for leather. [↑](#footnote-ref-203)
204. This is in the second hand that wrote this text, but is black unlike the other red rubrics, and is squeezed into a gap instead of being on a line by itself. [↑](#footnote-ref-204)
205. Sheep: *DMLBS*, bidens a. [↑](#footnote-ref-205)
206. *Flicches*, flitches, a side of a slaughtered animal: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 739; *MED* flicche n. [↑](#footnote-ref-206)
207. Boat: *DMLBS*, 2 batellus. [↑](#footnote-ref-207)
208. This line was omitted by Haines. [↑](#footnote-ref-208)
209. A cart: *DMLBS*, 2 biga. [↑](#footnote-ref-209)
210. *Summarius*, packhorse: Gras, *Early English Customs*, 761; *DMLBS*, sumetarius 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-210)
211. Presumably for adfert, brings. [↑](#footnote-ref-211)
212. *Sabelus*, sable: *DMLBS*, sabelus. [↑](#footnote-ref-212)
213. A package of forty furs: *DMLBS*, timbria; *AND*, timbre4. [↑](#footnote-ref-213)
214. Marten fur: *DMLBS*, marterinus 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-214)
215. *Vair*, fur: *AND*, vair1 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-215)
216. Hide: *DMLBS*, pellis; *pellis ouium* is a woolfell. [↑](#footnote-ref-216)
217. Silk fabric: *DMLBS*, sericus. [↑](#footnote-ref-217)
218. It is not clear what this means. [↑](#footnote-ref-218)
219. *Anchoragium*, payment for an anchorage: *DMLBS*, ancoragium. The earliest reference elsewhere is from 1286. [↑](#footnote-ref-219)
220. Guines is now in northern France, some 10 km south of Calais. The counts of Guines ruled a small county centred on it, but were often overshadowed by their more powerful neighbours (Leah Shopkow, introduction to her translation of Lambert of Ardres, *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2007)). The counts were much affected by the activities of Philip II Augustus, king of France, who expanded his interests in the area, especially from 1200, and ultimately annexed the county (Lambert of Ardres, *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2007), 30–33; Ch. Dehay *et al.*, *Histoire des territoires ayant formé le departement du Pas-de-Calais* (Arras: Librairie Brunet, 1946), 84–6.). Earlier counts had interests in England (For holdings in 1217–18 see *Liber feodorum: the Book of Fees, commonly called Testa de Nevill*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (3 volumes, London: HMSO, 1920–31), i. 236, 240; and for holdings in 1235–6 see i. 484.), but the one who was most closely linked with England was Baldwin III, who inherited his claim to the county on his father’s death in 1220. He went to England in 1233 and served Henry III as a military commander (Matthew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. H. R. Luard (7 volumes, Rolls Series 57, London, 1872–83), iii. 248, 254.). He was involved in fighting against the rebellion of Richard Marshal, earl of Pembroke (Nicholas Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An Alien in English Politics, 1205*–*1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 161, 323 on Baldwin as an enemy of Hubert de Burgh, 395, 406 on Baldwin as recipient of some of de Burgh’s assets after his fall; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, iii. 254–5. Björn Weiler, *Henry III of England and the Staufen Empire, 1216*–*1272* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Royal Historical Society, 2006), 57). Count Baldwin of Guines was concerned about his liability for toll at Dover in 1233, for the king ordered, presumably at his behest, that the constable of Dover should hold an inquest to see if Baldwin’s ancestors had been free of toll there (*Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1231*–*1234*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1905), 184). The inquest agreed with the claim, for in 1235 the king ordered that the result be observed and that the count should be free of toll at Dover henceforth (*Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1234*–*1237*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1908), 171). It is not clear why Henry III ordered that another inquest should be held on the same question in 1236 (*Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1234*–*1237*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1908), 335). The evidence of the close rolls shows that Baldwin’s claim to exemption was accepted for at least part of the 1230s. [↑](#footnote-ref-220)
221. There was a lordship or viscountcy of Merck or Marck which included Calais, and was just to the north-east of the lordships of Ardres and Guines. There were links between its rulers and the Guines family (Lambert of Ardres, *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2007), 29, mentions that semi-detached lordship of Ardres was held by Arnold, viscount of Merck *c.* 1147–*c.* 1176. His daughter Christine married Baldwin II of Guines (1169–1206). Lambert of Ardres, *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2007), Cap. 133, pp. 167–8, of text describes the lords of Merck.). Engelramus or Ingram is hard to place, but a man of that name held land in England from the honour of Boulogne and died in 1261 (*Liber feodorum: the Book of Fees, commonly called Testa de Nevill*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (3 volumes, London: HMSO, 1920–31), i. 485 and ii. 1292.). [↑](#footnote-ref-221)
222. William de Fiennes was descended from Faramus of Boulogne, and was made to hand over the constableship of Dover Castle in exchange for the manor of Wendover in Buckinghamshire (F. W. Hardman, ‘Castleguard Service of Dover Castle’, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 49 (1938), 96–107, at 96–7 and 100–1; *Liber feodorum: the Book of Fees, commonly called Testa de Nevill*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (3 volumes, London: HMSO, 1920–31), ii. 876; also i. 235, 462, 464, 468, 472; ii. 896, 1146 (this notes that William was dead before 1249), 1154; *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, ed. Hubert Hall (3 volumes, Rolls Series 99, London, 1896), ii. 683; *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 34.). Fiennes is 5 km south-west of Guines, and so he may have drawn on the networks that linked Guines and Merk. A William de Frenes (presumably Fiennes) was seneschal of Hamo II Pecche, who also appears in this list of exemptions **[d13]**. [↑](#footnote-ref-222)
223. The choice of words here may be meaningful. The dependents of the abbot of Battle or the countess of Eu **[d11]** would more usually be described as *homines*; the use of *tenentes* perhaps indicates that something else was meant, perhaps visiting merchants using a *hospitium* owned by either of these individuals, for these were used elsewhere as a means of accommodating visitors. See Oksanen, *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World*, 148; Neil Middleton, ‘Early Medieval Port Customs, Tolls and Controls on Foreign Trade’, *Early Medieval Europe* 13 (2005), 313–58, at 337–9. [↑](#footnote-ref-223)
224. The counts of Eu were powerful lords on the Norman frontier and had longstanding landed interests in England. Most importantly, they were lords of Hastings and so controlled that part of Sussex known as the Rape of Hastings, which depended on Hastings Castle (J. F. A. Mason, ‘The Rapes of Sussex and the Norman Conquest’, *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 102 (1964) 68–93, at 72 and 74–6, on the counts of Eu at Hastings). Hastings was one of the Cinque Ports, and so was closely linked to Dover. The specification of a countess of Eu in the list suggests that the list must have been drawn up during a time when a countess was lord of Hastings in her own right. This situation applied in the first half of the thirteenth century, when Alice, countess of Eu, held the lands in her own right (I. J. Sanders, *English Baronies: A Study of the their Origin and Descent, 1086*–*1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 147). She held the Hastings lands from 1214, and from 1219 additionally held the honour of Tickhill in Yorkshire. In 1244, though, she was deprived of her estates when the remaining Norman landholders in England were expropriated (D. A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London: Methuen, 1990), 89, 160–1, 187–8, 261, 275; I. J. Sanders, *English Baronies: A Study of the their Origin and Descent, 1086*–*1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 147). [↑](#footnote-ref-224)
225. Hamo II de Crevequer was lord of the honour of Chatham from 1217 to 1263 (I. J. Sanders, *English Baronies: A Study of the their Origin and Descent, 1086*–*1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 31), and so an important landholder in Kent. He held land through knight service owed at Dover Castle (F. W. Hardman, ‘Castleguard Service of Dover Castle’, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 49 (1938), 96–107, at 106–7). [↑](#footnote-ref-225)
226. Hamo II Pecche came of age in about 1215 and died in 1241 (I. J. Sanders, *English Baronies: A Study of the their Origin and Descent, 1086*–*1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 48). He was the son of his predecessor, Gilbert. The Dover cartulary includes a charter of donation in the name of Hamo Pecche, son of Gilbert Pecche, which recorded the grant of a mill to the monks, and was witnessed by, among others, William de Frenes (presumably Fiennes), seneschal of Hamo Pecche, who is also on the list **[d9]** (Lambeth Palace Library ms. 241, fo. 80v). [↑](#footnote-ref-226)
227. There were numerous Richards who the sons of kings, including Richard the Lionheart, son of Henry II, and Richard, later earl of Cornwall and king of Germany, son of John, among others. The reference is probably not to one of these distinguished Richards, for they were ordinarily known under elevated titles. This Richard is probably one of the more obscure ones, and was an illegitimate son of King John and a Warenne (Richard Cassidy, ‘Rose of Dover (d. 1261), Richard of Chilham and in Inheritance in Kent’, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 131 (2011), 305–19; I. J. Sanders, *English Baronies: A Study of the their Origin and Descent, 1086*–*1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 111; Simon Lloyd, ‘Chilham, Sir Richard of (d. 1246)’, *ODNB*; Chris Given-Wilson and Alice Curteis, *The Royal Bastards of Medieval England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 130). He is a likely identification because he was active around the time of the other persons named on the list, and because he was strongly linked to Kent and to Dover. He led in the 1217 sea battle off Sandwich in which Eustace the Monk was defeated, and in 1214 married an heiress who brought him lands in Kent, and whose lands owed knight service at Dover; after many financial travails, he died in 1246 (Richard Cassidy, ‘Rose of Dover (d. 1261), Richard of Chilham and in Inheritance in Kent’, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 131 (2011), 305–19, at 312). [↑](#footnote-ref-227)
228. There were two men named Henry of Sandwich who might have been meant here. One was a churchman, successively archdeacon of Oxford 1259–62 and bishop of London 1262–73 (John Le Neve,*Fasti ecclesiae Anglicanae,**1066–1300*; i: D. E. Greenway, *St Paul’s, London* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1968), 3, 84; iii: D. E. Greenway, *Lincoln* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1977), 37, 112; Clive H. Knowles, ‘Sandwich, Henry of (b. before 1205, d. 1273), bishop of London’, *ODNB*; Philippa Hoskin, *English Episcopal Acta* 38: *London, 1229*–*1280* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2011), lv–lix). The other was the bishop’s father, who was knight in Kent (Continuation to Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, in *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 volumes, Rolls Series 73, London, 1879–80), ii. 218). Either could have been meant, but perhaps the father was the more likely. [↑](#footnote-ref-228)
229. This refers to the Cinque Ports federation, which consisted of the five head ports and the thirty-five members or havens; on this see K. M. E. Murray, *The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935), introduction. [↑](#footnote-ref-229)
230. This is probably the priory of Ware, Hertfordshire. The exchequer list of toll exemptions at Dover printed in Appendix 2 below notes that one of the entities exempted was the Abbey of Saint Evroult in Normandy. Ware Priory was a dependency of Saint Evroult, and so presumably its exemption could have been claimed there as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-230)
231. It is not entirely clear who was meant by this designation. The heirs of John of St Leger held two knights’ fees in *Hulecumbe* until the time of Archbishop Edmund, who died seised of them (1240) (*Liber feodorum: the Book of Fees, commonly called Testa de Nevill*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (3 volumes, London: HMSO, 1920–31), ii. 1153). Alternatively, the heirs of Gralandus de St Leger held half a fee in Swanscombe, Kent, in 1242–3 (*Liber feodorum: the Book of Fees, commonly called Testa de Nevill*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (3 volumes, London: HMSO, 1920–31), ii. 669, 679). It is not clear which of these was meant in the list of exemptions. [↑](#footnote-ref-231)
232. The version here is taken from *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, ed. Hubert Hall (3 volumes, Rolls Series 99, London, 1896), iii. 722–4. The list of customs and exemptions at Dover listed in the catalogue of the borough muniments, John Bavington Jones, *The Records of Dover: The Charters, Record Books and Papers of the Corporation, with the Dover Custumal* (Dover: Dover Express, 1926), 86, refers to the item which is now Maidstone, Kent History and Library Centre, ms. Do/ZZ2/3, parts 1 and 2, which is a nineteenth-century translation of this source. [↑](#footnote-ref-232)
233. Nicholas Vincent, ‘New Light on Master Alexander of Swerford (d.1246): The Career and Connections of an Oxfordshire Civil Servant’, Oxoniensia 61 (1996), 297–309; David Crook, ‘Swerford, Alexander of, (*b.* before 1180, *d.* 1246)’, *ODNB*. [↑](#footnote-ref-233)
234. *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1231*–*1234*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1905), 167. [↑](#footnote-ref-234)
235. Nicholas Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An Alien in English Politics, 1205*–*1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 311–20, and 313 on demands that he render account. [↑](#footnote-ref-235)
236. The case was heard in Trinity Term 1306, and there is an exemplification on the Patent Roll 12 Edward III, 20 February 1338, *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, AD 1338*–*1340*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1898), 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-236)
237. Albert Way, ‘Original Documents’, *Archaeological Journal* 2 (1854), 381–8, at 383. [↑](#footnote-ref-237)
238. On the Maison Dieu, otherwise the Hospital of St Mary, Dover, see R. C. Fowler, ‘The Hospital of St Mary, Dover’, *Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of the County of Kent*, ii. ed. William Page (London: Archibald Constable, St Catherine’s Press, 1926), 217–19. The gift is *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 48, 6 July 1227. [↑](#footnote-ref-238)
239. *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 79, 14 July 1229; 99, 20 September 1229; 126, 10 November 1230; 142, 12 December 1231. [↑](#footnote-ref-239)
240. *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, AD 1226*–*1257*, ed. Deputy Keeper of the Records (London: HMSO, 1903), 78, 14 July 1228. [↑](#footnote-ref-240)
241. The earl of Kent must be Hubert de Burgh, so this refers to the time before his fall in 1232; in **[39]** below he is noted as still alive, so the list must refer to the years between his fall and his death in 1243. [↑](#footnote-ref-241)
242. See **[d16]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-242)
243. This probably means the townspeople of London (Middlesex), for the bishop, chapter and religious houses are mentioned separately below **[19]**. [↑](#footnote-ref-243)
244. See **[d17]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-244)
245. This probably means the townspeople of Winchester (Hampshire), for the bishop and cathedral priory are mentioned separately below **[17, 18]**. [↑](#footnote-ref-245)
246. The townsfolk of Norwich (Norfolk). [↑](#footnote-ref-246)
247. The townsfolk of Rochester (Kent). The bishop is noted separately below **[22]**. [↑](#footnote-ref-247)
248. See **[d4]** above; **[d6]** is the archdeacon of Canterbury, not specified here. [↑](#footnote-ref-248)
249. The abbey of St Augustine, Canterbury (Kent). [↑](#footnote-ref-249)
250. This probably refers to the Priory of Holy Trinity Aldgate, London. [↑](#footnote-ref-250)
251. The bishop of Winchester and the cathedral priory. [↑](#footnote-ref-251)
252. The bishop of Exeter (Devon). [↑](#footnote-ref-252)
253. The bishop of Carlisle (Cumberland). [↑](#footnote-ref-253)
254. See **[d2]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-254)
255. See **[d2]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-255)
256. See **[d3]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-256)
257. Presumably Lillechurch or Higham Priory, Kent, the mother house of which was Saint-Sulpice at Rennes, and of which Saint Sulpice was one of the titular saints; it is odd, though, that the head of this house was described here as *prior* rather than the correct *priorissa*. [↑](#footnote-ref-257)
258. Presumably the order of Cluny. [↑](#footnote-ref-258)
259. The order of Sempringham (Lincolnshire). [↑](#footnote-ref-259)
260. *Scella* here and in **[34, 36, 37]** must stand for *cella* (note also **[35]** where *prioratus* is used in the same role) *DMLBS*, 1 cella 4b, the dependent cell of a monastery. Westminster’s dependent priories were Alvecote (Warwickshire), Great Malvern (Worcestershire), Hurley (Berkshire), and Sudbury (Suffolk). [↑](#footnote-ref-260)
261. See **[d10]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-261)
262. The abbey of Le Bec; its dependent priories were Cowick (Devon), Goldcliff (Monmouthshire), Ogbourne St George (Wiltshire), St Neots (Huntingdonshire), Steventon (Berkshire), Stoke by Clare (Suffolk), and Wilsford (Lincolnshire). [↑](#footnote-ref-262)
263. The abbey of Fécamp; its dependent priories were Cogges (Oxfordshire) and Warminghurst (Sussex). [↑](#footnote-ref-263)
264. There is some uncertainty as to what was meant here; it could refer to Fontevrault or to Saint-Evroult, but the latter is slightly more likely. For Fontevrault it would be necessary to correct *Fronte* to *Fonte*, and to correct *abbas* to *abbatissa*. For Saint Evroult it would be necessary to correct *Fronte* to *Sancto*. Both Fontevrault and Saint-Evroult had dependencies in England, at Grovebury (Bedfordshire) and Ware (Hertfordshire) respectively. In the Dover list in Appendix 1, one of the entries is *prior de War’* **[d20]**, which can only be a reference to Ware Priory, which makes the link to Saint-Evroult. [↑](#footnote-ref-264)
265. This is the abbey of Saint Taurin at Évreux; its dependencies were the priories at Astley (Worcestershire) and Llangennith (Glamorgan). [↑](#footnote-ref-265)
266. See **[d5]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-266)
267. See **[d13]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-267)
268. Otherwise Richard, son of King John; see **[d14]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-268)
269. See **[d11]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-269)
270. See **[d7]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-270)
271. See **[d9]** above, where only the lord of Fyenes. [↑](#footnote-ref-271)
272. See **[d8]** above. [↑](#footnote-ref-272)