

Aids and scutages : 1235-6 : Aid for getting the king's sister married : Introduction

The marriage of a sister did not normally justify an aid, but in 1235 it was agreed to make an exception. The king's sister Isabel (she was not even his oldest sister) was about to be married to the emperor Frederic II, and it was understood, I suppose, that marrying an emperor could not be done on the cheap. Whatever the reasoning, the upshot was that an "aid of knights for getting the king's sister married" was levied in 1235-6, at the rate of two marks (320 pence) per fee.

Not everyone paid up at once; I do not know how long it took for all the money to come in. In the first year's account, many of the entries end with a debt which is going to be carried forward. This account was copied into the "Book of Fees" (E 164/5-6); and so was the account for "an aid of prelates" (bishops, abbots, priors) levied at the same time. Both accounts were printed in the PRO edition (*Book of fees*, pp 569-70, 565). I reproduce them in the accompanying file, with some conjectural emendations, and with the entries numbered for reference.

(It is pointless, I think, to translate this sort of business Latin. Anyone who wants to work with the exchequer records will have to get used to the language - as well as to Roman numerals and pounds, shillings and pence - and it hardly helps to translate the jargon from something resembling Latin into something resembling English. Though the PRO editors extended the abbreviations, it is generally not necessary to read beyond the first syllable: rather than "reddit compotum de triginta marcis de quindecim feodis", all one needs to say is "redd comp de 30 marc de 15 feod".)

The "aid of knights" of 1235-6 had a special significance which did not become clear till ten years after the event. As things turned out, this was the last occasion on which an aid or scutage was collected in the traditional way, from the king's tenants in chief, on the basis of the figures reported in 1166. (Collectors were appointed in each county, but they acted as go-betweens only: they collected some of the money and delivered it to the treasury, but they did not themselves have to answer for the proceeds.) Experimentally in 1242-3, definitively after that, a new method was adopted.

Some notes are attached which may be helpful.

(01) The abbot of St Augustine's is treated as a baron, like any other baron. He has 15 knight's fees to answer for.

(02-04) This is Hamo (not Robert) de Crevequer, answering first for his wife's barony (Folkestone) and then for his own (Chatham). He only got possession of his wife's inheritance in January 1236 (*Excerpts fine rolls* 1:296).

(04) Hamo is charged for 14 fees with respect to his own barony; so far he has only paid for 10.5 fees. The two lost fees are

entered separately below (14, 17); whether Hamo was able to get those payments credited to him (as his father had succeeded in doing in 1211 (GREx 1211:242)) is something which only the subsequent rolls would reveal.

(03) The reference ("sicut continetur ...") is to GREx 1168:212.

(05) The reference ("sicut in rotulo ...") is to GREx 1211:242. (But that entry got things wrong: Hugo de Auberville never had anything to do with the barony of Monchensy.)

(08) This entry was evidently altered, and I have had to resort to some guesswork to knock it into shape. I take it that Robert was originally charged for one fee and a seventh part of a fee: the arithmetic was $\text{INT}(320 * 8 / 7) = 365$ pence, $365 - 320 = 45$ pence still owing. (An odd halfpenny "et ob'" was probably part of this sum, but I omit it and ignore it.) Then it was decided that "a seventh" ought to be "a sixth", and the arithmetic became $\text{INT}(320 * 7 / 6) = 373$ pence, $373 - 320 = 53$ pence. And then it was realized that Robert's holding (half of Aldington) was part of the barony of Willelm fiz Helto; so the payment which he had made was deducted from that account (11).

(09) Milstead.

(10) Kingsdown (TQ 5763).

(11) The additions made to this entry show the exchequer officials waking up to the fact that this was the barony of Willelm fiz Helto (GREx 1168:212), now split into three equal shares. (They seem to have consulted the entry in GREx 1222:63, or perhaps some matching entry on the memoranda roll.) One share belonged to Willelm de Cerintone, the second to Willelm de Auberville (this is the share which Johan Marescal had answered for in 1222, when Willelm was under age), the third to Robert de Setvans.

(12) Shorne.

(13) This man - I think his name was Reinold (perhaps misheard as Arnold and then misspelt as Arnulf) - was Isolda Bardolf's second husband (occ 1227 *Curia regis rolls* 13:7). (He and Isolda owned only half of Hoo. The other half belonged to Nicol Poinz, who was under age at the time.)

(14) West Barming.

(15) Adam has paid the collectors 80 pence (as if for 1/4 fee) with respect to his land in Cobham; the exchequer is not sure whether this settles the account. (It does: the land was indeed rated at a quarter of a fee (*Excerpts fine rolls* 1:94, 1:402-3). It was held from Adam by Johan de Cobeham (*Close rolls 1231-4* 183); possibly he made the payment.)

(16) Henric has paid the collectors 320 pence (as if for one fee) with respect to his land in Hoo (actually in Stoke) and Beckenham; the exchequer is not sure whether this settles the account. (In

1242-3 it was still doubtful whether Henric should be charged for one fee or for one fee and a half.)

(17) Nashenden.

(18) A new entry for Willelm de Say, replacing (06). Some payments made to the collectors for Middlesex are credited to his account. (Note, conversely, that a payment made to the collectors for Kent is credited to one of the Cambridgeshire accounts (*Book of fees*, p 571).)

(19) The archbishop is charged 300 marks (48000 pence) - 200 marks for his knight's fees and 100 marks on top of that. He has paid the money, but not without making some protest, the nature of which is not clear to me.

(27) The prior of Christ Church is charged 60 marks (9600 pence). The king has decided that the prior can keep the money, on condition that it is spent on the work of the shrine of Saint Thomas.

First posted Feb 2010