

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

ROLL A 10

5

of “Lubek” and also the endorsement relating to the date of enrolment had been erased, and when search was made on the Roll, no enrolment could be found on the date alleged. Under these suspicious circumstances, the will was retained by the Mayor and Aldermen for further examination. The defendant then asked leave to come to terms with the plaintiff, and the Court assented. Afterwards on 26 Nov. Thomas Askull, Roger de Excestre, John Tykhull, Thomas Bachelor and John Lenechylde, saddlers, mainprised the said John for his good behaviour under penalty of £15.

John de Lubek was committed to prison by assent of the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty for coming before the Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs, and declaring in full court that they refused him justice in his plaints, in contempt of the King and his court. He was afterwards mainprised as noted above. 21 Nov. 1364

John de Munden, *wyndrawere*, was committed to prison on his own confession that he took 16d from a carter unjustly and against the peace. 23 Nov. 1364

John Meredien, butcher, was committed to prison for having perjured himself, when he was being examined on a charge of having sold a wey of tallow (*wayam sepe*) to John de Pritelwell of co. Essex, for conveyance out of the City contrary to the custom of the City¹.

John Bayly, brewer, was attached to answer William Frere of Wycombe in a plea of debt on demand of 105s, according to the Statute of Smithfield, for malt bought at Queenhithe. He acknowledged the debt and was committed to prison till he paid. 5 Dec. 1364

Richard Palmer, *pelter*, who struck his wife in the breast with a knife, was committed to Newgate until it was known whether she would die or not. 2 Dec. 1364

John de Dunton, attorney in the Common Bench, was fined for drawing a knife in Cheap against the constable of Aldgate Ward.

¹ Butchers and their wives were forbidden to sell tallow or lard for export on account of the dearness and scarcity of such commodities in the City. Cf. *Liber Custumarum*, fo. 206 b.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Membr. 2 b John Iklyngham was mainprised by Thomas Athelby and William Iklyngham to pay a fine (*pro fine faciend^o*) for obstructing the four masters of the Vintners in the discharge of their duty.

John Hydyngham, William Pershore and William de Bathe, constables of Fleet Street, brought a bill of complaint against John Maunsiple for having threatened the above William de Bathe, when he went into the defendant's cellar to examine his ale-measures. They also charged him with having rescued by force a man who, after wounding John de Lodelawe, cordwainer, in an affray, had taken sanctuary in a church.

[*French*]

The defendant was summoned to answer the King and the plaintiffs on the above charges. He admitted the first and was committed to prison. He denied the second and put himself on the country, being mainprised to hear the verdict and keep the peace meanwhile by Thurstan de Chesenhale and John Bakere, brewer. Afterwards a jury (including the two mainpurnors) found him not guilty, and he was acquitted.

William Nosterfeld and Rose his wife were attached to answer John de Briclesworth, who prosecuted for the Commonalty, on a charge of having sold ale with a quart-measure sealed with a counterfeit seal of the Alderman of Dowgate Ward, which measure was found to be short by one-third when compared with the standard measure of the City. The defendants admitted using the measure and charging a higher price than was allowed by the proclamation, but as regards the charge of counterfeiting the Alderman's seal they put themselves on the country, and were found not guilty and acquitted.

14 Dec. 1364 John le Bakere, Fleming, was committed to prison for selling white cloth not properly soaked (*non plene madefactus*), in deception of the common people.

The same day, Beatrice Bassett was committed to the custody of the Sheriff for calling Simon de Worstede, Alderman, "a thief," when he told her not to put her refuse in the highway.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

ROLL A 10

7

William de Twyford, cutler, was mainprised by William Spaldyng and Richard Godchyld, cutlers, to keep the peace with Paul Paneky, merchant of Lucca. Membr. 3
5 Nov. 1364

John Curteys was sworn before the Mayor to supervise the sale of *hostres*, *muskeles*, *cokkes* and *welkes*¹, to see that they were sold in sealed measures, and to remove them from the stalls if unwholesome, and that the assay should take place at half-prime (*ad dimidium prime*)². 6 Nov. 1364

Robert de Horwode, foreign poulterer, put himself on the mercy of the Court for having sold his poultry in secret places instead of in open market. 2 Nov. 1364

Joan, wife of William atte Grene, after being sworn not to keep her house as a brothel, was mainprised by John Chaundeler and William Bedel, cordwainer.

At an inquest held the same day, a jury of William Clophull, John Clerk, John Popul, Henry Polter, John Conyngburgh, John Clapschethe, Peter Polter, John Wastell, John atte Noke, Adam Polter, John Messenger and John Clerk presented John Stukle, poulterer, as guilty of selling his poultry in secret places and not in open market, and of having sold poultry to John Wenge, cook, at the latter's lodgings³. 2 Nov. 1364

Seven of the above jury, together with John Depyng and John Whytefeld, bailiff of Cheap, were sworn to supervise the poultry trade and keep down excessive prices.

¹ Oysters, mussels and whelks were sold on arrival by basket to private citizens. Any not sold by noon might be bought by retailers for sale in their shops and on stalls. All measures had to correspond with the standard measures of Guildhall, and be sealed by the Alderman of the Ward. See the ordinances of the Fishmongers, *temp.* Edw. II, in *Lib. Alb.* I, p. 381, copied from Letter Book A, fo. 89 *b seq.*, and the Articles of the Wardmote Inquest, *temp.* Edw. I, *ibid.* p. 337.

² Prime usually denoted 6 a.m., though it was also used for the period between prime and tierce (9 a.m.). As sales in the City markets began at prime, it seems probable that the assay took place earlier, and that half-prime was some hour before 6 a.m. Cf. Letter Book G, fo. 72, *nul manere de blee soit vendu a Billyngesgate ne a la Ryve la Royne avant heure de deny prime*.

³ This practice was forbidden by a writ of Edw. II, 20 March 1315. Cotton Claudius D, II, fo. 134 *a* printed in *Lib. Cust.* II, pp. 678–9. Regulations for the sale of poultry in the City by denizens and foreigners were proclaimed in 1345. H. T. Riley, *Memorials of London and London Life*, pp. 220–1.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

5 Nov. 1364 At an inquest held on Tuesday after the Feast of All Saints [1 Nov.], a jury of Hamo Crepulgate, William Hamond, William Senesterre, Robert Hervy, Richard Donmowe and others presented John Cokhow and John Style as partners in poultry-selling, and John Belte, a foreign poulterer, for keeping a shop in the Poultry, where he sold the goods of other foreign poulterers, as though they were the goods of freemen, thus defrauding the Sheriff of his customs. The above persons put themselves on the mercy of the Court. The jury said further that all the poulterers of the City sold poultry at a higher price than was allowed by the Statute¹. On being ordered to give the names of persons so offending, they produced a lengthy list including their own names.

4 Dec. 1364 Richard Bayoun admitted that he was an apprentice of William Plumer of Westminster, and because he refused to be enrolled according to the custom of the City², he was committed to Newgate.

5 Dec. 1364 William Stolmaker recovered 16s 3½d from John Brewere, carter, for the loss of goods in carriage caused by the latter's negligence.

John Byrrade, John Cortour, Roger Vanyewylowe, John de Poules, William þe Mayre and Peter Pellyn were mainprised to keep the peace with John Yongehere, Fleming, who was also mainprised with his son John, to keep the peace with the other Flemings. The said John Yongehere had previously been committed to prison on his confession that he had aided and abetted his son John in striking a man of Flanders.

Membr. 3 b
Nov. 1364 William Holbech, Alderman, brought a bill of complaint against Simon Levelif, brewer, for impleading him by writ at Westminster on matters arising within the franchise of the City, contrary to his oath as a freeman³. [French]

¹ Edw. II regulated prices of poultry by ordinance. Rymer's *Foedera*, vol. II, pt. i, p. 263, and several statutes of Edw. III fixed prices, the most recent being 37 Edw. III, A.D. 1363, c. 3. *Statutes of the Realm*, I, p. 378.

² Among certain articles of "ancient usage" recorded in 1312 in Letter Book D, fos. 155 b–159 b, is a provision that no person in the City should receive an apprentice unless he were himself free of the City, and that no apprentice should follow his trade unless he had been enrolled.

³ Cf. Letter Book D, fo. 86: *Vous nenplederes nul home qest de la Franchise de la dite Citee hors de mesme la Citee si vous purrez avoir droit devaunt les*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

ROLL A 10

9

The said Simon, happening to be in court, was questioned on the charges and admitted that they were true. He was committed to prison until the Court should be advised as to their judgment.

Writ, dated at Westminster, 22 Nov., enclosing a petition 22 Nov. 1364
to the Chancellor from John van Stene, merchant of Ghent, who complained that he had sued John Penetrie and Henry Forester, skinnners, before the Mayor of the Staple at Westminster for moneys due for goods supplied, and that the above Mayor had sent a bill of the Staple to the Mayor and Recorder of the City requesting them to do justice therein, but owing to the neglect of John Not, then Mayor of the City, and the fact that his serjeant had been bribed, no sequestration was made on the defendants, who had fled with their goods to Westminster, so that the petitioner was unable to recover his debt in the City. [French]

The late Mayor and his serjeant were summoned to answer the articles in the above bill, but when they appeared the plaintiff said that he did not wish to prosecute his bill. Judgment was given that the plaintiff take nothing by his bill and be in mercy, and that the defendants go thence without a day.

Robert Vynter of Maydenstane¹ and Andrew Pyebakere of 17 Dec. 1364
Cornhill entered into a recognizance for the appearance of Roger de Heryetesham, a monk of Boxlee², at an audit of accounts between the said monk and John Burgeys, mariner, as regards the profit and loss of a *farcost*³, engaged in carrying

ministres de la Citee. The City's right to jurisdiction over citizens was implied in the charter of William I. The charter of Henry I granted that the citizens of London should not plead outside the walls of the City for any plea. That of Henry II added the words "save only pleas of foreign tenures," and the King's moneyers and officers were excepted. In 1324 the City claimed its jurisdiction, when John de Coton of London sued Nicholas de Whitton in King's Bench for trespass, and cited an instance four years before when the City's liberty was allowed. Edw. II issued a writ confirming the liberty, notwithstanding any non-user, and a day was given for the parties in Guildhall. *Lib. Alb.* 1, pp. 433–6. For earlier instances in 1314–15, see *Cal. of Letter Book E*, pp. 38–9, 49.

¹ Maidstone, co. Kent.

² The Cistercian Abbey of Boxley, co. Kent.

³ A light-draught-boat, used for coasting and river traffic.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

red herrings from Yarmouth to the monastery at Boxley and in other trading.

On the quindene of Easter next year the recognizance was cancelled because the above John Burgeys did not put in an appearance at the account.

Membr. 4
5 Dec. 1364

Vane Camby of Pistoja, Lombard, brought a bill of complaint to the effect that he had bought a letter of exchange in London for £30 from Nicholas Sardouch of Lucca, Lombard, which letter was to be payable to himself or his attorney at Bruges in the form of 200 scudos, each scudo being worth 3s; that he had given the letter to his attorney John Paule, and that the latter had been refused payment in Bruges.

[*French*]

The said Nicholas in his defence said that the plaintiff had instructed him to pay the money, i.e. 200 scudos, value £28 15s, to Sir Paul Johan of Pistoja or to a certain John Paule, and that he had paid the former. He prayed judgment whether the plaintiff had any action against him. To this the plaintiff replied that the payment was to be made to John Paule and not to Sir Paul Johan or any one else.

After an adjournment that the Court might be advised, the parties agreed that the defendant should enter into a bond to produce a receipt from the person to whom he had paid the money, and also a letter from the Echevins and Burgomasters of Bruges as to the payment. On 16 July next year the action was further adjourned till Monday after the quindene of Michaelmas.

Complaint having been made that many who were born within the franchise of the City of London were prevented from enjoying the freedom, unless they had been admitted to it in some other way (than by birth), it was ordained by the Mayor, Aldermen and Commons that any one born free within the City or the bounds of the franchise thereof, who could prove the fact, should enjoy the freedom as fully as others who had been admitted by apprenticeship or redemption or in any other way, as had always been the custom, provided that if his freedom were challenged and

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

ROLL A 10

11

he claimed it by birth¹, he should take the oath like others. [French]

Adam de Bury, Mayor, delivered to Roger Regas a girdle, 13 Dec. 1364
value 5 marks, in full court.

John de Hatfeld, Gilbert Bonet, vintner, John Chaucier, Membr. 4 b
Blasius de Bury and Thomas de Athelby, pelter, mainprised 9 Dec. 1364
Richard Lyeuns² of London to keep the peace with Alice de Perers³, and not to interfere with her going where she wished on the King's business and on her own.

John Talbot brought a bill of complaint to the effect that 16 Jan. 1365
he went to lodge at the inn of Richard Pecok, hostiller, in Fancherstret and entrusted (*bailla*) to him certain goods, *viz.* £4 13s 4d in gold; 4 ells of scarlet, value 40s; a silver *ouche*⁴, value 16s; 6 spoons, value 8s; a bond in which the master of the ship called "*Katerine*" was bound to him in £21; and two acquittances—of which goods he could not have delivery from the said Richard, who was intending to leave the City, and had threatened him. He prays a remedy, and that the said Richard may find security for keeping the peace. [French]

¹ Freedom by patrimony was an ancient right. In the *Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II* (Rolls Series), p. 86, it is noted, in reference to events in 1275, that the freedom was acquired in three ways: by birth, apprenticeship, and payment to the Chamberlain. In 1364 the Commonalty urged that freemen of the first class ought not to pay fine or service, but that when they came of age they ought to take the same oath as other freemen. *Cal. of Letter Book G*, pp. 179–81. Being born free seems to have implied being the son of a freeman as well as being born in the City.

² Afterwards Alderman of Broad Street Ward, 1374–6, and Sheriff, 1374–5. He was employed by Edw. III in financial business. Together with Lord Latimer he was impeached by the good Parliament of 1376 for frauds upon the King and was condemned to forfeiture and imprisonment. These proceedings were reversed by the Parliament of 1377. Meanwhile in 1376, Lyons and two other Aldermen, John Pecche and Adam de Bury, were dismissed from their Aldermanries in consequence of the charges made against them. Lyons reappears in 1380 as Member of Parliament for Essex, and was murdered in 1381 by Wat Tyler's insurgents. See *Cal. of Letter Book H*, pp. 30, 38; *Rolls of Parliament*, II, pp. 323–4, 330; *Chron. Angliae* (Rolls Series), pp. 78–9; Walsingham (Rolls Series), I, p. 321; A. B. Beaven's *Aldermen*, II, p. 161.

³ Said to have been mistress of Edw. III. See biography in *D.N.B.* and defences of her character in Barnes, *History of Edward III*, pp. 872–3 and *Notes and Queries*, 7th S. VII, pp. 449–51.

⁴ A clasp, buckle or brooch for holding together the two sides of a garment.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Both parties appearing on 18 Jan., the defendant produced the goods mentioned, with the exception of the money and the acquittances. As regards the money, nothing he said had the effect of exonerating him (*nichil dicit in effectu ad exonerandum ipsum*), and he was committed to prison until *etc.* He denied receiving the two acquittances, and in this matter the plaintiff did not prosecute further. The defendant was bound over to keep the peace with the plaintiff.

The same day the defendant sued the plaintiff for 31s 6d due for 6 ells of green cloth, which debt the said John declared that he had paid, and waged and made his law¹ to that effect, and was acquitted thereof. On this, Richard Pecok drew a knife, and was fined for so doing.

10 Dec. 1364 John de Wynchecombe, armourer, came and stated that his apprentice, William atte Hawe, son of Margaret de Grubbelane, refused to be enrolled according to the custom of the City. The apprentice confessed refusing and was committed to Newgate. Thereupon his mother came into court and said that there was an agreement between the two that the indentures of apprenticeship were to be broken and that the master was to give the apprentice a general acquittance. This the master could not deny. The Court allowed the indentures to be cancelled and then fined the master 20s for not having enrolled his apprentice.

The same day Walter atte Grene, Henry Asselyn, William Ryf and William Mareschal, masters of the Butchers at St Nicholas Shambles, reported that a pig found in the shop of John Huntynghdon of Bykleswade, butcher, was corrupt and abominable to the human race. William Cornewaylle, taverner, paid the fine of 20s and mainprised the said John to appear before the Mayor and Aldermen when required.

¹ An oath by plaintiff or defendant, fortified by the oaths of six others, was admissible in such actions as breach of covenant, debt and detinue, where the plaintiff had no writing or tally, or where the writing did not cover the matter in dispute. Citizens were generally given an interval of a fortnight to produce their oath-helpers, while foreigners were expected to have them ready and to make their law on the spot (*incontinenti*)—a provision probably intended to prevent delays in doing justice to passing merchants. *Lib. Alb.* 1, pp. 203, 294–5, 295–6; *Cal. of Early Mayor's Court Rolls*, p. 74.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

ROLL A 10

13

John Parys, *shethere*¹, was committed to prison for 10 days and fined 10s for rebellious conduct towards the masters of his mistery². 14 Jan. 1365

Writ *de minis*, dated at Westminster 20 Nov., notifying that the King had taken John de Brampton under his protection, and ordering the Mayor and Sheriffs to take security from William de Nafferton, who had threatened to burn the said John's houses and do him personal injury. Membr. 5
20 Nov. 1364

Return to the effect that the above-mentioned William had been mainprised for keeping the peace by William Ledbetere, John Geddyng, glazier, Roger Parchemyner and William Yoman, *mareschall*³.

The Cordwainers of London brought a bill of complaint to the effect that Thomas de Folkeshull, *wyrdrawere*, claimed to monopolise⁴ the whole outfit of Robert Leg, *ageletmakere*⁵, who had been accustomed hitherto to make laces for shoemakers in general. 8 Jan. 1365

[French]

The parties having been summoned to court, the said Thomas admitted buying shoe-laces (*aguylletes*) from the said Robert at 1¼d and selling them for 2½d, and put himself on the mercy of the Mayor and Aldermen. He was committed to prison. Robert also admitted making the alleged agreement. He was forbidden to make any such agreement again and was ordered to sell his wares to the cordwainers and any others who wanted to buy. The same day the defendant Thomas was

¹ A sheathmaker. The Mayor and Aldermen were informed in 1408 that every knife was prepared separately by three crafts, the blade by the bladesmiths, the handle and other fitting work by the cutlers and the sheath by the sheathers, but that the blame for false workmanship always fell on the cutlers—who appear to have employed the other crafts. See Letter Book I, fo. 71.

² In accordance with the “statutes” or ordinances of the Mayor and Aldermen of 19 Dec. 1364, which laid down that each craft should be governed by masters chosen from its members, and that any person proved to be rebellious should be imprisoned for 10 days and pay 10s on a first offence, 20 days and 20s for a second offence *etc.* See Letter Book G, fo. 135 b.

³ A farrier.

⁴ *Ad acroche a luy & luy ad constreynt qil ne doyt servir a nuly sinoun a luy.*

⁵ Originally an aglet was the tag of a lace, but came to mean the lace itself.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-46405-6 - Calender of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: A.D. 1364–1381

Edited by A. H. Thomas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

allowed to find mainprise for the payment of 20s fine to the Commonalty and undertook not to enter into any such arrangement again to the fraud and deception of the common people.

8 Jan. 1365 William Lytherpol, goldsmith, was committed to prison for saying in full court that the Mayor and Aldermen would not listen to him and do him justice. Next day he was mainprised by William de Burton and John Coraunt, goldsmiths, for the payment of 15d fine, and for his good behaviour towards the Mayor and Aldermen and other servants of the King, and also for keeping the peace with John de zeftele and Beatrice his wife.

John de Allesford of co. Southampton was put on the pillory and sent to Newgate for reasons noted in Letter Book G, fo. 147¹.

William Gedelyne complained that William de Ely, pouch-maker, had spread a report that the plaintiff was a man of ill-fame, who had robbed his master of six purses and was not fit to work at the trade. As no one would employ him, the plaintiff had been forced to seek work at York, where his behaviour disproved the scandals moved against him. He brought with him a certificate from York, testifying to his good conduct.

The defendant, being summoned, declared that he would submit to judgment if four good men of his mistery could be found who would declare him guilty. Thereupon four pouch-makers—John Rosemond, John Storm, John Norfolk and Richard Spark—declared on oath that he was guilty. The Court adjourned the case for consultation. Afterwards at the Husting held on Monday the Feast of SS. Fabian and Sebastian [20 Jan.] he publicly did penance for his false statements by standing on a stool (*scabellum*) in the great Hall, after which he was released.

¹ His offence was that of pretending to be a summoner of the Archbishop of Canterbury and a purveyor of the King authorised to take carpenters from the City to work on the Castle of Windsor. He denied the latter charge but confessed that he had posed as a summoner before the Prioress of Clerkenwell and said that he did so in order to obtain money from her. See Riley's *Memorials*, pp. 320–1.