Politics, Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Reigns of Henry III and Edward I



by

D. W. Burton

A thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford, 1985

D. W. Burton - Christ Church, Oxford

Politics, Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Reigns of Henry III and Edward I

D.Phil. - Trinity Term 1985

Abstract (1)

This thesis traces the way in which the growing political consciousness of the English nation in the thirteenth century led the king to pay more attention to public opinion, and considers the arguments he used to justify his policies, and in particular his military undertakings, before a wider public audience.

The development of such political propaganda began during Henry III's reign. Yet he felt little need to explain his policies until this increasingly unrealistic position was exposed during 1258-65, when the barons made strenuous and successful attempts to exploit public opinion. Edward I probably learnt much from his father's experience, and during his reign took considerable care to explain how his wars were in the interests of the realm. The traditional means of communication and the arguments put across both underwent considerable development as a result.

Much of the material for this study is in print. The king's arguments can be established from the writs entered on the chancery rolls, supplemented by the accounts of the chroniclers, while the outline of the barons' arguments in 1258-65 can be established from the same sources. Bishops' registers and the memoranda rolls provide further information towards the end of the century.

Throughout an attempt has been made to show how the king's claims and arguments were viewed, which is not particularly easy. The main sources for public opinion, the chronicles, supplemented by political songs, reflect mainly the views of literate churchmen, and the opinions of the laity can be ascertained only indirectly. Yet the picture which emerges is of an increasingly politically conscious nation following the main political events with interest, and able to judge the merits of the king's arguments for itself.

Abstract (2)

This thesis traces the way in which the growing political consciousness of the English nation in the thirteenth century led the king to pay more attention to public opinion, and looks at the arguments he used to justify his policies, and in particular his military undertakings, before a wider public audience. The need for such political explanations to men other than the king's immediate political circle was a new development in the thirteenth century, the result of a growing political awareness stimulated by social and economic changes and the greater impact of royal policies. Increasingly the king would have to show that his policies were of benefit to the whole realm and not just himself. This thesis is therefore looking at the beginnings of political propaganda which is directed at the nation in general, something which has been investigated in the fourteenth and later centuries, but has received little detailed study in the thirteenth.

The first two chapters consider the reign of Henry III. The years of his personal rule, 1258-65, are only briefly covered, for there is little evidence that Henry felt the need to explain his policies to more than his immediate political associates. Those explanations which he did offer took little account of the nascent political community of the realm, failing to show how royal policies were of benefit to the nation. The first chapter shows how this was an increasingly unrealistic position, a fact which was underlined by the period of reform and rebellion after 1258. The investigation of this period in chapter two shows the extent to which political awareness was developing, and how Henry's failure to recognize this had alienated the country. The barons were quick to exploit this position, making strenuous efforts to win the support of the localities, and carefully

presenting their actions to show that they were in the interests of the realm. Only when it was too late did Henry respond, at first merely denying the accusations against him, and only slowly making a few claims of his own that he was concerned with the welfare of the nation. After appearing uninterested for so long he failed to be convincing, and the barons' success is indicated by the strength of the cult of Simon de Montfort after 1265, a study of which concludes this section.

Yet Edward I probably learnt much from his experiences during his father's reign and from the example of Montfort and the barons, and the remainder of the thesis shows how he applied his lessons. Different chapters look at his wars in Wales, Gascony and Scotland, and their repercussions in England from 1297 to 1301, subjects which were selected because warfare was a policy which concerned the nation more than any other, and for which the surviving evidence is therefore fairly extensive. These chapters show how Edward developed the means of putting across his policies, extending the traditional methods of communication through writs, parliament and visual display, and making new use of the spiritual support of the church. His arguments, too, were carefully chosen to show that what was being undertaken was in the best interests of the realm, and were adapted to meet the changing circumstances.

Much of the material for this thesis is in print. The king's arguments can be largely established from his writs entered on the close and patent rolls, and many of those relevant are collected in Palgrave's Parliamentary Writs. These can be supplemented by incidental information in the chronicles and, at the end of the century, from further writs entered on the unprinted memoranda rolls. Yet much must have failed to

survive. Records of the proceedings at parliament, for example, are virtually non-existent save in the occasional summary accounts of the chroniclers, while visual display, important in an illiterate age, has by its very nature left little trace. The outline of the barons' arguments in 1258-65 can be established from the chancery rolls, for they had control of the king's government for quite long periods, but in 1297-1301 we have to rely on the chronicles and the indirect evidence of the king's own writs. Not surprisingly the barons have left no records of their own, although some evidence of the clerical opposition to Edward in 1297 can be found in bishops' registers.

Throughout an attempt has been made to show how the king's claims and arguments were viewed. Yet it is a difficult task to establish public opinion with any precision and to measure the king's ability to influence it, both because of the limited amount of evidence surviving and because that which does reflects mainly the views of literate churchmen alone. Chronicles are inevitably the most important source for public opinion, and all but the Cronica Maiorum and the Annales Londonienses were the work of monks. Care also has to be taken to avoid treating as contemporary comment that which was only written later with the benefit of hindsight. The evidence of the chronicles can be supplemented by political songs, although those surviving are probably only a fragment of what was originally in existence, and again generally reflect only the views of literate and educated men. Some use has been made of both printed and unprinted bishops' registers and monastic letter-books and cartularies, which have preserved occasional items of political interest. Yet there is no real source for the opinions of the laity, and their views have to be tentatively established indirectly from these sources. The views of the peasantry in

particular inevitably remain very obscure.

The picture that emerges is of a society which is increasingly politically aware. Men followed the course of the baronial rebellion and Edward's wars with interest and formed their own opinions about them. The number of illustrative documents circulating the country is an important indication of the level of political consciousness, and a collection of references to these is compiled in the appendix. Yet although the king could arouse interest in political affairs, it seems that he could not always secure practical support for his undertakings. Men's political awareness led them to ponder the king's claims and to decide for themselves whether these undertakings were genuinely in their interests. Only when the king's arguments drew upon popular beliefs and attitudes did they appear convincing, and then he was more able to guide and strengthen political views in his favour.

Acknowledgement

The great debt I owe to many historians can be seen from the footnotes in this thesis. Yet no footnote can ever do justice to the debt I owe to my supervisor, Dr J. R. Maddicott. For seven years he has patiently read my typescripts, offering his knowledge of, and insight into, the thirteenth century. Whatever merits this thesis has are largely the result of his guidance.

Contents

Abbreviations v

Introduction 1

1. The Personal Rule of Henry III, 1225-58 14

2. The Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-65 31

(i) The Period of Reform 32

(ii) The Outbreak of Rebellion 45

(iii) The Propaganda Methods of the King and Barons 55

(iv) The Arguments of the Barons 61

(v) The Arguments of the King 80

(vi) The Pattern of Support for Reform and Rebellion 90

(a) The Church 90

(b) The Laity 107

(vii) The Cult of Simon de Montfort 126

3. The Reign of Edward I: Introduction 147

4. Edward I and Wales 154

5. Edward I and Gascony 196

6. The Clergy and the Crisis of 1297 230

7. The Laity and the Crisis of 1297 255

8. The Political Crisis of 1299-1301 279

9. Edward I and Scotland 290

(i) 1291-1296 290

(ii) 1297-1298 306

(iii) 1299-1307 322

(a) Writs 322

(b) Relations with the Local Communities 326

(c) Visual Propaganda 333

(d) Religious Propaganda 340

(e) Historical Research 344

(f) The End of the Reign 348

10. Political Propaganda and the Church 360

Conclusion 388

Appendix 1. The Distribution and Collection of Documents 393

Appendix 2. Gifts to the Dominicans and Franciscans,1250-67 408

Appendix 3. Requests for Prayers, 1294-1307 409

Bibliography 414

Abbreviations

Annales Londonienses	Annales Londonienses, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1882).
B.I.H.R.	Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research
B.L.	British Library
Burton	Annales Monasterii de Burton, in Annales Monastici, i, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864).
Bury St. Edmunds	Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301, ed. A. Gransden (London, 1964).
Cal. Inq. Misc.	Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous
Cal. Lib. Rolls	Calendar of Liberate Rolls
Cal. Pat. Rolls	Calendar of Patent Rolls
Cant. D. & C.	Canterbury Dean and Chapter Muniments
C.C.C.C.	Corpus Christi College, Cambridge
Cont. Newburgh	Continuatio Chronici Willelmi de Novoburgo, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I, ii ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1885).
Cotton	Bartholomaei de Cotton Monachi Norvicensis Historia Anglicana, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1859).
Cronica Maiorum	Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, in De Antiquis Legibus Liber, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Society, old series, xxxiv, 1846).
C.U.L.	Cambridge University Library
Dunstable	Annales Prioratus de Dunstaplia, in Annales Monastici, iii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1866).
E.H.R.	English Historical Review
Flores Historiarum	Flores Historiarum, ii, iii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1890).

Foedera	Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, i, ed. T. Rymer (Record Commission, 1816).
Gervase	Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, ii, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1880).
Guisborough	Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, ed. H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 3rd series, lxxxix, 1957).
Hagnaby	British Library MS Cotton Vespasian B xi.
Hailes	British Library MS Cotton Cleopatra D iii, printed in 'A Critical Edition of the Annals of Hailes with an Examination of their Sources' ed. M. N. Blount (Manchester M.A. thesis, 1974).
H.M.C.	Historical Manuscripts Commission
Lanercost	Chronicon de Lanercost, ed. J. Stevenson (Maitland Club, 1839).
Langtoft	Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft, 2 vols, ed. T. Wright (Rolls Series, 1866-8).
Melrose	Chronica de Mailros, ed. J. Stevenson (Bannatyne Club, 1835).
Northampton	Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 281.
Oseney	Annales Monasterii de Oseneia, in Annales Monastici, iv, ed. H. R. Luard Rolls Series, 1869).
Paris	Matthaei Parisiensis Chronica Majora, iii-vi, ed. H. R. Luard (1876-1882).
Parl. Writs	Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, i, ed. F. Palgrave (Record Commission, 1827).
Pat. Rolls	Patent Rolls
P.R.O.	Public Record Office
Reg. Dalderby	Lincoln Record Office, Register of bishop Dalderby (III).
Reg. Gandavo	Registrum Simonis de Gandavo Diocesis Saresbiriensis, 1297-1315, i, ed. C. T. Flower and M. C. B. Dawes (Canterbury and York Society, xl, 1934).

Reg. Peckham	Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, 3 vols, ed. C. T. Martin (Rolls Series, 1882-5).
Reg. Pontissara	Registrum Johannis de Pontissara Episcopi Wyntoniensis, 1282-1304, 2 vols, ed. C. Deedes (Canterbury and York Society, xix, xxx, 1915-24).
Reg. Sutton	Rolls and Register of Bishop Oliver Sutton, 1280-99, iv-vi, ed. R.M.T. Hill (Lincoln Record Society, lii, lx, lxiv, 1958-69).
Reg. Winchelsey	Registrum Roberti Winchelsey Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, 1294-1313, 2 vols, ed. R. Graham (Canterbury and York Society, li, lii, 1952-6).
Rishanger	Chronicle of William de Rishanger, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Camden Society, old series, xv, 1840).
Robert of Gloucester	Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, ii, ed. W. A. Wright (Rolls Series, 1887).
St. Augustine's	Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 301.
Tewkesbury	Annales Monasterii de Theokesberia, in Annales Monastici, i, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864).
Trevet	Nicholai Triveti Annales Sex Regum Angliae, ed. T. Hog (English History Society, 1845).
V.C.H.	Victoria County History
Waverley	Annales Monasterii de Waverleia, in Annales Monastici, ii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1865).
Wendover	Rogeri de Wendover Flores Historiarum, iii, ed. H. G. Hewlett (Rolls Series, 1889).
Worcester	Annales Prioratus de Wigornia, in Annales Monastici, iv, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1869).
Wykes	Chronicon Vulgo Dictum Thomae Wykes, in Annales Monastici, iv, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1869).

INTRODUCTION

During the thirteenth century political propaganda grew both in its intensity and in the number of people to whom it was directed. This is partly a reflection of the growth of written records during the century. From the reign of John the chancery rolls allow us to follow the daily work of the government, while the second half of the century is further illuminated by the development of the memoranda rolls and other exchequer and wardrobe documents. Non-royal documents, too, add further detail as the practice of keeping registers and letter books grew amongst bishops and the monastic communities. Yet it is not only the better survival of records which we are witnessing in the thirteenth century, but also a change in the political structure of society and an increase in the demands being placed upon it. Under the pressure of royal demands and economic and social change, the political nation was widening beyond the magnates to include the shire knights, and by the end of the century political awareness probably extended to the more substantial peasantry as well. The growth of the political nation meant that the king would have to seek support more widely than hitherto, while the increasing scale

of his undertakings meant that such support would have to be sought more avidly. This thesis is a study of the way in which Henry III and Edward I responded to this changing situation and sought to win support for their policies, and in particular for their military undertakings. Warfare was the most costly of their activities and its effects upon society could be profound, and inevitably it was accompanied by much propaganda. Reasons of space have necessitated a certain narrowing of the topic. The way in which kings projected their regal image is a study in its own right which cannot be included here. It must also be remembered that kings had more weapons at their disposal than mere explanation and argument: patronage and royal disfavour could be equally persuasive, if not more so. Moreoever there is a danger that this thesis might present a distorted picture. Inevitably the information comes from written records, and in an intensely oral society this ignores the large amount of propaganda which must have been disseminated by word of mouth or through visual images. Some of this can be recovered from chronicle accounts or from references in royal records, but most of it must remain unknown. Similarly in a religious society the sermons and prayers of the clergy were regarded as an important means of winning both human and divine support for the king's causes, but unfortunately the precise role of the church is obscure until ecclesiastical records begin to survive from the end of the thirteenth century.

Despite the severe problems of communication in the thirteenth century the king was able to put his arguments across to large numbers of people. He himself was constantly on the move, while the holding of regular parliaments allowed many to

visit the king's court. But of more importance were the royal writs and proclamations which would be disseminated throughout the country and could include explanations of royal policy. A medieval proclamation had none of the precision of the Tudor proclamation, but was simply a royal writ which included a request for its contents to be proclaimed. Only occasionally were the precise words specified and it was not even necessary for the writ specifically to order the proclamation. For example, some writs summoning the feudal army asked for a proclamation, although it is difficult to imagine how those which do not could have been made known otherwise. Letters addressed to the shire would also have been automatically proclaimed as the only practical way of making their contents known.

Sheriffs were required to make proclamations in their county courts and 'per totam ballivam' or 'per totam comitatum', an instruction which was sometimes expanded into a phrase such as 'in civitatibus, burgis, mercatis et hundredis'. The writs of Edward I often added to this 'and wherever you think fit'. The little surviving evidence from the thirteenth century does suggest that the king's writs did receive such widespread publicity. It was apparently fairly common to hear royal proclamations in the abbot of Reading's hundred court, for in 1234 he claimed that Robert of Aldermaston owed suit to the court: 'ibi presentare debet placita corone et attachiamenta et ibi audire statuta et assisias panis et cervisie et alia que statuta sunt ad pacem domini regis'.[1] Proclamations were also heard in the hundred court of the abbot of Cirencester,

1. Bracton's Note Book, ii, ed. F. W. Maitland (London, 1887), no. 842.

for in 1263 he claimed that he had distrained William Pontdelarch the previous year, in accordance with the sheriff's order to secure the attendance of all the free tenants of his hundred 'ad audiendum preceptum domini regis, scilicet quasdam novas constituciones factas per dominum regem et consilium'. William Pontdelarch denied that the abbot had received any such mandate, and claimed that he was anyway under no such obligation to attend the reading because he had already heard the new constitutions, presumably the Provisions of Westminster, in both the king's court and the county court.[1]

A few writs for proclamations were returned to the chancery during Edward I's reign. The endorsement of one by the sheriff of Rutland records that in 1306 he had proclaimed the Statute of Winchester in his county court and had then gone to each hundred and market town and to other places in the county to read the statute before assemblies of the constables and iurati ad arma.[2] Yet unfortunately such endorsements do not specify exactly where the proclamations were made before the reign of Edward III.

Although in 1306 the sheriff of Rutland appears to have travelled round his county to supervise the making of the proclamation in person, this was probably not the usual practice. Indeed the occasional request for the sheriff to go and personally supervise the proclamation implies that this was not customary.[3] It was probably more usual for the sheriff to pass on the king's writ to the bailiffs of the hundreds and other local officials for execution, as he did for other writs.

1. P. A. Brand, 'The Contribution of the Period of Baronial Reform (1258-67) to the Development of the Common Law in England' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974), p. 33 n.3.

2. P.R.O. C255/3/3, no. 6.

3. For example, Cotton, pp. 313-4, Foedera, pp. 880, 882.

Three examples of such a practice have been found from Edward I's reign. The first occurs in 1290 when Edward wrote to Stephen de Pencester, warden of the Cinque Ports, ordering him to proclaim throughout his bailiwick the prohibition of the export of timber and coal. The writ which the warden then sent to the bailiffs of Sandwich ordering them to make the proclamation in the hundred court is recorded in a Canterbury register. The second example is of a writ sent by the sheriff of Hereford to the bailiff of the liberty of St. Albans in 1303 passing on the king's order for a proclamation that all clerics who wished to fine for service were to appear on Ascension day. The third concerns a writ for the proclamation of the Statute of Winchester in 1306 which was passed on by the sheriff of Northampton to the bailiffs of the liberty of Peterborough.[1] In this way the king's writs would have received widespread publicity. Not only would there have been a number of suitors at the shire and hundred courts, but also jurors, litigants, lawyers and others having business there, as well as merchants and tradesmen seeking to profit from the gathering.

With such efforts being made to give the king's writs widespread publicity it is inconceivable that they would have been read in the original Latin. Latin was anyway not generally a spoken language, and business which was recorded in Latin was usually transacted in French or English.[2] There is some evidence to support this suggestion of vernacular

1. Cant. D. & C., Register I, f.196^{r}; B.L. MSS Cotton Tiberius E vi, f.195^{v}, Cotton Vespasian E xxii, ff.101^{v}-102^{r} .

2. M. T. Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record (London, 1979), esp. chap. 6.

proclamations. For example, in 1253 the sentence of excommunication against those who transgressed Magna Carta, known as the sentencia lata, was drawn up and distributed in Latin, but, according to the Burton chronicler, was actually proclaimed in French and English,[1] while in 1295 we hear of a Latin charter being read out in French and English before the county court of Essex.[2] In 1299 a papal bull on the Gascon war was read out before parliament 'Latinaliter ad ~~litteratos~~ illeratos, patria lingua ad illiteratos',[3] and in the following year Edward had the papal bull, Scimus fili, read to the army in Latin and explained in French.[4] One of the letter-books of the City of London also contains two French proclamations which were originally issued by the chancery in Latin, presumably translated for a reason other than pure academic interest.[5]

Such translations were probably made locally. Not only is there no evidence that the government provided them, but also the government rarely felt the need to provide even the exact Latin text of the proclamation. Several French versions

1. Burton, p. 322. A French translation survives in B.L. Add. MS 38821, ff. 85^{v}-86^{r}.

2. W. A. Morris, Early English County Court (Berkeley, 1926), pp. 107, 163.

3. Annales Angliae et Scotiae, in Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1865), p. 389.

4. Reg. Winchelsey, ii. 572.

5. Corporation of London Records Office, Letter-Book C, ff. 73 (translated from the writ concerning the Anglo-French peace in Foedera, p. 950), 88 (translated from a writ against the export of victuals similar to that addressed to Great Yarmouth in Foedera, p. 1007). Both are calendared in Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, Letter-Book C, ed. R. R. Sharpe (London, 1901), pp. 119, 150. Further French proclamations are on ff. 3, 24^{v}, 38^{v}, 74^{v}, 86^{v} (calendared pp. 6, 28, 54-5, 121, 145), but no Latin originals appear to survive.

of Magna Carta have been found,[1] their considerable differences pointing to the absence of an official French text, and the government is unlikely to have provided translations of documents of lesser importance. There were however a few exceptions to this general practice, notably the two famous English proclamations of 1258. Yet these remained unique documents. They were the product of exceptional circumstances and were probably an effort to produce.[2] Moreover English was a spoken rather than a written language, and the number of local dialects would have made comprehension difficult. In 1290 the general chapter of York went as far as resolving that all business would in future be conducted in French or Latin to avoid the confusion which could arise from the use of English.[3] French, or Anglo-Norman, on the other hand, was learnt as a second language and would have been more free from such regional variations and more easily understood.[4] The baronial government issued three French proclamations in 1258-9, but it was not until the end of the century, as French was developing more as a written language, that many others were sent out. Edward was in general more concerned about the content of proclamations than his father, and after 1290 it also became more usual for the full Latin text of a

1. One is printed by J. C. Holt, 'A Vernacular-French Text of Magna Carta, 1215', E.H.R.,lxxxix (1974), 356-364, who considered it to be a local translation. Other French versions, most with the Forest Charter, are in B.L. Add. MS 6159, ff. 117^{r}-121^{r}, 249^{v}-253^{r}, MS 32085, ff.102^{r}-106, and MS 38821, ff. 86^{r}-90^{r}; Bodleian MS Lat. Misc. d.82,ff.1-4; C.U.L. MS Dd x 28, ff.5^{v}-10^{v}.

2. See below, p. 40 and n.2.

3. H. J. Chaytor, From Script to Print (Cambridge, 1945), p.32.

4. M. D. Legge, 'Anglo-Norman and the Historian', History, xxvi (1941-2), 175.

proclamation to be issued. Furthermore it was during his reign that the government began to require information about the execution of proclamations which has resulted in a small collection of returned writs for proclamation in the Public Record Office.[1]

The second aspect of this study is to consider the response to the king's propaganda. Any conclusions will necessarily be only tentative, for they will be based largely on the evidence of the literate churchmen who wrote chronicles. Yet the monastic chroniclers did not have such narrow interests as might appear at first. Undoubtedly they were to a certain extent regarding the world from the particular viewpoint of the welfare of their communities. Even Matthew Paris, who was exceptional in the breadth of his interests and his contacts with the outside world, regarded and interpreted it with the interests of St. Albans firmly in mind.[2] Yet monks could not escape involvement in the outside world. As landowners they had to look after the affairs of their estates, which included providing soldiers for the royal armies and paying taxes. They suffered equally from purveyance and at the end of the century from the dislocation of trade caused by the war with France and the maltolt on wool.[3] As landowners they were also expected to play a part in political affairs. Monastic heads were frequently summoned to parliament under Edward I, some were appointed as itinerant justices, and others were given

1. P.R.O. C255/3.

2. R. Vaughan, Matthew Paris (Cambridge, 1958), pp. 136-143.

3. See, for example, M. Mate, 'The Impact of War on the Economy of Canterbury Cathedral Priory, 1294-1340', Speculum, lvii (1982), 761-766.

administrative tasks.[1] Inevitably monks maintained links with the outside world. Matthew Paris, for example, is known to have occasionally visited the royal court, and in 1248 went on an embassy to the king of Norway.[2] Thomas de Wykes did not enter Oseney abbey until he was sixty, and he was presumably well experienced by then in the ways of the world. His patrons included Philip of Eye, who was the treasurer of Richard of Cornwall for many years, and later treasurer of England.[3] Langtoft, a canon at Bridlington, not only wrote his chronicle for a lay patron, Scaffeld, but also travelled outside the priory to defend its legal interests.[4] William de Hoo, the sacrist of Bury St. Edmunds, who probably wrote part of the Bury chronicle, used to act on the abbot's behalf in the borough of St. Edmunds,[5] while Bartholomew Cotton, the master of the cellar at Norwich priory, was likewise responsible for conducting the priory's relations with the outside world.[6]

Such contacts were reinforced by the frequent visits of laymen to the monasteries themselves. The guests' stables at

1. D. Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, i (Cambridge, 1948), 276-7.

2. Vaughan, op.cit., pp. 2-7.

3. N. Denholm-Young, 'Thomas de Wykes and his Chronicle', E.H.R., lxi (1946), 158, 159-60.

4. Abstracts of the Charters and other Documents contained in the Chartulary of the Priory of Bridlington, ed. W. D. Lancaster (Leeds, 1912), pp. 13, 55, 169, 360, 420. Unfortunately nothing is known about Scaffeld.

5. A. Gransden, Historical Writing in England, c.500-1307 (London, 1974), pp. 396-7.

6. H. W. Saunders, Introduction to the Obedientiary and Manor Rolls of Norwich Cathedral Priory (Norwich, 1930), p.76.

St. Albans, for example, could hold three hundred horses, and the community's hospitality meant Matthew Paris was personally acquainted with many of the leading men of his day, who became an important source of information for him.[1] At Norwich priory it was the groom of a local landowner, Stephen de Depham, who brought the news in 1283 of the death of Llywelyn.[2] Moreover, in order to manage their secular affairs monasteries were accustomed to retain the services of influential men who could help promote and protect the community's interests.[3] For example, Norwich priory gave annual pensions to three leading justices, Richard de Boyland, William de Giselham and William de Ormesby, as well as to Simon de Dalling, a local landowner.[4] Westminster abbey's long list of annuitants included a number of royal justices and other officials, amongst whom were John de Droxford, keeper of the king's wardrobe, and Walter Reynolds, keeper of the wardrobe of the prince of Wales and later archbishop of Canterbury.[5] A pension list of Durham priory from the end of Henry III's reign includes Bogo de Clare and Robert Burnell, the future chancellor,[6] while Oseney abbey paid five marks a year to Simon de Walton, an important royal

1. Vaughan, op.cit., pp. 11-18.

2. 'The Camera Rolls of the Prior of Norwich in 1283', ed. W. Hudson, Original Papers of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaelogical Society, xix (1914-16), 283.

3. Knowles, op.cit., i.271-2.

4. 'Camera Roll', ed. Hudson, p.281.

5. Documents Illustrating the Rule of Walter de Wenlock, Abbot of Westminster, 1283-1307, ed. B. F. Harvey (Camden Society, 4th series, ii, 1965), pp. 30-32.

6. Durham Annals and Documents of the Thirteenth Century, ed. F. Barlow (Surtees Society, clv, 1940), p.87.

official who was to become bishop of Norwich in 1257.[1] Worcester priory included amongst its annuitants Thomas de Loggonere, an important royal clerk who on a number of occasions went abroad on behalf of Edward I and was present at several of his parliaments at the turn of the century.[2] Finally Bury St. Edmunds also paid an annual pension to Thomas de Bottetourte, possibly the local landowner of that name who died in 1322 and held the manors of Bradley in Suffolk and Upton in Norfolk.[3] Annual pensions could be supplemented by occasional gifts. The accounts of Westminster abbey include the cost of fourteen cheeses given to the justices in eyre in 1293, two quarters of wheat and three of oats to the wife of John de Lisle, a baron of the exchequer, in 1296, and in 1307 four quarters of oats to Robert Brabazon and twelve to Peter Malure, both royal justices.[4] Similarly in 1294-5 Worcester priory gave three geese to the itinerant justices, William de Hamilton and John de Berwick, and hams worth 30s. to the earl of Warwick.[5] Monasteries were also closely associated with their patrons, receiving them as visitors, looking after them during their illnesses and burying their families.[6] The

1. Cartulary of Oseney Abbey, ed. H. E. Salter, iii (Oxford Historical Society, xci, 1931), 42; A. B. Emden, Biographical Register of Oxford University to 1500 (Oxford, 1957-9), pp. 1975-6.

2. Early Computus Rolls of the Priory of Worcester, ed. J. M. Wilson (Worcestershire Historical Society, xxi, 1908), pp. 14, 18, 29, 30; Emden, Biographical Register, p. 1174.

3. B.L. MS Harley 230, f.75^{r}; Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, vi, no. 412.

4. Documents of Walter de Wenlock, pp. 62, 79, 126.

5. Computus Rolls of Worcester, p. 30.

6. S. Wood, English Monasteries and their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century (Oxford, 1955), pp. 122-135.

Tewkesbury chronicle, for example, is full of the births, marriages and deaths of the monastery's patrons, the Clares, and contains a letter from the period of baronial reform critical of Montfort and praising the earl of Gloucester.[1] Inevitably monastic chroniclers were part of the world they wrote about. They would be well informed about political affairs and would share the opinions of laymen on many issues. Although written by a distinct group of men, the opinions expressed in their chronicles would have much in common with those of other landowners.

The evidence of the chronicles can be supplemented by that of political songs. The surviving corpus of political verse is not really a representative collection. Much verse would have been circulated orally and not written down. Much of it, too, was ephemeral and not worth preserving even if originally written down. Amongst the 'Worcester Fragments', for example, is a poem protesting at the introduction of foreign prelates after the Conquest from a manuscript which had been cut up to make book covers,[2] while a version of the Elegy on the Death of Edward I has also been rescued from a similar fate.[3] Moreover poems would not necessarily have been written down in manuscript books. Minstrels used to carry their songs written out on small rolls of parchment which were easily lost or destroyed. The Song of the Barons was written on such a roll twenty-two inches long and three wide, and even this rare survival is now missing from

1. ibid., p.123.

2. Early Middle English Texts, ed. B. Dickens and R. M. Wilson (London, 1956), pp.223-5.

3. Printed by W. W. Skeat, '"Elegy on the Death of Edward I" from a new MS', Modern Language Review, vii (1912), 149-152.

the British Library.[1] That verse which has survived has therefore usually survived for a particular reason. About half of it is in Latin, the work of educated men who were more used to writing things down, and which would have circulated in writing rather than orally. This different method of transmission is illustrated by the fact that different versions of a Latin poem generally contain only scribal differences, whereas versions of vernacular poems reveal their oral circulation in their more substantial variations. Latin verse, too, would have had only a limited appeal, but the vernacular verse, slightly more in Anglo-Norman than English, was not necessarily much more popular. That which has survived has some literary merit and seems to have been preserved largely for that reason. Indeed much of it is known from one manuscript, Harley 2253, which was compiled in the fourteenth century as a kind of literary anthology.[2] This and the sentiments they express make it clear that they are not examples of lower class culture. Langtoft's soldiers' songs from the Scottish wars, of little literary merit and popular amongst people who were not in the habit of writing things down, are a unique survival.

Public opinion, in the context of this thesis, necessarily has a rather limited definition: it is the opinion of the educated and landowning classes. Occasional scraps of information, the gathering of crowds at particular ceremonies, the desertion of infantry from the army and the popular cult of Simon de Montfort, give glimpses of the opinions of other social classes, but any detailed analysis of such opinion is impossible.

1. B.L. Add. MS 23986.

2. See below, p. 121.

Chapter 1

THE PERSONAL RULE OF HENRY III, 1225-1258

The political struggles of Henry III's reign arose out of two conflicting developments, the continuing expansion of the Angevin monarchy and the growth of the community of the realm. In the second half of the twelfth century Henry II had transformed the position of the king of the English from a feudal overlord into a national ruler. Stimulated by the king's financial needs, royal power had continued to grow so that by the thirteenth century royal government had become more authoritarian and technical in its administration. It was a government in which the feudal baron was increasingly out of place.

At the same time as Henry II's reforms had created a new monarchy they had also stimulated a parallel development, that of the community of the realm, a national community with interests of its own.[1] This concept is clearly revealed in Magna Carta, which was granted to the whole nation and dealt not with the interests of a particular class or geographical

1. Much of what follows draws upon G. L. Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369 (Oxford, 1975), chapter 1, and 'Parliamentary Taxation and the Origins of Appropriation of Supply in England, 1207-1340', Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'Histoire Comparative des Institutions, xxiv (1966), 165-168.

area, but of all classes within England.[1] A comparison with Henry I's Coronation Charter, which was primarily a charter for the barons, shows how far the concept of a national community with its own interests had developed. Early in the thirteenth century the concept of the community of the realm received literary expression in the work of the London interpolator of the Leges Edwardi Confessoris. For example, he wrote that all men should have arms 'ad tuicionem regni,' and that shire levies 'pro communi utilitate regni' should be ready to serve 'ad honorem et ad utilitatem corone regni'.[2] Such awareness of a national community with interests of its own developed rapidly during the first half of the thirteenth century, assisted by the grant of Magna Carta and the peculiar circumstances of Henry III's minority. Wendover, for example, said that Richard Marshal was moved to rebellion because he saw the rights of the realm were being destroyed, and that he demanded the correction of abuses which threatened to subvert the crown and kingdom.[3] Matthew Paris similarly complained that Henry did not consider the benefit and utility of the kingdom and respublica, and on the occasion of the papal tax of 1246 remarked that the king heeded the will of the Romans who were the enemies of the kingdom and community.[4] By the

1. J. C. Holt, Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 47-62.

2. Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen, ed. F. Liebermann, i (Halle, 1903), 656, cited Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, p.9; see the comments of J.E.A. Jolliffe, Angevin Kingship (London, 1955), pp.322-3.

3. Wendover, iii.49.

4. Paris, iii.410, iv.577.

middle of the thirteenth century it seems that even village peasants had grasped the notion of the community of the realm.[1]

The growth of both royal power and the concept of a nation with an identity and interests of its own meant that the traditional feudal relationship between the king and his subjects would be increasingly under strain. The notion that the king was the lord of the realm was coming to be challenged by the belief that he was merely entrusted with the welfare of this national community. The king was more and more expected to rule in the interests of the nation and to call upon the nation's military and financial resources only in the interest of its preservation. This new identity of interest between king and subject was expressed in the concept of the crown, a symbol of the authority exercised by the king in the interest of the realm and which both king and subject were expected to maintain.[2] Master Simon the Norman, one of Henry's favoured clerks and keeper of the seal, understood the implications of this new concept, being dismissed in 1299 when he refused to seal a letter which he considered to be contrary to the interests of the crown.[3]

Since the barons, as the representatives of the community of the realm, were responsible for maintaining the state of the realm, even against the will of the king, they expected to be consulted and to play a part in government. Their resentment at their exclusion in favour of a small group of advisers, who often included foreigners with little stake in the realm, lay behind the political crises of the reign. They

1. F. M. Powicke, King Henry III and the Lord Edward (Oxford, 1947), ii.509-10.

2. Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, pp.128-9.

3. Paris, iii.629. See F. M. Powicke, 'Master Simon the Norman', E.H.R., lviii (1943), 330-343.

felt that Henry ruled the realm as a private estate and with little regard for the community of the realm. It was for this reason that they rebelled in 1233-4 in an attempt to remove the small clique of counsellors and get themselves restored as the king's natural advisers, Richard Marshal claiming that the rights of the realm were perishing, threatening the subversion of the crown and realm.[1] Later, after the small sworn council was instituted in 1236, they directed their efforts towards getting some sort of representation on this council. The Paper Constitution and the various other schemes of government proposed before 1258 were all directed towards restoring the barons to their traditional role in government and ending its domination by a small group of Henry's personal friends and relations. Yet they failed to achieve any lasting success, and we frequently hear the barons complaining that they had not been consulted on important matters.[2]

If Henry III was to resolve these recurrent political crises he would have to show that his policies were indeed in the national interest. He and his counsellors were not unaware of this growing concept of the community of the realm. Writs were on occasion sent out summoning men to discuss business touching both king and realm.[3] Wendover says that in 1225 Henry told the papal legate that he could not resolve matters alone which touched the clergy and laity of the whole realm,[4] and in 1236 the Statute of Merton was issued for the 'common utility of the

1. Wendover, iii.49.

2. For example, Paris, iii.381, 475; iv.183; v.520.

3. For example, Close Rolls, 1234-7, 331; Close Rolls, 1237-42, 428; Close Rolls, 1253-4, 107; and the writ of 1246 printed in A. J. Piper, 'Writs of Summons of 1246, 1247 and 1255', B.I.H.R., xlix (1976), 286.

4. Wendover, ii.289.

realm.'[1] Yet Henry was reluctant to recognize that the nation had independent interests of its own, but continued to believe that his concerns and interests ought to be those of his vassals. For example, he declared to a clerical assembly in 1244:

> 'I am your prince and your king. I am not able to live without you, nor you without me. Your [benefit] depends on me and mine on you, since if I am rich you are rich, and if I am poor you are poor'.[2]

Similarly many of his appeals for aid were couched in traditional, feudal, terms. For example, in 1226 aid was requested from the Irish church to cover the heavy expenses of recovering the king's rights in Poitou,[3] while in 1227 military summonses were issued as the king was going to Poitou 'for our business in those parts'.[4] Likewise in 1229 Henry sought aid in his 'urgent necessity' for he was going overseas to recover his hereditary rights.[5] In 1244 he summoned military service to go to Scotland 'to avenge certain transgressions and injuries done to us by the king of Scotland',[6] and in 1245 he summoned men to fight the Welsh

1. Close Rolls, 1234-7, 337.

2. R. Hill, Ecclesiastical Letter-Books of the Thirteenth Century (privately printed), p.268. This is taken from a letter in a register belonging to Stanley, Wiltshire, Bodleian MS Digby 11, f.96^{v}. It is undated but the circumstances described in the letter point to the assembly of 1244 which is described by Paris, iv. 365. Cf. also M. T. Clanchy, 'Did Henry III have a Policy?', History, lii (1968), 207-211.

3. Pat. Rolls, 1225-32, 100-1, 103.

4. Close Rolls, 1227-31, 211.

5. ibid., p.383.

6. Close Rolls, 1242-7, 245-6, 254-5.

to avenge the damage and injuries done to him by David ap Llywelyn and his accomplices.[1] Finally in 1252 he issued a summons for military service in Gascony to conserve his rights there, for unless he went there would be irreparable loss to him and his heirs.[2] Such explanations assumed that the personal interests of the king were also those of his subjects, and often ended with the appeal that these things should be done 'as you love us and our honour'.

To a certain extent this assumption was a valid one, particularly where campaigns in Wales were concerned, for Welsh raids were clearly a threat to the interests of many others apart from the king. Moreover the burden of Henry's Welsh wars fell mainly on the feudal classes, who were perhaps more inclined to respond to Henry's personal appeals. His campaigns in Wales were also fairly short and he did not employ large infantry forces or indulge in expensive castle building as Edward was to do, so that heavy military and financial burdens were not being placed on the community. In general the response to Henry's feudal summonses for service in Wales was good, except in 1257 on the eve of the baronial rebellion, and the size of his cavalry forces compare favourably with those of Edward.[3] Indeed in 1231 some knights were sent home as the force was too large.[4] Yet had Henry wished or needed to widen the scope of his demands it is doubtful whether they would have found such a ready response. He was already experiencing some

1. ibid., p. 357.
2. Close Rolls, 1251-3, 240.
3. R. F. Walker, 'The Anglo-Welsh Wars of 1217-67' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1953), pp. 169, 231, 275, 510, 666.
4. ibid., p. 283.

difficulty in provisioning his armies,[1] while the chroniclers display a marked lack of interest in Welsh affairs. Their accounts of the Welsh wars are generally short, and although Henry's successes in 1241 and 1245 are noted, they did not provoke a particularly enthusiastic response. Clearly campaigns which sought to draw upon the resources of the nation would have to be argued more persuasively.

Henry's assumption that the barons shared his overseas interests was also to a certain extent true. In 1225 Hubert de Burgh was entirely justified in requesting an aid from the great council on the grounds that the damage and injuries done to the king overseas were to the disinheritance not only of the king but also of the earls and barons.[2] He was referring to the territorial losses suffered by both king and barons through the French conquest of Normandy, which the barons were anxious to recover. An indication of the barons' continuing desire to recover their continental possessions comes from a report made to Henry by a citizen of Caen in 1227. He claimed that Blanche of Castile was planning to invade England and would restore the Norman lands of those Englishmen who helped her.[3] It is also interesting that in 1229 and 1242 Henry's summons of military service specifically included those with claims to land in Normandy and Brittany.[4] Yet following the failure of the 1230 expedition the barons' hope of recovering these lands dwindled, and during the 1230s both the

1. ibid., p. 502.

2. Wendover, ii.282.

3. J. C. Holt, 'The End of the Anglo-Norman Realm', Proceedings of the British Academy, lxi (1975), 264-5.

4. Close Rolls, 1227-31, 248; Close Rolls, 1237-42, 431.

growing separation of interests between the king and the barons and the concept of a community of the realm with interests of its own began to become more felt.

Henry did adapt his requests for aid to take account of this changing situation. In 1242, for example, when he was trying to raise money for another expedition to Poitou, he argued that the nation's interests were the same as his. He told the assembled magnates that they should be more avid for the rights of the kingdom; the king had to protect his rights and he asked them how they could leave him, their lord, poor and unaided in such an important business which touched upon the respublica.[1] In the same year he ordered the archbishop of York to assemble the Cistercians and demand the proceeds of the sale of their wool, for he was going abroad to fight and expose himself to the hazards of war 'pro regni promotione'.[2] The following year London was tallaged because Henry was fighting abroad 'pro commoditate regni'.[3] Likewise in 1244 Henry summoned his army to go to Scotland to avenge the injuries done to him by the king of Scotland which were to his dishonour and that of the kingdom;[4] and finally in 1255 he levied a tallage on London to cover his expenses incurred in the Gascon war which he had undertaken for the tranquillity of the realm of England.[5]

Yet Henry failed to show convincingly how the nation's interests were best served by safeguarding what were increasingly

1. Paris, iv.183.
2. ibid., p. 234.
3. ibid., p. 242.
4. Close Rolls, 1242-7, 254.
5. Close Rolls, 1254-6, 157.

regarded as the king's interests. In 1237 the barons only granted a thirtieth to Henry on condition that commissioners were appointed to ensure that it was spent in the interests of the respublica.[1] Similarly in 1244 they complained that past aids had not been spent to the profit of either king or kingdom, and again made the grant of an aid conditional upon their supervision to ensure that it was spent on the welfare of the realm.[2] The Paper Constitution, which was perhaps drawn up in that year, also provided for the supervision of the treasury to ensure that money was spent for the welfare of the king and kingdom.[3] It was in these years that the barons began to put pressure upon the king to introduce reforms and broaden the basis of his counsel, but Henry's refusal, albeit on the traditional grounds that he was free to appoint his own officials, merely served to widen the gulf between the king and community.

The thirtieth of 1237 was the last national aid that the barons were prepared to grant Henry, apart from the aid of 1269 for his proposed crusade. Their subsequent refusals to grant national taxes were because they did not believe that Henry's undertakings were in the national interest. This is shown by the fact that, under pressure, they were still prepared to pay those feudal aids which, as his vassals, they owed to the king in his personal necessity. These included not only scutages, but also in 1245 an aid to marry his infant daughter and in 1253 an aid towards the knighting of the Lord Edward. In 1242,

1. Paris, iii. 380.

2. ibid., p. 363.

3. ibid., iv. 367. For the arguments about the date of the Paper Constitution see N. Denholm-Young, 'The Paper Constitution attributed to 1244', E.H.R., lviii (1943), 401-23; C. R. Cheney, 'The Paper Constitution preserved by Matthew Paris', E.H.R., lxv (1950), 213-21.

although a national aid was refused, some magnates went to France because they felt it dishonourable not to join their lord in war.[1] Likewise in 1254 the barons refused to make a grant of national taxation as they did not believe that Henry's war in Gascony was in the national interest. They were however prepared to fulfil their feudal obligation to help their lord in his necessity and perform military service, but only if he was in personal danger and not to help him to acquire new territory.[2] Yet in both 1242 and 1254 Henry had difficulty raising an army, indicating that interest in these foreign ventures was lacking.[3]

The constant criticism of the barons and their more careful distinction between the interests of the king and the realm led Henry and his counsellors in time to phrase their demands more carefully. To a certain extent this merely led to more detailed writs emphasizing the danger to the king's interests and requesting the aid of his subjects. For example, in 1242 Henry wrote from France to the bishops explaining at some length that he had been prepared to meet Louis IX to discuss breaches of the truce and to make amends for them, but that Louis had failed to co-operate. He therefore considered that he was no longer bound to observe the truce and appealed for the bishops to provide him with men and money.[4] This writ met one of the criticisms levelled at his proposed expedition before he left England, that an expedition was unnecessary

1. Paris, iv.198.
2. Paris, v. ~~439-40~~ 440 - 1.
3. Close Rolls, 1237-42, 486; Close Rolls, 1251-3, 512.
4. Close Rolls, 1237-42, 497; cf. the writ summoning the barons, ibid., p. 498.

while there was a truce with France,[1] but it did nothing to show that it was genuinely in the national interest.

The writs issued in connection with the Gascon expedition of 1253-4 were also far more detailed than earlier in the reign. Here the usual arguments, that the magnates and prelates should aid the king in his great necessity and that the loss of Gascony would be to their everlasting shame, were expanded by details of the actual threat to the king's interests. It was claimed that the king of Castile was about to invade Gascony with a large and powerful army,[2] and later Henry wrote from Gascony, no doubt after hearing that the great council was sceptical about his claim, and developed this argument further. He admitted that peace negotiations were taking place with the king of Castile, but declared he did not expect a successful outcome. This was because the Gascons were still in revolt and were receiving financial aid from Castile, the prospect of further Castilian aid making them daily more resolute. Moreover the king of Castile was himself assembling an army to invade at Easter. Henry concluded by saying that it would be to the shame of the English nobles if they allowed the land of Gascony which belonged to the king and crown of England to be lost.[3] This writ is very different from the terse demands for aid which were issued during the early years of the reign, and is not untypical of the more detailed writs at the end of Henry's personal rule.[4] Yet, even now, there is no attempt to shift the

1. Paris, iv.183, 185.
2. Close Rolls, 1253-4, 111-2, 115.
3. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1247-58, 279-80.
4. See, for example, Close Rolls, 1254-6, 218; ibid., 1256-9, 290-1.

ground of the appeal and argue that the expedition is in the genuine interests of the realm.

However, there are signs that towards the end of his personal rule Henry and his counsellors were beginning to realize that he had to show that his subjects' interests were also involved. In 1254 a writ was sent to the justiciar of Ireland requesting aid in Gascony, explaining that the king of Castile was planning to invade Gascony and not only to occupy and destroy that land, but England and Ireland as well.[1] We do not know how this particular writ was received, but it cannot have seemed particularly plausible. Similarly in March 1257 the claim made the previous year, that the expedition to Wales was for the defence of the crown and kingdom, was explained by the fact that Llywelyn had occupied and devastated 'our lands as well as those of our son Edward and our other faithful'.[2] During the second half of the thirteenth century such writs which expressed the common danger to king and realm were developed and became much more commonplace, although other examples are rare before 1258. Henry's appeals to his barons for military and financial aid could perhaps be called 'feudal' in the sense that he expected his vassals to come and give aid to their lord in his necessity. In keeping with such an attitude he made little effort to explain his policies to any but his immediate tenants. In theory it was their responsibility to enforce the obligation of their vassals to come and give aid when their lord needed their support.

1. Close Rolls, 1253-4, 109.
2. Close Rolls, 1256-9, 142, 294.

Therefore on no occasion before 1254 did the writs sent to the sheriffs ordering them to make proclamations for military service contain any request for the sheriffs to explain why such a summons was necessary.[1] Similarly during the revolt of Richard Marshal in 1233-4 we look in vain for royal appeals for public support. Many writs were issued for the arrest of the rebels or forbidding people to supply them with victuals or shelter, but on no occasion were these accompanied by explanations or denunciations of the rebels, other than that they were rebels and enemies of the king.[2]

This assumption that the barons could be relied on to secure the support of their tenants was increasingly questionable during the thirteenth century as the feudal framework of society began to break down.[3] Above all the gradual process of sub-infeudation had complicated tenurial relationships, diminishing the hold which a lord could exercise over his tenants. Tenants had also gained the freedom to alienate land without seeking their lord's permission, so that his authority was further diluted by the chain of intermediaries interposed between him and his tenant. The importance of his court was also diminishing because of the

1. For example, Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum, ed. T. D. Hardy, ii (Record Commission, 1844), 151, 212; Close Rolls, 1227-31, 579, 592; ibid., 1231-4, 313, 542; ibid., 1242-7, 360, 475.

2. For example, Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1232-47, 25; Close Rolls, 1231-4, 271, 326, 554, 557-8.

3. For the following paragraph see the discussions in E. Miller and J. Hatcher, Medieval England: Rural Society and Economic Change, 1086-1348 (London, 1978), pp. 173-6; H. M. Cam, 'The Quality of English Feudalism', Law-finders and Law-makers in Medieval England (London, 1962), pp. 50-1; S. Harvey, 'The Knight and the Knight's Fee in England', Past and Present, xlix (1970), 3-43; R. F. Treharne, 'The Knights in the Period of Reform and Rebellion: A Critical Phase in the Rise of a New Class', B.I.H.R., xxi (1946-8), 1-12; J. R. Maddicott, 'Magna Carta and the Local Community, 1215-59', Past and Present, cii (1984), 25-6.

legal reforms introduced by Henry II, who had further increased the independence of the tenant by giving hereditary tenure the protection of law. The growth of knightly independence was also assisted by their improving economic position in the thirteenth century. As a result the shire court was replacing that of the baron as the focus of loyalty, and the shire community, encouraged by 'self-government at the king's command', began to emerge as an important force with demands and aspirations of its own. Some of these were met in Magna Carta, but others remained and were stimulated by the arbitrary government of Henry III and his officials until the pressure for reform pushed the barons into action in 1258.

The emergence of the knights as a political force in their own right can be seen as early as the civil war at the end of John's reign, for although the majority of knights merely followed their lords onto one side or the other, some were able and willing to act independently and decide for themselves.[1] For example, although Ranulf of Chester, who held the honour of Richmond, was a royalist, the knights of Richmond all joined the rebels.[2] Ten years later in 1226 two Lincolnshire knights, Theobald Hautein and Hugh of Humby, led a protest against the activities of their sheriff,[3] while in 1231 it was a young knight, Robert Tweng, who under the pseudonym of William Wither led the protest against foreign clergy,[4] a movement which also attracted other knights.[5] Such activities made it increasingly

1. J. C. Holt, The Northerners (Oxford, 1961), chapter 4.
2. J. A. P. Jones, King John and Magna Carta (London, 1971), p.23.
3. Holt, Magna Carta, pp. 279-81.
4. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, i.78 and n.1.
5. Wendover, iii.28.

unrealistic for Henry III to ignore the opinions of the shire gentry and to assume that his barons could still speak on their behalf and secure their co-operation. Moreover the changing situation was possibly being recognized and exploited by some of Henry's opponents. For example in 1233 the bishops excommunicated all those who disturbed the peace by deed or word, and although we are not specifically told that the rebels were trying to appeal to public opinion, the suggestion is there. Certainly the king accused Richard Seward and Warin and Philip Basset of raising the hue and cry in all the places they passed through. Similarly in 1238, when Richard of Cornwall was in revolt, Henry wrote to the barons of the Cinque Ports ordering them not to obey Richard or any of his men if they claimed to be acting for the king's honour.[1]

It is perhaps significant that the first time the government seems to have paid serious attention to the opinions of the shire knights was in 1254 while Richard of Cornwall was regent. In this year the shire representatives were summoned to parliament to make a grant of taxation. Writs were also sent to the sheriffs asking them to explain the king's position in Gascony and his urgent need of an army to meet the threatened invasion of the king of Castile.[2] No doubt sheriffs had often explained in the past why military summons were necessary, but this is the first time that the government seems to have taken an interest in such explanations. Although this was prompted by the barons' unwillingness to agree to anything more than

1. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1232-47, 20, 26, 209.
2. Close Rolls, 1253-4, 119.

their own personal service, Richard was altogether a far more practical man than his brother and perhaps realized the realities of the situation more fully than Henry. In the event nothing came of this parliament in May. Montfort, who had just returned from Gascony, explained that there was no danger from the king of Castile, and when Eleanor left for Gascony at the end of the month she was accompanied by only forty knights.[1]

The years of Henry's personal rule are important because they illustrate how the political nation was changing. A community of the realm was emerging with definite interests of its own, interests which were not necessarily compatible with those of the king himself. Henry paid lip service to these political changes, talking about the business of the realm, the needs of the respublica and the interest of the crown, but ignored the new political spirit behind these phrases. It was largely for this reason that he was unable to secure a national aid after 1237 and had difficulty securing overseas service after 1230. Co-operation between king and community could not be restored until the king played down his own interests and sought to promote those of the realm, a lesson which Henry only began to learn during the years of baronial reform and rebellion. The political nation was also expanding to include the gentry, although this went largely unnoticed because they were given few opportunities to express their feelings. The obstruction of many of the king's plans by the barons and the relatively small scale of those military undertakings which did occur meant that few direct demands were being placed upon the shire

1. N. Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall (Oxford, 1947), p. 79.

communities. Rather Henry's demands were more insidious, the financial pressure on the shires being gradually increased through the raising of the sheriffs' farms and through the general eyre. Such demands nevertheless stimulated the growth of a politically conscious shire community which was able to express itself following the collapse of political authority after 1258. After 1258 not only would Henry have to show that he had the interests of the realm at heart, but he would also have to prove it to the shires as well as his barons.

Chapter 2

THE PERIOD OF BARONIAL REFORM AND REBELLION, 1258-1265

In 1258 the frustration of the barons with Henry III's government and the grievances of the shires led to the launch of the reform movement. On 2nd May Henry III issued letters patent announcing that he had agreed to reform the realm with the advice of his barons, in effect surrendering his powers to a baronial council. The following month the basis on which the barons should proceed was set out in the Provisions of Oxford. The council then set to work with enthusiasm, providing for the redress of grievances, and introducing legal reforms which culminated in the issue of the Provisions of Westminster in October 1259. It is possible that Henry accepted the work of the council at first, but he was soon seeking to recover power. His opportunity came after October 1259 as the waning enthusiasm of the barons and their crumbling unity allowed him to win some of them back to his side. Throughout 1260 the authority of the council was declining and its last recorded act took place on 28th December 1260.[1] During the early months of 1261 Henry completed the recovery of his power and in June published a papal bull absolving him from his

1. R. F. Treharne, The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-63 (Manchester, 1932), p. 250.

oath to the baronial government. In July his dismissal of the barons' sheriffs provoked a revolt, but he survived this and in May 1262 announced that he had obtained papal confirmation of his absolution. Yet in 1263 civil war broke out as Henry's opponents led by Simon de Montfort tried to restore the baronial government. In July Henry was forced to come to terms and accept the barons' demands, eventually agreeing that Louis IX should arbitrate on the issues between them. Louis announced his decision in January 1264 in the Mise of Amiens, unexpectedly condemning the baronial system of government and ordering the unconditional restoration of Henry's authority. The barons naturally could not accept this and prepared for war again. On May 14th 1264 Henry was captured at the battle of Lewes, enabling Simon de Montfort to rule the country in the king's name until his death at the battle of Evesham on 4th August 1265.

(i) The Period of Reform

The motives which led the barons to attempt to reform the king's government are complicated, but several general concerns may be discerned. Their main aim was to re-establish their natural position in the realm. They resented Henry's reliance upon a small and exclusive group of counsellors, and in particular upon the Lusignans. Patronage was unevenly distributed in their favour, legal favours were bestowed upon them, and the barons felt they had been ousted from their natural place in the king's counsels. Their jealousy was aggravated by the frustration they felt at the policies followed by the king and his advisers which seemed to put their private interests before those of the realm. After 1237 the barons had refused further financial aid to the king, not wishing to waste money on expensive projects over which they had little control and which brought little benefit to the realm. Finally it was

the folly of Henry's Sicilian projects, his inability to cope with the Welsh in 1257 and the culmination of the barons' feud with the Lusignans which prompted them to take over the government.[1]

Not only were the baronial reformers anxious to secure their rightful place in government, but they were also concerned about the increasing unrest in the shires,which were under considerable pressure from Henry's government.[2] His sheriffs and bailiffs were required to raise large sums of money, but their methods and misdeeds tended to be overlooked provided the central government received its money. Justice was hard to obtain where it was contrary to the interests of the king and his counsellors, and scant regard had been paid to local privileges and interests. One of the barons' major concerns was to redress these grievances and to reform local govenment. Some historians, and Treharne in particular, have described this aim as altruistic, seeing the barons as disinterested reformers anxious to improve the state of the realm even where this was contrary to their own interests.[3] Yet the weakening of the feudal bonds of society meant that such unrest posed a real threat to the position of the barons. Explicit evidence is difficult to find, but the concern of the barons to arrest their declining control and meet the danger is apparent.

1. For the importance of Wales see M. Altschul, A Baronial Family in Medieval England : The Clares, 1217-1314 (Baltimore, 1965), pp. 81-4; T. F. Tout, 'Wales and the March in the Barons' Wars', Collected Papers, ii (Manchester,1934), p. 57. For the barons' quarrels with the Lusignans see D. A. Carpenter 'What happened in 1258?', War and Government in the Middle Ages : Essays in Honour of J. O. Prestwich, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 106-119.

2. For the increasing pressure on the shires see D. A. Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff in England, 1194-1258', E.H.R.,xci (1976), 1-32.

3. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 1-4.

First there are several indications that the barons had been trying to reinforce their feudal authority over the countryside. For the previous twenty years or so they had been attempting to extend the obligations of suit of court in order to increase their local powers. However in the long run this probably merely created further unrest, for suit of court was one of the main grievances of the communities in 1258.[1] A further attempt to maintain their feudal position can be seen in the baronial petition of 1258 against the unauthorized alienation of lands to the church by which they were losing valuable services.[2] Another grievance was later met in the Statute of Marlborough in 1267 in the clause which dealt with various fraudulent enfeoffments which deprived lords of their rights.[3] Moreover the anxiety of the barons lest the pressure for reform should get out of control is revealed in October 1259 during the famous intervention of the communitas bacheleria Angliae. The bachelors complained that the barons had failed to keep their promise to introduce reforms, and eventually the barons 'saw that it was preferable to fulfil their promises themselves than to allow others to, and published their provisions'.[4] The intervention of the bachelors, who were probably drawn from the ranks of the more substantial landowners

1. For the issue of suit of court see Brand, 'The Contribution of Baronial Reform', chapter 2; Maddicott, 'Magna Carta and the Local Community', pp. 57-9.

2. Petition of the Barons, cap. 10, cited J. M. W. Bean, The Decline of English Feudalism, 1215-1540 (Manchester, 1968), p. 51. This complaint was met in the Provisions of Westminster, cap. 14.

3. Bean, op.cit., pp. 21-2.

4. Burton, p. 471.

and were present as members of the households of the great magnates, probably did little more than hasten the publication of the Provisions of Westminster.[1] Yet it underlines the fear of the barons that the situation might get out of control. The strength of feeling behind the demand for reform is also revealed later by the outburst in the shires which met the removal of the baronial sheriffs in 1261, and by the fact that the new provision for appointing the sheriffs was the last of the baronial reforms to be removed.[2]

There is some indication that the government itself was becoming aware of the growing crisis, for it had held several inquiries into the misconduct of sheriffs and bailiffs which foreshadowed the later more comprehensive inquiries of the barons. Although it could be argued that the crown was doing no more than protecting its own interests, it does seem to have been submitting a little to the pressure for reform.[3] Yet clearly it did not go far enough, and in 1258 the barons stepped in to reassert their position in society. On the one hand they had to try and re-establish themselves as the natural counsellors of the king, and on the other they had to try and protect their local interests by meeting and

1. For the bachelors and their role see J. M. W. Bean, '"Bachelor"and Retainer', Medievalia et Humanistica, n.s.,iii (1972), 118, 121-3; T. F. Tout, 'Communitas Bacheleria Angliae', E.H.R., xvii (1902), 89-95.

2. E. F. Jacob, Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67 (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, viii, 1925), pp. 140-1; R. F. Treharne, 'The Significance of the Baronial Reform Movement, 1258-67', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, xxv (1943), 53.

3. Jacob, Studies, pp. 25-6; H. M. Cam, Studies in the Hundred Rolls: Some Aspects of Thirteenth Century Administration (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, vi, 1921),pp. 23-5.

controlling the pressure for reform.

This was a formidable task which had revolutionary implications. Although it was widely accepted that the king should rule with the aid of his natural counsellors, the magnates, medieval political theory offered no practical solutions to the problem of the recalcitrant king.[1] The king was God's representative and could therefore not be subject to any other human or human institution. The only effective restraint was his own conscience. Therefore, although the baronial reformers could claim that they were seeking to restore the king to his proper role, they could only enforce this by means which seemed revolutionary to medieval minds. For this reason they proceeded with great care, making every effort to present their actions in as conservative a light as possible.

First of all, they sought to give their movement unity and legitimacy. The reformers each took oaths to work for reform, while their work was given authority when Henry and his son Edward were both required to swear to accept the proposals for the reform of the realm. Later in 1258 when the Provisions of Oxford were established, oaths were required not only from those who were at Oxford, but also from 'all faithful and loyal men' throughout the realm. The earl of Norfolk was entrusted with the taking of the oath from the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk and from the bailiffs and men of the ports, and the repetition of this throughout the country would have helped make known and bind men to the

1. See R. F. Treharne, 'The Constitutional Problem in Thirteenth Century England', Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson, ed. T. A. Sandquist and M. R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969), pp. 46-78.

intended baronial reforms.[1] The approval and support of the church was also sought and obtained, the archbishop of Canterbury and several of his suffragans publicly excommunicating all those who opposed the provisions in any way.[2] Finally the barons sent an embassy to the pope with a detailed explanation of their actions, and asked for a papal legate to help them in the task of reform. Alexander approved the plan of reform, but declined to send the legate who would have given the barons much valuable moral support.[3]

Perhaps of greatest importance was the language used to describe the activities of the reformers, for it was carefully chosen to disguise the revolutionary implications of their actions as much as possible. Outwardly nothing was to be seen to have changed. All writs were still issued in the king's name and every effort was made to suggest that the king's government still continued. Moreover, considerable attention was paid to portraying the barons not as revolutionaries or rebels, but as the king's faithful barons who were working to secure the interests of the king and realm. For example, the king's letter of 2nd May 1258 agreeing to the reform of the realm said that the barons were going to reform 'as they shall see to be most fitting to the honour of God, their fealty to us and the good of our kingdom'. The oaths taken at Oxford similarly emphasized the loyal nature of the reform movement. Each of the council of twenty-four swore to proceed 'to the honour of God, his fealty

1. Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67, ed. R. F. Treharne and I. J. Sanders (Oxford, 1973), pp. 72-6, 100, 116; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1246-58, 649.

2. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 258-9; Waverley, p. 355; Guisborough, p. 186.

3. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 104-6; Foedera, p. 379.

to the king and to the profit of the realm'. The chief justiciar swore that he would act 'well and loyally....to the profit of the king and of the realm,' and the new castellans were to swear to 'keep the king's castles loyally and faithfully to the use of the king and of his heirs'. On 18th October 1258 letters patent were issued in the king's name announcing that he confirmed whatever the council 'has done and shall do for the honour of God, our own faith, and the prosperity of the realm'.[1]

Although the reforming movement was at this stage essentially aristocratic and it was important to maintain the unity of the ruling classes if Henry was to be compelled to accept reform, such justifications were also intended for the shires. The reformers did not yet need to seek the support of the gentry to achieve their aims, but were nevertheless anxious to contain the pressure from below by showing that measures were being taken to reform the realm. To this end two interesting and famous proclamations were issued in October 1258.[2] The first was that of 18th October, announcing that the king confirmed all that the council enacted, and requiring all to take oaths to uphold the work of the barons. The second, issued on 20th October, the Ordinance of Sheriffs, was clearly directed at those anxious for the redress of grievances and reflects the barons' concern to contain such desires. It announced that justice would be done to all, both rich and poor, and that all grievances would be remedied.

1. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 74-5, 100-3, 116-7.
2. ibid., pp. 116-123.

Yet it warned people not to be surprised if this work could not be done as fast as they might wish, for such grievances had gone unremedied for so long and would be corrected as quickly as possible. The proclamation also announced that a new oath had been imposed on the sheriffs. The terms of this oath were set out in detail, the intention being to show people that corruption was no longer to go unpunished and that the government was taking its promise to reform seriously.

The Burton chronicler said that these two proclamations were both issued in Latin, French and English. No Latin form survives, but French and English versions of the former and a French version of the latter were entered upon the patent rolls.[1] This English proclamation has naturally received much attention, for it is a unique document. It survives in two versions: one, which was sent to the men of Huntingdon, is recorded on the patent rolls and the other, originally sent to Oxfordshire, is now in Oxford City Archives.[2] Although this English proclamation is important, its political significance has sometimes been overestimated. Ellis, for example, writing in the nineteenth century, called it the first appeal to the English people, and suggested it was the work of the popular leader Simon de Montfort.[3] Few would now accept the attribution of the proclamation to Montfort, while

1. Burton, p. 453; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1247-1258, 655-6; Cal.Pat. Rolls, 1258-66, 3. Copies of the French version of each letter are also in Bodleian MS Douce 137, ff.94^{v}-95^{v}.

2. Oxford City Archives, H 29, 1258. A facsimile is in Royal Letters addressed to Oxford, ed. O. Ogle (Oxford, 1892), frontispiece.

3. A. J. Ellis, 'On the only English Proclamation of Henry III', Transactions of the Philological Society (1868-9), 8.

it was probably quite usual for proclamations to be made in the vernacular language.[1] These vernacular proclamations show therefore not so much a desire to reach more people than usual, but an attempt to ensure that people heard what the government wanted them to hear. Subtleties and nuances of language could well be lost in translation, and the government was concerned that this important matter should be communicated as clearly as possible, especially since it involved a subject which the sheriffs, the chief target of the local reforms, might well want to obscure.

These two vernacular proclamations were followed in March 1259 by the Ordinance of the Magnates, similarly issued in French for proclamation in the shires. Apparently there was no English version this time, perhaps because the task had been too expensive and time-consuming.[2] The publication of this ordinance provides further evidence that the barons were anxious to control the pressure for reform, for it announced that the barons would allow grievances against their own officials to be investigated and remedied, and agreed that all ordinances which were issued before 1st November 1259 were to apply not only to the king and his subjects, but also to the barons and their tenants. It is possible to argue that this self-limitation is the supreme example of the altruism of the barons, for they were prepared to attack their own interests in

1. See above, pp. 5-6.

2. Cal.Lib.Rolls, 1251-60, 440, records the special payment of 50s. to Robert of Fulham, an exchequer clerk, on 7th November 1258, for writing charters in French and English to be sent to the shires. The effort involved in writing the English charter is suggested by the fact that it is entered under 43 Henry III, although dated ten days before the end of 42 Henry III. The Ordinance of the Magnates is printed by Treharne and Sanders, pp. 130-6.

the interests of the realm. Yet Powicke is surely right when he calls this document 'the charter of the lesser men.... the surest testimony one could have to their growing independence and their ability to assert their claims'.[1] At the same time as the Ordinance of the Magnates was proclaimed, the Provisions of the Barons may well have been published at the New Temple.[2] These were the proposed legislative changes to be made by the barons, and although they were not finished in March 1259 their publication was perhaps felt to be desirable to show that progress was being made and the barons were keeping their promise to reform.[3]

In October 1259 when the long awaited legal reforms were finally completed, efforts were made to give them as much publicity as possible. The Provisions of Westminster survive in both French and Latin versions, and it has been suggested, not unreasonably, that the French version was issued by the government for the purposes of publication.[4] However Brand has studied the two versions and believes that the important differences between them indicate that the French version was a late draft rather than an official version for publication.[5] The vernacular versions used for publication, whether issued by the government or drawn up locally, apparently do not

1. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, i.399. Intriguingly this ordinance, unlike the other reforming ordinances, is noticed by none of the chronicles: the only surviving text is the official one on the patent roll. Were its provisions so damaging to the barons' interests that its publication was eventually prevented altogether?

2. Paris, vi.496, says they were published.

3. For the Provisions of the Barons see Brand, 'The Contribution of Baronial Reform', pp. 14-17. His arguments for the date of March 1259 seem convincing.

4. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, i.400.

5. Brand, op.cit., p. 31.

survive. The initial publication was made on 24th October in Westminster Hall before the king, the earls, barons and 'innumerabili populo', the archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans pronouncing all who violated its provisions to be excommunicate.[1] Copies were then sent to the individual shires, the itinerant justices being ordered to ensure that the provisions were enjoined upon the counties for observance. At Worcester, the publication was made shortly after All Saints.[2]

Although further reforms were intended after the issue of the Provisions of Westminster, it did in fact mark the end of the barons' reforming activities. Waning enthusiasm, the crumbling unity of the reformers and Henry's determination to recover his authority led to the gradual overthrow of the baronial system. But until the issue of the Provisions of Westminster in October 1259 the unity of the ruling classes behind the reforming movement once the Poitevins had been expelled is remarkable. Although on occasion, particularly in March 1259, this unity became rather fragile, there is little sign of outright opposition. The aldermen of London hesitated to take the oath to the Provisions,[3] but the chronicles and chancery rolls do not reveal that there were any other problems in exacting the oath. The reformers were also disappointed that Fulk Basset, the bishop of London, did not give them his

1. Cronica Maiorum, p. 42.

2. Treharne and Sanders, p. 149; Worcester, p. 445. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 167-8, suggests that publication was to be made only by the itinerant justices, and that since the eyre never reached Staffordshire, the Burton chronicler had to make his own Latin version from the French text he had obtained. This is unlikely. The Provisions were published at Worcester although the eyre never reached the county, implying that the justices were merely assuring that the sheriffs had carried out the order to publish the Provisions properly. See Brand, op.cit., pp. 31-2.

3. Cronica Maiorum, pp. 38-9; Paris, v.704; G. A. Williams, Medieval London (London, 1963), p. 212.

wholehearted support, but he does not seem to have actually obstructed their plans.[1] Even the royal clerks seem to have co-operated with the reformers.[2]

As one would expect, the shires also seem to have wholeheartedly supported the work of the reformers. Although they were at first rather slow to come forward, the justiciar could not cope with all the pleas eventually presented to him. Nor, despite the fears of the barons, do things seem to have got out of hand. A proclamation was sent to all the shires in April 1259 dealing with the maintenance of law and order, but there do not seem to have been any serious disturbances.[3] Those chroniclers who are known to be writing close to the events they describe were all very much in favour of the work of the reformers. The Burton chronicler called it a reformation for the better and the Waverley chronicler described how the barons and prelates were divinely awoken to the depressed state of England and set about reviving the old laws and customs. The Dunstable chronicler similarly described it as a movement for the revival of the good old laws, while the Flores Historiarum praised at length the justice and impartiality of the eyre. The Worcester chronicle referred to the good laws made at Oxford, and the brief but little known Barlings chronicle similarly spoke about the good laws made at Oxford to relieve the depressed state of England. Matthew Paris reflected the barons' description of the movement as a loyal undertaking for the good of the realm, describing their demands at Oxford as 'for the common utility of the king and kingdom'. Even

1. Paris, v.705. Tewkesbury, p. 165, says that Fulk joined the Poitevins in not wanting to take the oath.
2. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 95-6, 177.
3. Close Rolls, 1256-9, 474-5.

Arnold fitz Thedmar, who thoroughly disapproved of the way in which the barons set about the remedying of grievances, welcomed their efforts to end the bad customs with which the kingdom was burdened.[1] Such approval of the baronial reforms was not the result of their promises alone: the appointment of baronial sheriffs, the appointment of commissioners in each county to inquire into the misdeeds of royal and other officials and the hearing of querelae in some of them by Bigod must have brought home the reality of reform better than mere proclamation.

Local interest in and enthusiasm for the work of the reformers is also revealed by the number of documents relating to their work which were preserved. Eight copies of the 1259 version of the Provisions of Westminster are known outside official records, which is remarkable considering the short life of this document. More surprisingly a number of government documents which were not officially circulated also survive.[2] Some of these survive on their own, recorded to illustrate the text of a chronicle or entered on a spare folio in a manuscript, but others survive in collections of documents. Some of these collections are famous: the Liber Additamentorum of Matthew Paris and the collection made by the Burton chronicler are particularly well known. One rather interesting collection is that made by Robert Carpenter of Hareslade, a freeholder of the Isle of Wight.[3] He seems to have owed suit

1. Burton, p. 438; Waverley, p. 350; Dunstable, p. 209; Flores Historiarum, ii.439; Worcester, p. 445; 'Extracts from the Barlings Chronicle', Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, ii. ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1883), cxiii-cxiv; Paris, v.696; Cronica Maiorum, p. 37.

2. For these and other documents see below, pp. 397-401.

3. Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 205/11. The following discussion is based upon N. Denholm-Young, 'Robert Carpenter and the Provisions of Westminster', E.H.R., 1 (1935), 22-35; C.A.F. Meekings, 'More about Robert Carpenter of Hareslade', E.H.R., lxxii (1957),260-269.

to the hundred court of West Medina and was one of many similar men who held public responsibilities in local administration. His manuscript is a contemporary collection of legal and administrative documents which he presumably came across and found useful in his daily work. It includes copies of the Provisions of the Barons and the French version of the Provisions of Westminster.

The problem of how these texts were obtained is an interesting and important one and is discussed below.[1] Yet whatever the origins of these documents, they reveal not only the apparent willingness of the reformers to make the details of their work publicly known, but also a widespread interest in such work. There was a new spirit in the government which was conducted in the interests of the realm, enabling the author of the Flores Historiarum to declare that the country was beginning to recover from its oppressions and injuries and to breathe again as just remedies were applied.[2] Henry's attempts to dismantle the baronial government would therefore be likely to meet considerable local resistance unless he could convince the men of the shires that the spirit of these reforms was to be maintained.

(ii) The Outbreak of Rebellion

The issue of the Provisions of Westminster in October 1259 was the last major act of the reformers. After this their unity and enthusiasm declined, and many became frightened of the radicalism of Montfort and his supporters and returned to their traditional loyalty and obedience to the crown. The

1. See below, pp. 393-7.
2. Flores Historiarum, ii.426-7.

baronial council gradually declined in importance, and by the parliament of March 1261 Henry felt strong enough to announce that he intended to seek papal absolution from his oath to the Provisions of Oxford. He said that the barons had claimed that their aim was to work for the good of the king and people, and to diminish the king's debts and increase his treasure. They had taken an oath amongst themselves to do this and had compelled Henry and his son to take similar oaths. Yet, Henry asserted, they had not worked for the king and kingdom, but enriched themselves, and treated him not as their lord but as a ~~minister~~ minor in their custody. His treasure had decreased and his debts had mounted, and the king's bounty and power had been virtually brought to nothing. The barons had broken their oath and so Henry no longer intended to regard them as his counsellors.[1]

This is one of the earliest indications of the coming struggle between the king and the barons. Although for a long while Henry had been seeking to undermine the baronial council, this is the first occasion that their quarrel is known to have been made public. Yet as far as Henry was concerned, it was still a quarrel between him and his barons. There is no suggestion that anyone but the magnates attended this parliament and that Henry's speech was intended for a wider audience. It is of interest that the speech is reported only by the well-informed Flores Historiarum and by the later chronicler Wykes whose patrons may have included Richard of Cornwall.[2]

1. Flores Historiarum, ii.463-4. Wykes, p. 125, seems to place this episode or a similar one in 1260 after Henry's return from France in April.

2. See below, pp. 96-7.

Yet the time was coming when it would no longer be safe for Henry to ignore the general public in this way, for there are signs that even if the majority of the barons were returning to their traditional loyalty, many people in the countryside were anxious that the reform movement should continue. Already Henry had shown that the loyalty of his subjects was beginning to worry him, for on 13th February 1261 he had assembled the London folkmoot at St. Paul's Cross and attended it in person with Richard of Cornwall, the archbishop of Canterbury, John Mansel and many others. The assembly was clearly considered to be important. What was said we do not know, but all Londoners aged twelve and above were ordered to swear before the aldermen in their wards that they would be faithful to the king and his heir.[1] Later in May he went on a tour of the south-east to take further oaths of fealty from his subjects, visiting Sandwich, Dover and Romney in person, and meeting the men of Rye, Winchelsea, Hastings and Pevensey at Lydd.[2] The sheriffs of Sussex, Hampshire and Kent and the warden of the Cinque Ports were appointed to receive oaths from all the other knights and freemen in those counties.[3] A writ was also issued to the sheriff of Kent about this time ordering him to deal with the many malefactors roaming the county.[4] Rumours about Henry's intentions were also beginning to circulate, for on February 17th he had written to twenty-seven of the magnates summoned to the forthcoming parliament

1. Cronica Maiorum, p. 46.
2. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 152; Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 386.
3. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 153.
4. Close Rolls, 1259-61, 476.

ordering them to come at once with horses and arms,as certain rumours had reached him which made such preparations necessary.[1] This was followed on 14th March 1261 by a writ to all the sheriffs. Henry reported that certain of his enemies maintained that he was going to impose unaccustomed tallages on his magnates and the community of the realm and to demand unowed customs. The sheriffs were ordered to proclaim without delay that Henry dearly loved the magnates and did not propose to make such demands on them. They were to arrest all those repeating such lies and to try and find those responsible for them.[2]

At this stage it is difficult to say to what extent this unrest was spontaneous or was being encouraged by Henry's opponents. Yet there is one suggestion that Henry's baronial opponents were now beginning to appeal to that wider public whose aspirations they had earlier tried to control and appease. In November 1260 plans had been announced for a new eyre to replace the barons' eyre which had been cancelled earlier in the year. When it reached Hertford in May 1261 the Flores Historiarum says that 'quidam ex barnagii' prevented the justices from sitting on the technical grounds that the necessary forty days notice had not been given and that six years had not elapsed since the last eyre.[3] In choosing these grounds the barons showed that they were anxious not to be seen to be disloyal to the king. Henry was perhaps concerned

1. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 141; Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 251.
2. Close Rolls, 1259-61, 461-2.
3. Flores Historiarum, ii.468; Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 259. Treharne, p. 401, corrects the mistake of Flores Historiarum in putting Hereford instead of Hertford. For the validity of the barons' argument see the discussion ibid.,pp. 398-406.

at the support they received for he ordered that no-one was to be prejudiced by the irregular summons, and had it proclaimed throughout the county that he would 'keep them all from loss, and proposes to confer upon them in liberal fashion his benevolent favour and his gracious justice in all things'.[1] Similar objections to the eyre were put forward at Worcester in July where the 'totus comitatus' refused to allow the justices to sit, although on whose initiative we do not know.[2] Arnold fitz Thedmar wrote in the autumn that 'up to the present day [the barons] have not allowed the justices who were sent on eyre throughout the realm to do their office'.[3] Although Hertfordshire and Worcestershire are the only counties known to have opposed the eyre before the autumn of 1261,[4] it is apparent that the barons were beginning to involve themselves in the localities.[5]

The complete involvement of the local gentry in the national political conflict was finally brought about on 12th June 1261 when Henry had the bull of Alexander IV absolving him from his oath to the Provisions read out at Winchester. This was followed in early July by the replacement of all the sheriffs who had been appointed by the barons. These two measures, and particularly the latter, closely touched the interests of the local gentry. In many shires they rose against the new sheriff, a clear indication that the opinions of those classes whose

1. Close Rolls, 1259-61, 377; Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 404.
2. Worcester, p. 446; Flores Historiarum, ii.472.
3. Cronica Maiorum, p. 49.
4. Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 401 n.1.
5. Similar objections were later raised in Buckingham in January 1262 and in Norfolk in September 1263: Treharne, op.cit., pp. 259, 399.

expectations had been aroused, only to be dampened in mid-1261, could no longer be safely disregarded. The king's opponents welcomed this new and spontaneous support, and from now on the baronial organization of public opinion is apparent. Sixteen counties responded to Henry's act by nominating their own sheriff, the suggestion of some sort of baronial co-ordination being confirmed by the Dunstable chronicler's statement that 'the magnates provided and appointed sheriffs and bailiffs throughout almost the whole of England'.[1] At Gloucester it was certainly the barons who were responsible for replacing Henry's sheriff, Matthew de Besile, with their own nominee, William Tracy.[2] The earls of Gloucester and Leicester also visited the Cinque Ports in the summer of 1261 and obtained letters from the men of the ports that they would stand with the barons and prevent the entry of aliens into the country.[3] Montfort's attempts to give some direction to this upsurge in popular feeling can also be seen in his summons of the shire knights to St. Albans in September 1261.

Rumours appear to have been rife in the counties about Henry's intentions. On 30th July he wrote to the men of Kent reminding them of their recent oath of fealty to him, and appealed to them to remain faithful to him and not to listen to any suggestions or assertions which were made against him.[4] Yet it was not until 16th August that Henry seems to have made

1. Treharne, op.cit., p. 267; Dunstable, p. 217. See also Cronica Maiorum, p. 49.
2. Robert of Gloucester, ii.736.
3. Gervase, ii.213.
4. Foedera, p. 407.

any attempt to influence public opinion himself. In a long letter which was probably proclaimed in all the shires he tried to show that he had the interests of the realm at heart. He said that he was very disturbed that evil men had been making false suggestions to turn people away from their loyalty to him. He was especially disturbed since he had striven for forty-five years to rule the kingdom in tranquillity and peace, during which time God had always kept the realm free from discord, impoverishment and subversion. All had been able to enjoy their possessions in peace and to obtain true justice. He had neither taken away anyone's rights nor exiled anyone without just cause, and since he was always ready to relieve and defend his subjects they ought not to believe the false suggestions made by men who were seeking to oppress them. These men said that he sought to subvert his subjects' rights and the ancient and just customs and to grieve them with unowed exactions; and that he intended to oppress the native men of the realm and had brought over foreigners for this purpose. This was not true, for the king intended to harm none of his subjects by bringing over these foreigners. Henry went on to defend the appointment of new castellans and sheriffs, explaining that they were more powerful than those previously appointed so that they would be better able to protect people from oppression and injustice. Their weaker predecessors were appointed and dominated by men who intended to do the people harm, and who were therefore able to introduce intolerable obligations. Moreover, if any of the new sheriffs harmed people in any way, he would remove them as soon as he could, for, contrary to the suggestions made, he was always ready to do justice to all, both great and small, and to observe all

just laws, rights and customs.[1]

This letter clearly shows that what had begun as a conflict between Henry and his barons had finally spilled over into the localities. Public opinion was now something to be courted and could no longer safely be ignored. There are signs that Henry never appreciated this as much as Montfort who came to rely far more heavily on the support of the shires. It was Montfort who first began to exploit public opinion in the summer of 1261 and who developed the practice of summoning shire knights to parliament through whom information could be passed to the localities. It was however some weeks before Henry began to defend himself publicly in 1261 and for much of the time his response was largely defensive. He refuted the claims of his opponents and sought to suppress hostile comment rather than create a public opinion which would enthusiastically support him against his baronial opponents. Yet he was not totally unaware of the growing importance of public opinion. Contentious issues, such as the publication of the bull of Urban in 1262 absolving Henry from his oath,were explained to the shires,[2] whereas earlier the bull of Alexander in 1261 had simply been announced to an assembly of magnates with no preceeding preparation of public opinion.

Of course not everyone was in a position to make a choice between the two sides, for the inquisitions after the baronial wars reveal a number of cases where men were forced to give

1. ibid., pp. 408-9. Flores Historiarum, ii.473, mentions this letter, saying that it was sent to all the shires.

2. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 123.

their service, a fact which was recognized in the Dictum of Kenilworth.[1] A number of knights merely followed their lords into war. Henry de Childerley, for example, was in the service of Ralph de Camoys at Kenilworth in 1265,[2] while William de Preston was also there in the service of the abbot of Ramsey.[3] Many others also claimed to have been impressed for service. In Berkshire the jury of Ocke said that William le Chamberlayn had driven the whole countryside to the house of his lord, the earl of Derby,[4] while in Buckinghamshire William de Lay threatened to burn down the house of Walter de Burgh and hang him if he did not help pillage John de Grey's manors.[5] Similarly at Windsor Thomas de Uppenor, Robert de la Mare, Philip Burnel, John de Molins and Nicholas his son all claimed to have been impressed into the garrison against their will.[6] Of course the plea of compulsion was one way to try and lessen the consequences of unsuccessful rebellion. William de Warwick claimed that he had been forced to serve in the garrison at Windsor, but the jury declared that he had been there of his own free will and for pay.[7] However the story of David de Ashby does seem plausible. Ashby was a tenant of Henry de Hastings in Northampton. He was unwilling to fight against the king, and

1. Dictum of Kenilworth, cap. 27: Treharne and Sanders, pp. 332-3.
2. C. H. Knowles, 'The Disinherited, 1265-80: A Political and Social Study of the Supporters of Simon de Montfort and the Resettlement after the Barons' War' (Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1959), ii.57; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1266-72, 61.
3. Knowles, op.cit.,ii.57-8; Cal.Inq.Misc., no. 840.
4. Jacob, Studies, p. 231.
5. ibid., pp. 231-2.
6. P.R.O. JUST 1/42, m. 15.
7. ibid.

when Hastings put pressure on him to do so he fled to Lincolnshire. Hastings in return removed Ashby's goods and took his tenants' rents and fealty. At length poverty forced him to return, and he took up his lands again after giving Hastings a charter discharging him of responsibility for what he had done. He was now compelled to accompany his lord to the battle of Lewes. In the spring of 1265 Ashby again fled, returning to his home and later submitting to the earl of Gloucester's steward who was receiving those who wished to join the king's party. Unfortunately this was insufficient to prevent the confiscation of his lands after Evesham.[1]

Yet there were probably a large number who voluntarily chose which side to support. When Henry visited Battle abbey shortly before Lewes in 1264 he complained that some of his men had been killed by the abbot's men and at the abbot's command at Flimwell. The chronicler of Battle said the first charge was true, but not the second, for it was no longer possible for lords to restrain their men from such actions.[2] Henry himself could not always command the loyalty of his tenants, for his vassals Roger de Tregoz and Henry de Crammarvill both supported the barons.[3] Similarly the men of his manors at Bromsgrove and Norton in Worcestershire were all declared by the local jury to have supported Montfort, save one Richard de Horfalton who had been with Edward at Evesham.[4] Richard de Vernon,

1. G. T. Lapsley, 'John de Warenne and the Quo Warranto Proceedings in 1279', Crown, Community and Parliament in the Later Middle Ages, ed. H. M. Cam and G. Barraclough (Studies in Medieval History, vi, 1951), pp. 43-4.

2. 'Fragment d'une Chronique rédigée à l'Abbeye de Battle sur la Guerre des Barons (1258-65)', ed. C. Bémont, Simon de Montfort (Paris, 1884), pp. 375-6.

3. Knowles, 'The Disinherited', ii.60-1.

4. Cal.Inq.Misc., no. 936.

a vassal of the earl of Derby, continued to support Montfort after his lord's arrest in 1265,[1] while a number of Gloucester's familia also remained loyal to Montfort in 1265 after he had deserted to Edward.[2]

In the summer of 1261 men began openly to take sides. It is apparent that vassals could no longer be expected to follow their lords and some began to exercise an independent judgement. It was to such men in particular that king and barons would have to direct their arguments and appeals for support.[3]

(iii) The Propaganda Methods of the King and Barons

There were a number of ways in which attempts could be made to influence public opinion. Proclamation was one way in which a potentially large audience could be reached, yet since this depended upon the co-operation of local officials it was not always a reliable method. For example, Henry's proclamation of 18th August 1261 would not have been heard in those counties where his sheriffs had been replaced by baronial nominees. Similarly it may have been distrust of Henry's sheriffs which led the barons to take the unusual step of proclaiming the peace after the battle of Lewes in 1264 through the coroners.[4]

Men could also be sent by the government into the localities, or summoned to come to the government. For example, in September 1261 Henry sent John Blundel to Norfolk and Suffolk to explain the king's affection and benevolence towards the men of those

1. Knowles, op.cit., ii.58; Cal. Inq. Misc., no. 645.
2. Altschul, The Clares, p. 113.
3. For a possible lost song on the events of 1261 see below, pp. 287-9.
4. Foedera, p. 441.

shires as some men were making false claims about him. Similarly in May 1264, shortly before the battle of Lewes, Henry ordered the men of the Weald of Kent to come armed to Canterbury where he had certain things to communicate to them. Likewise, in December 1265 Henry sent John Balliol to the army assembled at Northampton in preparation for the Kenilworth campaign to explain to them the purpose of the expedition.[1] Such personal contacts were probably more important than the surviving records suggest. We rarely know what was said on such occasions, and it is likely that many such visits and contacts have gone unnoticed on the more formal records of the period.

Henry's opponents also used such personal contacts to put their views across. For example, in June 1265 during Montfort's administration it seems that there was some doubt being expressed whether the mandates issued in the king's name were really being issued with his knowledge. To satisfy these doubts ten or twelve of the more discreet men of Bristol were summoned to come and hear the king's will more fully.[2] Montfort also paid several personal visits to the Cinque Ports to ensure their loyalty towards the baronial cause.[3]

The inquisitions held after the rebellion reveal some of the men who helped organize public opinion for Montfort. William de Talebrook from Cromhall in Gloucestershire was said to have gone to the garrison of Bristol where he acted as an 'insidiator' and turned them against the king.[4] In

1. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 174, 316; Foedera, p. 467.
2. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 430.
3. See below, p. 114.
4. Cal.Inq.Misc., no. 677.

Northamptonshire a jury declared that Robert de Muscote had been a 'procurator' of Simon de Montfort.[1] The keepers of the peace whom Montfort appointed in 1263 and again in 1264 not only had the task of distraining men to serve,[2] but may also have been responsible for rallying public support. William Marshal, who was keeper of Northamptonshire, seems to have compelled a number of men to come to Northampton where they were forced to join the baronial army. The jurors of Fawsley said that he gathered the community of the shire on the Cow Meadow outside Northampton where his assistant, Walter Hyldeburn', had preached to them justifying Simon de Montfort and detracting from the king.[3] Jacob also pointed out that the justices showed little mercy to Montfort's own bailiffs and stewards, suggesting that they were important agents in rousing the countryside.[4] Indeed the practically simultaneous attacks all over the country in 1263 which led to the thorough and systematic pillaging of the lands of royalists, but, interestingly, not those of the king, point to considerable local organization.[5]

Montfort also developed the use of parliament as a means of communicating with the shires. Although shire representatives had been summoned to appear at Westminster before,[6] the three

1. Rotuli Selecti ad Res Anglicas et Hibernicas Spectantes, ed. J. Hunter (Record Commission, 1834), p. 180; Jacob, Studies, p. 229.

2. For example see Cal.Inq.Misc., nos 728, 871, 936, 939, and Jacob, Studies, pp. 231-2.

3. Rotuli Selecti, pp. 155, 157-8, 165-6, 179-80, 194-5.

4. Jacob, Studies, p. 230. See below, pp. 373-6, for examples of preaching in the localities.

5. Jacob, Studies, pp. 224, 225, 229.

6. See J. C. Holt, 'The Pre-History of Parliament', The English Parliament in the Middle Ages, ed. R. G. Davies and J. H. Denton (Manchester, 1981), pp. 1-28.

parliaments of Montfort which they attended do reveal a changing attitude. That summoned to St. Albans in September 1261 was in response to an upsurge of feeling in the localities and shows Montfort to be ready to listen and appeal to the shire knights. In June 1264 the knights of the shires were present to witness and report that the new form of government was drawn up 'with the consent, will and precept of the lord king'.[1] These were revolutionary proceedings, taking place after the civil war of the spring had culminated in the capture of the king at Lewes. Montfort needed to restore unity and seek support for his actions and above all to show that the settlement was taking place within the normal political framework. He may even have involved the shire representatives in the settlement, for the forma regiminis was confirmed in a charter issued by the bishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons, clergy and populi of the realm of England.[2] This was probably more than the constitutional platitude it had been in 1237 when used to authorize the collection of the thirtieth, for the forma regiminis itself declared the approval of king, prelates, barons and 'the community at that time present'.[3] Such a demonstration of unity was valuable to Montfort and was later used to strengthen his protest at the legate's rejection of the settlement.[4]

This parliament also discussed the proposed visit of Guy Foulquois, the legate, to England. A letter subsequently

1. Treharne and Sanders, p. 299, from the forma pacis.

2. J. P. Gilson, 'The Parliament of 1264', E.H.R., xvi (1901), 500, taken from B.L. MS Royal 8 D iii.

3. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 298-9.

4. J. Heidemann, Papst Clemens IV, Eine Monographie, i: Das Vorleben des Papstes und sein Legationsregister (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, VI, iv, 1903), no. 25.

sent to the legate in the name of the 'earls, barons, knights and communitates of the realm of England', informing him of the discussions at parliament, suggests that Montfort had presented the visit as a threat to the realm in an attempt to unite the kingdom behind him. The letter declared that it was against the privilege of the realm for a legate to come uninvited, and that it was the will of the community that no prelate left the kingdom unless they were ordered to do or publish nothing against the kingdom or its inhabitants. Montfort may also have spoken to parliament about the threat of foreign invasion. This letter concludes by claiming that such an invasion would be contrary to God and the church and the profit of England.[1]

The shire knights were summoned by Montfort for the third time to the parliament which met in January 1265. Their growing importance is shown by their summons 'to treat with us and with the magnates of our realm and to give your counsel on these matters'.[2] No longer were they required merely to bring in or disseminate information, but their own opinions were coming to have some weight. The borough representatives were also summoned to parliament for the first time, an indication that Montfort was seeking to draw upon the support

1. Heidemann, no. 14. It is dated by the editor as c.27th July, but the legate's reply, no. 15, is dated 26th July in a copy in a Worcester manuscript: H.M.C., 14th Report, App. viii (1895), 173. The end of June or beginning of July would be a reasonable date, parliament having met on 24th June. The first writs for coastguard defence went out on 7th July: Cronica Maiorum, pp. 67-9.

2. Close Rolls, 1264-8, 88, 98-9; cf. Holt, 'Pre-History of Parliament', pp. 20-21.

he was receiving from the towns. Each of the Cinque Ports, towns which were especially valuable and loyal to Montfort, were required to send four representatives instead of the usual two.[1] The purpose of the parliament was to confirm the new form of government and to provide for the release of Edward. In the event a final settlement was delayed until 14th March, but the shire representatives probably remained long enough to hear on 14th February that Henry was ready to swear to observe Magna Carta and the form of peace of June 1264 and to issue a pardon to those who had fought against him.[2] Certainly important affairs had been discussed which Montfort was anxious for the knights to hear, for on 23rd February a writ was sent to the sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire whose counties had sent no representatives, insisting that two knights from each county should appear before the king, wherever he was, by March 8th.[3]

In all these ways, through the use of proclamations, itinerant officials and parliament, Henry III and Montfort in particular sought to make their views known to the men of the shires. Although they were already becoming politically aware, such competition for their support must have increased the level of political interest and understanding in the localities, making such competition all the more intense.[4]

1. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 300-305. There was also an extraordinarily large clerical attendance at this parliament: see below, p. 92.

2. Cronica Maiorum, p. 71; C. Bémont, Simon de Montfort, trans. E. F. Jacob (Oxford, 1930), p. 229. (All references are to the English edition of this book unless otherwise stated). Writs were issued on the following day to the sheriffs to provide the expenses of the knights who had left parliament: Treharne and Sanders, pp. 304-7.

3. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 306-9.

4. For propaganda through the church see below, pp. 360-387.

(iv) The Arguments of the Barons

Although little direct evidence of the arguments put forward by the barons has survived, some indication of what they were saying can be gained from royal records and the chroniclers. Above all, as they had done in the early days of the reform movement, the barons continued to claim that they were motivated only by feelings of loyalty towards the king and kingdom. Everything was still done in the king's name to show that the barons were not rebels but loyal counsellors. For example, when Leicester and Gloucester went to the Cinque Ports in 1261 to ensure the support of the men of the ports, the men took an oath that they would stand by the barons 'to the honour of God, the faith of the king and the profit of the realm'. The Canterbury chronicler says that Henry was angry and frightened, but adds that he need not have been afraid, for the barons sought only his good and benefit and to keep their faith to him.[1] In 1263 the barons made a similar appeal to the Londoners, asking if they would stand by the Provisions which had been made 'to the honour of God, the faith of the king and the utility of the realm'. When the barons appointed new castellans in the same year, they all had to take an oath to the king, and always carried before them the king's banner.[2] These were not merely pious declarations, for surprisingly little damage was done to the royal demesne during the disturbances of 1263.[3] At Amiens in January 1264 the barons justified the actions they had taken by showing that with the

1. Gervase, ii.213.
2. Cronica Maiorum, pp. 53-4.
3. Jacob, Studies, pp. 224-5.

consent of the king they had undertaken to reform the realm 'to the honour of God, the faith of the king and the advantage of the realm'. They had appointed faithful men as castellans; a treasurer had been appointed who was 'of approved fidelity and industry'; 'good and responsible men' were selected as sheriffs, while they themselves had sworn 'to counsel the lord king in good faith, to the honour of God, to his faith and to the advantage of the realm'.[1] In the spring of 1264 the anxiety of the barons to show that they were loyal subjects of the king, and their consequent reluctance to begin open hostilities, nearly lost them the war. Henry was able to take the initiative and inflict a heavy defeat upon them at Northampton. Even now the barons continued to proclaim their loyalty, sending a letter to Henry shortly before the battle of Lewes protesting their faith to him, and claiming that they sought only to secure his safety and to fight his enemies who were also their enemies. Yet they were in a desperate military situation from which they were only rescued at Lewes by Montfort's generalship.[2] After the battle of Lewes, the barons continued to make similar claims. The Song of Lewes stressed the common interests of the king and barons:

> '[The baronial party] devises naught against the royal honour, or seeks anything contrary to it; nay, is zealous to reform and magnify the kingly state...He who can contribute aught of aid to the king's honour, owes it to his lord when he is in peril, when the kingdom is deformed as it were in extremity.'[3]

1. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 256-63.

2. R. F. Treharne, 'The Battle of Northampton, 5th April 1264', Northamptonshire Past and Present, ii (1954-9), 80, 89-90. For the letter see below, pp. 400-401.

3. Song of Lewes, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1890), ll. 536-8, 544-6.

In the summer of 1264 the bishop of London protested to the papal legate that it was not true that all royal power had been removed, for all continued to recognize the king as their lord just as before. Moreover, the counsellors, whom the legate had called kings, did not want to be kings: they were 'servi', not 'domini'.[1] At Evesham the king was even taken onto the battlefield with the barons' army, where he seems to have been in severe danger of being killed by his son's troops.[2]

The barons' claim to be acting on behalf of Henry was never less convincing than in the months between Lewes and Evesham,and they made considerable efforts to gloss over this weakness in their position. Montfort's concern can be seen in his continued attempts to obtain a favourable arbitration from Louis IX, even after the Mise of Amiens. It can also be seen in the new importance being given to Magna Carta. Since 1258 Magna Carta had been rather overshadowed by the Provisions of Oxford, but it began to become prominent again after the Provisions were condemned in the Mise of Amiens. The Mise had specifically allowed Magna Carta to stand,[3] and Montfort seems to have considered using it to indicate the legitimacy of his actions. In August 1264 it was confirmed again, and in March 1265 it was not only reconfirmed but also reissued with orders that it be read in the shire courts twice a year with the excommunication of all those who contravened its provisions.[4]

1. Heidemann, no. 28 (pp. 226-7).

2. Guisborough, p. 201.

3. Treharne and Sanders, p. 289, cap. 18.

4. ibid., pp. 298-9, 312-5. Reference to a Magna Carta dated March 1265 can be found in B.L. MS Cotton Claudius D ii, f. 128^{v}, and a copy in MS Harley 489, ff. 4^{r}-8^{r}, where there is also a Forest Charter of the same date, ff. 8^{v}-10^{v}.

A further order for the proclamation of the charters was issued in May 1265.[1] At the same time a new writ was introduced concerning fines for miskenning contrary to Magna Carta. In fact fines for miskenning were only abolished by the Provisions of Westminster, although it could be argued that the principle had been established in the clause of Magna Carta which forbade unreasonable amercements for petty offences. Nevertheless this writ is perhaps an indication that the barons were using Magna Carta to demonstrate the legality of their recent actions.[2] Indeed Rishanger said that Montfort resolved to keep the Provisions of Oxford because they were founded on Magna Carta which Louis IX had upheld.[3]

Montfort also sought to give greater authority to his government by using the title of steward of England.[4] When he had received the honour of Leicester in 1231 he had also become the king's steward. This was largely an honorific title, and the only duty of the steward was to officiate at state banquets. Yet after his return from Gascony in 1253 Montfort began to call himself the steward of England rather than king's steward, a title never assumed by his predecessors. Possibly he had in mind the vice-regal authority which he had exercised as seneschal of Gascony and which had once belonged to the seneschal of France, an office offered to him in 1252 during the absence of Louis IX. After the battle of Lewes he constantly used this

1. Close Rolls, 1264-8, 119.

2. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, p. 489 n. 2. The writ is Close Rolls, 1264-8, 100.

3. Rishanger, p. 17.

4. For the following paragraph see L. W. V. Harcourt, His Grace the Steward and Trial of Peers (London, 1907), pp. 78-86, 115-125.

title in official documents, and there are signs that he hoped to use it to consolidate his position of authority. He had already complained to Louis IX in 1261 that Henry was not allowing him to exercise fully the duties of the steward.[1] Now, in April 1265, the recluse of Hackington, the widow of the last Beaumont earl of Leicester who had died in 1204, was asked to provide details of the rights and liberties of the stewardship of England. Unfortunately, neither her reply nor any indication of what Montfort considered these rights and liberties to be have survived.[2]

The evidence of the chroniclers suggests that the baronial claims to be acting loyally were widely believed. For example the Flores Historiarum declared that the barons were united in their faith and love of God and did not fear to die for their country, while Silegrave wrote that the barons were ready to die for the liberty of the land rather than incur the crime of perjury against God and justice. The Dunstable chronicler believed that they were fighting for truth and justice, and Guisborough, who was drawing upon a contemporary source, declared that at Evesham the barons were fighting for God, justice and the patria.[3] Only the royalist Wykes dissented from this unanimous opinion, claiming that the barons were not inspired by a zeal for justice, but by greed for temporal gain which led them to fight against their lord and king.[4]

1. Bémont, Simon de Montfort (French edition, Paris, 1884), app. 34, p. 333.

2. F. M. Powicke, 'Loretta, Countess of Leicester', in Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait, ed. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith and E. F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), p. 267.

3. Flores Historiarum, ii.495; Chronicon Henrici de Silegrave, ed. C. Hook (Caxton Society, 1849), p. 104; Dunstable, pp. 226, 232; Guisborough, p. 201. For the source of Guisborough see below, p. 94 n.2.

4. Wykes, p. 134.

The barons based their claim to loyalty upon the oaths which they and the king had taken to the Provisions of Oxford. The Provisions had been to the benefit of the king and the kingdom, and therefore it was a sign of their loyalty and their concern for the welfare of the kingdom that they insisted on maintaining their oaths to them. They pointed this out in the letter which they sent to Henry before the battle of Lewes, saying that they only wished to observe their oath to God and the king.[1] The chroniclers also wrote in similar terms. The Oseney chronicler, for example, wrote that dissension arose in 1261 because some tried to break the Provisions made 'to the honour of the king and kingdom'. The Dunstable chronicler said that Montfort fought the battle of Lewes because he preferred to die for the truth rather than break his oath. The chronicler of St. Mary's, York, similarly said that at Evesham the barons died because they kept their oath to the Provisions, while the Battle chronicler said they fought there to maintain justice and their oath to the Provisions.[2]

Yet it was not easy for the barons to reconcile their claims to loyalty with their adherence to the Provisions which Henry had himself repudiated. They were able to do this because they saw themselves as acting in the name of the crown rather than the king, a distinction which was appearing by the beginning of the thirteenth century.[3] In 1308 the barons justified their opposition to Edward II by declaring that homage and allegiance

1. For the letter see below, pp. 400-401.

2. Oseney, pp. 127-8; Dunstable, p. 232; The Chronicle of St. Mary's Abbey, York, ed. H.H.E. Craster and M. E. Thornton (Surtees Society, cxlviii, 1933), p.7; 'Fragment d'une Chronique de Battle', p. 380.

3. See above, p. 16.

were owed to the crown, so that they had the duty to correct the king should he not fulfil his responsibilities as holder of the crown.[1] The Song of Lewes shows that in the mid-thirteenth century the barons were beginning to move towards such a theory. Here the poet stressed that the king is merely the servant of God and that the people over whom he rules are not his but God's. He therefore cannot rule them completely at will but has to provide for the welfare of the kingdom and its people by maintaining just laws. If the king does not rule according to the law, then it is the duty of the magnates to intervene and ensure that he does so. This is quite compatible with their oaths to the king for 'there will be no disinheritance of the king if provision be made in accordance with just law'.[2] Thus, although the poet draws no firm distinction between the king and the crown, he is able to justify the intervention of the barons. Such theories did receive more practical expression. Since the barons saw themselves as acting not so much on behalf of the king but on behalf of the realm, they referred to the 'council of the whole realm of England' rather than the more usual curia regis.[3] The oath taken by the twenty-four in 1258 also stressed their obligation to the realm,whereas the oath of the king's councillors in 1257 had emphasized their obligations to the king.[4] Similarly the justiciar and chancellor were called the chief justiciar of England and the chancellor of England, drawing attention to their obligations to the realm

1. J. R. Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322 (Oxford, 1970), p. 81.

2. Song of Lewes, ll.887-8.

3. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 82-3, and n.10.

4. ibid., p.10. For the oath of 1258 see ibid., pp. 100-103, and for that of 1257 see Burton, p. 395.

rather than the king.[1]

Such distinctions made it possible for the barons to reconcile their claims to be acting loyally in the face of the king's hostility. They also reinforced the barons' claim that it was those who broke their oaths to the Provisions who were the real rebels. The claim was first made in 1258 when it was declared that all who opposed the Provisions of Oxford would be regarded as capital enemies. A baronial assembly which met in April 1263 repeated this, once again calling all those who were against the Provisions of Oxford capital enemies.[2] This belief can be seen particularly between the battles of Lewes and Evesham when the letters of the royal chancery reflected the views of the baronial government. In June 1265, for example, several letters were issued in the king's name claiming that Edward had broken his oath and had joined the Marchers and other rebels.[3] Those supporters of the king who were fighting in the Marches under earl Warenne and William de Valence were likewise called rebels, and men were ordered to observe their oaths made to the government and fight such malefactors.[4] Such claims were taken up enthusiastically by the chroniclers. The Flores Historiarum related how Montfort went to fight against the rebel Marchers, ~~who~~ AS IF THEY were 'public enemies of the kingdom'. The Oseney chronicler also called Gloucester and the Marchers who opposed Montfort in 1265 capital enemies.[5]

1. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 82 n.10, 90-1, 102-3; Cronica Maiorum, p. 38.

2. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 116-7; Dunstable, p. 200.

3. Close Rolls, 1264-8, 67; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 429-30, 432.

4. Foedera, p. 456.

5. Flores Historiarum, ii.503; Oseney, pp. 162-3.

Several chroniclers considered opposition to the barons to be treason. The Tewkesbury chronicler called the Poitevins traitors for refusing to accept the Provisions of Oxford in 1258, and said that those who broke this oath in 1263 and joined the king did so 'hostiliter', not 'fideliter'. Robert of Gloucester and the continuator of Gervase of Canterbury said that the battle of Northampton was won by the king's army through the treason of the defenders of the town, a reference to the prior of Northampton who is said to have weakened the city walls being defended by the baronial army. In a similar manner the Canterbury chronicler also mentioned the removal of those whom he called traitors from the king's council after the battle of Lewes. One manuscript of the Flores Historiarum likewise described the army which attacked Kenilworth under Edward in 1265 as composed of traitors.[1]

Such arguments were not merely the legal niceties of men seeking to justify a dubious position, for there are indications that people took them seriously, and that this led to some confusion. In 1261, for example, pope Urban was confused by the presence of two proctors from England both claiming to speak for the king, one arguing for the maintenance of the Provisions and the other arguing against them.[2] Similarly in June 1265,when Montfort was issuing letters in the king's name,there were claims that the king's mandates were being issued without his knowledge, so ten or twelve men were ordered to come from Bristol to satisfy themselves that the king's

1. Tewkesbury, pp.165, 175; Robert of Gloucester, ii.747; Gervase, ii.234, 237; Flores Historiarum, iii.5n (from Luard's MS W, not written before 1306, so possibly a later interpolation).

2. See below, pp. 365-6.

letters were genuine. The author of the Flores Historiarum also seemed a little confused when he wrote that Montfort and the king went against the Marchers, as if they were the public enemies of the kingdom, for he added that it seemed that the heart of the king was with the Marchers and that they were fighting for the king and Edward.[1]

The inquiries held after Evesham reveal several cases where men appear to have been similarly confused. Several men pleaded that they had thought they were obeying royal mandates when they had joined Montfort, apparently believing that the mandates were genuine and not issued against the king's will. Richard de Flore, for example, said that he had gone to Northampton in 1264 in answer to a summons from William Marshal to come and hear the king's will. Only when he arrived did he realize his mistake, but by then it was too late and he was prevented from leaving.[2] The jury of the hundred of Huxloe in Northamptonshire said that Geoffrey Russel had been on the side of Simon de Montfort, but they did not know whether he was against the king or not.[3] Gilbert de Humfraville claimed that he had answered the king's summons in 1265 and gone to Kenilworth, but had left again when he found himself on the wrong side.[4] Similarly when the abbot of Reading was accused of helping Montfort, he claimed that it was the king who had ordered the sheriffs to distrain the clergy to send their service to him at Canterbury. The abbot had merely responded to a royal mandate like the other clergy in

1. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 430; Flores Historiarum, ii.503.
2. Rotuli Selecti, p. 155. A similar claim was also made by other defendants during the Northampton assize, ibid., passim.
3. Cal.Inq.Misc., no. 839.
4. ibid., no. 847; Jacob, Studies, p. 244.

his area.[1] Although the plea of ignorance was an obvious one to make in order to escape the consequences of rebellion, there does seem to have been a genuine element of confusion in some of these claims. Yet the papal legate, Guy Fulquois, felt that this was not always the case. In 1264 he excommunicated all those who crossed to England on the pretext of helping the king, but who in fact served the barons in the king's name.[2]

The barons' arguments thus revolved around their claim to be acting on behalf of the king in the best interests of the country. The Provisions, promoted by the barons, approved by the king and welcomed by the country, became a symbol of the barons' faith and loyalty: anything which stood in their way could be dismissed as the work of rebels and traitors.

Such arguments help to explain the widespread hostility shown to aliens, a hostility shared by both the barons and the king's subjects. Foreigners, and in particular the Lusignans, had been prominent in Henry's councils, and had received a disproportionate share of his patronage and favour. By 1258 they had become associated with many of the more unpleasant aspects of Henry's personal rule, especially the uneven dispensation of justice and the grasping nature of his government, and it was largely baronial frustration with the Lusignans which prompted them to take over the government.[3] Yet it was not at first a movement directed particularly against all foreigners. Peter of Savoy was able to take part in the early reforms,[4]

1. P.R.O. JUST 1/42, m.10.
2. Heidemann, no. 20 (p. 218).
3. Carpenter, 'What happened in 1258?', pp. 112-9.
4. Altschul, The Clares, p. 82.

while the Petitions of the Barons of May 1258 make little reference to foreigners.[1] Rather the reformers were determined to deal with the state of affairs which allowed the Lusignans such excessive influence.

The chroniclers welcomed this attack on the Lusignans. For Matthew Paris the main importance of the Oxford parliament of June 1258 was the successful expulsion of the Poitevin counsellors, while the Flores Historiarum held the brothers to be responsible for the oppressions of the realm.[2] Yet others, perhaps less politically aware, distinguished less clearly between the Poitevins and other foreigners and saw the movement as directed against all aliens. The Waverley chronicler, for example, described at length how 'alienigenae diversarum linguarum' were the cause of the troubles of the realm. The Bury chronicler similarly wrote that the magnates were exasperated by the queen, the Poitevins and the Savoyards who ruled 'intollerabiliter' like tyrants, and that after the exile of the Poitevins and Savoyards the oppressions began to cease.[3] Thus as early as 1258 the barons' attack on the Poitevins was already being seen as part of a wider movement against all foreigners, an attitude which was fostered by Henry's reliance on foreign mercenaries as he sought to recover his power. During 1260 Montfort was able to justify his opposition to Henry's attempt to bring foreign mercenaries into the country on the grounds that this would be to the harm of

1. Clauses four and five require castles to be entrusted to Englishmen for fear of the risk to security should foreigners be placed in charge, while clause six petitioned against the disparagement of women by marrying them to foreigners, relatively minor issues.

2. Vaughan, Matthew Paris, p. 140; Flores Historiarum, ii.419.

3. Waverley, pp. 349-50; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 23.

both king and country.[1]

In 1261 the question of aliens began to grow in importance. During the first few months of the year the exiled Poitevins were slowly returning to England. At the same time Henry had declared that he no longer considered himself to be bound to observe the Provisions, and later in the year he proposed to enforce the bull of absolution with the aid of foreign soldiers.[2] Not surprisingly it seemed to many that Henry sought to return to the days of his personal rule when foreigners were apparently allowed to oppress England. The barons took advantage of the situation, and when Leicester and Gloucester visited the Cinque Ports later in 1261 they made clear the connection between foreigners and oppression in the oath they took from the men of the ports. The men swore to stand by the barons to the honour of God, the faith of the king and the profit of the realm, and to guard the land with all their power lest foreigners were introduced to the damage of the king and realm.[3] In his proclamation of August 1261 Henry felt the need to deny the charge that he intended to oppress the realm by introducing foreigners. He pointed out that he had brought foreigners into the realm the previous year, but this had been to help settle the disturbances in the realm and no harm had come to anyone as a result.[4]

The issue became prominent again in the civil war which began in the summer of 1263 as the barons sought to uphold the

1. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 208-9.
2. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 256-7, 261, 269-70.
3. Gervase, ii.213.
4. Foedera, pp. 408-9.

Provisions of Oxford. The war quickly broadened into an attack on all foreigners, associated by implication with the failure to keep the Provisions. The Flores Historiarum tells how all those who could not speak English were attacked, while Robert of Gloucester dwelt upon the xenophobic aspect of the wars, reporting that 'wherever the French were found, they dragged them vilely about in all the land'. In July 1263 Montfort once again visited the Cinque Ports and urged them to resist all foreigners should they attempt to invade 'terram Anglicanum'.[1] Henry did not really help himself by bringing across foreign mercenaries, for this seemed to prove that he intended to oppress the realm. It meant that when the barons had regained control of the government in July they could issue a military summons in the king's name, claiming that foreigners had invaded the realm and were resisting the king in his own castle. Men were summoned to come and defeat these foreigners who opposed the king and kingdom and to expel them from the land.[2] In fact these foreigners were the mercenaries Henry himself had brought across and garrisoned in Windsor castle, where they were still holding out under Edward against the barons. On 8th December Henry had to write to the citizens of London denying the rumours that he wanted to introduce foreigners into the realm with the intention of subverting it and disinheriting his faithful subjects, and denying that his recent trip to Dover had been for this purpose. On 20th December he issued a further proclamation on the same subject,

1. Flores Historiarum, ii.481; Robert of Gloucester, ii.739; Gervase, ii.223.

2. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 308-9.

probably sent to all the shires of England, denying that this was ever his intention.[1]

Thus by the end of 1263 the welfare of the realm had become identified completely with the removal of aliens. The barons were reported to be levying tallages in the shires to pay for four or five men to go from each vill to defend the coasts against aliens.[2] The London annals even claim that before the battle of Lewes the barons offered to accept the Mise of ~~Lewes~~ AMIENS provided Henry promised to rule without foreigners.[3] In July 1264, when the barons faced the serious threat of an invasion from forces raised abroad by the queen and other exiled royalists, they presented them as a great force of aliens. They claimed they were preparing to enter the realm to the perpetual confusion and disinheritance of the king and every single inhabitant of the realm, and were threatening to take away all the people's lands and goods and to spill their blood, sparing none of any age or sex from death.[4]

Such claims illustrate how the supposed threat from foreigners was taking on an increasingly nationalistic air. Nationalistic feelings were never very far from the surface as is shown by an early political song, the Song upon the Divisions of the Barons, probably written early in 1260:

> 'Lament with weeping, O England, full
> as thou now art with matter of grief....
> the state is ruined and the land is
> laid waste; the stranger is strengthened
> and raised up; the native is debased and
> trodden under foot'.[5]

1. ibid., 371; Foedera, p. 433.

2. ibid.

3. Annales Londonienses, p. 61; Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.448-9.

4. Foedera, p. 433.

5. Political Songs of England, ed. T. Wright (Camden Society, vi, 1839), pp. 121-2.

Yet such nationalistic feelings seem to have become stronger as time went on, as the struggle widened from one of individuals against the Poitevins into one of the English nation against all foreigners. The Song of Lewes proclaimed in 1264:

> 'Now England breathes again, hoping for liberty....The English, likened unto dogs were become vile, but now they have raised their head over their vanquished foes...The English bore the shock of a very grievous fight at the castle of Lewes...The faith and fidelity of Simon alone is become the security of the peace of England.... for certain men had aimed to blot out the name of the English, whom they had already begun to hold in hatred... May the power of the Almighty complete what He has commenced and may He restore the kingdom of the English nation'.[1]

The chroniclers also show how they saw the threat of invasion in the summer of 1264 in purely nationalistic terms. The Flores Historiarum said that a coastguard was mounted by the inhabitants of the realm to defend their own land and lives against the aliens. The Dunstable chronicler wrote that the army intended to invade to the complete confusion and destruction of the English, while the Annales Londonienses said that the invaders intended to devastate and subjugate England to themselves. The Worcester annalist described the coastguard as the defence of the patria against aliens, whom the Melrose chronicler claimed intended to conquer England and wipe all its inhabitants from the face of the earth.[2] This

1. Song of Lewes, 11.9, 11-12, 16-17, 267-8, 281-2, 409-10.
2. Flores Historiarum, ii.499; Dunstable, p. 233; Annales Londonienses, p. 65; Worcester, p. 453; Melrose, p. 192.

invasion never materialized, but the fear of aliens continued. Gloucester's agreement with Edward in May 1265 emphasized that foreigners were not to be appointed to official positions,[1] and as late as January 1266 preachers were claiming that Henry had confiscated the lands of Roger Bigod, earl of Norfolk, and other subjects and had given them to foreigners.[2]

The final argument of the barons was that this movement was approved of and assisted by God, a belief which appeared early on in the war. Indeed a religious element was present from the very start, for the Provisions of Oxford had been sanctioned by oaths and had been strengthened by the excommunication of those who infringed them. Inevitably the barons' actions to maintain the Provisions were seen as a religious undertaking. The Waverley chronicler for example saw divine inspiration behind the barons' attack on the Poitevins in 1258, while the Tewkesbury chronicler likened the Poitevins to the Pharisees.[3] Moreover, deliberate attempts were made by the barons to develop this notion of a holy war. For example when they went into battle they wore the white cross of the crusaders. This was not merely to make recognition easier, for the Dunstable chronicler explained that they wore the cross in the name of God. Rishanger said that the white crosses showed that they fought for the truth, while the Furness chronicler explained the barons were signed with the cross of God.[4] The royalists apparently used a red

1. Wykes, pp. 164-5.
2. Foedera, p. 467.
3. Waverley, p. 350; Tewkesbury, p. 165.
4. Dunstable, p. 266; Rishanger, p. 30; Cont. Newburgh, p. 543.

cross as their emblem,[1] but it did not have the same significance as the white cross of the crusaders. Similarly before the battle of Lewes the religious nature of the war was carefully explained to the troops. Montfort made a speech saying that they were fighting 'for the realm of England, to the honour of God and the blessed Mary, all the saints and the mother church.' He asked for God's aid in the coming fight, and all prostrated themselves to pray to God for victory. After these spiritual preparations the bishop of Worcester gave them absolution of their sins.[2] The chroniclers do not tell us so much about the preparations before the battle of Evesham, for it was a heavy defeat for the baronial cause and they preferred not to dwell upon it, yet Robert of Gloucester tells us that once again the bishop of Worcester was present to give them absolution and to encourage them to fight God's war.[3]

The chroniclers make it quite clear that they believed that the barons were fighting a holy war. John de Oxenedes wrote that those who fought for the barons at Lewes were blessed and rejoiced in the glory of the just since they were fighting for their country, and that the day of the battle was a holy day. The Dunstable chronicler described how the barons fought at Lewes with God before them, fortified by their faith, and claimed that their victory on that day against overwhelming odds was a miracle. The Canterbury chronicler called the victory at Lewes a most glorious one which should be attributed to God. He tells how some men had seen an unknown knight and an

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.6; Rishanger, p. 46.
2. Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes, ed. H. Ellis (Rolls Series, 1859), p. 222; Rishanger, p. 30.
3. Robert of Gloucester, ii.763.

archbishop dressed in full pontificals blessing the baronial army, said by some to be St. George and St. Thomas. The chronicler also tells of a small boy who in his sleep had seen St. Thomas rise from his tomb. The boy asked him what he was doing for he thought that Thomas was dead. The saint answered that he was not dead but resting in peace, and that it was now necessary for him to rise and fight for his country. The chronicler also claimed that there were some in the royal army who had arrived on the battlefield and found that they could hardly see their opponents or hold their weapons. This, it was believed, was the work of God. The Oseney chronicler reported that before Evesham Montfort's supporters had advised him to escape to Kenilworth, and recorded approvingly how he replied that it was not for a soldier of Christ to flee but rather to fall fighting for the truth. The Annales Londonienses similarly recounted how Montfort had gone to Evesham unafraid of crucifixion and submitting himself totally to the divine will, an obvious comparison with the crucifixion of Christ on behalf of his people.[1] The Song of Lewes likewise presented the war as a holy war, the poet rejoicing that:

> 'The wisdom of God, that rules the whole world, has done marvellous things, and made a joyful war.... Certain men had aimed to blot out the name of the English....against whom God opposed a remedy when He willed not the sudden ruin of them....So let no man now presume to trust in himself, but if he know how to place his hope in God, let him take up arms with constancy...since God is on behalf of justice.[2]

1. Chronica Oxenedes, p. 223; Dunstable, p. 232; Gervase, ii.237-8; Oseney, p. 169; Annales Londonienses, p. 69.

2. Song of Lewes, 11.33-4, 281, 283-4, 367-70.

It was the strength of this feeling that the war was a holy crusade which meant that Simon de Montfort could be regarded after his death as a holy martyr through whom miracles were performed.[1]

(v) The Arguments of the King

The barons' arguments were clearly very compelling. They had drawn upon the belief that political authority should be exercised on behalf of the community and had shown how their actions were inspired by the desire to serve the interests of that community. By implication the king who opposed them, relied on foreigners and sought to undermine the Provisions of Oxford, was acting only in his own interests and needed to be coerced into ruling responsibly.

These were difficult arguments for Henry to meet. During the years of his personal rule he had become involved in personal ventures and his government had borne heavily upon the local communities. The reforms of the barons had therefore met a real need and any attack on their position could be interpreted as a sign that Henry was still unwilling to rule in the interests of the realm. Thus Henry not only had to overcome the widespread resentment towards his government which existed in 1258, but also had to show clearly that his opposition to the baronial government did not extend to the beneficial reforms they had introduced, a distinction which Henry at first did not make.

Henry began by showing that his original oath to the Provisions, upon which the barons placed so much importance, was

1. See below, pp. 126-144.

no longer valid. In February 1261 he explained to the barons assembled in parliament that since they had not kept their oath towards him, he was not obliged to keep his oath towards them.[1] In a proclamation sent to all the shires in May 1262 in preparation for the publication of Urban's bull of absolution Henry claimed that not only had the barons not observed their oaths, but they had also worked to depress rather than relieve the kingdom.[2] Alexander's bull of absolution, no doubt based on the claims of Henry's proctors in Rome, added that such constraints upon the king were contrary to the natural order:

> 'To rational minds it would imply cause for justified wonder that the axe should turn against him who wields it or the saw against him who uses it, or that those, forsooth, whom a lawful order of subordination have subjected to the more powerful should be raised against the authority of the rulers, and that princes, who are the lords of laws, whom a celestial ordinance has inscribed at the head of their partners, should be curbed by the will of their subjects.'[3]

Henry placed great importance upon this argument that the barons had usurped his kingly functions. It was an argument which appealed to his high conception of kingship, and no doubt was one which he hoped would appeal to traditional feelings of loyalty towards the king. The burden of Henry's complaints against the barons in 1261 was that they had deprived him of his power, dignity and regality.[4] Similarly at Amiens

1. See above, p. 46.
2. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 123.
3. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 242-5.
4. ibid., pp. 210-39.

in January 1264 he attacked the baronial system of government mainly on the grounds that it took away the king's powers, rights and duties.[1] Such personalization of the issues is not untypical of Henry who identified the interests of the realm very much with his own. The barons, however, who distinguished clearly the interests of the king and the realm, argued at Amiens that their actions had been in the interests of the realm.[2]

Guy Foulquois, the papal legate sent to settle the war in 1264, similarly charged the barons with usurping the king's powers, presumably based on information received from Henry. He declared that the king's power had been taken away and assumed by the barons who, with the prelates, had usurped the rule of the kingdom and the tutelage of the king.[3] It was presumably in response to such a charge that the bishop of London wrote to the legate denying that all royal power had been removed, for all recognized the king as lord just as before, and asserting that his councillors were not kings but 'servi'.[4] The king's argument was also repeated by Wykes, the only royalist chronicler, who wrote that the Provisions of Oxford were an inversion of the natural order so that the

1. ibid., pp. 252-7.

2. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 256-279. The French text of Henry's complaints of 1261 do contain a few charges that the barons' actions had not been in the interests of the realm (caps. 26-9, ibid., pp. 236-9). But these appear neither in the original Latin text nor the revised Latin text in Durham Dean and Chapter Muniments, Locellus I 62, and would appear to be a late addition to give Henry's complaints a wider appeal. I am grateful to Dr. H. Ridgway for the loan of his transcript of the Durham manuscript.

3. Heidemann, no. 20 (p. 212).

4. ibid., no. 28 (pp. 226-7).

king who ought to rule his subjects was now ruled by them. After the battle of Lewes he similarly accused Montfort of transforming the natural order and not being ashamed to rule the king by whom he should properly be ruled.[1] Such claims were not without some effect. The author of the Flores Historiarum admitted that Henry was reduced to the shadow of a king, while Silegrave, who was equally baronial in his sympathies, noted that after Evesham Henry was restored to his kingdom as was fitting. But not all were convinced, for the Bury St. Edmunds chronicler still asserted that Henry was held as a lord and not as a captive after the battle of Lewes.[2]

This charge of usurping royal power was exactly what the barons had hoped to avoid when they claimed that they were faithful and loyal subjects of the king who were merely giving him assistance in reforming the realm. Once Henry had been able to show that this was not the case, the way was open to him to call the barons rebels against the king. In September 1261 he wrote to Edward's bailiffs at Eton saying that he was amazed that they, who were in the service of his son and were bound to keep the king's rights and crown, did not allow the king's sheriff to work, but strove for the king's disinheritance.[3] In October 1261 he denounced the baronial sheriffs as having been set up without the king's permission and mandate. They were preventing him from making his authority effective in the shires, contrary to the faith owed to him and to the disinheritance of the king.[4] He also wrote to the Cinque Ports in August of that year asking them to prevent the entry of rebels

1. Wykes, pp. 119, 153.

2. Flores Historiarum, ii.505; Chronicon Silegrave, p. 105; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 28.

3. Close Rolls, 1259-61, 493.

4. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 178.

into the kingdom, warning that they were coming hidden in barrels and other merchandise.[1] In February 1264 he wrote to the sheriffs in the Welsh Marches warning that some of the barons were seeking to cross the Severn preparatory to a hostile invasion with Llywelyn and his supporters, the king's enemies.[2] The different arguments of the two sides are clearly revealed by the letters they exchanged before Lewes. The barons, who were anxious to demonstrate that their actions were inspired purely out of loyalty, wrote protesting their faith to the king, saying that the king's enemies were their enemies also. Henry, who wanted to make it clear that the barons were rebels, wrote back a letter of diffidation.[3]

One of the weaknesses of Henry's arguments was that in rejecting the baronial system of government he was also seen to be revoking all the popular legal reforms which had culminated in the Provisions of Westminster. Therefore early in the war he made some attempt to dispel the impression that the dispensation of justice was indissolubly linked with the maintenance of the Provisions of Oxford. For example, in August 1261, not long after the publication of the bull of absolution and the dismissal of the baronial sheriffs, he tried to calm fears by saying that not only did he not propose to subvert the ancient and just customs, but also that the appointment of new sheriffs would ensure the better dispensation of justice. This was because the previous sheriffs had been men of a lesser social standing who had been unable to prevent the

1. Close Rolls, 1259-61, 489-90.
2. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 374.
3. For the many texts of this letter see below, pp. 400-401.

oppressions of the barons. Moreover Henry proclaimed his willingness to hear any complaints which people might have against his officials. In October 1261 he wrote to several shires protesting about the baronial sheriffs who had been appointed there, pointing out that they prevented him from doing justice in those areas, and stressing that he was always ready to do justice and to keep the rights of his subjects. In May 1262 he issued a proclamation explaining why he had sought a bull from Urban absolving him from his oath to the Provisions, assuring all that he would continue to do justice to both great and small and that he wished Magna Carta and the Forest Charter to be fully observed.[1]

Yet until 1263 Henry refrained from reissuing any of the less controversial legal reforms, which would have helped to show the sincerity of his claims, although some of them were in fact still being enforced by the justices as late as 1262.[2] Henry had a high conception of his importance as king, and may well have had a natural aversion to accepting anything which others sought to impose upon him.[3] Yet, whatever the reason for his reluctance to allow the legal reforms to stand, the situation had become sufficiently serious by January 1263 for him to reissue the Provisions of Westminster in an attempt to weaken the position of the barons who took their stand upon the Provisions of Oxford. In the preamble Henry stressed that the Provisions had been issued of his own free will, which would

1. Foedera, pp. 408-9; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 178; Close Rolls, 1261-4, 123.

2. Brand, 'The Contribution of Baronial Reform', p. 353.

3. It is interesting that when the Provisions were reissued by Henry, the original preamble was altered to emphasize the king's unique role in the making of legislation, and that there is nowhere any suggestion that he was merely reissuing a revised text of the original Provisions: see Brand, op.cit., p. 35; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 253.

help to remove any doubts about his sincerity. In 1261 he had obtained the bull of absolution on the grounds that he had been coerced into giving his oath to the Provisions. There seems to have been a further reissue of the Provisions by Henry in June 1263,[1] and in December of that year he announced that he would always be ready to keep his oath to the Provisions of Oxford.[2] Furthermore in the spring of 1265 the Lord Edward was ready to swear to the earl of Gloucester that he would keep the good old laws and abolish bad customs, that he would seek the removal of foreigners from the kingdom and the king's council and not permit them to hold office and that he would rule with the advice of native counsellors.[3] During the summer the followers of Edward and Gloucester even declared they were ready to observe the ordinances of government drawn up in London in the previous March.[4] Thus with the arrival of Gloucester in the royal ranks claiming that Montfort left much of the Provisions unobserved, the royalists could claim to be the true upholders of both the spirit and content of the Provisions.

Yet the evidence of the chroniclers indicates that Henry's claims to be ready to observe the reforms were not believed. They preferred to listen to the counter-claims of the barons that the dispensation of justice and the maintenance of the Provisions of Oxford did indeed go together. For example, in July 1263 the barons declared that the recent disturbances had

1. Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 295 n. 5, thought there was only one issue in January 1263, but Brand, op.cit., p.37, shows that there was probably a second issue in June.

2. Foedera, p. 433.

3. Wykes, pp. 164-5.

4. Foedera, p. 433; Close Rolls, 1264-8, 67.

arisen because the Provisions of Oxford had not been observed. The following month they appointed a commission of _oyer_ and _terminer_ to hear complaints of trespasses against the Provisions of Oxford 'as the king hears that many robberies, extortions and trespasses are committed in the realm against the said Provisions'.[1] Similarly in July 1264 a letter was issued addressed to the bishops and all the faithful which announced the determination of the king and barons to remedy all injuries which had been done contrary to the Provisions of Oxford.[2]

The chroniclers accepted the barons' claim that the civil war of 1263 was necessary to uphold the Provisions. The Dunstable chronicler explained that the barons took action against those who were against the Provisions and had broken their oaths, while the Worcester chronicler similarly argued that the barons acted because they wished to keep the Provisions. The Furness chronicler said that the wars arose because the king failed to keep his oath to the Provisions whereas the barons maintained theirs, and the Chester chronicle likewise blamed the war on Henry because he did not keep the Provisions.[3] Even Robert Carpenter of Hareslade made a brief note in his manuscript that the wars were fought to secure the Provisions of Oxford.[4] Similarly in 1264 the chroniclers record how the barons fought to uphold their oaths to the Provisions. The Dunstable chronicler said that at Lewes Montfort preferred to die for the sake of truth rather than break his oath, while the Barlings

1. _Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66_, 271-2, 288.
2. Gilson, 'Parliament of 1264', pp. 500-1.
3. _Dunstable_, p. 222; _Worcester_, p. 448; _Cont. Newburgh_, p. 540; _Annales Cestrienses_, ed. R. C. Christie (Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, xiv, 1886), p. 82.
4. Gonville and Caius, Cambridge, MS 205/11, p. 251.

annalist said that the war broke out in 1264 over the non-observance of the Provisions of Oxford. Likewise Silegrave said that the barons would rather die at Lewes than commit perjury, and Robert Carpenter once again blamed the battle on Henry's unwillingness to observe the Provisions.[1] Similarly the Battle chronicler explained that Montfort was martyred at Evesham because he sought justice and the maintenance of the Provisions.[2] This unanimity of opinion is quite remarkable, and it is not really surprising that the Dunstable chronicler should seem rather puzzled when he reports that in March 1264 Henry had ordered the violators of the Provisions to be excommunicated, introducing his account with 'ut dictum est'.[3] He was in fact mistaken,for the baronial bishops who visited Henry at Oxford to try and come to terms with him issued their excommunication after their dismissal by the king and not at his invitation.[4]

The strength of popular feeling against Henry is revealed by his inability to put across successfully the argument that, as befitted an anointed king, God was on his side and that he was fighting a holy war. In his proclamation of August 1261 Henry stressed that it was God who had made him king and had

1. Dunstable, p. 232; 'Extracts from the Barlings Chronicle', p. cxiv; Chronicon Silegrave, p. 104; Gonville and Caius, Cambridge, MS 205/11, p. 251.

2. 'Fragment d'une Chronique de Battle', p. 380. Yet it is noticeable how in 1264, and even more so in 1265, the chroniclers pay less attention to the Provisions as the cause of the conflict, even though remaining equally firm in their support. This is perhaps because the barons themselves placed less emphasis on them after their rejection in the Mise of Amiens.

3. Dunstable, p. 229.

4. Annales Londonienses, p. 61; Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii. 458-9, 459 n.1.

preserved the realm during his forty-five year reign. Similarly in a proclamation issued in December 1263 he announced that peace with the barons had been made with God's blessing, and that with God's approval those still resisting would be defeated. Following the battle of Evesham he claimed that the victory had been obtained by divine clemency.[1] Guy Foulquois, the papal legate who tried to enter England in 1264, was critical of the barons' claim to God's favour, attacking the unjust laws and abominable sanctions which he said were made at Oxford under the cover of piety.[2] Both he and his successor Ottobon were given the power to preach a crusade against the barons if they felt it was necessary.[3] The royalist chronicler Wykes similarly commented that some out of simplicity thought it was pious work to rise against the lord king and Christ. He called those barons who sacked Winchester in 1265 the followers of Satan whom God avenged when they were later defeated at Kenilworth.[4] An interesting illustration of such views comes from the Douce Apocalypse. This manuscript was probably commissioned by the Lord Edward who appears on the first page kneeling with his wife before the Trinity. Later in the manuscript the arms of Clare appear amongst the banners of Satan and those of Montfort are on the banner of the Slaughtering Host, illuminations which were presumably executed before the earl of Gloucester joined Edward in May 1265.[5] But as we have seen such views did not receive

1. Foedera, pp. 408-9, 433; Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 488.
2. Heidemann, no. 20 (p. 212).
3. Calendar of Papal Letters, i.397, 419.
4. Wykes, pp. 134, 169, 171.
5. The Apocalypse in Latin and French (Bodleian MS Douce 180), ed. M. R. James (Roxburghe Club, 1922), pp. 9, 31, 87, cited by E. W. Tristram, English Medieval Wall Painting, ii,

much support, and the claims of the barons backed by the majority of the bishops seemed much more compelling. In general Henry's argument, that the barons were rebels and usurpers of his authority and that he himself would perform justice, were not accepted. His claims were not borne out by men's experience of his personal rule, whereas those of the barons, that they were acting on behalf of the community, were much more appealing.

(vi) The Pattern of Support for Reform and Rebellion

(a) The church

The church lent its support to the work of the reformers from its inception in 1258, being prepared to place its spiritual authority behind the enforcement of the Provisions of Oxford and Westminster. The bishops were also conspicuous by their absence from the parliament of March 1260 when Henry seems to have summoned only those whom he could trust.[1] Yet before 1263 the church does not seem to have been closely involved in the work of the baronial reformers, preferring to work independently at its own programme of church reform.[2] No clerical petitions appear in the Petitions of the Barons, while the pious declaration in the Provisions of Oxford in favour of church reform was not followed up in any way.[3] The change occurred as the bishop of Worcester, Walter de Cantilupe, took over the leadership of the church in the

1. Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 226.

2. For church reform see D. T. Williams, 'Aspects of the Career of Boniface of Savoy, 1241-70' (Univ. of Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1970), esp. pp. 279-88; Councils and Synods with Other Documents relating to the English Church, II, 1205-1313, ed. F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964), ii.530-548, 568-585, 660-692.

3. cap. 12, Treharne and Sanders, pp. 106-7.

absence of the exiled archbishop of Canterbury.[1] The bishop was a close friend of Montfort and had long been associated with Henry III's opponents. He was also one of the few clergy to have played a leading role in the baronial reforms since 1258, being one of the twelve nominated by the barons to the committee of the twenty-four, one of the regents during the king's absence in 1259-60, and involved with Montfort and Gloucester in the summons of the shire knights in 1261. Both Cantilupe and Montfort had earlier been associated with the group of church reformers led by bishop Grosseteste and Adam Marsh,[2] and it was the successors of this group who were emerging in the early 1260s. Another prominent bishop, Richard Gravesend of Lincoln, had been a protégé of Grosseteste and a friend of Adam Marsh. In 1262 Stephen Berksted, the former confessor of one of the earlier reformers, St. Richard Wych,[3] became bishop of Chichester, and another friend of the saint, John Gervais, became bishop of Winchester. These four bishops were to be suspended from office in 1265 for their part in the baronial movement, together with a fifth, Henry of Sandwich, who became bishop of London in 1263.

With the changing composition of the bishops and their new leadership under Cantilupe, the church became very much more involved in the baronial wars. On several occasions bishops

1. For Cantilupe and the following bishops see their entries in Emden, Biographical Register; C. H. Lawrence, 'The University of Oxford and the Chronicle of the Barons' Wars', E.H.R., xcv (1980), 111.

2. M. W. Labarge, Simon de Montfort (New York, 1963), pp. 74-9.

3. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.464.

acted as the ambassadors of the barons in negotiations with the king,[1] while after the battle of Lewes the bishop of Chichester was a member of the triumvirate and three further prelates were members of the Council of Nine.[2] In January 1265 the clergy were heavily represented at Montfort's parliament, thirteen bishops, five deans, ninety-nine abbots and priors, the prior of the order of Sempringham, the prior of the Hospitallers and the master of the Templars all being summoned,[3] indicating the extent to which Montfort was drawing upon clerical support. Two months later nine bishops excommunicated all those who opposed the baronial government.[4]

In return for the support of the bishops the barons gave more attention to the problems of the church. At Amiens the barons put forward detailed complaints about Henry's management of vacant bishoprics and abbacies and his intervention in church elections.[5] In the summer of 1264 the barons also supported the bishops' efforts to restore the church after the civil war.[6] The bishops clearly valued such support, for in the same summer they were prepared to grant a tenth of their ecclesiastical revenues for the defence of the realm and the baronial government. A writ from the bishop of Exeter to his official

1. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.438 (June 1263: the bishops of London, Lincoln and Coventry); ii.458-9, 459 n.1 (March 1264: the bishops of Worcester, Winchester, London and Chichester); ii.464 (May 1264: the bishops of Chichester, Worcester and London).

2. The bishop of London, the prior of St. Ragemund in Kent and Thomas de Cantilupe.

3. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 300-3; Foedera, p. 449.

4. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.490.

5. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 268-71.

6. Powicke, op.cit., pp. 484-5; Gilson,'Parliament of 1264', pp. 500-1.

for its collection emphasized how much he felt the welfare of both church and state to be involved in this defence against the aliens.[1]

Clerical support for Montfort was of course not confined to the prelates. For example the lower clergy were prepared to help him through their preaching.[2] The overwhelming support of the monastic chroniclers is also apparent. Their joyous reaction to the news of Lewes and their lamentations at the death of Montfort make it clear where their sympathies lay. Dunstable priory was even prepared to admit Montfort to the brotherhood of the house in 1263,[3] while Waverley priory enjoyed particularly close relations with Montfort, the prior dining with his wife, Eleanor, in February 1265.[4]

Monastic interest in political affairs is also revealed in the growth of chronicle writing towards the end of the baronial wars. The Furness chronicle, for example, is very brief until 1263 but then becomes far more informative. John de Taxter at Bury St. Edmunds seems to have begun writing his chronicle around 1265,[5] while Henry de Silegrave probably started work shortly after the wars, although his chronicle is very brief and summary before 1264. At Ramsay the prior, who died in 1267 and was confusingly named Henry de Sulegrave, seems

1. The Registers of Walter Bronescombe (1257-80) and Peter Quivil (1280-1291), Bishops of Exeter, ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph (London, 1889), p. 53.

2. See below, pp. 373-7.

3. Dunstable, p. 226.

4. Manners and Household Expenses of England in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, ed. H. T. Turner (Roxburghe Club, 1841), pp. 5, 26; Labarge, Simon de Montfort, pp. 79, 91.

5. Gransden, Historical Writing, p. 396.

to have begun his chronicle of the baronial wars around this time, for his copy of the Provisions of Westminster near the beginning of his account is dated from Worcester on 15th May 1265.[1] Later chroniclers were sometimes able to draw upon original material for these years, suggesting that there was much historical writing which has now been lost. The chronicle of Guisborough, for example, contains a detailed account of the events of 1264-7 which derives from a contemporary account of these years,[2] while the fourteenth century chronicle of Evesham also seems to be drawing on an original account for the years 1263-6.[3] The Battle chronicle, which is an abbreviated Brut, contains some additional material on the baronial wars, becoming more extensive from 1264.[4] Similarly the Annales Sancti Pauli, which were largely based on the Flores Historiarum, are fuller for the period 1264-7 and draw upon some original material.[5]

1. B.L. MS Cotton Otho D viii, ff.257^{v}-259^{v}, a manuscript badly burnt in the Cottonian fire. This issue of the Provisions is otherwise unknown. Their reading was ordered in the shires on 10th May 1265, but by 15th May Henry III was at Hereford, not Worcester (Close Rolls, 1264-8, 119). Gransden, op.cit., p.405 n.8, does not think that the prior of Ramsay was also the author of the chronicle edited by C. Hook and published as Chronicon Henrici de Silegrave.

2. Lawrence, 'Chronicle of the Barons' Wars', pp. 102-7.

3. J. H. Denton, 'The Crisis of 1297 from the Evesham Chronicle', E.H.R., xciii (1978), 561.

4. Bémont, Simon de Montfort (French edition), pp. xiv-xv.

5. Annales S. Pauli Londonienses, ed. F. Liebermann (Monumenta Germanica Historica, Scriptores, xxviii, 1888), 548-51. See Gransden, Historical Writing, p. 508.

The interest of the monks and churchmen is also revealed by their avid collection of documents relating to the baronial wars. As in 1258-9 some documents were entered in isolation in the text of a chronicle or on spare folios in manuscripts, but some men managed to compile quite large collections. One such collection was made at Winchester and now survives appended to the Hyde chronicle,[1] while a number of documents survive in manuscripts from Ramsay abbey.[2] Another collection, now existing only in a transcript by Dugdale, comes from the cartulary once thought to be from Darley abbey in Derbyshire,[3] while a further collection is entered in an early fourteenth century hand in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R 5.40/728. This manuscript later belonged to York minster but might at some time have had a connection with East Anglia. The spirit in which churchmen collected these documents is suggested by a copy of the letters exchanged between the king and barons before Lewes which survives on a small piece of loose parchment in the archives of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, endorsed by another hand 'Beatus es Symon Bariona'.[4] Newsletters, too, probably circulated widely meeting an appetite for news. One such newsletter, unaddressed, but clearly written by a baronial supporter, survives in the Trinity College manuscript.

1. Bodleian MS Bodley 91, ff.133^{r}-141^{v}. On this see N. Denholm-Young, 'The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle', E.H.R., xlix (1934), 85-91, esp. 88.

2. B.L. MSS Cotton Otho D viii. Royal 5 F xv, Royal 8 D iii. See p. 400 for further details. The two Royal manuscripts are discussed by Gilson, 'The Parliament of 1264', where some documents are printed, pp. 499-501.

3. Bodleian MS Dugdale 20, ff.135^{v}-141^{v}. On this see N. Denholm-Young, 'Documents of the Barons' Wars', E.H.R., xlviii (1933), 569-572,and The Cartulary of Darley Abbey, ed. R. R. Darlington (Kendal, 1945), i.lxxvi-lxxvii.

4. Cant. D. & C., Chartae Antiquae K.2. A full description of this manuscript is given in H.M.C., 5th Report, Appendix (1876),pp.454-5. 'Beatus es Symon Bariona' is from Matthew xvi.17; Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.508 n.4.

It gives an account of the battle of Lewes before passing on to give details of the Mise of Lewes. Extracts from it appear in two independent chronicles, the Cronica Maiorum and the Furness chronicle, suggesting that it was widely known.[1]

A further insight into monastic opinion is contained in a religious tract in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 385, which includes some reflections on the state of England in 1264. The author complained that under Henry III it had not been possible to obtain justice against the foreigners, that justice was sold, and that instead of living of his own Henry had lived off plunder and the tears of the poor. He explained that the Provisions of Oxford had been framed to revive the old laws and make good new ones so that all might have justice, and believed that whoever sought to maintain the Provisions and correct the laws of England in order to end the oppressions of aliens received the blessing of the lord.[2]

There were of course some monks and clergy who did not support Montfort. The monastic chronicler, Thomas de Wykes supported Henry, but he cannot be regarded as typical. He was not writing until after the wars, probably being at work between 1275 and 1282. Moreover his principal benefactor was Philip of Eye, the treasurer of Richard of Cornwall for twenty-five years before becoming treasurer of England in 1271. Wykes may also

1. Cronica Maiorum, p. 63; Cont. Newburgh p. 544. See J. R. Maddicott, 'The Mise of Lewes, 1264', E.H.R., xcviii (1983), 594.

2. C.C.C.C., MS 385, pp. 57-9, 80. The composer of these thoughts is unfortunately unknown. N.R. Ker, in Medieval Libraries of Great Britain (Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks, iii, 1964), p. 339, considered that the manuscript came from St. Albans, but Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.470 n.1, suggested that the writer may have been a monk of Rufford in Nottinghamshire, a daughter house of Rievaulx. He prints some extracts, ii.470.

have been in Richard's household, and he certainly developed a warm admiration for Richard which is apparent in his chronicle,[1] so that his support for Henry during the baronial wars is not really surprising. The Barnwell chronicle also displays royalist sympathies, but it was a much later compilation, not being written until the 1290s. Its opinions seem to have been shaped mainly by the widespread damage done by the disinherited in East Anglia in 1266-7.[2] Similarly Trevet and the Merton Flores were both written too late for their royalist opinions to be considered of significance.[3]

However some contemporary clergy were also prepared to support the royalist cause. Apart from aliens such as the bishop of Hereford and John Mansel, Henry could also claim the support of Walter de Merton, John of Darlington and, for a while, the bishop of Coventry. Furthermore Montfort complained about the preachers who supported the royalist cause in 1265.[4] We also hear about a certain Stephen, chaplain of Brenteles in Hereford, and an unnamed priest from Wells who were divinely punished for refusing to believe that Montfort was a saint.[5] Yet the overwhelming impression is that such men were very much in the minority. The Furness chronicler said that the greater part of the clergy were with the barons,[6] and this statement

1. Denholm-Young, 'Thomas de Wykes', pp. 159-60.
2. Liber Memorandorum Ecclesie de Bernewelle, ed. J. W. Clark (Cambridge, 1907), esp. pp. 121-3.
3. For Trevet see below, pp. 102-3; for the Merton Flores see A. Gransden, 'The Continuations of the Flores Historiarum from 1265 to 1307', Medieval Studies, xxxvi (1974), 472-92, esp. 486-8.
4. See below, p. 376.
5. 'The Miracles of Simon de Montfort', in Rishanger, pp. 90, 96.
6. Cont. Newburgh, p. 540.

receives confirmation from a letter of John Mansel to Robert de Thwenge, probably written in August 1262, which complains about the lack of good royalist preachers.[1]

It has often been stated that the Franciscan friars were keen supporters of the barons and that the Dominicans supported the king. The evidence is insufficient for such a categorical assertion to be made, and indeed it would be surprising if the two orders were so completely divided. Yet the claim of Franciscan support for Montfort is not without foundation, for it was mentioned by two chroniclers. Unfortunately neither of them were contemporary works, but they were written independently and may well be recording the memory of such support. The first, the Melrose chronicle, is not always accurate in its details, and although drawing upon earlier materials was not written in its present form until the end of the thirteenth century.[2] The chronicler claimed that Montfort loved the Franciscans and that after his death they wrote a history of his life and deeds and composed hymns and verses in his memory.[3] The second piece of evidence comes from the Merton Flores of the early fourteenth century, which, because of their support for Montfort in his rebellion, accused the Franciscans of ingratitude to Henry, who had shown them

1. Royal and Other Letters Illustrative of the Reign of Henry III, ii, ed. W. W. Shirley (Rolls Series, 1886), 158. For the date of this letter see Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall, pp. 172-3.

2. Song of Lewes, p. xxiii; The Chronicle of Melrose, ed. A.O. and M. O. Anderson (London, 1936), pp. xvi-xvii. This is a facsimile edition, but, unless otherwise stated, all references are to the edition of the Melrose chronicle by J. Stevenson for the Bannatyne Club in 1835.

3. Melrose, p. 212. Kingsford, Song of Lewes, p. xxi, thought that the hymns printed by G. W. Prothero, The Life of Simon de Montfort (London, 1877), pp. 388-91, were examples of such Franciscan writing. There is no evidence to support this, and indeed they are printed from a manuscript from Norwich cathedral priory, C.U.L. MS Kk iv 20. See below, pp. 142-3.

much favour in the past.[1]

These two statements receive no explicit corroboration from government records which complain only in general terms about those clergy who supported Montfort. Nor have the Franciscans themselves left many writings against which such statements can be tested. The Lanercost chronicle, which was probably written originally by a Franciscan friar,[2] does show strong support for Montfort, but there is nothing particularly unusual in this. The Song of Lewes, which is a strongly baronial work, is often supposed to be the work of a Franciscan friar, but this attribution is by no means certain. Kingsford's original suggestion[3] was based on the statement of the Melrose chronicler and on the presence of Franciscans on the mission of the bishop of Chichester to the king before the battle, of which the poet had particular knowledge. Yet there were others on this mission, including some Dominican friars,[4] and there is no definite reason for assuming that the poet was one of the Franciscans. Kingsford thought his suggestion was strengthened by the similarity between the Song and some hymns composed for Montfort which he thought were also the work of Franciscans. Yet not only is the resemblance not particularly close, there being a similarity only in attitude and not in language, but there is no indication apart from the statement of the Melrose chronicler that these hymns were indeed the work of a Franciscan.[5] The

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.266.

2. A. G. Little, 'The Authorship of the Lanercost Chronicle', E.H.R.,xxxi (1916), 269-79.

3. Song of Lewes, pp. xviii-xxiii.

4. J. P. Gilson, 'An Unpublished Notice of the Battle of Lewes', E.H.R., xi (1896), 521.

5. For these hymns see above, p. 98 n.3, and below, pp. 142-3.

Franciscan authorship of the Song of Lewes can therefore be no more than a supposition, unsupported by any firm contemporary evidence.

One Franciscan friar, John of Wales, has left some political writings. He was regent at Oxford before 1260 and at Paris in 1281-2.[1] His Communiloquium discusses the nature of kingship, but only in traditional terms and with no evident partisan spirit.[2] Similarly his Breviloquium is no more than a popularization of John of Salisbury's Policraticus.[3] Yet the Franciscan, Thomas Docking, who was teaching at Oxford between 1260 and 1265, made an interesting observation during his commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul:

> 'It seems to me, but without prejudice to a more balanced judgement or opinion, that if some man who is prudent and well fitted for the business of rule, seeing God's people endangered by defect of government, should aspire to the dignity of ruling for the love of God and the benefit of the subjects, his aim is good and he desires to do a good work'.[4]

It is possible that this is a guarded statement of approval for Montfort's regime.[5]

However there was nothing inherent in the Franciscan order which made it a natural supporter of the 'people' during the baronial wars. Although the Franciscans stressed the ideal of poverty and gave their sermons a wider appeal through

1. B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1964), p. 325; Knowles, Religious Orders, i.211-2.

2. I. J. Sanders, 'Some Political Activities of the Franciscan Friars in England in the Thirteenth Century' (Univ. of Wales M.A. thesis, 1935), discusses the Communiloquium, pp. 92-6.

3. Smalley, op.cit., p. 325.

4. ibid., p. 327.

5. ibid. This is also the opinion of A. G. Little, 'Thomas Docking', Franciscan Papers, Lists and Documents (Manchester,

their use of lyrics and stories,[1] there is no reason to suppose that they were any more 'popular' in their appeal than the Dominicans. Both orders were drawn upon by bishops to assist in preaching,[2] and both depended equally upon popular benefactions for their survival. Nor had relations between Henry and the Franciscans ever been particularly fraught. They received numerous royal gifts; they were employed with Dominicans on diplomatic missions;[3] and several such as Ralph de Rosa, Solomon and William Abingdon were well known at court.[4] A chamber was even provided for their use at Clarendon,[5] while William de Valence employed a Franciscan confessor, Peter de Rupe.[6] The only occasion when the Franciscans are known to have opposed the king was in 1233, when they joined the Dominicans to put pressure on Henry to dismiss the Poitevins and recall his natural advisers.[7] Yet during the baronial wars they may have displeased him in a way which has gone unrecorded save for the vague statements of the Melrose chronicle and the

1. D. L. Jeffrey, The Early English Lyric in Franciscan Spirituality (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975), esp. pp. 203-4.

2. See, for example, Reg. Peckham, ii.742-3; Roberti Grosseteste Epistolae, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1861), no. cvii, pp. 317-8.

3. See, for example, Cal.Lib.Rolls, 1245-51, 132; Cal.Lib.Rolls, 1251-60, 416.

4. Thomas de Eccleston, De Adventu Fratris Minorum, in Monumenta Franciscana, i, ed. J. S. Brewer (Rolls Series, 1858), 24, 36, 41.

5. Cal.Lib.Rolls, 1245-51, 297.

6. Calendar of Papal Letters, i.321.

7. Paris, iii.251.

Merton Flores, for after 1260 Henry ceased to show them much favour. Until then his patronage of Franciscan friaries had compared favourably with that shown to the Dominicans, but few gifts are recorded after that date.[1]

There is on the other hand little reason to suppose that the Dominicans were naturally sympathetic towards the king. John of Darlington did become a royal councillor and Henry's confessor in 1256,[2] but Montfort and his family had also had links with the order for some while. Simon himself was probably a patron of the Dominican friary at Leicester, even if he was not the founder as claimed by tradition,[3] and in 1256 the general chapter of the Dominican order asked for prayers for his father and the family 'quod multa devocione nobis est astrictum'.[4] There is indeed no evidence to suggest that the Dominicans gave particular support to Henry. He showed them no special favours, while the presence of Dominicans in the baronial army at Lewes[5] and the involvement of three Dominicans in miracles performed by Montfort after his death shows that the order was certainly not unanimous in that support.[6] Nor can any weight be placed on the royalist sympathies of the Dominican chronicler Trevet. He was not writing until the

1. See appendix 2, p. 408.
2. C. F. R. Palmer, 'The King's Confessors', Antiquary, xxii (1890), 115.
3. W. A. Hinnebush, The Early English Friars Preachers (Rome, 1951), p. 92.
4. ibid., p. 92 n.45. For further links see Bémont, Simon de Montfort, p. 41.
5. See above, p. 99.
6. Rishanger, pp. 75, 77.

fourteenth century and was moreover the son of a royal official and had his own contacts at court.[1] The tradition of Dominican support for the king can probably be safely discarded: that of Franciscan support for the barons may be tentatively accepted.

Finally it may be considered whether the support shown to the barons by the academic Thomas Docking was typical of the feeling in the universities. It is certainly noticeable that the leading clerical supporters of Montfort, the bishops of Worcester, Lincoln, Winchester, Chichester and London, all had an academic background. They were supported by Thomas de Cantilupe, who was chancellor of Oxford until 1263 and later chancellor of England under Montfort.[2] Although such support was not unanimous, for the academic Walter de Merton was a leading royalist,[3] the impression gained is that the universities generally did support the barons. A university trained cleric seems to have been behind the barons' letter to the pope justifying the expulsion of the Poitevins in 1258, for it draws upon John of Salisbury's definition of the corporate state.[4] Likewise another letter sent to the pope in August 1258, which claimed that the best ordered city was one in which nobody

1. Gransden, Historical Writing, pp. 501-2, 503-4.
2. Lawrence, 'Chronicle of the Barons' Wars', p. 111.
3. ibid., p. 112.
4. A. Linder, 'John of Salisbury's Policraticus in Thirteenth Century England: The Evidence of MS Cambridge Corpus Christi College 469', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, xl (1977), 282.

followed private ends, drew upon Plato's Republic.[1]

During 1264 and 1265 this academic support became more pronounced. In April 1264 it seems that some Oxford scholars were involved in the defence of Northampton against the royalist army. Until recently this story was treated with some scepticism because it was found only in the later chronicle of Walter Guisborough,[2] but it has now been shown that Guisborough was drawing upon the work of a contemporary observer.[3] The reason why the clerks were in Northampton is not entirely clear. The king's writ expelling them from Oxford in March 1264 merely stated that this was for their own safety while the army was in the town, but Rishanger adds that Henry doubted the loyalty of the clerks.[4] There might be an element of truth in this in view of some of the clerks' later actions, although Lawrence dismisses it as a later embellishment of the story.[5] Powicke also thought that the support of the burgesses of Oxford for the barons, which led later to a 500 mark fine, precluded any university support.[6] Nevertheless we do hear that a clerk of Oxford was brought before the justices for vilely slandering Edward and the earl of Gloucester in

1. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, i.387 n.2.
2. ibid., ii.784-7.
3. Lawrence, 'Chronicle of the Barons' Wars', pp. 100-107.
4. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 307; Rishanger, p. 22.
5. Lawrence, art.cit., p. 109 n.3.
6. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.787.

1265.[1]

Clearer evidence of scholastic support for the barons is to be found in the Song of Lewes. This is a long Latin poem of 968 lines entered in B.L. MS Harley 978, a manuscript of the thirteenth century which belonged to Reading abbey. The manuscript includes a miscellany of religious, theological and literary items, of which this poem is one, forming a fairly typical monastic compilation. The poem was probably composed very soon after the battle of Lewes, for there is a feeling of joy and relief at the outcome of the battle:

> 'My tongue is like the pen of the scribe hastily writing and laudably praising thee....The proud people is fallen; the faithful are filled with joy. Now England breathes again, hoping for liberty.[2]

Yet the poem was not intended as a popular work. Stubbs described it as 'clearly a manifesto, amongst themselves, of the men whose preaching guided the people',[3] and this is a fairly accurate description. It is largely an academic tract, not really concerned with giving a historical narrative, but seeking to justify the opposition of the barons to the king by discussing the nature of kingship and the duties of, and restrictions placed upon, royal power. The sentiments it expresses agree entirely with the sentiments we have seen expressed in the barons' propaganda and by the chroniclers. It stresses the loyalty of the barons towards the king and the kingdom; it displays a hatred of foreigners and a concern for

1. Knowles, 'The Disinherited', iv.61.

2. Song of Lewes, ll.1-2, 9-10. The translation given here for lines 1-2 differs slightly from that of Kingsford.

3. W. Stubbs, Constitutional History of England, ii (3rd edition, Oxford, 1883), 313 n.1, cited Song of Lewes, p.vii.

the welfare of the English; and it presents the baronial war as a holy crusade for the welfare of England. We do not know who the author was, but his clerical background is clearly indicated by the large number of biblical quotations and allusions in the poem. He was perhaps in the household of Montfort or one of the other leading magnates and prelates at Lewes, for he was well informed about the circumstances of the battle. He possibly had some connection with the bishop of Chichester for whom he shows some feeling.[1]

Although this work was written primarily for an academic audience, it may have achieved a fairly wide circulation. The fact that it is entered in a manuscript of Reading abbey points to at least a limited circulation. The song may also have been known to the writer of the 'opusculum de Simone' incorporated in the Melrose chronicle, who seems to have come from the north.[2] On one occasion the writer refers to Simon and his supporters fighting for justice, protecting England from those foreigners whom Henry III unjustly retained, as was told 'in editione facta de bello Lawensi, de manu viri sancti Roberti Grostehte'. Later he refers to Simon's religious devotion, which was recorded 'in editiuncula de bello Lawensi facta'.[3] Although the chronicler is clearly wrong in attributing the tract to Robert Grosseteste, both the subjects he refers to are in fact dealt with by the Song of Lewes.

A final piece of evidence concerning scholastic opinion is

1. Song of Lewes, pp. xviii-xix.
2. See below, p. 141.
3. Melrose, pp. 200, 203.

provided by a story in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 469.[1] This manuscript was written in the second half of the thirteenth century and contains an academic treatise on tyranny which drew upon John of Salisbury's Policraticus. It may have been the baronial wars which renewed the interest of this writer and others in the Policraticus around this time, although he makes no comment on contemporary politics. However a collection of proverbs and edificatory matter in the same manuscript, and apparently by the same author, includes an interesting story. It tells of Simon de Montfort and 'quidam cisterciensis nobilis' and praises Montfort's charity and good works. It was written after 1265, internal evidence suggesting the author was himself of Cistercian origin.

The impression given by this evidence is that academic opinion was firmly behind Montfort. It would be unreasonable to expect it to have been unanimous, but the paucity of evidence showing support for the king indicates the balance of opinion. In expressing such support academic clerks shared the general feelings of other members of the church, both of the prelates and lower clergy and also of the monks, feelings which persisted and if anything strengthened as time went on. By 1264 the church appears to have become fully involved in the baronial movement, playing an active political role, sharing in baronial triumphs and collecting and recording documents and information about its actions.

(b) The Laity.

The opinions of the laity, especially the lower classes,

1. For the following see Linder, 'John of Salisbury's Policraticus', pp. 276, 277.

are less easy to determine, for there is very little direct evidence on which to base an assessment. The lay Annales Londonienses were written at a much later date and draw heavily upon the Flores Historiarum, making them an unreliable guide to contemporary lay opinion.[1] The only other lay chronicle is the Cronica Maiorum written by Arnold fitz Thedmar from the narrow viewpoint of a member of the city oligarchy. He initially welcomed the Provisions of Oxford, but disliked the methods the barons used to redress grievances, feeling they were an infringement of the privileges of the city. Later, as the barons drew increasingly upon the popular support of the Londoners, his early enthusiasm waned,[2] so that although his chronicle gives a valuable account of these years, it is hardly representative of lay opinion.

Yet despite this lack of direct literary evidence it is clear that the composition of lay support for Montfort was changing during the period. The early unity of the barons did not survive long after 1259 as many returned to their former allegiance. Occasional crises, such as the events of July 1261 and the summer of 1263, brought a temporary resurgence in baronial unity, but the unity of 1258-9 was never really restored. This was possibly because their original demands were to a certain extent being met. The removal of the aliens from court probably helped to open up royal patronage and favour to a wider group of barons, and it is possible that this led many to return to their former allegiance. Certainly the Tewkesbury chronicler said that it was the desire of earthly gain

1. A. Gransden, Historial Writing, pp. 508-9.
2. ibid., pp. 509, 514-6.

which made some of the barons change sides, a view which was supported by Rishanger.[1] Others may simply have been uneasy or frightened at what they had begun. The earl of Gloucester, for example, was clearly unhappy about the Ordinance of the Magnates, while the promptings of the bachelors in October 1259 may indicate further reservations by some magnates about the Provisions of Westminster. They had embarked upon the course of reform in order to preserve their own positions, but there was a danger that such reforms could go too far. Others may have been concerned at the revolutionary implications of what they were doing, despite the care with which the actions of the reformers were clothed in traditional forms. The desire of Montfort to hold a parliament in February 1260 in the absence of the king, for example, contributed to the revival of the king's fortunes in that year.[2] Later, as civil war threatened, the barons turned increasingly towards the monarchy in order to preserve the peace and their positions. The changing composition of the party of reform can be clearly seen by comparing the baronial and royal twelve in 1258 with the representatives each side sent to Amiens in 1264. In 1258 the weight of the barons clearly lay behind the reformers, but by 1264 the situation had been completely reversed and many barons once again supported the king. In January 1265 only five earls and twenty tenants-in-chief were invited to Montfort's parliament, and his management of the government led to further desertions during the following spring, notably that of the earl of Gloucester.

1. Tewkesbury, p. 175; Rishanger, p. 10.
2. Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 224.

Although the barons were increasingly returning to their traditional loyalty, the shire knights seem to have remained strong in their support for Montfort for much longer. After all, the movement of reform was largely in their interests and they had more to lose by its abandonment. The Cronica Maiorum tells us that nearly all the middle order in England rejected the Mise of Amiens.[1] Montfort's reliance upon their support is shown by their involvement in his parliaments as late as January 1265. Yet Knowles has shown that by 1265 they too were wavering in their loyalty to Montfort. After the escape of Edward in the spring of 1265, the majority of the Montfortian sheriffs deserted and, since they had been elected in the counties, this desertion is likely to have been typical of the knightly classes. Knowles also suggests that the majority of the men selected in 1258 as commissioners for the grievances of the shires had also deserted the baronial cause by 1265. Like the barons, they too were probably not ready to take on permanently the extra administrative duties entailed by the reforms.[2] They may also have been increasingly disturbed by the growing radicalism of Montfort and the disorder in the country. They were perhaps encouraged to abandon him by the fact that Gloucester and the Lord Edward were by then offering the same programme of reform which had led them to rise in the first place. Only in central England does Montfort's support seem to have remained firm.[3]

1. Cronica Maiorum, p. 61: 'fere omnis communa mediocris populi regni Angliae'.
2. Knowles, 'The Disinherited', ii.81-3.
3. ibid., i.13.

Montfort seems to have been able to draw upon the support of a number of towns, but the nature of that support and the reasons for it are not very clear. It was certainly not the result of any encouragement of urban aspirations. There was much urban unrest at this time,[1] perhaps stimulated by the atmosphere of reform and change, but it would be unreasonable to expect Montfort as lord of Leicester, or indeed any of the other barons, to encourage it. In fact his government ordered the suppression of illicit gatherings and confederacies at Oxford[2] and helped to restore the rule of the abbot of Bury St. Edmunds which was threatened by an urban uprising.[3] The support of towns was offered for a variety of reasons and seems to have been inspired more by local than national considerations. After all the baronial programme had few specific reforms to offer the urban classes. Some towns which supported the barons, such as Leicester, may simply have followed the example of their lord. Aylesbury was in the hands of the baronialist John fitz John and its plea that it was compelled to give aid to the barons was accepted.[4] Others, such as Lincoln and Hereford, may have supported the barons against their lords. Lincoln was in dispute with Peter of Savoy over tolls[5] and Hereford was in dispute with the bishop.[6]

1. S. Reynolds, An Introduction to the History of English Medieval Towns (Oxford, 1977), pp. 133-5.
2. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 363-4.
3. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii. 449-50.
4. Jacob, Studies, pp. 291-2.
5. Knowles, 'The Disinherited', ii.105.
6. Jacob, Studies, p. 289.

The Cinque Ports were possibly loyal to Montfort because of the licence he allowed them to engage in acts of piracy.[1] Support was also received from different social classes. At Northampton and Lincoln, for example, the ruling oligarchies remained in power,[2] but at London the support came from the men who overthrew the city government in 1263. Of course the towns were not unanimous in their support. It was probably the loyalty of the Cinque Ports which encouraged their rivals Dunwich and Ipswich to support the king, while royalist Portsmouth suffered punishment at the hands of the Cinque Ports in November 1265.[3] Towns were also divided within themselves and the opinions expressed were only those of the dominant faction. Not surprisingly the aldermen who were overthrown in London were royalist, while at Kenilworth in 1266 we hear of certain townsmen who rose against their fellows and raised the royal standard.[4] The surviving evidence suggests, however, that the baronial towns were more numerous,although it is drawn mainly from records of fines after the war which would naturally record more baronial than royalist towns.

Although urban support for Montfort was strong enough in January 1265 for an unspecified number of burgesses to be called to parliament, detailed information about the nature of such support is only available in the case of the Cinque Ports and London. The king and barons were particularly concerned to win

1. Cronica Maiorum, p. 73,says that Montfort and his sons were to receive one third of the proceeds.
2. Knowles, 'The Disinherited', ii.97.
3. ibid., ii.100.
4. Hailes, f. 46 (p. 74).

the support of the Cinque Ports, for they controlled the entrance and exit of people going to and from the continent. Through them would come any military aid and papal letters, and it was in the interest of both sides to secure their loyalty.[1] In January 1259 the baronial government sent two officials, Henry Bone and Pharao de Porta, to explain the need to watch the coasts so that no magnate might enter or leave without the king's licence.[2] In April of the following year Henry sent a letter to the Cinque Ports from France explaining his position. Its exceptional length and unusual detail shows how much he was concerned to win their support. He complained that he had ruled the kingdom in peace all his life, but now certain men were about to assemble in arms in London contrary to their faith to the king and the king's mandate and that this would lead to war. He had hoped that his absence abroad would have stilled the sparks of war but he was now going to return, for he had heard that some had sent for armed men from abroad which would jeopardize the chances of a just settlement of the disturbances. He himself was returning with some knights to help restore peace in the kingdom, not to harm it, and he appealed to them to maintain their faith towards him.[3] This letter was followed at the end of the month by a writ to the bailiffs and barons of Dover ordering them to send four men before the king for certain business to be explained to them, although its exact nature is not stated.[4] Henry was clearly

1. For the Cinque Ports see K. M. E. Murray, Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports (Manchester, 1935), esp. pp. 37-40.

2. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 8.

3. Close Rolls, 1259-61, 253-4.

4. ibid., p. 287.

anxious to secure the loyalty of the ports to prevent his opponents bringing mercenaries into the realm and to enable him to have access to overseas aid should he need it. The following May, as he prepared to revoke the Provisions, he visited the ports in person to receive their oaths of homage, and later in the month appealed to them not to allow any foreigners to enter to help Montfort.[1]

The barons valued the support of the ports equally highly, for in the unrest which followed the announcement of the bull of absolution in 1261 one of the first actions of Montfort and Gloucester was to visit the Cinque Ports and obtain from them letters promising loyalty to the reforming movement.[2] In the disturbances of 1263 there was further competition for the support of the Cinque Ports. At Christmas 1262 the majores of the ports had been summoned to attend the king's court[3] and in the early summer of 1263 Edward visited the ports to secure their homage.[4] But in July, as the civil war began, Montfort also visited them to urge them to resist any aliens who might attempt to invade, and obtained their oath that they would follow him until death if necessary.[5] On several occasions during the summer of 1265 Eleanor de Montfort dined with the burgesses of the ports, and on 14th June Simon himself was present when she dined with the burgesses of Winchelsea.[6]

1. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 185; Foedera, p. 406.
2. See above, p. 50.
3. Gervase, ii.218.
4. Cal.Pat.Rolls, 1258-66, 265.
5. Gervase, ii.223.
6. Manners and Household Expenses, pp. 47, 50, 62, 77; Labarge, Simon de Montfort, p. 96.

Despite the efforts of Henry it is clear that the sympathy of the Cinque Ports lay with the barons throughout this period. In 1259 he had to resort to a strategem to obtain the entry of the papal envoy, Velascus, into the country.[1] In 1261 the ports readily deserted Henry, and in 1263 it was only after 'multis altercacionibus', in the course of which the barons of the ports told Edward that he should love the English and dismiss the French from his side, that they renewed their homage to Edward. The Canterbury chronicler added that even then this was done 'ficte'.[2] They quickly abandoned their oath later in the year, and when the bishop of Lincoln was summoned to Rome the barons at Dover refused to let him cross.[3] For the remainder of the war they gave loyal support to Montfort, and Henry felt it necessary to take hostages from Winchelsea and Dover shortly before the battle of Lewes.[4] After Lewes they prevented the entry of papal envoys and papal letters into the kingdom,[5] the effectiveness of their blockade being shown by the fact that the P.R.O. holds no papal bulls issued between May 1264 and September 1265, a gap of unusual length. Their loyalty and importance to Montfort is also shown by his request that each port send four burgesses instead of the usual two to his parliament of January 1265.[6] Their support also meant that in July 1265 the ports were specifically named in a papal bull for the excommunication of rebels. A further bull issued in September against the rebels named the Cinque Ports as one

1. R. F. Treharne, 'An Unauthorized Use of the Great Seal under the Provisional Government in 1259', E.H.R., xl (1925), 403-11.
2. St. Augustine's, p.76; Gervase, ii.222.
3. St. Augustine's, p. 77.
4. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 384; Worcester, p. 450.
5. See below, pp. 378-9.
6. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 304-5.

of the places where it was to be published,[1] but their resistance to the king nevertheless continued until early 1266.

It is interesting that despite the importance of local factors in determining the allegiance of towns, both king and barons appear to have resorted to the familiar arguments to try and secure the allegiance of the Ports. The interplay of urban and national politics is even more apparent in the case of London. The support of London was valuable, for not only was it the seat of government, but it was also of great strategic importance. Like the Cinque Ports it was also firm in its support for the barons. As early as July 1258 a meeting of the folkmoot compelled the aldermen to seal an oath to the Provisions of Oxford,[2] and when Bigod arrived on eyre in December he attracted a large number of complaints against them. The reforming movement was acting as a focus for unenfranchised and discontented Londoners and those patricians who had earlier been displaced by Henry,[3] and it is not really surprising that fitz Thedmar, an alderman of the city, did not approve of Bigod's methods.[4] In June 1263 as civil war began to break out, the Londoners rose against the city government led by fitz Thomas, a radical of the 1250s, and established themselves as a commune with fitz Thomas as mayor. Later in July they pelted the queen as she attempted to leave London on the Thames.[5] Not surprisingly a close alliance was formed between the barons and the rebel Londoners for the observation of the Provisions, 'saving their faith to the king'.[6] At the end of this year the Londoners

1. Cal. Papal Letters, i.430, 431.
2. Cronica Maiorum, pp. 38-9; Paris, v.704; Williams, Medieval London, p. 212.
3. Williams, op.cit., pp. 213-4.
4. See above, p. 108.
5. Williams, op.cit., pp. 219-222.
6. Cronica Maiorum, pp. 53-4. This alliance was renewed in 1264, the record surviving in the Liber de Antiquis Legibus, attached to f.146^{r}, in the Corporation of London Records

rescued Montfort as he lay trapped between the closed city gates and the approaching royalist army by breaking open the city gates and enabling him to retreat.[1] In the spring of 1264, following the Londoners' rejection of the Mise of Amiens,[2] London became Montfort's base. The townsmen took part in the destruction of royalist property, were closely involved in the capture of Rochester in April, and provided the bulk of Montfort's infantry at Lewes.[3]

The support of the Londoners for Montfort is also indicated by the collection of documents they preserved at Guildhall relating to Montfort's government in 1264-5, which in the early fourteenth century were entered into an ornate manuscript of the laws and charters of the kings of England.[4] Yet, not surprisingly, such literary evidence to illustrate the support of laymen for Montfort is generally rather meagre. The manuscript of Robert Carpenter of Hareslade makes it clear where his sympathies lay,[5] but his comments are altogether too brief to provide any detailed information. It is possible that the collection of documents in B.L. Add. MS 38821, a register of writs and statutes written about 1285, was also compiled by a layman. The flyleaves contain some fourteenth century memoranda of farm accounts relating to Glaston and the surrounding neighbourhood, held at the time by the earls of Hereford.[6] This register was possibly owned by one of their officials.[7]

There are however three political songs and poems

1. Gervase, ii.230-1; Williams, op.cit., p. 223.

2. Cronica Maiorum, p. 61.

3. Williams, op.cit., pp. 224-5.

4. B.L. MS Cotton Claudius D ii. On this manuscript see N.R. Ker, 'Liber Custumarum, and other Manuscripts formerly at the Guildhall', The Guildhall Miscellany, i (1952-9), 37.

5. See above, pp. 87, 88.

6. V.C.H. Rutland, ii.182.

7. However the register and the collection of documents are written in one hand throughout, which suggests that another register to which these documents had been added lies behind it: was this also a lay manuscript?

surviving from this period which may throw further light on the opinions of the laity, although they cannot be attributed exclusively or with any certainty to laymen. The first is a Latin song, the Song upon the Divisions of the Barons, which is preserved in Rishanger's chronicle.[1] It is an appeal to the earls of Gloucester, Leicester and Norfolk to complete the reforms they have begun and not to desert the cause as many have begun to do. Rishanger, who was probably not writing until the fourteenth century, placed this song after the Mise of Amiens, obviously considering it to relate to the baronial desertions which had begun in the autumn of 1263. Yet a date fairly early in the reform movement is more likely. The three earls are addressed equally as leaders of the movement, a situation which prevailed only in the early years of reform, for Montfort had established himself as the sole leader by early 1263. Moreover, although Richard, earl of Gloucester, and his successor, Gilbert, did remain prominent in politics, the earl of Norfolk seems to have ceased playing an important role by 1261 and could certainly no longer be regarded as a baronial leader.[2] The tone of the poem also suggests an early date. Its appeal to the earls to keep their oaths and complete what they have begun does not suggest the later revival of the baronial cause, but rather its decline in early 1260 after so much work had been done.

It is not very easy to establish what sort of person the author was, or for whom he was writing. His use of Latin points

1. Rishanger, pp. 18-20; Political Songs, pp. 121-4.
2. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 224-5, 264, 314.

to a man of some education, the clarity of his style indicating a certain familiarity with the language. Yet this does not necessarily mean he was a cleric, for such learning was by no means still the exclusive preserve of clergymen. There is little internal evidence to help us. The poet uses no biblical quotations or allusions which might indicate clerical authorship. Nor does he display exclusively secular or ecclesiastical interests, for 'both knight as well as clergy are become mute' under the oppressions of the foreigners. One could imagine his sentiments coming equally well from a monastic chronicler, a baronial reformer or a member of the gentry.

The Anglo-Norman Song of the Barons is a very different song.[1] It is particularly interesting because it is written out on a small roll such as a minstrel might have used. Several corruptions in the text show that this is a copy and not the autograph. The beginning and end of the roll are now missing, which makes it difficult to be certain on what occasion the song was composed, but what remains falls into three sections. The first gives a brief description of the achievements of six of the barons during the war. This is followed by a celebration of the deeds of Simon de Montfort, who was apparently mentioned earlier in the song. The final two verses turn to two royalists, John de Gray and William Latimer, who had suffered at the hands of the Londoners. From internal evidence this poem seems to have been written between June 29th and August 18th 1263.[2] The occasion of its composition was therefore possibly the arrival

1. Anglo-Norman Political Songs, ed. I.S.T. Aspin (Anglo-Norman Text Society, xi, 1953), pp. 16-19; Political Songs, pp. 59-63, from B. L. Additional MS 23986, now missing.

2. Anglo-Norman Political Songs, p. 14.

of the baronial army under Montfort in London and the baronial assumption of the government in mid-July. The poet seems to be discussing a particular occasion or gathering of the barons, for he mentions Sir John d'Ayvile who was 'of the company'. Certainly no other geographical location for the assembly is apparent, for the deeds of the barons which are mentioned were not performed in any one particular area, while the surviving portion of the song suggests that some prominence was to be given later to the deeds of the Londoners.

Like most medieval writings this song is unfortunately anonymous, yet it is not impossible that it was commissioned by one of the barons. It is interesting to compare this song with the Song of Caerlaverock, a song of triumph written to celebrate the deeds of the barons at the siege of Caerlaverock in 1300 and which was probably commissioned by Robert Clifford.[1] Had the Song of the Barons survived in full a baronial patron might have been more apparent. Yet the song also seems to have been intended for a more popular audience as well, for the last two stanzas suggest that the poet was about to embark upon a celebration of the deeds of the Londoners. The Londoners were strong supporters of the barons, and even if it was not actually written by one of them, it seems to have been intended for their ears as much as the barons'. Anglo-Norman would almost certainly have been understood by many of the Londoners, although perhaps not the poorest, for it seems to have been the language

1. N. Denholm-Young, 'The Song of Carlaverock and the Parliamentary Roll of Arms as found in Cott. MS Calig. A xviii in the British Museum', Proceedings of the British Academy, xlvii (1961), 255-6.

in which commerce and business was transacted.[1]

The third song, the English Song against the King of Almaigne, was written to commemorate the battle of Lewes, and is known only from a copy entered in the famous Harley MS 2253.[2] There has been much speculation about the origin of this manuscript, and it has been variously suggested that the scribe was attached to the households of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore or bishop Orleton of Hereford. More recent research has suggested that the scribe came from Ludlow where he was employed writing legal documents between 1314 and 1349, and that he wrote the manuscript over a number of years between 1330 and 1347.[3] It is composed of a mixture of religious and secular poetry, romances and saints' lives, and could be regarded as an anthology of literature.

The Song is above all a song of victory, a song exulting at the humiliation suffered by Richard of Cornwall at the battle of Lewes. It was written very soon after the battle was fought on 14th May 1264, for Edward was still on his way to imprisonment at Dover.[4] This is therefore the spontaneous reaction of the poet to some welcome news. The dialect of the

1. H. Suggett, 'The Use of French in England in the Later Middle Ages', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, xxviii (1946), 74-8; R. M. Wilson, 'English and French in England, 1100-1300', History, xxviii (1943), 44, 58.

2. Political Songs, pp. 69-71.

3. See Facsimilie of British Museum MS Harley, 2253, ed. N.R. Ker (Early English Text Society, old series, cclv, 1964), esp. pp. xx-xxiii; C. Revard, 'Richard Hurd and MS Harley 2253', Notes and Queries, ccxxiv (1979), 200, 202 nn. 8 and 9.

4. Edward was sent to Dover after the battle of Lewes, but we do not know exactly when he arrived. He did not stay there long, but was soon moved to Wallingford: Annales Londonienses, p. 64; Dunstable, p. 233; Wykes, p. 153.

song indicates that he came from the south,[1] and the pleasing nature of the song suggests that he was not an uneducated man. It was certainly of sufficient quality to be included in an anthology of literature about seventy years later. Owst suggests that this poem was another 'manifesto of the Franciscan order',[2] but there is no real evidence to suggest such authorship. There are no biblical references or allusions, and the subject matter is entirely secular. Whoever this poet was, he clearly intended to share his feelings with others. He began with a request for the attention of his audience, 'Sitteth alle stille ant harkneth to me', and included a refrain at the end of each verse which his listeners could join in singing. It is far more likely that this was the work of a minstrel whose business was to entertain.

However it is not so clear who would have been in his audience. The use of the English language does not automatically mean that it was intended for the lower classes, for English was also the first language of the upper classes and it was not unknown for English literature to be written for them.[3] Its inclusion in Harley 2253 shows that in the fourteenth century it appealed to someone who appreciated good literature, which makes one wonder whether it ever really appealed to the uneducated lower classes. It is interesting to compare this song with the soldiers' songs which survive from the Scottish

1. G. L. Brook, 'The Original Dialects of the Harley Lyrics', Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages, ii (1933), 61.

2. G. R. Owst, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (2nd edition, Cambridge, 1961), p. 222.

3. Wilson, 'English and French', pp. 37-40.

wars at the end of the century, for at first their style seems similar. For example compare the following extracts:

Richard
þah þou be ever trichard
Trichen shalt þou never more.

To pyke
þe rohes of þe rike
þat in þe felde felte.

Yet if the soldiers' songs are read in full, it can be seen that they were intended for a different audience. They are not so well polished as the Song against the King of Almaigne and contain some rather crude expressions which would be entirely out of place in the other song.[1]

However, even if it is doubtful whether this poem ever particularly appealed to the lowest classes, its views do seem to reflect those of tenants, perhaps the more substantial tenants, rather than those of the upper classes. It criticizes Richard for his love of money, for he asked for £30,000 to make peace, and rejoices that all his treasure has been spent. Earl Warenne is similarly criticized for his financial exactions from England. These are the complaints of people who suffered such financial oppressions, rather than the earls' fellow barons. The song also shows strong feelings of hatred toward Richard. Richard's relations with his fellow barons do not seem to have been bitter enough to warrant such an attack,[2] but he was little loved by their followers. One of the first events of the civil war which broke out after the Mise of Amiens in 1264 was an attack by the Londoners on

1. G. E. Morris, 'Soldiers' Songs of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries' (Sheffield M.A. thesis, 1947), compares the two songs on p. 9. See also his comments on the crudity of the Scottish songs, pp. 83-4, 119, 123. This extract from Langtoft is not in the printed edition. It was taken by Morris from All Souls, Oxford, MS 39, f. 102^{r}.

2. Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall, pp. 118-124.

Richard's manor at Isleworth. The Barnwell chronicler also says that after Richard had stayed at Barnwell in 1266 the rebels came from Ely and threatened the priory, being chiefly interested in burning the hall where he had stayed.[1]

Some tentative conclusions can be drawn from these political songs and poems, although they probably represent only a fragment of those which once existed. Their unanimous support for the baronial cause is remarkable and is not merely the result of chance survival, for a poem written about 1273 in praise of Edward I complains that his deeds have all been passed over. The poet, who appears to have been the royalist Thomas de Wykes, remedied this with a brief account of his actions during the baronial wars.[2] It is also interesting how these poems reflect the sentiments we have seen expressed by the barons and the chroniclers. The Song upon the Divisions of the Barons welcomed the barons' legal reforms and urged them to keep their oath to reform the realm, lamenting the oppression of the English by the foreigners. The Song of the Barons similarly criticized the bishop of Hereford 'who sought to eat up all the English', and praised Montfort because he loved right and hated wrong. The Song against the King of Almaigne also reflected chronicle opinion when it called Richard a traitor, a taunt which was levelled at those royalists who opposed the barons. He had refused to make peace unless he

1. ibid., p. 126; Liber Bernewelle, p. 123.

2. The song, The Praise of the Young Edward, is printed in Political Songs, pp. 128-132. In the manuscript, B. L. MS Cotton Vespasian B xiii, the poem ends on f.130^{v} with a colophon in a different hand attributing it to Thomas de Wyca, although Wright read this as Wyta: Political Songs, p. 132. Certainly the sentiments of the composer agree with those of the chronicler.

was paid thirty thousand pounds, and had brought in foreign mercenaries, both actions which showed little concern for the welfare of the country. For the same reason the Song was also critical of earl Warenne who took all his wealth abroad.

These songs help to illustrate the opinions of the more prosperous of the barons' supporters, and suggest that as late as May 1264 they were still firmly behind the barons. Moreover it seems that the opinions which we have seen expressed by the clergy were also to a large extent shared by the laity. The other evidence assembled here suggests that this situation prevailed until early 1265 when the leading shire gentry began to turn back towards the king. However these songs do not really throw any light on the most obscure of the social classes, the peasantry. Any songs which they were singing amongst themselves have, as we should expect, gone unrecorded. Their opinions are much harder to establish, especially since they do not feature in the records of the disinherited. One invaluable insight which suggests that they may have shared the opinions of the more substantial laity comes from a court case in which the villagers of Peatling Magna in Leicestershire were accused of assaulting some royalists shortly after the battle of Evesham. It was alleged that they accused the royalists of sedition and of going against the commonalty of the realm and the barons, statements which echo baronial propaganda. This part of Leicestershire was near Montfort's estates and seems to have been under the influence of the Bassets, but nevertheless the villagers appear to have been acting on their own initiative.[1]

1. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.509-10; Select Cases of Procedure without Writ under Henry III, ed. H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles (Selden Society, lx, 1941), p. 43. Note however that these words were not spoken by the villagers themselves at the trial, but were attributed to them by Peter de Neville.

This suggestion that the peasants, too, had been caught up in the baronial wars is confirmed by the posthumous cult of Montfort.

(vii) The Cult of Simon de Montfort

A cult was developing around Simon de Montfort well before his death at Evesham in August 1265. It is difficult to tell exactly when this cult began or how far it had developed before Evesham, for the majority of the surviving accounts were written with hindsight, and are coloured by the knowledge of his martyrdom on the battlefield. Yet Montfort's personality had made a strong impression as early as 1258, for Matthew Paris mentioned that many were amazed that the Poitevins dared to insult a man so much more noble than they.[1] Moreover it seems that Montfort was already becoming something of a cult figure by 1263 when he emerged as sole leader of the baronial cause. For example, the Song of the Barons, which was written in the summer of 1263, is already drawing attention to him:

> 'He is called of Montfort: he is in the world and he is strong, and great is his prowess; this is the truth and I concur: he loves right and hates wrong and he will get the upper hand.
> Of a truth he is in the world, where the common folk of the land granted to him, acknowledge him; he is the earl of Leicester and he can be proud and rejoice in this renown.'[2]

The Song of Lewes, written in May 1264, also has much to say about Simon which foreshadows his posthumous cult. The poet stressed Simon's concern for the truth and the maintenance of his oath to the Provisions, even where this meant personal

1. Paris, v.703.

2. Anglo-Norman Political Songs, p. 20.

loss and hardship. He dwelt upon Simon as a religious man through whom God was working to preserve the people of England from oppression. He was like Moses rescuing the people of Israel from the tyranny of Pharaoh, a new Mathathias, another Gideon, and like David when he defeated Goliath. Like Christ, he is represented as a cornerstone, and like Christ 'the venerable Simon de Montfort.....gives himself to death for the many.'[1]

Such attitudes were very common amongst the chroniclers who wrote after Montfort's death. The Waverley chronicler called him a martyr for the peace of the land and the reform of the church and kingdom. One manuscript of the Flores Historiarum said that he did not fear to undergo death for the liberties of the country and his oath, and likened his journey to Evesham to a journey towards eternal salvation. The Oseney chronicler said he was a man of God who died commending his cause to God and Mary, while Henry de Silegrave said that he and his companions were martyred as they fought for the peace of the land and for truth.[2] The circumstances of Montfort's death, apart from its violence, helped to promote this belief in his martyrdom. It was widely reported by the chroniclers that the battle of Evesham took place during an exceptionally heavy thunderstorm which seems to have been experienced by much of the country, and several chroniclers drew a parallel between the darkness of the skies

1. Song of Lewes, ll.73-4, 76, 119, 173, 149, 261, 265 (reflecting Ps.cxvii.22, Is. xxviii.16, 1 Peter ii.6), 345-6.

2. Waverley, p. 365; Flores Historiarum, iii.5 n.1. (from Luard's MS W, not written before 1306); Oseney, p. 170; Chronicon Silegrave, p. 105; see also the later eulogies in Chronica Oxenedes, p. 229, and Rishanger, pp. 6-7.

at Montfort's death and at the crucifixion of Christ.[1]

An aura of sanctity is also present in several surviving songs and poems which pay tribute to Simon de Montfort. One of them is in Anglo-Norman and survives in two manuscripts, B.L. MS Harley 2253 and Trinity College, Dublin, MS 347.[2] There are marked differences between the two versions, for each has verses omitted by the other, while there are also variations within the material common to both. For example, the Harley version gives 'molt enplorra la terre' where the Dublin text has 'en plura Engleterre'. Similarly the Harley version has 'Sire Hue le fer, ly Despenser, tres noble justice', where the Dublin manuscript reads 'Huge Despenser, li noble ber, la dreiturel justice'. Such differences are not scribal errors, but are the sort of variation which would have arisen when a song was transmitted orally. They point to the widespread popularity of this lament for Simon de Montfort, indicating that it had become part of an oral culture. The lively rhythm of this song and the presence of a refrain for the listeners to sing perhaps help to explain its popularity.

This song was probably written very soon after Evesham, recording the reaction of the composer upon first hearing the

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.5 n.1; Robert of Gloucester, ii.765; Oseney, pp. 172-3,said that the storm was a portent for the future; Worcester, p. 454,drew a parallel with the darkness during the battles of Maccabees. Many other chronicles mention the darkness without further comment.

2. The Harley version is printed in Political Songs, pp. 125-7, and Anglo-Norman Political Songs, pp. 28-32. The Dublin version is printed by H. Shields, 'The Lament for Simon de Montfort', Medium Aevum, xli (1972), 206. This version is written out in two early fourteenth century hands at the beginning of an Irish collection of theological and religious works. It also contains the annals of Multyfarnham, a Franciscan house in Co. Westmeath, which is interesting bearing in mind the support said to have been given to Montfort by the Franciscans. The following discussion draws upon Shields' introduction, pp. 202-6.

news of Simon's death. Miss Aspin thought it was not written until 1267, believing there to be a reference to the peace concluded at Marlborough in that year, but Shields has shown this reference to be rather ambiguous.[1] Moreover, there are good reasons for placing the poem earlier than 1267. The opening line, 'chanter m'estoit' (I must sing), are the words of someone closely involved in the events he is describing, not the words of someone writing two or three years later. The Harley version also says that Simon and his companions are now going to heaven, while the Dublin version adds a description of Simon as he lay unburied on his bier, both suggesting that the poem was written not long after the battle. The poet is also not particularly well-informed about the events he is commemmorating, giving the impression that news of the defeat has only just arrived and that the full details are not yet known. Firstly he is uncertain on which day of the week the battle was fought. Furthermore in the Harley version he also seems not to know the names of the dead, for he ends his list with 'many others, as you will hear', while in the Dublin version he says he does not know the manner of Despenser's death. The Dublin version shows signs that some revisions were subsequently made to take account of the passing of time. For example, the list of the dead now ends 'and many others as you have heard', while Simon and his companions are said to be in heaven, rather than on their way.

We do not know the name of the poet or his background. Although he clearly saw the baronial wars in religious terms,

1. Anglo-Norman Political Songs, p. 26; Shields, art.cit., pp. 204-5.

there is no real reason to suppose that he was a clerk or a monk. There are no biblical references, and although it is a pleasing piece of verse there are no indications that he was a well educated or learned man. Similarly it is not really clear whom this song appealed to. It is quite possible that its appeal was general, for it survives in both a monastic source and what was probably a secular compilation, and contains sentiments which would have appealed to laity and clergy alike.

The sentiments of the song are already familiar to us from other sources. The composer praises the barons for their sacrifice in dying to save their country and to maintain peace and justice, but most of his praise is lavished upon Simon. He was the flower of fame whose death is lamented by the whole land. He was killed while fighting to keep his faith, a holy martyr who in death won victory. Although not explicitly called a saint, he is already marked out as a man of especial holiness, for a hair shirt was found near his body, 'that great treasure'. He is also compared to St. Thomas of Canterbury, for he unflinchingly met a martyr's death. This is an interesting and not an uncommon comparison, and it seems that people believed that Becket and Montfort were working in heaven to protect the English people from royal aggression.[1]

Apart from this Anglo-Norman song, two Latin laments also survive. The first is written on the flyleaf of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 85/167.[2] This volume contains several treatises on canon law to which several marginal notes

1. J. C. Russell, 'The Canonization of Opposition to the King in Angevin England', Anniversary Essays in Medieval History, by Students of Charles H. Haskins, ed. C. H. Taylor and J. L. LaMonte (Boston, 1929), p. 285. For other associations with Becket see below, pp. 134,143.

2. Printed by F. W. Maitland, 'A Song on the Death of Simon de Montfort', E.H.R., xi (1896), 316-8. The details in the following paragraph are taken from this article, pp. 314-6.

have been added in the same hand which wrote the poem. These are mostly legal formulas concerning one Walter de Hyda and reveal a little about the probable owner of the manuscript. He was illegitimate, but of gentle birth, and took degrees in arts and canon law at Paris. On the presentation of a certain M. de B., knight, the bishop of Chichester instituted him in the church of N., and in 1274 he was presented to the bishop of Chichester by Adelinya[1] la Savage, lady of Broadwater, for institution as rector of Broadwater. In 1272 he gave a bond to the lady A. Salvage, widow of R. Salvage.

These statements may well be true. In 1242 Broadwater manor, near Worthing, was held by Robert le Savage, but after a long dispute it passed to John de Gatesden in 1256. In 1259 Robert's widow recovered her dower from him.[2] The advowson descended with the manor,[3] but it is not impossible that she had obtained the right of presentation in 1274. Although no definite traces of Walter de Hyda can be found, there was certainly a landowning family called Hyde or Hyda living in the area.[4] If the clergyman of this name was connected with this family, it would seem that he has come from a local gentry family, a suggestion which agrees with the marginal note in the manuscript that he was of gentle birth.

The poet was clearly a well educated man for his verse has

1. The reading 'Adelinya' is not certain.

2. V.C.H. Sussex, vi, part 1, 69.

3. ibid., p. 77.

4. See, for example, ibid., p. 57; The Chartulary of the High Church of Chichester, ed. W. D. Peckham (Sussex Record Society, xlvi, 1942-3), pp. 171, 298; and Placita de Quo Warranto (Record Commission, 1818), p. 760, cited by J. Ley, 'Waldron: Its Church, its Mansions, and its Manors', Sussex Archaeological Collections, xiii (1861), 95.

a number of classical and biblical references, indicating that he was probably a cleric. He may have had some connection with Montfort's household for he seems well acquainted with Guy de Balliol, his standard bearer, to whom he devoted six verses. The only other person mentioned in the poem apart from Montfort and his sons is Ralph Basset whom he called his knight. There were two Ralph Bassets at Evesham, Ralph Basset of Drayton, who was killed, and Ralph Basset of Sapcote, who died in 1282. The Ralph Basset of the poem is said to have been badly injured, and if this were Ralph Basset of Drayton it would point to an early date for the poem's composition, before Ralph died of his wounds. Unfortunately we cannot be sure which of the two is referred to by the poet. However, it is likely that the poem was written not long after Evesham, for the last few verses point to the perils facing England without Montfort:

> 'Simon, Simon, if you were living, you would not permit robberies to continue in the land. Who can defend us?..... The English can now cry and grieve unceasingly, for they have no remedy unless God sends them deliverance from those who do such wicked things. Consider these things lest fraudulent aliens subvert this land. Amen.'[1]

Such sentiments are in keeping with the months following Evesham when the royalists were able to plunder and appropriate the barons' lands indiscriminately. It is doubtful whether this lament ever achieved wide circulation in the way that the Anglo-Norman lament seems to have done. Its difficult Latinity and its biblical and classical allusions would mean it would

1. Maitland, 'Song on Simon de Montfort', vv. 53-7.

have little appeal except to educated clergy such as Walter de Hyda. The poet's sentiments, however, are not unlike those in the Anglo-Norman song. Montfort is presented as fighting a holy war on behalf of his country, with his thoughts fixed upon heaven. He was a holy martyr, a 'knight bound for heaven' who wore a hair-shirt, and was killed by conspirators and ignorant men. Moreover, throughout the poem there are phrases which remind us of the passion of Christ. The first sentence reflects a prophecy of Isaiah about the coming of Christ and suggests that it has also been fulfilled in his servant Simon.[1] Later, in verse sixteen, Montfort is warned to withdraw or he will be delivered to death. His protector is said to be like Pilate, who was reluctant to condemn Christ, just as Montfort's protector is reluctant to see him killed. This is followed by appeals for Montfort's death, similar to the appeals of the people of Jerusalem for the crucifixion of Christ, to which Montfort replied, like Christ, 'I give myself to the Almighty'.[2] We are told that he was killed by ignorant men, perhaps reminiscent of Christ's words from the cross, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'.[3] Similarly, his last words, 'O Highest Father, help Montfort', remind us of Christ's appeal from the cross,'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'[4]

1. 'Where there was a mountain is now a valley; from the hill is made a road and public paths' perhaps reflects Is. xl. 3-4: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be lifted up, and every mountain and hill be madė low; the uneven ground shall become level and the rough places plain'.

2. cf. Mark xiv.36.

3. Luke xxiii.34.

4. Mark xv.34.

Although in none of these cases are the exact words of the bible repeated, the similarities are too close to be ignored. Like Christ, Montfort was killed by the people he was fighting to save. This poem also associates Montfort once again with St. Thomas. Both Thomas and Simon are shown to be martyrs, the one dying for the church, the other for his country. The poet also introduced some prophecies about Montfort which were attributed to Grosseteste, thus associating Montfort with a communion of saints who opposed royal tyranny and oppression.[1]

A second Latin lament, hitherto unpublished, survives in a thirteenth century collection of theological tracts, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 349/542, f.10^{v}. The poem has been entered on a spare leaf in a neat hand, probably of the mid-thirteenth century. The scribe is working from a copy, for on several occasions he seems to have been unable to read his exemplar, and has noted possible variant readings in the margin. He also seems to have omitted a line near the beginning, and there are several textual corruptions. There is unfortunately nothing in the manuscript to indicate its provenance or the identity of the scribe, although one can safely assume he was a cleric.[2] The poem consists of 82 lines of not particularly good verse written in a Latin which is at times rather obscure and a style which is rather laboured. The poet does not display the learning of the author of the first Latin lament, and employs no classical or biblical allusions and references. It is

1. Haskins, 'The Canonization of Opposition', p. 285.

2. The same hand has probably added the statutes of the 1222 Council of Oxford and some other synodal statutes on ff. 134^{v}-136^{v}, and the miscellaneous theological notes on f. 136^{v}.

not impossible that it is the work of a layman, but there is nothing which really suggests this.

It is also difficult to establish when this lament was written. It was certainly composed before the death in 1271 of Simon de Montfort, junior, who was still alive when the poem was written. Yet it lacks the spontaneity which we have seen, particularly in the Anglo-Norman lament, and which probably indicated an early date. Moreover sufficient time has elapsed for the poet to write that a thousand signs show that Montfort has been sanctified. The poem adds little to our knowledge of the cult of Montfort, presenting him in the usual manner. He is shown to have been fighting on behalf of the English people without any thought for himself, seeking the maintenance of justice and the punishment of the perjurors and wicked. He fought for the poor and oppressed, but perished only in body and not in spirit, and lives on in heaven, undefeated, with Christ and his martyrs.

Finally there are two further poems or tracts which no longer survive. The first was a Vita Simonis de Montefortis rithmice which was entered in MS I.xiii of Peterborough abbey.[1] The second was a work entitled Planctus Anglie de morte Simonis de Montisfortis which was in a volume of political writings presented to St. Augustine's abbey, Canterbury, by Ralph de Gatwick. He was ordained priest in 1297 and was probably the

1. Bémont, Simon de Montfort (French edition), p. xvi n.1; M. R. James, List of Manuscripts formerly in Peterborough Abbey (Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, supplement v, 1926), p. 71.

infirmarer in 1330.[1]

The chroniclers and the authors of these laments all show that Montfort was seen to have been a martyr for a holy and just cause, and it is not really surprising that miracles were soon attributed to him. The cult seems to have developed rapidly, the Bury St. Edmunds chronicler implying that miracles were being performed by the end of 1265.[2] Certainly by October 1266 the reports of miracles were sufficient for the Dictum of Kenilworth to deny that miracles were being performed and to forbid people to report them under pain of corporal punishment.[3] It was possibly about this time that his body was exhumed from its resting place in Evesham abbey and disposed of on the grounds that he had died excommunicate. Certainly this had taken place by May 1267 when the legate Ottobon was ordered by the pope to enquire into and report on the assertion of Amaury de Montfort that his father had obtained absolution before the battle of Evesham and had given signs of repentance before his death, but did not have a church burial.[4] The only other evidence that the government attempted to suppress the reports

1. A. B. Emden, Donors of Books to St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury (Oxford Bibliographical Society, Occasional Publications, iv, 1968), p. 10; M. R. James, Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover (Cambridge, 1903), p. 290.

2. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler notes the death of Montfort without comment on p. 31, and only adds later in the account for 1265 that miracles were being performed (p.33). It would seem that he had already entered Montfort's death before miracles began to occur later in the year. There are two miracles dated August 1265 in 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', p. 91, but the dates in this work are most erratic. It includes two dated 1259 and even one of 1208, pp. 69, 74, 83.

3. Treharne and Sanders, pp. 322-3.

4. Cal.Papal Letters, i.434. See also Oseney, pp. 175-6.

of miracles comes from the Furness chronicler, who said that none dared to speak about Simon's miracles for fear of the king and his men, and the Melrose chronicler who said that all the while Edward was alive no-one could sing his praises in church.[1] It may also have been fear of the government which led someone to erase a statement that Montfort performed miracles from one of the manuscripts of the Bury St. Edmunds chronicle.[2] Fortunately not all were as reticent as the Furness monk, and we have some idea about the cult of St. Simon. The most important source is a collection of nearly two hundred miracles in B.L. MS Cotton Vespasian A vi.[3] This is a fifteenth century manuscript which is full of errors and textual corruptions; but it is clearly derived from a contemporary compilation, for the author says he personally witnessed several of the miracles at Evesham, and none of the miracles in the collection can be dated after 1279.[4] It was probably the work of one of those monastic registrars whose task it was to collect information about such miracles.[5]

The cult of Simon de Montfort was a popular one. Evesham became a centre of pilgrimage, and the Lanercost chronicler tells us of the daily offerings there and that such building works were carried out that even if men kept quiet, his miracles would

1. Cont. Newburgh, p. 548; Melrose, p. 212.

2. Gransden, Historical Writing, p. 467 n.24, plate xi.

3. Printed as 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort' in Rishanger.

4. 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', pp. 71, 76. The miracle of 1279 is on p. 108. On p. 88 there is the date m.cc^{o} sexagesimo xx, which is an unusual way of writing 1280 and may be a corruption.

5. For registrars see R. C. Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims (London, 1977), pp. 59, 100-3 and passim.

be proclaimed by the stones. An oratory was built outside the cemetery over the barons' tombs where miracles were said to occur.[1] A holy spring, said to have arisen at the place where Montfort fell, was also the cause of a number of health-giving miracles.[2] The Melrose chronicle reports that serious men and religious of different orders went about England and even into Scotland praising Simon, saying that they would prefer to go to his tomb than to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Others said they would rather go to his tomb to pray than to that of St. Thomas of Canterbury.[3] Indeed the collection of miracles does contain several miracles which happened at Evesham to people from Canterbury and the surrounding area.[4]

The collection also reveals how the cult achieved widespread popularity. Not only do we often hear that whole villages were testifying to the veracity of miracles, but also these miracles were occurring to people from all over the country. Many pilgrims came from central England,[5] but the cult also drew people from as far away as Devon, Kent, Lincolnshire and Northumberland, and even Ireland and France.[6] Indeed, it is an unusual feature of the cult of Montfort that most of the miracles happened to people living over forty miles away from Evesham

1. Lanercost, p. 77. This is possibly the 'capella comitis Simonis' mentioned in 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', p. 79.

2. For the well see D. C. Cox, 'Battlewell, Evesham', Transactions of the Worcester Archaeological Society, new series, xli (1964), 1-9.

3. Melrose, pp. 211-2.

4. For example, 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', pp. 76, 97, 101.

5. Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p. 170.

6. 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', pp. 82, 96 (Northumberland), 99 (Devon), 98 (Lincoln), 73 (Ireland), 76 (France). For Kent see note 4 above.

rather than to people living within that distance, and that there was not a neat falling off in participation as one moved away from the shrine.[1]

The cult of Montfort is also unusual in the number of different people to whom it appealed. More members of the upper classes were involved than was usual in such a cult.[2] Several members of the Cantilupe family, the countess of Gloucester, the countess of Aumale and several members of the knightly classes were all involved in miracles.[3] The cult also appealed to some of the prelates, for the abbot of the Premonstratensian house of Dale in Derbyshire, the abbots of Pershore and Evesham and the priors of Waltham, St. Frideswide's, Oxford, and St. Peter's, Gloucester, all experienced or testified to miracles.[4] Two magistri, Thomas de Cantilupe and John Crowoltone,also received cures.[5] Yet the majority of the miracles occured to the lesser clergy and lower classes. A number of monks, chaplains and rectors, a tailor, a carpenter and a fisherman[6] are listed in the collection, together with many more whom we have no hope of being able to identify now, the very people who were not recorded in the royal records of the 'disinherited'.

1. Finucane, op.cit., pp. 169-70.
2. ibid., p. 135.
3. 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', pp. 69-70, 71, 87 (Cantilupe), 68-9 (countess of Gloucester), 98 (countess of Aumale), 70, 73, 83, 96, 99, 106 (knights). There are other examples, passim.
4. ibid., pp. 88, 92, 92-3, 83-4, 91 (bis).
5. ibid., pp. 71, 78.
6. These three artisans are ibid., pp. 79, 79-80, 96.

Not only did the cult of Montfort involve miracles and pilgrimages, but men also treasured his relics. His body was dismembered on the battlefield by his enemies, but fragments of his body later came to be venerated. Lanercost said that his dismembered limbs did not suffer decay, but remained whole and gave off a pleasant odour.[1] One of his feet was taken to Alnwick priory where it remained incorrupt for many months. The canons encased it in a silver shoe and it was the cause of a miraculous cure upon a rich burgess from Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The other foot was sent to Llywelyn as a sign of contempt for Montfort's former ally, but miracles were later reported to have been performed by it. Thomas de Strangrife, the abbot of Rievaulx about 1268,[2] also related miracles which had been performed by one of Montfort's hands.[3]

The Melrose chronicler tells us that the Franciscans composed a life and services in Montfort's honour.[4] It is possible that the 'opusculum de nobili Simone de Monte forti' incorporated into the Melrose chronicle is one such life, although there is nothing which definitely indicates Franciscan authorship. As it stands this life is now rather corrupt. There are both errors in chronology and factual errors, yet there are indications that it was a fairly contemporary compilation. The writer was certainly well informed about the battles of Lewes and Evesham and gives detailed accounts of them. Moreover, Thomas de Strangrife was one of the chronicler's

1. Lanercost, p. 77.

2. V.C.H. Yorkshire, iii.153.

3. Melrose, pp. 203-4. See also 'Miracles of Simon de Montfort', p. 70, for another miracle performed through one of Montfort's hands.

4. Melrose, p. 212.

sources of information.[1] The life seems to have undergone some substantial revision, perhaps by the Melrose chronicler late in the thirteenth century,[2] which accounts for its inaccuracies. A certain amount of Scottish material, which would not have been present in the original, has been intruded and there is also mention of the late John de Vescy, who died in 1289.[3] However, the substance of the life is probably contemporary. The account begins with the barons' wars shortly before Lewes, and gives a detailed account of events leading up to Simon's death at Evesham. Then the hagiographer turns to the miracles which were performed after his death, and concludes with a discussion of his personal sanctity, telling how he kept vigil every night, how he wore a hair shirt and always ate frugally, comparing him at length with the apostle Simon Peter. This is a typical saint's life, written in an anecdotal and gossipy style which we would associate with such works. We do not know who the author was. He may have been a Franciscan, for the writer mentions that Franciscans wrote such lives, while his style is not dissimilar to that of the Franciscan chronicle of Lanercost. Yet there are no references within the life to indicate Franciscan interests. All that can be said was that he was probably a northerner, for he knew the abbot of Rievaulx and had information about a relic of Simon at Alnwick Abbey in Northumberland.[4]

Religious services were also held in Simon's honour. Two

1. Melrose, p. 205.
2. See above, p. 98.
3. Melrose, p. 203; Cal. Inq. Post Mortem, ii. no. 723, p. 445.
4. Melrose, p. 204.

monastic calendars record his feast day on 4th August. One is a late thirteenth century calendar, which was possibly of Benedictine provenance, in B.L. MS Harley 2951,[1] and the other is an eighteenth century copy of an Evesham calendar in B.L. MS Lansdowne 427.[2] Several fragments of the services composed for Montfort survive. One fragment is in C.U.L. MS Kk iv 20 where three hymns, an antiphon, a versicle and a collect have been entered on the flyleaf.[3] This manuscript contains a mixture of theological and religious items and at one time belonged to Ralph de Fretenham, the cellarer of Norwich priory in 1274.[4] The hymns speak of Montfort in the usual way, seeing him as the salvation of England, a holy martyr who died for the sake of his country. There is a sense of loss and despair in such lines as 'Alas, the misfortune of many griefs tortures us,[5] which suggests that they were composed not long after Evesham. The third hymn in particular suggests that peace has not yet been made, for 'there is no faith in the whole kingdom, the laws lay low....How many souls and bodies are confounded and killed; how many ships and how much merchandise are taken and plundered?' The composer hopes that the wheel of fortune will turn once again and raise the oppressed.[6] However the second hymn is not

1. P. M. Lefferts, 'Two English Motets on Simon de Montfort', Early Music History, i (1981), 210.

2. I am grateful to Dr. Cox for this reference. The manuscript is a transcript of B.L. MS Cotton Vitellius E xii, burnt in the Cottonian fire.

3. Printed by Prothero, Simon de Montfort, pp. 388-91; see Lefferts, art.cit., p. 211.

4. H. C. Beechings and M. R. James, 'The Library of the Cathedral Church of Norwich', Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society, xix (1915-17), 74.

5. Hymn 1, v.2.

6. Hymn 3, vv. 12, 14, 11.

so pessimistic, rejoicing that there is a new martyr in heaven and comparing Simon once again to St. Thomas of Canterbury. The antiphon of this manuscript is also preserved with a different collect in a fifteenth century devotionale which possibly comes from Salisbury.[1] Two motets composed in Simon's honour also survive. One is appended to the collection of miracles and also survives with some of its musical setting in a gradual or cantatorium of around 1300 from Durham cathedral. The second motet is entered with fragments of music on the flyleaf of a late thirteenth century manuscript from Bury St. Edmunds.[2] Both praise the sanctity of Montfort and his efforts to secure justice for the English people. He was a glorious soldier of Christ, the flower of all soldiery, who met an evil and most lamentable death for his faith.

It is difficult to say how long the cult of Simon de Montfort continued. The last miracle recorded by the Evesham monk took place in 1279, and after this date there is no further evidence that the cult was important. Yet since there are very few dates in the miracle collection, we cannot tell whether the cult was still strong when the monk ceased his collection, or whether he was forced to cease work as the flow of miracles ended. At the end of the century memories of the cult were still strong enough for the Melrose chronicler to incorporate a hagiographical life of Simon into his work and for Rishanger to write a lengthy eulogy.[3] At Evesham there was still a Battlewell

1. Cologne Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek MS 28, cited Lefferts, art.cit., p. 211.

2. These two manuscripts, Jesus College, Cambridge, MS Q B 5, and St. John's College, Cambridge, MS 138 (F1), are both discussed and printed by Lefferts, art.cit., pp. 221-5. I have not seen them myself.

3. Rishanger, pp. 6-7.

chapel at the end of the fifteenth century, while the healing traditions of the well were still alive at the beginning of the twentieth century.[1] Yet by the fourteenth century it is likely that memories of Montfort were losing their political overtones. This is suggested by some fourteenth century stained glass at Fladbury near Evesham which contains the shields of Montfort and Despenser, two baronial leaders at the battle, as well as that of Roger Mortimer, a leading royalist.[2] Moreover in 1323 Edward II was prepared to give 3s. to two women who had chanted songs about Simon de Montfort before him.[3]

The cult of Simon de Montfort confirms much of what is learnt from other sources about the way in which the barons' campaigns were viewed. Yet it also draws attention to the intensity of the feelings raised during the wars and the extent to which the royal government was disliked and had failed to win popular support. The amount of literature surviving is exceptional, particularly when it is borne in mind that the government was trying to suppress the cult. This was a cult which appealed to all classes, both clergy and laity, and which had followers all over the country. Few but the king seem to have condemned it. Above all the cult shows that the lower classes too had been caught up in the wars, for many peasants looked to Montfort at his death as a holy martyr.

The period of reform and rebellion shows the extent to which the king and his court had become isolated by 1258. The government had been seen as working largely for its own ends

1. Cox, 'Battlewell', pp. 4, 8.

2. ibid., p. 5.

3. R. M. Wilson, The Lost Literature of Medieval England (2nd edition, London, 1970), p. 190.

with apparently little consideration for the needs of the country and seemed to be generally unaware of the changing nature of the political community. The events of 1258 showed how this political community had grown and acquired interests of its own which could no longer be safely ignored. Under the pressure of political conflict and civil war the political awareness of the shires was further developed. Policies were explained to them, appeals were made for their support and they were consulted in parliament. Weakening ties of lordship were loosened still further and the gentry classes began to acquire greater political independence. Such changes helped strengthen and develop the concept of the community of the realm, making that community more aware that it had definite interests of its own. The barons had challenged the king on the grounds that he ignored those interests and they had justified their opposition to the king as being for the welfare of that community.

Henry himself only grudgingly accepted that the political community was changing. He was slow to issue his own appeals to the shires, was unwilling to recognize the need to reissue the Provisions of Westminster until too late and based his defence on the affront the barons gave to his regal position rather than on the benefits of his rule to the community. The overwhelming success of the baronial reformers in winning support revealed the weakness of his arguments.

Edward inherited from his father a very different kingdom from that which Henry had inherited. But fortunately he had learnt much from the baronial wars. In 1265 he had even been ready to adopt the baronial programme as his own. During his

reign he showed that he was aware of the need to accommodate the new political forces stimulated and released by the wars and reconcile the growing power of the monarchy with the interests of a developing community of the realm.

Chapter 3

THE REIGN OF EDWARD I : INTRODUCTION

During his reign Edward showed that he had learnt from his father's experiences. Henry III had tried to rule the nascent community of the realm along what may be called feudal lines. He had paid little regard to the growth of the political realm until the fact had been forced upon him during the baronial wars. Edward, however, was aware from the beginning of his reign that the political framework of the country had changed. The wishes of the knightly classes could no longer be ignored, but had to be accommodated. This awareness can be seen in the series of statutes which were drawn up in the first half of the reign after careful inquiry into the needs of the realm. In 1275 the first statute was preceded by a parliament attended by four knights from each county who were knowledgeable in the law, as well as burgesses from each town,[1] a clear indication that the new king had adjusted to the realities of the political situation. This need to adjust was moreoever increased as the unprecedented demands which Edward made on his subjects during his wars against Wales, France and Scotland reinforced

1. C. H. Jenkinson, 'The First Parliament of Edward I', E.H.R., xxv (1910), 231-242, esp. 236.

and developed further the concept of the community of the realm. These wars drew upon the resources of the realm in a way which Henry III had never done, and it was more necessary than ever that Edward should seek to win the support of his subjects. The Welsh wars of 1277, 1282-3 and 1287-8 cost £23,000, £150,000 and £10,000 respectively,[1] apart from the large sums spent on the Welsh castles which by 1301 probably approached £80,000, most of it spent before 1289.[2] Such a war effort could not be met out of the crown's ordinary revenues of £30,000 a year or less,[3] and involved a considerable burden on the king's subjects. Although no figures can be calculated for Henry III's wars, it is unlikely that their cost ever approached those of his son. They were on a smaller scale, and the burden was further eased by their relative infrequency.

Yet even Edward's Welsh wars were relatively inexpensive when compared with the wars of the 1290s. Between 1294 and 1298, when Edward faced war in Gascony, Scotland and Wales, a total of about £750,000 was spent.[4] The collapse of the Riccardi bankers in 1294, who had previously lent money to Edward, made the burden on his subjects all the more acute.[5] Subsidies, including the unprecedented moiety of 1294, were required annually; purveyance was extended to supply the armies; wool was seized and the maltolt imposed. Many people must have been

1. M. C. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance under Edward I (London, 1972), pp. 170-1.

2. J. G. Edwards, 'Edward I's Castle Building in Wales', Proceedings of the British Academy, xxxii (1946), 62.

3. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 178; J. H. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution (Oxford, 1908), p. 539.

4. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 175.

5. ibid., pp. 207-8; R. W. Kaeuper, 'Royal Finance and the Crisis of 1297', Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer, ed. W. C. Jordan, B. McNab and T. F. Ruiz (Princeton, 1976), pp. 107-8.

reduced to desperate circumstances by the king's demands. Few people had much surplus cash, and often goods would have to be sold to meet the government's demands for money. For example, in 1294 the monks of Dunstable were unable to pay their share of the moiety without farming tithes and selling corrodies worth about 100 marks.[1] Ramsay abbey was also placed in severe financial difficulties, and abbot Sawtrey had to borrow money to raise £1,000 for the papal tenths of 1301.[2] The Song of the Husbandman written at about this time complains that it was even necessary to sell seed in order to pay the king's taxes, so that the land had to lie fallow.[3] At a time when many people lived close to the subsistence level, such extra burdens could be disastrous. Purveyance had consequences equally as harsh as those arising from direct taxation. The government did not pay the market price for the goods it took, often delayed payment, and after 1296 was very lax about paying for them at all.[4] A petition of 1304 asked for payment for prises, including some taken before 1297.[5] Goods were taken without assessment, and must often have included items essential for the continued well-being of those concerned. If a peasant lost his cart or his oxen it could ruin his whole livlihood. The Lincolnshire assize roll of 1298 contains a case concerning a man who was left with insufficient food for himself after the

1. Dunstable, pp. 387-8.

2. Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis, ed. W. D. Macray (Rolls Series, 1886), pp. 379, 380-1, 393, 399-400. Other examples are given by Prestwich, op.cit., pp. 193-4.

3. Political Songs, p. 152.

4. D. Beddoe, 'Some Financial and Political Aspects of the Constitutional Crisis of 1297' (Univ. of Wales, Ph.D. thesis, 1969), p. 69 and passim.

5. M. C. Prestwich, 'Edward I's Wars and their Financing, 1294-1307' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1968), p. 209.

purveyors had been,[1] and on several occasions Edward intervened to protect growing corn and sustenance.[2] The husbandman in the Song complained that his cattle had been taken, and attributed the growth in the number of beggars to such policies.[3] The corruption of many officials merely made the system more arbitrary and oppressive in its application. Under such circumstances it was necessity as much as conviction which led the government to appeal for help from the shires and to spread its appeal beyond the knightly classes.[4]

Edward's subjects not only had to pay for his wars, but also had to fight in his armies. The knightly and baronial classes were probably better able to absorb the demands of taxation than the peasantry, but the obligation to fight in the king's army fell equally upon them. Precise information about the size of the armies before 1272 is hard to find, but there is sufficient information to point to the growing burden of military service at the end of the century. The researches of R. F. Walker into Henry III's Welsh wars suggest that his cavalry usually numbered between 450 and 600.[5] The 1245 campaign was the most ambitious, and in that year there was probably a cavalry force of about 660,[6] while in October 1229

1. A Lincolnshire Assize Roll for 1298, ed. W. S. Thomson (Lincoln Record Society, xxxvi, 1944), no. 241, cited Prestwich, 'Edward I's Wars', p. 208.

2. Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 139.

3. Political Songs, p. 152.

4. For the burdens of war in general see J. R. Maddicott, The English Peasantry and the Demands of the Crown, 1294-1341 (Past and Present, Supp. 1, 1975).

5. Walker, 'Anglo-Welsh Wars', pp. 169, 182, 231, 275, 340, 510, 666.

6. ibid., p. 510.

a cavalry force of about 600 collected at Portsmouth ready to go to Brittany.[1] Distraint of knighthood was practised from the beginning of his reign, but there are indications that the pressure to become a knight was not considerable. By the 1250s the alternative of paying a fine suggests that it has become as much a financial as a military device.[2] Edward's cavalry forces were however much larger. Walker estimates that on his 1277 expedition there were 650 cavalry, apart from the household troops, while J. E. Morris put the figure higher at 850 cavalry together with a further 150 household troops.[3] About 1,000 cavalry went to Wales in 1294,[4] while there were about 3,000 cavalry on the Falkirk campaign in 1298, probably the largest cavalry force Edward ever assembled.[5] Distraint of knighthood continued to be practised, but the option of a fine was not so readily available, and it seems clear that Edward was practising distraint largely for military reasons.[6] The shortage of war horses in 1282 may well have been because of the growth in the size of the cavalry.[7]

1. I. J. Sanders, Feudal Military Service in England (Oxford, 1956), p. 121.

2. M. Powicke, Military Obligations in Medieval England (Oxford, 1962), pp. 71-80, 103.

3. Walker, 'Anglo-Welsh Wars', p. 510; J. E. Morris, The Welsh Wars of Edward I (Oxford, 1901), p. 65. The discrepancy shows how cautiously these figures must be treated.

4. Morris, op.cit., p. 247.

5. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 91.

6. Powicke, Military Obligations, pp. 103-12.

7. ibid., p. 108.

There are unfortunately no figures to indicate the size of Henry III's infantry. Walker has suggested that Henry had 6-10,000 infantry in Wales in 1245, but this was little more than an informed guess unsupported by firm evidence.[1] Edward's infantry were however much larger, for during his Welsh wars new tactics were developed which greatly enhanced their value.[2] In the 1290s the size of his infantry forces reached such colossal dimensions as Edward sought to crush his enemies by sheer weight of numbers that he was compelled to pardon criminals who would fight in his armies. In 1277 there were about 15,000 infantry in Edward's army in Wales at any one time, and similar numbers in the following two Welsh campaigns. Yet in November 1294 there were probably over 31,000 infantry serving, while a further 16,000 gathered at Chester in the following month.[3] On the Scottish campaigns of 1296 and 1298 about 25,000 infantry were assembled, and it was not until the end of the reign that the government ceased to summon such large numbers.[4] The unattractive rate of pay[5] and the frequency of the campaigns must have made service in Edward's armies a real burden for many people, and not only for those who had to serve. It has been estimated that about five per cent of the adult male population would have been involved in the 1298 campaign, and since the army was recruited from those areas

1. Walker, 'Anglo-Welsh Wars', p. 511.
2. Powicke, Military Obligations, p. 121.
3. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 92-3.
4. ibid., pp. 94-5.
5. J. R. Strayer, 'The Costs and Profits of War: The Anglo-French Conflict of 1294-1303', The Medieval City, ed. H. A. Miskimin, D. Herlihy and A. L. Udovitch (New Haven, 1977), p. 279.

nearest to the fighting this would involve a real drain on the manpower of some communities.[1] Understandably a number were anxious to pay bribes to avoid military service. It is therefore not really surprising that Edward's reign should have seen the rapid growth of royal propaganda as the government sought to secure the co-operation of the king's subjects in the war effort.

1. Prestwich, 'Edward I's Wars', p. 149.

Chapter 4

EDWARD I AND WALES

In the thirteenth century Wales still lacked real political unity. There was certainly a geographical conception of Wales, but authority was still divided amongst a number of lords, each owing homage to the king of England. When Edward I came to the throne in 1272 Wales was dominated by prince Llywelyn, the ruler of Gwynedd in the north of Wales. By the treaty of Montgomery in 1267 he had become the overlord of the Welsh rulers and performed homage to the king on their behalf. This meant that when Llywelyn refused to perform the homage he owed to Edward, Edward had little choice but to launch his first expedition against Wales in 1277. This was a quick campaign, for Edward was able to blockade Llywelyn in Snowdonia and starve him into submission. The prince's authority in Wales was vastly curtailed, and Edward retained the lands he had conquered. Five years of peace followed until 1282 when Llywelyn's brother, David, led a revolt against English domination of Wales in which he was soon joined by Llywelyn. This was the longest and most expensive of Edward's Welsh campaigns. It led to the death of prince Llywelyn in 1282 and the capture and execution of David in 1283, marking the end of the rule of the Welsh princes. In 1284 the Statute of Wales

formally annexed Wales to the English crown. There were two further expeditions to Wales during Edward's reign, both to put down revolts against English rule. The first in 1287-8 was a relatively minor affair, a personal revolt led by Rhys ap Maredudd. The second was more serious, for it involved the whole of Wales and occurred in 1294-5 when Edward was preparing an expedition to Gascony. At the last minute men and resources had to be diverted to deal with the Welsh rising, but following the successful conclusion of this campaign Wales was quiet for the remainder of the reign.

Centuries of warfare between the English and the Welsh meant the English had a very low opinion of their Welsh neighbours. They regarded them as an inferior race and as members of a wild, barbaric civilization whose morals left much to be desired. For example, the author of the Gesta Stephani wrote that Wales 'breeds men of an animal type.....accustomed to war, volatile always in breaking their word as in changing their abodes'.[1] Similarly, John of Salisbury wrote that they were 'ignorant of divine law and the institutions of the church. This people are rude and untamed, they live like animals and despise the word of life; they nominally confess Christ but deny him in their life and customs'.[2] Gerald of Wales complained that they lived by 'plunder, theft and brigandage', and that they indulged in incest and trial marriages, and

1. Gesta Stephani, ed. K. R. Potter (2nd edition, Oxford, 1976), p. 15.

2. The Letters of John of Salisbury, ed. W. J. Millor and H. E. Butler, i (London, 1955), no. 87, cited by R. J. Bartlett,'Gerald of Wales' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978), p. 269.

allowed illegitimate children to inherit.[1] Despite the intermingling of races in Wales and in particular in the Marches, such prejudices were still strong in the thirteenth century. Wendover wrote that in 1231 the Welsh burst from their hiding places like shrews from their caves and that Llywelyn spared neither churches nor children and burnt them with the noble women and their daughters who had fled to the churches for peace and safety.[2] In 1232 the Tewkesbury chronicler claimed that Llywelyn broke the truce as was his wont, while Paris wrote that in 1245 the Welsh came rushing forth like bees from their hiding places to burn and kill, particularly by night.[3] There were some Welshmen who were prepared to enter the service of Englishmen[4] or serve in English armies, but on the whole the two races still kept themselves apart.[5] In the Welsh Marches administration and law were conducted along racial lines. Often tenants were classified as Welsh or English for the purpose of collecting rent or exacting labour services, and sometimes separate officials were appointed

1. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, vi, ed. J. F. Dimock (Rolls Series, 1868), pp. 207, 213-4, cited by Bartlett, op.cit., pp. 265, 269. For other examples and for general discussions of attitudes towards the Welsh and other outlying societies see Bartlett, op.cit., esp. pp. 253-275; R. R. Davies, 'Race Relations in Post-Conquest Wales: Confrontation and Compromise', Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (1974-5), 33-39; W. R. Jones, 'England against the Celtic Fringe: A Study in Cultural Stereotypes', Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, xiii (1971), 155-171; and E. D. Snyder, 'The Wild Irish: A Study of some English Satires against the Irish, Scots and Welsh', Modern Philology, xvii (1919-20), 687-725.

2. Wendover, iii.10.

3. Tewkesbury, p. 88; Paris, iv.385.

4. G. Roberts, 'Wales and England: Antipathy and Sympathy, 1282-1485', Welsh Historical Review, i (1960-3), 375-96; R. R. Davies, Lordship and Society in the March of Wales, 1282-1400 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 315-6.

5. The following is derived from Davies, op.cit., pp. 302-18.

to deal with the Welsh and English within a single lordship. The English were the more privileged race,being privileged at law and holding most of the key posts, and as a result tended to regard Welshmen as inferior. Englishmen were anxious not to be identified with them,[1] and in 1359 the argument was even advanced in court that it was tantamount to defamation to call someone Welsh when he was not.[2]

Edward's expeditions into Wales helped to maintain such prejudices. For example the Flores Historiarum said that in 1287 the Welsh committed atrocities 'according to their ancient custom', while Cotton accused them of being 'versed in sedition' in 1294. Langtoft, writing of their revolt in that year, cursed Wales because 'it has always been full of treason: may Wales be sunk deep to the devil for there was never any truth in it'.[3] Archbishop Peckham, who was inspired by a zeal for religious and moral purity, was particularly shocked by what he found in Wales. He claimed that the Welsh were crueller than the Saracens, because when the Saracens took prisoners they kept them for ransom, whereas the Welsh killed them, or, even worse, received a ransom before killing them. He thought they were a savage and malicious people, who knew little good, and whose evil nature arose from their idleness.[4] An anonymous chronicler, who was possibly in the archbishop's entourage when he visited Wales and who certainly shared his ideas, criticized their lax moral standards and their brutal nature, complaining

1. ibid., p. 2.
2. ibid., p. 316.
3. Flores Historiarum, iii.66; Cotton, p. 253; Langtoft, ii.220.
4. Reg. Peckham, ii.436, iii.776.

that they believed they were not doing any good unless they were indulging in drunkenness, carnal pleasures, murder, arson or plunder, and that they stole their food rather than cultivate the ground. He explained that it was only the piety of the English kings, who pardoned the Welsh when they pretended to be penitent, which had prevented all memory of this repugnant race being eradicated long ago.[1]

Henry III had occasionally drawn upon such attitudes in his writs, but Edward deliberately exploited them in order to build up wider support for his Welsh wars: the more he stressed the threat posed by the Welsh the easier it was to present his wars as in the national interest. His first Welsh war in 1277 was, however, more conventional in its approach. Since it did not involve large numbers of infantry and was of short duration and at relatively small cost, Edward did not yet feel the need to impress his requirements so forcefully upon his subjects.

The decision to declare war against Llywelyn was taken at a council meeting on 12th November 1276, probably held at the end of an ordinary session of parliament. Widespread publicity does not seem to have been an important consideration. Parliament had met after Michaelmas, and the routine judicial work would have been virtually completed and most of the suitors and others involved departed for home by mid-November. Those who were present at the meeting, who included the archbishop of

1. This brief, but incomplete, chronicle of the Welsh wars is preserved on two pieces of parchment, possibly originally forming one membrane, now in Cant. D. & C., Sede Vacante Scrap Book III, no. 483, pp. 169-70. It is printed in H.M.C., Various Collections, i (1901), 246-50. Poole, ibid., p. 246, considered that it was written by one of Peckham's chaplains; D. L. Douie, Archbishop Peckham (Oxford, 1952), p. 252, suggests the author was a royal clerk.

Canterbury, six bishops, four abbots and the prior of the Hospitallers, eight earls, seventeen knights and other unnamed magnates of the council, justices and faithful, seem to have been drawn largely from amongst the king's counsellors and advisers, suggesting that this was not one of those larger assumblies held later in the reign in the interests of publicity. At this council meeting Edward explained his reasons for going to war. A memorandum survives recording that Llywelyn had been summoned on several occasions to perform the homage he owed, but that each time he had refused with less and less acceptable excuses. Such a refusal of homage was in violation of Llywelyn's oath and showed contempt for the king. Only at the end of the memorandum was it added that Llywelyn was raiding in the Marches and causing much damage there.[1] This was therefore a justification which emphasized Llywelyn's fault very much in feudal terms and as such would probably carry more weight with those counsellors who assembled in November 1276 than with the wider public. They agreed that Edward should lead an expedition to Wales in the following summer and preparations were begun. Yet when the writs for the army were issued the following month it is interesting to see how the argument had been modified to make it more appealing. Whereas the emphasis had earlier been placed on Llywelyn's refusal to perform homage, it was now placed upon his raids in the Marches. The sheriffs were required to proclaim that he and his accomplices were rebels who had invaded the lands of the king and his faithful subjects in the Marches and who were daily invading and perpetrating murders and other enormities there. His refusal to perform homage was rather

1. Parl. Writs, p. 5 (no. 1).

glossed over with the phrase 'et idem Lewelinus nobis prout deberet obedire contempsit' tucked away in the middle of the writ.[1] There is here already some awareness that a successful expedition requires more than the support of the leading barons, for the war has been presented in terms which show that more than the king's interests were involved.

There is another interesting document from this war in the collection of correspondence in the P.R.O.,[2] but it is not clear why it was drawn up. It is a statement of the events leading up to the declaration of war with Llywelyn in November 1276 and was clearly compiled not long after the decision to go to war was made. It concentrates upon the historical obligation of Llywelyn and his ancestors to perform homage and fealty to the kings of England and in particular Llywelyn's failure to do so. It concludes by accusing Llywelyn of committing robbery, murder and other crimes against the Holy Church and of refusing to obey either the king or the church. The document's emphasis on Llywelyn's failure to perform his legal obligations probably indicates that it was not drawn up for public consumption, while the concluding remarks about his crimes being against the church, rather than against the king and his subjects, which was more usual in 1276-7, suggest a clerical recipient. It is possible that this letter was sent to the pope, for Edward had already sought to persuade him of the justice of his cause earlier in the year.[3]

1. ibid., pp. 193 (nos. 1, 2), 196 (nos. 4, 5).
2. Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales, ed. J. G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1935), no. lv. 30b.
3. Treaty Rolls, i (1234-1325), ed. P. Chaplais (London, 1955), no. 135.

Although the chroniclers generally do not pay much attention to the war of 1277, probably because it did not involve a considerable national effort, they do nevertheless show an awareness of Edward's arguments that Llywelyn had failed to perform his homage and was committing much damage in the Marches. For example, Wykes explained that Edward sent an expedition to the Marches in January 1277 because Llywelyn had broken his fealty and that his frequent incursions had depopulated the area. The Waverley chronicler said that three hundred knights were sent to restrain the invasions of the Welsh over the English border, and the Dunstable annalist explained that Edward waged war because Llywelyn had withdrawn his homage. The Flores Historiarum similarly described how Llywelyn had refused to perform homage and that a force had to be sent to put down the Welsh risings in the March.[1] Yet although the reasons for the war seem to have been understood and accepted, there is very little sign that its course was followed with any enthusiasm. Few of the chroniclers give anything but the briefest details of the campaign and none express any feelings of delight or approval at its successful outcome. This may be partly explained by the fact that few of the chroniclers came from areas close to Wales or the Welsh Marches, and that therefore they would have had little direct or indirect involvement in the war. The only real sign of interest is provided by two Latin romances, the Historia Meriadoci and the De Ortu Walwanii, which were probably written about 1280. They describe how Arthur starved out Griffinus in Snowden, and

1. Wykes, p. 271; Waverley, p. 387; Dunstable, p. 275; Flores Historiarum, iii.45-6, 47, 48.

use as their model Edward's expedition of 1277 when he starved Llywelyn into surrender in the same area. The author, whose name is unfortunately not known, was probably an Englishman living in the Marches of south Wales, and seems to have written these romances largely as a rhetorical exercise.[1]

Unlike the war of 1277 that of 1282-3 was very much a national effort, and we can see how Edward adapted his propaganda accordingly to show that it involved the whole community of the realm. The Welsh rising which began on 21st March 1282 took Edward completely by surprise, and there was no time for him to hold a council or parliament to consider the need for an expedition. Yet at this early stage it seems that Edward envisaged only a small expedition. At the end of March and beginning of April writs were sent out to the men of the Welsh Marches and to 157 lay tenants, which led to the assembly of some 276 cavalry and 7,000 infantry, a relatively modest force.[2] These writs were couched in similar terms to those of 1277 save that the explanation was more detailed. They claimed that Welsh rebels who hated the king's peace and the tranquillity of the realm had seditiously imprisoned Roger de Clifford and killed some of his men, and were now daily committing plunder, murder, arson and many other enormities in the Welsh Marches.[3] Edward was thus drawing upon the traditional image of the Welsh and arguing that their activities were a threat to the interests of the realm as well as himself.

1. R. S. Loomis, 'The Latin Romances', Arthurian Literature of the Middle Ages, ed. R. S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp.472-9.

2. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, p. 339.

3. Parl. Writs, p. 222 (nos. 1, 2).

Yet at the end of May 1282 further military summonses were issued as Edward began to realize the enormous task which faced him.[1] The shortage of war horses which arose around this time perhaps suggests that distraint of knighthood was being pursued with more than usual vigour, and for military rather than financial reasons.[2] Moreover, as Edward began to make military and financial demands beyond his subject's normal obligations he dwelt increasingly upon the threat posed by the Welsh to the whole realm.[3] For example, in May 1282 a writ was issued ordering the thirty librate landholders to be prepared to serve if they were needed. It explained that the war was for the greater security of the kingdom and the welfare of its inhabitants, and omitted the usual reference to fighting in Wales or the Marches as if such a reference limited the number of people whose interests were involved.[4] Such references were rarely included from now on.

Similar arguments were perhaps expounded by John de Kirkeby, one of Edward's most senior officials, when he visited various towns and monasteries during the summer of 1282 to secure loans. Originally at the beginning of May, it had been planned to send out seven pairs of commissioners to visit the towns all over England.[5] Writs were drawn up reminding the towns that the king's subjects were bound to help him when he needed their

1. ibid., pp. 224-6 (nos. 5-8).

2. Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, pp. 252, 253; see above, p. 151.

3. This emphasis was new, although there were precedents. For an earlier example from 1279 see Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae,ed. D. Wilkins, ii (London, 1737), 40.

4. Parl. Writs, p. 226 (no. 8).

5. Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, p. 220.

assistance and ordering them to listen to what the commissioners told them on the king's behalf. This initial scheme was however cancelled and a new visitation planned, John de Kirkeby being appointed to visit not only all the towns in England, but also all the religious houses and cathedrals.[1] Possibly the realization of the growing seriousness of the situation during May meant that it was felt that this important task should be entrusted to a more senior official, for none of the original commissioners were of the standing of John de Kirkeby. We do not know what arguments he used to justify the request, but possibly he moved away from the argument of the king's need expressed in the earlier commission to that of public necessity which was increasingly used later. Certainly he met with some success for over £16,500 was raised,[2] including some substantial contributions from towns not directly affected by the war. Lincoln, for example, donated 1,016 marks and 2d, Newcastle-on-Tyne 1,758½ marks, Great Yarmouth 1,000 marks and London 6,000 marks.[3] Yet whatever arguments John de Kirkeby used, the Hagnaby chronicler did not seem very impressed, for he tells how Kirkeby took each monastic head on one side and asked how much they were prepared to give, but took no notice of their reply and fixed the sum himself.[4]

The argument of public necessity certainly became more prominent by the end of the year. In November 1282 Luke de Tany

1. Parl. Writs, p. 384 (no. 10). This was supplemented by a further commission in September, ibid., p. 385 (no. 13). Hagnaby, f. 29^{r}, says that Antony Bek visited the northern monasteries.

2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 253.

3. Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, pp. 238, 241-2. For other examples see ibid., pp. 249, 256, and Worcester, p. 487.

4. Hagnaby, f. 29^{r}.

had been decisively defeated by the Welsh after he had crossed over the Menai Straits from Anglesey. The loans raised during the summer were clearly insufficient now that Edward would have to undertake a major campaign in the spring of 1283. Therefore on 24th November writs were sent out for three provincial assemblies to meet the following January, the first such war-time assemblies which Edward had held. The language of these writs shows how much Edward was in need of support in Wales. They explained that Llywelyn and other hostile and rebel Welshmen had often disturbed the peace of the realm and had maliciously begun to rebel anew. The king had already taken steps to suppress them, but now proposed to crush them completely with the advice of the earls and barons and the whole community of the realm, to the peace and perpetual tranquillity of the king and kingdom. It was right, the writs claimed, that king and subjects should undertake this difficult and expensive burden to destroy this evil for the common utility, once and for all. The writs summoning the clergy added that this task was to the honour of God, the magnificence of the king and the perpetual peace and tranquillity of the whole realm and people.[1]

Three provincial assemblies met in January 1283 at Northampton, York and Durham,[2] on a scale probably not seen before. Not only were four knights from each shire and two representatives from each city, burgh and vill summoned, but also all those capable of bearing arms who held twenty or more

1. Parl. Writs, p. 10 (nos. 1, 2).

2. There are no writs extant for the Durham assembly, but a reference in the Welsh Rolls (Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, p. 261) indicates it took place.

librates of land and were not in Wales. The clergy were also summoned, including all the bishops, abbots, priors and other heads of houses and the proctors of each chapter and collegiate church. Clearly Edward was trying to make his military and financial needs as widely understood as possible.

Edward was not able to attend any of the provincial assemblies himself, but his choice of representatives shows how important he considered them to be. To Northampton he sent his cousin Edmund, earl of Cornwall, his treasurer, the abbot of Westminster, and John de Kirkeby, one of his most senior officials. The archbishop of York was sent to the York assembly with Thomas de Normanvill, Edward's escheator beyond the Trent, who was diverted from Durham to replace Edward's original choice, Antony Bek, another senior clerk who was shortly to become bishop of Durham. Henry Newark, the future archbishop of York, attended the Durham meeting alone.[1] Unfortunately we do not know how they presented the king's arguments, but the laity responded with a grant of a thirtieth, and this tax was to be the most productive of the reign after the tax of 1290.[2] However these assemblies were not called simply to grant taxation. An interesting feature is the presence of the twenty-librate landholders. Only those capable of bearing arms were to come, but since they were not required to come armed as was usual in a military summons, they were not simply attending a military muster. It has been suggested that the intention was to commute

1. Parl. Writs, p. 11 (no. 4); Cal.Various Chancery Rolls, pp. 261, 263-4.

2. See the table compiled by J. F. Hadwin, 'Medieval Lay Subsidies and Economic History', Economic History Review, 2nd series, xxxvi (1983), 216.

their military obligation into a monetary payment.[1] But some sort of military arrangements were certainly made at the York assembly, for on 1st February Thomas de Normanvill and Henry de Newark were appointed to dispose of the services granted by the knights, free men, communities and others at that assembly and to receive fines where necessary.[2] Moreover some may have served, for in 1285 Edward raised the qualification for knighthood to £100 in return for the free and gratuitous service given in Wales.[3] It seems that Edward had decided to take advantage of the assemblies to win support for a major campaign in the spring of 1283, for the service of the twenty-librate landholders, or its commutation, would have represented a considerable extension of the customary military obligations. These assemblies are thus an indication that Edward was beginning to realize how parliament could be used for the purposes of publicity and to prepare public opinion for a particular undertaking. It is possible that the treaty of Conway of 1277 was produced at the assemblies to demonstrate how the Welsh were in the wrong. This was certainly a well known document for it was either entered in full or summarized in a number of chronicles.[4] There is no firm evidence to connect the document with the assemblies of January 1283, but the lack of interest displayed in 1277 makes it unlikely that the treaty would have been circulated so widely then.

1. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 83; Powicke, Military Obligation, p. 109.
2. Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, p. 263.
3. Powicke, Military Obligation, p. 109.
4. For the texts of the treaty see below, pp. 401-2.

Although the laity were prepared to co-operate on this occasion, the clergy refused to help the war effort, even though archbishop Peckham gave his support to Edward's cause. He had urged the clergy to attend the assembly despite the condition of the roads and the weather at that time of the year,[1] and following the failure of the assembly ordered the clergy to attend a further convocation in May where affairs could be arranged 'to the honour of the church, the relief of the king and the peace of the realm'.[2] He later declared that the war had been fought because of public necessity, although this was in a letter seeking compensation from Edward for the war damage suffered by the church.[3] Yet his various statements on the war do suggest that he had no doubt about the justice of Edward's cause and that an English victory would benefit the Welsh church and people.[4]

The southern clergy refused an aid in January 1283 because they were already overburdened with taxation and because they felt the writ of summons had been irregular. As a result attendance at the assembly was poor, so that the question was postponed until a more properly constituted assembly could meet in May 1283.[5] Until then Edward turned to a more readily available source, the crusading tithe, which was deposited in churches and monasteries throughout the realm and amounted to about £40,000.[6] In the early months of 1283 royal officials

1. Reg. Peckham, ii.487.

2. ibid., ii.509.

3. Littere Wallie, ed. J. G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1940), no. 214; Foedera, p. 643.

4. Douie, Archbishop Peckham, pp. 235, 238-9, 248-51.

5. Councils and Synods, ii.940; Chronicon Petroburgense, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Society, old series, xlvii, 1849), pp. 59-60.

6. F. M. Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307 (2nd edition, Oxford, 1962), p. 506.

were despatched to seize the tithe, Edward justifying their actions to the church at some considerable length. He declared that it was a royal edict which was required for the utility of the respublica, for although Llywelyn, prince of Wales, had recently been killed, his brother David had taken upon himself the name of prince and continued the war. He had forgotten how Edward had received him as an exile from Wales and had supported him from his own lands as a mother would her own child, holding him amongst the maiores and superiores of his palace. He was now fighting, adding evil upon evil, murder upon murder, robbery upon robbery, sparing neither sacred nor other places, nor person, rank nor sex. Furthermore Edward was afraid that David or his accomplices might take the crusading tithe which was kept in insecure places to the detriment of king and respublica. Therefore he ordered it to be handed over to be kept for safekeeping, and in order to allay suspicions that it would be spent without restitution, he would provide letters patent that it would be restored if it were necessary to spend it on the defence, salvation and security of the church, realm and respublica.[1] No doubt he hoped that such arguments, which drew upon the popular image of the Welsh and emphasized the public benefit to be derived from the wars, would not only enable him to make use of the crusading tithe, but also help him to influence the clerical assembly which was to meet in May. However the argument that the Welsh threatened the safety of the

1. This letter does not survive in its original form, but is incorporated into a letter ordering the restitution of the tithe: Liber Epistolaris of Richard de Bury, ed. N. Denholm-Young (Roxburghe Club, 1950), no. 68. For an example of the letters patent issued, which contain similar arguments, see Durham Dean and Chapter Muniments, Cart. III, ff. 221^{v}-222^{r}. This is dated 24th February, although Reg. Peckham, ii.548, dates the seizure as 28th March, which is confirmed by Worcester, p. 486.

tithe was rather remarkable when addressed to houses as far away as Durham. In the event Edward was unsuccessful. The clergy regarded the seizure as despoliation and Peckham urged the excommunication of the despoilers,[1] an attitude which would not have helped Edward when the clerical assembly met in May. By then the military crisis of December 1282 had anyway all but passed away, and the replies of the clergy to Edward's request show that despite his claims they felt that there was no longer a national emergency which obliged them to make a contribution. They complained that they were too poor, that they were forbidden to give money which would be used for the spilling of Christian blood, and that money could only be given if the king were besieged, imprisoned or in some other way detained, or if the archbishop and clergy felt that there was such necessity that the common purse could not meet it.[2] None of these circumstances was felt to apply and therefore no aid could be given.

Nevertheless a third assembly was held in October 1283, and on this occasion the province of Canterbury was prevailed upon to grant a twentieth for three years.[3] Although Edward had ordered the restitution of the crusading tithe around the end of September,[4] it is rather surprising that this grant was made. David had by now been captured and executed so that there was even less of a case to be made for a national emergency. Yet some indication of Edward's arguments may perhaps be contained in a letter he sent subsequently to

1. Reg. Peckham, ii.548.

2. Chronicon Petroburgense, pp. 62-3; Dunstable, pp. 295-6.

3. It seems the northern convocation only gave a promise of aid which was still unfulfilled in 1286: Foedera, p. 673.

4. A letter in Reg. Peckham, ii.635-9, dated 29th November, says that the order was made two months before.

archbishop Peckham complaining that the first instalment of the tax had not been paid to the New Temple on 11th November as arranged.[1] He reminded the archbishop that his predecessors had on many occasions put down Welsh risings, but that the snake had remained lurking in the grass, and the scars of the wounds inflicted had become putrified and if they had not been bound up would have penetrated fatally to the heart of the kingdom. But now God had not only alleviated the condition, but also had cut away the putrifaction, completely extinguished the poison and cured the disease, bringing peace to the king and the whole realm. Now it was necessary to pay off the multitude of debts which had been incurred, and also to strengthen and maintain the formerly rebellious parts, and therefore a clerical grant had been sought. Edward's purpose was to remind the clergy that expenditure could not cease immediately the danger had passed and that much work remained to be done if the peace was to be secured and the Welsh prevented from rising again as in the past. This threat of renewed rebellion would not be lost upon people who regarded the Welsh as a naturally rebellious and warlike race. It may indeed have been successful, for the same letter was reissued in January 1285 to assist the collection of the clerical grant.[2]

Well before the clergy made their grant of taxation in October 1283 the Welsh war had been effectively ended when David

1. Liber Epistolaris, no. 506. This letter is undated, but it must be after 11th November and before 17th April 1284, the new date set for payment of the first instalment of the tax.

2. Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88, 350-1; Reg. Pontissara, ii.443-4. P.R.O. SC1/12/172A is a draft. Similar arguments were put forward in a letter to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer requesting their assistance in the collection of the clerical twentieth in January 1285: SC1/12/172.

was captured on 21st June. A week later Edward sent out writs for a parliament to meet in September at Shrewsbury for what amounted to a celebration of his triumph. This was an assembly of some size, for Edward summoned eleven earls and over one hundred other individuals, together with two representatives from each shire and from twenty-one towns.[1] Ostensibly the purpose was to discuss the fate of David ap Gruffydd, yet the majority of those who attended would have been there simply to witness David's trial and execution. There is no good reason why Edward should want so many witnesses except to share in his triumph. No further requests for taxation from the laity were to be made, while the clergy who had yet to make their grant were not summoned to Shrewsbury. Nor was the execution of David such a contentious issue that Edward needed to prepare public opinion with care. The celebratory character of the assembly is indicated by the writ of summons which dwelt upon the evils committed by the Welsh as if to highlight the extent of Edward's achievement:

> 'It is scarcely possible for the human tongue to relate truthfully and in detail with how many kinds of fraud and evil the Welsh have, like foxes, invaded our predecessors, us and our kingdom from time immemorial; how many noble magnates and others both English and foreign, how many young men and old, women and even children they have killed; how many castles and manors belonging to us and others they have burned; and how many times they have disturbed God and man and invaded our realm.'

The writ then continued to relate how Llywelyn and David had broken their oath of fealty and had treacherously burnt

1. Parl. Writs, pp. 15-16 (nos. 20-23).

villages, killed the king's men, burnt and imprisoned others and attacked the king's castles with the spilling of innocent blood.

Parliament assembled on 30th September 1283, and no doubt most of those summoned were still present when David was executed two days later on 2nd October.[1] It was a particularly brutal execution, for he was first drawn by horses through Shrewsbury to the place of execution, where he was hanged before being beheaded. His body was then quartered and his heart and entrails taken out and burned. Each part of this execution was symbolic of one of David's crimes. He was drawn for treason, hanged for murder, disembowelled for his sacrilege in attacking the church and making war at Passiontide, and dismembered because he had plotted the king's death.[2] The symbolism was presumably pointed out at the trial and it is recorded by several chroniclers, although they do not always agree on the specific details.[3] Following his execution the different parts of his body were dispersed over the country. The Londoners who had been present took David's head back with them and set it up next to Llywelyn's on the Tower.[4] Lincoln was intended to have one of the limbs, but had to pay a fine to

1. The execution was carried out by Geoffrey de Salop, who received 20s. for his labour: P.R.O. E101/351/9, m. 10.

2. J. G. Bellamy, The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1970), p. 26.

3. The Hagnaby chronicler, f.30^{r-v}, puts this judgement into the mouth of the presiding judge, John de Vallibus, variously called John de Vaux (Bury St. Edmunds, p. 78) and John de Waus (Northampton, f.33^{r}). The connection is also pointed out by Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 78-9, Dunstable, pp. 293-4, Lanercost, p. 113, Register and Chronicle of the Abbey of Aberconway, ed. H. Ellis (Camden Society, Miscellany i, old series, xxxix, 1847), p. 12.

4. Wykes, p. 294.

placate the king when it refused.[1] However Winchester secured David's right hand side after a quarrel with York, the remaining limbs being sent to York, Bristol and Northampton.[2] The purpose of this rather macabre display was no doubt to allow as many people as possible to share in Edward's triumph.

This was not the first time Edward had used such a display for public effect, for when Llywelyn was killed in December 1282 Edward had sent his head to the army on Anglesey. It was only a month after the disastrous attempt of Luke de Tany to cross the Menai Straits and morale cannot have been high. From Anglesey Llywelyn's head was taken to London by Edmund, earl of Lancaster, and Roger de Mortimer, and on 22nd December it was met by the Londoners blowing trumpets and horns. It was placed on the end of a lance and conducted through the middle of Westcheap to the pillory, where it remained until sunset before being placed on view at the Tower. The Londoners did not lose this opportunity to mock the dead Welshman, for his head was placed in a silver cloth as a sign that he was a prince, and crowned with ivy to fulfil the prophecy that a Welshman would come to London wearing a crown.[3] The author of the Annales Londonienses declared that whatever the Welsh should have achieved according to the prophecies had now been achieved by Edward.[4] Further executions were carried out on several other

1. Hagnaby, f.30^{v}.

2. Chronica Oxenedes, p. 262, says Chester instead of Bristol.

3. Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 75-6, Flores Historiarum, iii.56-7, Annales Londonienses, p. 90, and Wykes, p. 291. Guisborough, p. 221, says that Llywelyn believed a prophecy that he would ride through the middle of Westcheap, but Guisborough is perhaps embellishing the story with the advantage of hindsight.

4. Annales Londonienses, p. 91.

occasions during the Welsh wars, but without the publicity which surrounded David's death. In 1283 David's steward, Mabadinda, was drawn and hanged at the same time as his master, but the fate of his body is not known.[1] In 1292 Rhys ap Maredudd, who had been at large since his rebellion in 1287, was finally captured and brought to the king at York where he was drawn and hanged on 3rd June. His body was left hanging for three days, and the Hagnaby chronicle adds that it was then quartered and the four parts sent to different towns, although this is not mentioned in the judgement recorded on the close rolls.[2] Madoc ap Llywelyn, who led the revolt of 1294, was spared this fate and sent to the Tower after he had surrendered in July 1295, but another leader, Conan, and two of his subordinates were drawn and hanged at Hereford in September of that year.[3]

The Shrewsbury parliament and the execution of David was not the only celebration of Edward's conquest of Wales. In 1284 during his tour of the principality he held a round table at Nefyn.[4] Although we have few details of the festivities, it is possible that Edward was deliberately imitating king Arthur who, after subjecting Gaul to his power, returned to Britain and celebrated his victory with festivities at Caerleon.[5] Edward's celebration was certainly spectacular, for the Dunstable chronicler tells how a great number of Englishmen and

1. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 79; Hagnaby, f.30^{v}.

2. Lanercost, p. 145; Hagnaby, f.33^{v}; Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96, 267; Bellamy, The Law of Treason, p. 30.

3. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, p. 414; Flores Historiarum, iii.91; Worcester, p. 522.

4. Waverley, p. 402; Dunstable, p. 313.

5. Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia Regum Britannie, ed. A. Griscom (London, 1929), pp. 451-458.

foreigners assembled at Nefyn and that Edward spent large sums of money.[1] Some idea of the scale of the festivities may be gained from a writ sent to the chamberlain of Caernarvon ordering him to allow the sheriff £12 13s. 4d. for forty quarters of wheat and 26s. 8d. for the construction of two ovens on the occasion of those celebrations.[2] The celebrations culminated in the following year when Edward made his triumphal return to London, going in procession from the Tower of London to Westminster with the queen, the archbishop of Canterbury, fourteen bishops and a large number of clergy all dressed in their clerical vestments, and the magnates.[3] The archbishop led the procession bearing the 'Crosnaith', the piece of the true cross encrusted in gold and jewels which had belonged to the Welsh princes and was the most highly prized of the relics brought from Wales which were now taken to Westminster. The regalia of the Welsh princes had already been brought to Westminster on an earlier occasion by Edward's son,Alfonso, and offered to the shrine of St. Edward.[4] When the procession reached Westminster, the 'Crosnaith' was placed on the high altar, presumably during a service of thanks-giving for victory in Wales.[5] As Parliament was about to begin[6]

1. Dunstable, p. 313.

2. Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, p. 293.

3. Details are given by Chronicon Petroburgense, p. 102, Bury St. Edmunds, p. 85, Dunstable, p. 317, Flores Historiarum, iii.63, Cotton, p. 166, Waverley, p. 402, Lanercost, p. 112.

4. Flores Historiarum, iii.61.

5. The Annales Londonienses, pp.93-4, say that Edward then went with the magnates and bishops to present the Crosnaith to the nuns of St. Helens, but this is contradicted by exchequer records which suggest the cross remained in the royal chapel: for example, see P.R.O. E101/361/15, f.5^{v}; E101/356/1, m. 1. In 1361 it was preserved in the privy wardrobe: T. F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, iv (Manchester, 1937), 469n.

6. Parliament began on 4th May: Handbook of British Chronology, ed. F. M. Powicke and E. B. Fryde (Royal Historical Society, Guides and Handbooks, ii, 2nd edition, 1961), p.508.

large numbers of people would have been present to see this celebration, and the city joined in, receiving Edward with great jubilation and exultation.[1]

The offering of the Welsh regalia and relics at Westminster helped to underline the passing of the power of the Welsh princes and its assumption by Edward. This was important, for the Welsh were very conscious of their British origins and believed in prophecies that one day the English would be expelled and that a British kingdom would be restored to the whole island as in the days of Brutus. The Song of the Welsh, originally written in Welsh sometime during the thirteenth century, contains such a prophecy and looked forward to the time when a new Arthur would restore the supremacy of the Welsh people.[2] Furthermore the drowning of Luke de Tany and his followers as they were attempting to cross the Menai Straits in 1282 was interpreted by the Welsh as a sign that Llywelyn would soon be crowned with the crown of Brutus in fulfilment of Merlin's prophecy.[3] There was also a belief in Wales that Arthur was still alive and would one day return to lead his people to victory over the English, a belief which had declined since the discovery of Arthur's tomb at Glastonbury in 1191, but which nevertheless persisted.[4] Such

1. Oseney, p. 300; Wykes, p. 300; Lanercost, p. 112; Liber Bernewelle, p. 62.

2. The Latin version is printed in Political Songs, pp. 56-8. P. Zumthor, Merlin le Prophète (Lausanne, 1943), p. 60, suggests that the poem was written around 1282 and that the Latin version is a fourteenth century translation. However the reference in the poem to the fall of a large number of English in mutual slaughter suggests a date not long after 1215-6 or 1263-5.

3. Flores Historiarum, iii.57.

4. E. K. Chambers, Arthur of Britain (London, 1927), p. 123; R. S. Loomis, 'The Legend of Arthur's Survival', Arthurian Literature, pp. 64-71, esp. 66-7.

beliefs and prophecies had a strong influence in Wales, for late in the twelfth century Gerald of Wales complained at the credulity of his fellow countrymen who put such a strong trust in them.[1] Similarly the author of the Vita Edwardi Secundi, writing in about 1325, explained that the Welsh rose in revolt so often because they were trying to fulfil the prophecy of Merlin that they would one day recover England.[2] Yet even Langtoft confessed that he did not know whether Arthur was dead or not, while the Lanercost chronicler recorded a supposed meeting between Arthur and Peter des Roches in 1216.[3] It was partly for this reason that Edward had removed the Welsh regalia, some of which was said to have belonged to Arthur,[4] to Westminster, for this not only magnified Edward's position in the eyes of his English subjects, but also showed that he and not the Welsh people was the true inheritor of the rights and powers of Arthur and the British kings. This succession of power was perhaps further underlined in 1301, for the regalia may have been used to crown Edward's son as prince of Wales.[5]

Edward's confiscation of the Welsh regalia was not the

1. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, vi.216.

2. Vita Edwardi Secundi, ed. N. Denholm-Young (London, 1957), p.69.

3. Langtoft, i.224; Lanercost, p. 23. Both examples are cited by Loomis, 'Arthur's Survival', pp. 64, 70.

4. Flores Historiarum, iii.61; Lanercost, p. 112.

5. In 1343 the Black Prince was invested according to custom with a coronet, gold ring and silver wand. The fact that this was by custom suggests that prince Edward and possibly Llywelyn had been similarly invested: J. G. Edwards, The Principality of Wales, 1267-1967: A Study in Constitutional History (Denbigh, 1967), p. 11.

only way in which he sought to undermine Welsh prophecies. It is perhaps significant that he went to Glastonbury to re-open the tomb of Arthur shortly after returning from his first Welsh expedition, for he may possibly have encountered stories in Wales of Arthur's survival which he wished to put to rest. Adam de Domerham wrote a fairly detailed account of this exhumation.[1] It took place at Easter 1278, and there was presumably a fairly large gathering at Glastonbury to celebrate the festival with the king. On the Tuesday after Easter the tombs of Arthur and Guinevere were opened and their bones were revealed and left exposed overnight, perhaps to allow as many people as possible to see them. Then they were wrapped up in precious cloths and placed in a new tomb before the high altar, some bones being retained 'propter populi devocionem'. This ceremony did more than prove that stories of Arthur's survival and return were groundless: it also sought to show that Edward was Arthur's true successor, for he did not treat Arthur as the ruler of an enemy race, but instead venerated him, taking some of his bones as relics and placing him and his queen before the high altar between the tombs of Edward the Elder and Edmund Ironside.[2] By associating himself with Arthur in this way Edward wished to show that Arthur's powers as king of Britain had devolved not upon the Welsh people, but upon himself. It was perhaps for this reason that later in 1278 Edward also persuaded the king of Scotland to renew his homage. He had performed homage for his lands in England at Edward's

1. Adami de Domerham Historia de Rebus Gestis Glastoniensibus, ii, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1727), 588-9.

2. Itinerary of John Leland, ed. L. Toulmin Smith, i (London, 1957), 288.

coronation in 1274, but now performed an unrestricted homage, declaring himself the liege man of Edward against all men.[1] A number of chroniclers notice the translation of Arthur, including the Worcester chronicler who said 'quamquam causa a pluribus ignoretur'.[2] The point might not have been quite so lost on the Welsh.

Edward also associated himself with his British predecessors in other ways. The choice of Caernarvon as the centre of his government in Wales was a symbolic step, for not only was it the ancient centre of Gwynedd, but it was also a former Roman city, Segontium.[3] How much of the city was still evident in the thirteenth century is not known, but it was certainly remembered as the city founded by a former ruler of Britain, the emperor Constantine, whom Nennius recorded as being buried there. In 1284 the supposed body of Constantine's father was also found at Caernarvon, and Edward had him buried in Caernarvon church.[4]

The castle which Edward built at Caernarvon was also highly symbolic. A contemporary romance, the Dream of Macsen Wledig, in the collection of stories known as the Mabinogion, tells how the emperor Magnus Maximus came to Wales.[5] When he

1. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, pp. 322, 323.

2. Worcester, p. 389.

3. The information in this and the following paragraph is based on A. J. Taylor, 'The King's Works in Wales, 1277-1330', History of the King's Works, ed. R. A. Brown, H. M. Colvin and A. J. Taylor, i (London, 1963), 369-70.

4. There is some confusion about who was actually buried. Flores Historiarum, iii.59, reports the burial of 'maximi principis, patris imperatoris Constantini'. Taylor (op.cit., p. 370) has taken maximi as a personal name rather than an adjective and says it was Magnus Maximus who was buried. In fact Magnus Maximus was not emperor until nearly fifty years after Constantine's death, and Constantine's father was Constantius. Waverley, p. 401, adds to the confusion by saying that it was Constantine himself who was buried.

5. The Mabinogion, ed. T. P. Ellis and J. Lloyd (Oxford, 1929), i.133-50.

came to the north he discovered opposite Anglesey, at the mouth of the river Seiont, a great fortified city within which was a mighty castle, the fairest man ever saw, which had great towers of many colours. Edward probably knew of this romance, for the castle he built matched that described there. Its design was most unusual, for its polygonal towers had few precedents in England, while its banded masonry was entirely unknown. There was, however, a precedent for this combination at Constantinople, the city built by Constantine. Presumably Edward believed that the castle discovered by Maximus had been built by Constantine, the founder of Caernarvon, and therefore built his castle in the style of one of Constantine's buildings in order to portray himself as the inheritor of the powers of the British kings.

Edward was supported in his attempts to undermine Welsh pride in their mythical origins by archbishop Peckham, who put forward an ingenious argument to show that the Welsh could not base any claims on their descent from the Britons. In 1282, during their negotiations with the archbishop, the Welsh claimed that the four cantreds belonged to them because they had been held by their forbears since the time of Kamber, the son of Brutus. Peckham replied that not only was it no honour to be descended from the Britons, but also claimed that it did not give them a valid title to their lands. He reminded them that the Britons were descended from the Trojans who had been scattered because they defended the adultery of Paris, the memory of which contagion survived in the Welsh practice of allowing illegitimate children to inherit and in their rejection of holy matrimony. Moreover Brutus had come to England only after consulting the diabolical prophecies of Diana. When he arrived, England was already inhabited by men who

belonged to a race which lived all over northern Europe. Therefore when the Angles and Saxons, who were members of this race, came to England, they were merely seeking to recover what had been taken from them and the Welsh could have no grounds for complaint.[1] Peckham followed this up in 1284 in a letter to the bishops of St. Asaph and Bangor, urging them to teach their people to abandon foolish prophecies and follow Christ and not the idolatrous Brutus who had taken Britain from the forbears of the Saxons.[2] Peckham thus supported Edward's claim that he held the powers of the British kings legitimately, but was perhaps a little too ingenious for Edward's liking in arguing that the British kings were of debased stock and had no legitimate foundation to their power, for Edward liked to associate himself with the British kings as their true successor.

However the archbishop's concern for the spiritual welfare of the Welsh people does reflect Edward's use of religious arguments to justify his conduct during his second Welsh war. It is not particularly surprising that he should make use of such arguments, for the Welsh were traditionally seen as an irreligious race. Moreover since the king was anointed with holy oil and was considered to be God's representative on earth, any opposition to his rule would automatically be regarded as sacrilege. The church confirmed this sentiment in its readiness to pray for the king's success and to excommunicate his enemies.[3]

Edward himself drew attention in his writs to the attacks made by the Welsh upon the church. One of the grounds upon

1. Reg. Peckham, ii.474-5.
2. ibid., ii.741-2.
3. See below, pp. 367-8, 380-4.

which he justified his expedition in 1277 was that Llywelyn was committing grievous damage to the church.[1] In 1283 he posed as the defender of the crusading tithe against the Welsh[2] and accused them of attacking the church, claiming that his expedition would be to the praise and honour of God,[3] and for the defence and salvation of the church.[4] The crimes for which David was executed at the Shrewsbury parliament included that of sacrilege, for he had set fire to churches and made war at Passiontide,[5] and it was for this reason that he was disembowelled. Not only did Edward point to the religious crimes of the Welsh, but he also stressed the implication of this, that his wars were of a holy nature. His armies went to war behind banners bearing the cross and the arms of St. George, and his infantry wore armbands depicting the arms of St. George,[6] giving them the appearance of crusaders. Much ecclesiastical property seems to have been damaged during the course of the wars, but Edward excused this by claiming that canon law allowed princes to wage just wars and that his war had been commonly accepted as just,[7] and moreover arranged that those responsible should be absolved

1. Cal. of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales, no. lv.30b, p. 253.
2. Liber Epistolaris, nos. 68, 513.
3. Parl. Writs, p. 10 (no. 2).
4. Liber Epistolaris, no. 68.
5. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 79; Register and Chronicle of Aberconway, p. 12; Dunstable, p. 294.
6. Payments for such items are recorded in P.R.O. E101/351/9, mm. 2, 3, 9, and E101/3/15, m. 1.
7. Littere Wallie, no. 202, p. 107.

from the excommunication they had incurred.[1] Even Peckham felt that, although the burning of St. Asaph cathedral by the English was lamentable and to the dishonour of the church, he could excuse it as just if St. Asaph had been harbouring Welsh rebels.[2] Perhaps the most remarkable indication that Edward considered he was fighting a holy war comes in a letter he sent to king Alfonso of Castile. He explained that David, a former follower and counsellor of the king and now a traitor, had made war against Edward at Passiontide, the time when Judas had betrayed the Lord. Edward thus compared his former follower with the traitor, Judas, and himself with the betrayed Christ.[3]

Proof that Edward was fighting God's war came in the complete defeat of the Welsh in 1283, and Edward claimed on a number of occasions that his victory was obtained through divine providence. For example, he claimed in his writs that it was through God's will that Llywelyn was killed and David captured, and that the acquisition of the 'Crosnaith' was a sign of God's favour.[4] In his letter of 1284 urging the clergy to hasten their payment of the first instalment of the clerical subsidy, Edward declared that it was God who had

1. Douie, Archbishop Peckham, p. 260.

2. Reg. Peckham, i.367-9.

3. Foedera, p. 606. Guisborough, p. 218, writing in the early fourteenth century, used a similar image, stating that as Herod and Pilate had combined and conspired, so Llywelyn and David rose against Christ and the innocent English.

4. Parl. Writs, p. 15 (no. 20); Liber Epistolaris, no. 68; Cal. Various Chancery Rolls, p. 273.

brought the repeated rebellions of the Welsh to a final end.[1] One of the more explicit statements of the divine approval of Edward's Welsh expeditions occurs in the preamble to the Statute of Wales. This said that amongst other gifts which the kingdom had been worthy to receive, divine providence had caused the land of Wales to be first subjected to the king by feudal oath, and then to be completely annexed and united to the crown.[2] The religious ceremonies held in London in 1285 merely served to underline this point.

Edward's subjects shared his opinion that the Welsh wars were a holy undertaking. The archbishop of Canterbury, who had a low opinion of the Welsh church, believed that Edward's victory fulfilled God's will,[3] while the anonymous Canterbury chronicler presented his account of the wars as the story of God's revenge upon an evil people.[4] The bishop of Worcester believed that it was through the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the two patron saints of Worcester, Oswald and Wulfstan, that victory in Wales was obtained.[5] The Oseney

1. Liber Epistolaris, no. 506.

2. Statutes of the Realm, i (Record Commission, 1810), 55. This is an early example of the belief that England was a holy land which developed later in the reign: see pp. 343-4. A statement similar to that of the Statute of Wales is also contained in a charter of 1285 to Welbeck cited by M. Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis: The Growth of the Welsh Nation (Aberystwyth, 2nd edition,1976), p. 81; cf. Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1257-1300, 284.

3. Reg. Peckham, iii.774.

4. H.M.C. Various Collections, i.247.

5. Worcester Record Office,BA 2648/1 (i), f.184^{r}, calendared in Register of Bishop Godfrey Giffard, 1268-1302, ii, ed. J. W. Willis Bund (Worcester Historical Society, xiv, 1902), 203.

chronicler declared that Llywelyn was killed through God's disposition, while the Flores Historiarum claimed that through God's providence the glory of the Welsh passed to the English.[1]

Edward's concern in 1282-3 to make his needs and achievements more widely known than in previous wars means that it is not really surprising that this war received more attention from the chroniclers. Moreover their interest was roused because of the war's triumphant outcome and because it had involved the community on a greater scale than before. The chroniclers agreed that the Welsh were responsible for the war and constantly referred to them in the course of their accounts as rebels, malefactors, traitors and robbers. The extent to which such an attitude had become ingrained is suggested by a routine document in a register of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, recording the payment of thirty marks to Henry de Cobham for discharging the abbot's military obligation in the war against the 'sediciosos Wallenses et publicos hostes [regis]'.[2] Similar statements can also be found in routine government documents.[3]

It is also interesting how often the king's own explanations of the origins of the war are echoed in the wording of the chronicle narratives. For example the Oseney chronicler explained that David had incited his brother to rise, even though Edward had given him lands and possessions in England and honoured him as a familiar amongst the praecipui of his palace.

1. Oseney, p. 291; Flores Historiarum, iii.59.
2. B.L. Add. MS 46352, f.82, dated 30th June 1282.
3. For example, P.R.O. C62/59, m. 6.

This explanation followed closely that given in both Edward's writ for the confiscation of the crusading tithe and that summoning the Shrewsbury parliament of September 1283.[1] This argument was also used by the Peterborough chronicler who charged David with ingratitude because he had been supported, enriched and placed amongst the king's courtiers.[2] It was also an explanation which was probably well known to the Chester chronicler who said that it was David who had broken the peace despite the many benefits he had received from the king.[3] Similarly the account given by the Northampton chronicler, that David had risen on Palm Sunday and captured Roger de Clifford and many others, placing some of them in prison and killing others, reflects closely one of Edward's military writs of April 1282.[4]

Not only were the Welsh held to be responsible for the war, but the chroniclers felt that they had little justification for their revolt. Both Wykes and the Bury St. Edmunds chronicle, for example, point out that Llywelyn was breaking

1. Oseney, p. 287: 'cui rex Angliae terras et possessiones contulerat in Anglia et inter praecipuos sui familiater honoravit'; Liber Epistolaris, no. 68: 'quem...ditaverimus de propriis terris nostris, ipsum inter maiores et superiores nostri palacii collocantes'.

2. Chronicon Petroburgense, p. 65: 'eo quod dominus Rex ipsum nutriverat, ditaverat, et inter majores pallacii sui collocaverat'; Parl. Writs, p. 15 (no. 20): [David] susceperamus exulem nutriveramus orphanum, ditaverimus de propriis terris nostris et sub alarum nostrarum clamide foveramus, ipsum inter majores palacii nostri collocantes'.

3. Annales Cestrienses, p. 108.

4. Northampton, f.33^{r}: 'accepit David frater Leulini dominum Rogerus de Clypforh et multos alios et posuit [aliquos] eorum in carcerem et aliquos eorum occidit'; Parl. Writs, p. 222 (no. 2): 'dilectum et fidelum Rogerum de Clifford seniorem sediciose ceperunt et in prisona detinent et homines suos fideles nostros interfecerunt'.

the treaty of Conway of 1277.[1] The Hagnaby chronicler explained that war broke out because Edward had appointed Reginald de Grey as justiciar in Wales, who had tried to introduce English laws and to make safe a highway by cutting down some woods.[2] Bearing in mind the contempt which many English felt for Welsh laws and customs, the chronicler clearly considered resistance to the introduction of such benefits to be unjustified. The Dunstable chronicler probably shared the Hagnaby chronicler's indignation. He explained how Edward had introduced English laws and customs and divided the land up into shires and hundreds, and how trees had been cut down on a certain road to give more security to travellers. Yet the Welsh had revolted in anger at this and the hanging of one of David's men contrary to Welsh custom.[3] Only archbishop Peckham felt that the Welsh had some legitimate grievances, and that Edward ought to receive some Welsh delegates to try and resolve them.[4] Yet this was an opinion he had formed only after visiting Wales to try and negotiate a settlement to the dispute. He had originally sent a number of articles to Llywelyn showing why the Welsh were in the wrong and should come to terms,[5] and believed that the Welsh revolt was contrary to scripture and justice.[6] Yet even after his visit he strongly denounced the Welsh and believed that an English victory could only be beneficial to the Welsh because of the reforms which would

1. Wykes, p. 287; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 74.
2. Hagnaby, f.28^{v}.
3. Dunstable, p. 291.
4. Douie, Archbishop Peckham, p. 247.
5. Reg. Peckham, ii.435-7.
6. ibid., i.136.

follow.[1]

During the course of the war a number of the chroniclers reported the atrocities which Edward claimed the Welsh were committing. The Oseney chronicler described how David made frequent incursions through Wales and the Marches, depopulating them with fire and plunder. The Westminster Flores wrote that Llywelyn and David killed both the young and the old as well as women and children in their beds, and destroyed the Marches with fire and murder. Similarly the Waverley chronicler claimed that they laid waste a large part of the Marches through murder and fire, killing and burning young men and maidens, old men and children, sparing neither women in labour, nor age and infirmity. The anonymous Canterbury chronicler also reported that David burned villages, and killed men, women and infants, sparing none of any order, condition, sex or age.[2] Yet such accounts are rather stereotyped. Rather than report what was actually happening the chroniclers were writing what they thought ought to have happened considering what they knew about the Welsh people.

Such opinions were encouraged by Edward's propaganda which spoke in similar terms, and which in turn fed off the traditional image of the Welsh as a barbarian race. There was undoubtedly much destruction, but the chronicle accounts are exaggerated and put all the blame upon the Welsh. Official records in fact show that homicide was rare and confined to districts where there had been a wholesale displacement of the

1. Douie, op.cit., pp. 249-51; Reg. Peckham, ii.473-4.

2. Oseney, p. 287; Flores Historiarum, iii.56; Waverley, p. 397; H.M.C., Various Collections, i.249.

Welsh by English settlers.[1] The Hagnaby chronicler does mention that much destruction was done by both sides, and the Oseney chronicler reports that Edward destroyed, burned and depopulated the fortifications, lands and villages of the prince of Wales, but these statements by no means redress the balance.[2] Some idea of the extent of the damage caused by the English soldiers may be gained from the figure of £1,700 which Edward paid in compensation to those churches which had suffered at English hands, and which was moreover paid only to those clerks who had not been opposed to him.[3] The bishop of St. Asaph, whose cathedral had been burned by the English, ended up paying a fine of five hundred marks to the king, despite the protestations of the archbishop, although two hundred marks were subsequently remitted to help pay for the war damage.[4]

The interest and the extent to which the chroniclers felt themselves to be personally involved in the war is revealed not only by the stories they told but also by the bitter invective they levelled at the Welsh leaders. The Waverley chronicler, for example, described David as a deviser of evil deeds, a most savage persecutor of the English race, an imposter towards his own nation, and the author of war who carried out subversive activities, robbing and killing all the English he could find.[5]

1. Douie, op.cit., p. 236 n.3.

2. Hagnaby, f.28^{v}; Oseney, p. 288.

3. F. G. Cowley, The Monastic Order in South Wales, 1066-1349 (Cardiff, 1977), p. 214; Douie, op.cit., p. 260.

4. R. C. Easterling, 'Anian of Nanneu, O.F.P., Prior of Rhuddlan, Bishop of St. Asaph, 1268-93', Flintshire Historical Society Journal, v (1914-15), 27.

5. Waverley, p. 400; cf. Flores Historiarum, iii.58.

A passage of exceptional virulence is contained in a letter written by Master Stephen of St. George in a rhetorical and highly artificial style. He was writing from Italy early in 1283 to his fellow clerks at the wardrobe rejoicing in the news that Llywelyn had been killed. He called him 'a serpent..... father of treachery, child of rebellion, son of iniquity, author of sedition, patron of ingratitude, convict of perjury and head of all evil'.[1] Even if few wrote at such length, the approval expressed by the chroniclers at the death of David and Llywelyn suggests they would have agreed. The Oseney chronicler believed that the death of Llywelyn was a remarkable triumph and that the execution of David was a sentence reached 'judicaliter' after weighing up the merits of his impiety. The chroniclers of Aberconway and Hailes declared that this sentence was a sign that the king was just and an extirpator of traitors.[2] An English monk, probably from Chester, composed an epitaph on Llywelyn which called him the prince of errors, a plunderer of men, a traitor to the English, a malicious arsonist, a follower of outlaws (secta reorum numen), a savage leader of the Welsh, a murderer of the pious, the dregs (fax) of the Trojans, the source of falsehood and instigator of evil deeds.[3] Henry de Burgo, a canon of Lanercost priory, also wrote a few lines on the execution of David, proclaiming that

1. The letter is printed with translation by A. J. Taylor, 'The Death of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, xv (1952-4), 207-9.

2. Oseney, pp. 291, 294; Register and Chronicle of Aberconway, p. 12; Hailes, f.48 (p. 85).

3. Annales Cestrienses, p. 110, a satire on Llywelyn's epitaph. It is also in Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, viii, ed. J. R. Lumby, (Rolls Series, 1882), 266-8. Higden was also a monk of Chester, and his version of line 6 is preferred here. There is also a sixteenth century copy in C.C.C.C., MS 281, f.79.

he deserved the punishment he received, for he was a robber, murderer and an enemy of the church.[1] Many chroniclers give details of this execution, and, even if they make no specific comment, seem to accept its justice. Wykes declared it was a notable spectacle, and only Langtoft writing over ten years later said that the punishment was 'mout trop vilement'.[2]

There is unfortunately no real evidence to show the extent to which the laity shared the views of the chroniclers. Yet we know that the Londoners enthusiastically welcomed the death of Llywelyn in 1282 and joyfully received Edward on his return in 1285, while the citizens of York and Winchester argued over the dismembered body of David. There is moreover no real indication that Edward had any serious difficulty collecting the subsidy of 1283 or raising troops. Large numbers of infantry were after all not employed, and although we hear that the sheriff of Somerset took bribes from soldiers to avoid service,[3] this is probably little more than evidence of the peculation endemic in local government at the time, and was certainly not the problem it was to become during the Scottish wars.

The importance of the Welsh war of 1282-3 is that it was on a scale much larger than any military undertaking hitherto and that it required the king to draw heavily upon the resources of his kingdom. As a result both the techniques and arguments of royal propaganda were developed. Parliament was used as a

1. Lanercost, p. 113. For Henry de Burgo see J. C. Russell, A Dictionary of Thirteenth Century Writers (B.I.H.R., Speeial Supp., 3, 1936), pp. 44-5.

2. Wykes, p. 294; Langtoft, ii.180.

3. Morris, Welsh Wars, p. 168.

means of reaching large numbers of people, a device foreshadowed in Henry's reign, particularly during the baronial wars, and which was to be extensively used in the 1290s. Royal writs grew in length, becoming more informative, drawing upon popular beliefs and containing material designed specifically to win public support. Although Edward had already shown in the war of 1277 that he was aware of the importance of showing that more than royal interests were involved, in 1282-3 he began to make specific references to the welfare of the respublica and the common utility of the realm, which emphasized more than ever that this was a common enterprise. The response of the chroniclers shows that Edward was not unsuccessful. The Welsh wars of the thirteenth century had never evoked much of a response, but the chroniclers now showed a new interest, echoing Edward's arguments and claims and sharing in his triumph. Earlier victories in Wales in 1241, 1245 and even 1277 had received little comment, and although the Welsh campaign of 1282-3 involved Edward's subjects more than ever before and achieved far more, the attention of the chroniclers is also a reflection of Edward's increased propaganda.

There was not a great deal of propaganda issued in connection with the Welsh wars of 1287-8 and 1294-5. The first war was a relatively minor affair, being launched to suppress the personal revolt of Rhys ap Maredudd, and was unlike the national risings of 1282 and 1294. The second was on a much larger scale, but an army had already been raised and money granted for an expedition to Gascony so that there was not the same need to appeal for public support as in 1282-3. Nevertheless the few writs which were issued in connection with

the two wars continued to stress the evil nature of the Welsh. For example, a writ of November 1287 recounted how Rhys ap Maredudd, a felon and rebel, and other malevolent supporters had risen up against the king and his faithful, and were seeking to disturb the peace, going around the lands of the king and his faithful by night and day. They had also treacherously occupied the king's castle of Newcastle Emlyn, killing men and perpetrating many other enormities against the king's peace.[1] Similarly in 1294 Edward claimed that the Welsh had treacherously assembled against the king and were daily perpetrating plunder, arson, murder and other enormities against the king's peace.[2] This was certainly an aspect dwelt upon by the chroniclers, showing that their poor opinions of the Welsh race had been strengthened by the war of 1282-3 and Edward's propaganda. The Waverley chronicler said that Rhys invaded and plundered, and committed great slaughter amongst the people, being all the more ferocious because he knew that Edward was abroad, and that the Welsh assiduously plotted their customary fraud and deceit with foxlike cunning. Wykes described how Rhys retired into a dense wood with his fellow robbers, frequently emerging to plunder and pillage in the manner of Welshmen, mercilessly depopulating the neighbouring areas, merely because he had been compelled to observe English laws. Likewise the Hailes chronicler explained that Rhys invaded Edward's lands, robbing his men, burning villages and committing much destruction.[3] In 1294 the chroniclers reported

1. Parl. Writs, p. 253 (no. 7).
2. ibid., p. 265 (nos.1, 2).
3. Waverley, pp. 404-5 (cf. Flores Historiarum, iii.66); Wykes, pp. 309-10; Hailes, f. 48^{v} (p. 88).

the Welsh war in much the same terms. The Worcester chronicler said that the Welsh killed all the English they could catch, including the women and children. The Bury chronicler wrote that they killed many Englishmen, and committed evil and outrageous deeds, while Cotton declared that the Welsh, who were versed in sedition, destroyed many castles and savagely put to death those English whom they could catch at the point of a sword. Finally the Flores Historiarum said that the Welsh raged with a malign spirit and laid waste the borders of England with fire, pillage and slaughter.[1] Yet in 1294 their comments were not extensive for, like the king's, their attention was focussed more on the war in Gascony.

1. Worcester, p. 517; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 125; Cotton, p. 353; Flores Historiarum, iii.91.

Chapter 5

EDWARD-I AND GASCONY

Edward I did not want a war in Gascony, and it is difficult to see what advantages Philip IV thought he could gain by provoking his vassal into war.[1] There had been tension for some while between the king of France and the duke of Gascony as each sought to strengthen his authority within his lands, a tension which was made worse by the ambiguities which surrounded their relationship.[2] Yet suddenly in 1293 Philip decided to make an issue of a dispute between some English and French sailors which had flared up and led to some rather more serious acts of piracy than was usual. He began by demanding restitution of the goods and ships which had been taken. Edward replied by saying that he would hear the complaints in his courts, or if Philip preferred he was prepared to accept arbitration over the issue, but Philip merely cited Edward to appear before his court. Edward then sent his brother Edmund, earl of Lancaster, to Paris to come to some more amicable arrangement. Elaborate terms were eventually agreed whereby Edward would surrender Gascony for a

1. J. R. Strayer, The Reign of Philip the Fair (Princeton, 1980), pp. 317-9.

2. ibid., p. 317.

token period and then receive it back with the hand of Philip's sister, Margaret. Yet once Philip had Gascony in his hands he refused to return it, or to issue a safe conduct to allow Edward to answer his summons, leaving Edward little choice but to renounce his allegiance and prepare to recover Gascony by military means. In the summer of 1294 he gathered a large army together, but at the last minute most of it had to be diverted to meet a Welsh rising. It was not until 1297, after the Welsh rising and a Scottish rebellion in 1296 had been settled, that Edward was again free to give his full attention to Gascony. He then built up an expensive coalition of powers in the Low Countries and planned an invasion of France from Flanders. Political opposition, however, reduced the army's effectiveness, and Edward could achieve little. A truce was arranged at the end of 1297 and renewed several times before a firm peace was concluded in 1303, restoring Gascony to Edward.[1]

Edward's task of building up support for the recovery of Gascony was made difficult by both the lack of hostility felt towards the French by his subjects and their lack of concern about the fate of Gascony itself. Of course this was not the first time that an English king had gone to war with the king of France, for ever since the dukes of Normandy had become kings of England, Englishmen had been involved in French wars. Yet there had been no major war since 1214 and fighting had anyway always been confined to the continent, save for the French involvement in the civil war of 1216-17. Moreover Frenchmen had never posed

1. For an account of the Gascon war see Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, pp. 644-54; Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, pp. 399-419; Strayer, op.cit., pp. 317-24.

a serious threat to the welfare of the English in the way that Welsh or Scottish invasions did. There were occasionally fears of invasion, particularly in 1264, but any feelings of rivalry which had arisen between the two peoples were more than offset by the strong cultural links between them. These had arisen largely as a consequence of the Norman invasion of 1066, since for the next hundred and fifty years the ruling aristocracy in England had also been landowners in France. They were frequent visitors to France, going to look after their family interests or to take part in tournaments. During the twelfth century the rise of the university of Paris had also encouraged a number of English clerks to go there to study, and the writings of some of them, such as John of Salisbury, Walter Map, and later Gerald of Wales, show that they returned with a love of France.[1] These close ties began to slacken during the thirteenth century following the loss of Normandy and the development of Oxford university, but they were by no means completely broken. English academics continued to have links with the continent, and the two royal families became closely related, while Edmund of Lancaster was also the ruler of Champagne and the count of Brittany an English magnate. Some barons, such as Richard, earl of Gloucester, were frequent visitors to the continent and were well known there,[2] while foreigners such as Simon de Montfort and Otto de Grandison were absorbed without too much difficulty into English society. The xenophobic feelings shown towards

1. Bartlett, 'Gerald of Wales', p. 162 and passim.
2. Altschul, The Clares, p. 67.

the Lusignans are to be explained largely by the threat they posed to the position of the native aristocracy, rather than by an implacable hostility to all Frenchmen. Moreover French, albeit a rather debased Anglo-Norman, remained the language of society and the traditional sympathy for France continued. Matthew Paris always spoke of the king of France in respectful terms,[1] while Bartholomew Anglicus, writing in the late 1240s, wrote an approving description of the country, describing its inhabitants as 'seemly and fair of body and strong....and generally fair and seemly of face, mild of will and fair of speech, sad of bearing, honest of clothing, peaceable to their neighbours, true and trusty to all strangers.'[2] It is not clear how far this French based culture reached down the social scale, but there is no reason to suppose that the ordinary Englishman was much more opposed to the French than he was to the men of the neighbouring shire or town.[3]

Even when England was at war with France the chroniclers did not speak about the French in particularly hostile terms. Occasionally tales were told of their misdeeds, such as their conduct at Dover in 1295, but there is nothing to compare with the atrocity stories related about the Welsh and Scottish. One story which does seem to have been widely believed concerns the Norman sailors in 1293 who were said to have hanged Englishmen

1. Paris, v.1, 5, 76, 133, 480 and passim.

2. Medieval Lore from Bartholomew Anglicus, ed. R. Steele (London, 1905), pp. 91-3.

3. For the links between England and France see R. W. Southern, 'England's First Entry into Europe', Medieval Humanism and Other Studies (Oxford, 1970), pp. 135-57; T. F. Tout, France and England: Their Relations in the Middle Ages and Now (Manchester, 1922), pp. 81-93; F. M. Powicke, 'England and Europe in the Thirteenth Century', in Independence, Convergence and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought and Art (Harvard Tercentenary Pbns, 1937), pp. 135-50.

and dogs from the same gibbet to express their contempt of Englishmen.[1] Yet there was generally little hostility towards the French people. The Welsh and the Scots were disparaged as barbarian races, but the most the French were accused of is pride. Langtoft referred to their pomp and boasting, the Westminster Flores said they made false boasts about the success of their raid on Dover, while the Worcester and Dunstable chroniclers explained that the expeditions of 1294 and 1295 were to tame the pride of the French.[2] Similarly, notices about the defeat of the French by the Flemings at Courtrai in 1302 expressed a certain exaltation at the humbling of the French, and a number of chroniclers listed the French nobles who were killed. Langtoft began his account of the battle by declaring 'hear the mishap which is happened to France, and what honour is accrued to Flanders by stroke of sword and spear, over the fraud of France, the pomp and boasting'.[3] Yet these comments are mild when compared with the invective levelled at the Welsh and Scottish.[4] There is also very little personal criticism of Philip IV apart from the condemnation of his

1. Guisborough, p. 240; Flores Historiarum, iii.85; Worcester, p. 512; Lanercost, p. 150. A note to p. 150 of Lanercost refers to an official document listing the aggressions of the French on the sailors of the Cinque Ports. Amongst them is the charge that they hanged the English with dogs, together with a marginal illustration.

2. Langtoft, ii.338; Flores Historiarum, iii.94; Worcester, p. 515; Dunstable, p. 397.

3. Langtoft, ii.338; cf. also Flores Historiarum, iii.112, 307-8, and the Song on the Flemish Insurrection, in Political Songs, pp. 187-195.

4. See pp. 155-8, 292-4. The story that Edward's son, Thomas Brotherton, fell ill while he was in the care of a French nurse, but immediately recovered as soon as she was replaced by an English nurse occurs in a later chronicle and cannot be taken as representative of contemporary opinion. It perhaps shows a later hardening of feelings towards the French: Annales Regis Edwardi Primi, Fragmentum I, in Willelmi Rishanger Chronica, ed. Riley, p. 438.

fraudulent confiscation of Gascony. The Westminster Flores accused him of gluttony. The Lanercost chronicler also accused him of being a bad Christian because he consulted a soothsayer who performed 'ars diabolica' to see what would be the outcome of his dispute with England,[1] but such criticism is mild when compared to the treatment given by the chroniclers to the Welsh and Scottish leaders.[2]

Not only was there a lack of hostile feelings towards the French, but there was also a disconcerting lack of concern about the fate of Gascony itself. Henry III had tried to show that Gascony was part of the realm and therefore was a concern of the English nobles, but this belief never received general acceptance. Since Gascony had been an inheritance rather than a conquest of the kings of England, few Englishmen had acquired any specific rights there. Moreover, Henry's claims were perhaps further undermined by the development of the concept of the community of the realm which emphasized the separate and exclusive nature of the English people.[3] Despite Henry's efforts, the English magnates had never felt any real obligation to fight for the king's interests in Gascony and, indeed, there was a growing recognition throughout Europe that service could only be performed outside the realm provided it was essential for the safety of the realm.[4] Edward therefore faced a difficult task. He had to overcome a lack of concern for the fate of Gascony and the lack of hostile feelings towards

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.112; Opus Chronicorum, in Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneforde Chronica et Annales, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1866), p. 55; Lanercost, p. 150.

2. See pp. 190-2, 336-9.

3. Powicke, art.cit., pp. 142-3.

4. Holt, Magna Carta, pp. 64-6.

the French in order to encourage people to fight a vastly expensive war in which, since it was not a war of conquest, the rewards would be slight. For a while he was successful, but in the end his arguments could not overcome the growing opposition to this unwanted war.

Edward's first concern was to show that this was indeed a just war, for there were rather suspicious circumstances surrounding its origins. A just war was one which was not aggressive in nature, but was fought in self-defence to defend territory, persons or rights, and which sought the restoration of peace and harmony through the redress of wrong.[1] However the Gascon war had arisen suddenly out of an insignificant event and followed the failure of negotiations which had deliberately been kept secret,[2] suspicious circumstances which could and did lead to the circulation of damaging stories questioning the justice of the war. Traces of two such stories survive in the chronicles. The Bury chronicler said that some people thought Edward had handed Gascony over to Philip preparatory to going on crusade,[3] but a far more damaging rumour was recorded by three of the chroniclers that Edward had become infatuated with Philip IV's sister, Blanche, and had entered into negotiations over the future of Gascony so that he could

1. F. H. Russell, The Just War in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1975), p. 2; M. H. Keen, The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1975), p. 66; Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, p. 62.

2. Cal. Chancery Warrants, 1244-1326, 40, records an order to the chancellor to bring the great seal as secretly as possible to the king. This was to be used to seal the letter resigning Gascony: Bury St. Edmunds, p. 119 n. 2. See also Cotton, p. 232.

3. Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 119-120.

marry her.[1]

The circulation of such stories made it important to explain and justify the war as fully and as widely as possible. Therefore at the beginning of June 1294, soon after the return in May of Edmund of Lancaster who had been conducting negotiations on Edward's behalf, Edward held a parliament to explain the causes of the dispute to the magnates and to seek their support for the war.[2] Edward's desire to publicize the origins of the war as quickly as possible is illustrated further by a writ sent out on 7th June to another sixty-two individuals asking them to come to the king wherever he was without delay to discuss the urgent business which had arisen.[3]

Unfortunately no writs of summons survive for the parliament of June 1294, and it is not clear who was present. Nor do we know exactly what was said on this occasion, although the lines of Edward's arguments are probably indicated by an official Latin document which survives in the P.R.O. giving an account of the origins of the Gascon war. It may have been drawn up as some sort of record for diplomatic purposes and was perhaps the account which Guisborough tells us was put before the cardinals' peace mission in 1295.[4] Two copies of this document survive, both unfortunately missing the opening section.[5] However the

1. Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 118-9; Langtoft, ii.196-8; Worcester, p. 515. This rumour lingered, for the fourteenth century Evesham chronicle says that Edward rejoiced at the truce of 1298 more out of love for the king's sister, whom he was going to marry, than on account of the recovery of Gascony: Bodleian MS Laud.Misc. 529, f.90^{v}.

2. Guisborough, p. 243; Cotton, pp. 233-4; Flores Historiarum, iii.88.

3. Parl. Writs, p. 25 (no. 1).

4. Guisborough, p. 257; cf. Flores Historiarum, iii.94.

5. P.R.O. C47/27/4, f.5^{r-v}, a small book of chancery miscellanea relating to the Anglo-French war; C47/29/4, no. 11, a much more legible fourteenth century copy. Slight variations suggest that the latter was not actually copied from the first document.

opening section can probably be recovered since part of the account was based very closely upon the report of the affair made by Edmund himself, which is printed in Foedera, while Nicholas Trevet seems to have incorporated a summary of the official account in his chronicle.[1]

Trevet begins by telling how Edward had made several proposals to Philip by which the naval dispute could be settled, but Philip had rejected them and cited Edward to appear before his court. When Edward failed to appear, Philip ordered the confiscation of Gascony. Edmund of Lancaster was then sent to negotiate, and Trevet's account of the settlement he reached is closely based on Edmund's own account. The official narrative now takes up the story, explaining how Philip had failed to keep his agreement, renewed his citation of Edward and eventually confiscated Gascony. It concludes with Edward's renunciation of his homage, explaining that since Philip had not observed the agreements reached between them Edward no longer considered Philip to be his lord. The whole tone of the account demonstrated how Edward had always acted reasonably and had been anxious for a peaceful settlement to the dispute, but was unfairly and unjustly tricked out of Gascony by Philip, who disregarded the settlement which had been negotiated and ceased to behave as a good lord should. Edward could therefore be considered most justified in launching a war for the recovery of his lands.

This argument justifying the war is the one most commonly met in its early stages. For example when Edward summoned the

1. Foedera, p. 794, from P.R.O. SC1/30/4; Trevet, pp. 325-30.

military service from Ireland in June 1294 he explained that a meeting had been held to resolve the differences between the kings of France and England, and that it was agreed that Edward should surrender certain castles and towns in Gascony under certain conditions. Yet Philip had not observed their agreement and had seized the whole of Gascony into his hands and maliciously kept it, to the manifest disinheritance of the king and crown.[1] A similar argument was rehearsed at length in a letter sent to all the bishops in the same month, urging them to encourage all the clergy, religious and people in their dioceses to pray for the success of his expedition.[2] Edward explained that the devil had aroused the king of France against him, and stressed how he himself was anxious to preserve the peace. Yet the king of France, at the point when peace seemed possible, had iniquitously occupied Gascony and disinherited Edward. Edward now proposed, with God's guidance, to recover his hereditary rights. If the clergy carried out Edward's intentions this particular letter would have helped to make Edward's views widely known. The bishop of Lincoln, for example, passed on this request to his archdeacons asking for the appropriate prayers to be said. In addition he asked that there be processions every Saturday with the chanting of the seven penitential psalms and the litany, while on every Sunday and feast day and other suitable occasions the clergy and laity were to be exhorted to pray for the peace of the church and

1. Rôles Gascons, iii, ed. C. Bémont (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1906), nos. 3372-3.

2. ibid., no. 3451; Foedera, p. 802.

kingdom.[1] Although the bishop's emphasis was on a penitential approach to avoid the horrors of war, and not on the nature of Edward's expedition itself, there could have been few people in the diocese of Lincoln, if these instructions were carried out, with no knowledge whatsoever of the Gascon crisis.[2]

In August 1294 Edward began to turn his thoughts to raising taxation to pay for the expedition, and similar arguments were put forward to convince the clergy of the need to contribute. On the 19th they were summoned to convocation, Edward's writs again reminding them that Philip IV had maliciously deceived him and fraudulently expelled him from Gascony.[3] Edward himself addressed the assembly when it met in September, pointing out that the war was not of his making and emphasizing that he himself desired peace but was being frustrated in his desire by Philip. For the sake of justice he had to continue the war to the bitter end, and to do this he needed their aid which it was just and reasonable that they give.[4] Since Edward was demanding the unprecedented sum of a moiety, he no doubt felt it wise to have these arguments heard by as many clergy as possible. The large size of this assembly was therefore determined as much by the desire for publicity as the need to meet the constitutional claim which had been made in 1283 that no aid could be given as the clergy had not been fully represented.[5] In 1294 he summoned all the bishops, deans and

1. Reg. Sutton, v. 14.
2. For the church and royal propaganda see chapter 10.
3. Parl. Writs, p. 25 (no. 2).
4. Guisborough, p. 249.
5. J. H. Denton, Robert Winchelsey and the Crown, 1294-1313 (Cambridge, 1980), p. 70.

archdeacons, a proctor for each cathedral chapter and two more for the clergy of each diocese, together with sixty-seven abbots and priors and the master of the order of Sempringham. Following this convocation further local clerical assemblies may have taken place at which this information was diffused more widely still, although on whose initiative it is not known. Certainly the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, acting during a vacancy in the archiepiscopal see, held two such assemblies during October to explain to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Canterbury and the deanery of Shoreham what had been decided at the convocation.[1] The laity also granted a tax later in the year in November. Unfortunately there are no accounts of this parliament, but since, unusually, four knights were summoned from each shire,[2] Edward no doubt used the occasion to explain his views further. It is interesting to note that two of the knights were summoned on 8th October to come with full power 'ad consulendum et consenciendum' and that the other two were summoned on 9th October merely 'ad audiendum et faciendum' what was enjoined upon them.[3] It seems the second pair were simply required as witnesses, and those returned for Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire were subsequently appointed as collectors of the tenth in their counties, where their knowledge of the king's need would help the collection.[4] This may have been the standard pattern in

1. Concilia, ed. Wilkins, i.201-2; C.U.L. MS Ee v 31, f.63.
2. Parl. Writs, p. 26 (no. 3).
3. G. O. Sayles, 'Parliamentary Representation in 1294, 1295 and 1307', B.I.H.R., iii (1925-6), 110. The writs are Parl. Writs, p. 26 (no. 3).
4. The first pair returned for Buckingham were also appointed as collectors in Berkshire and Oxfordshire.

most counties, but no other returns survive.[1]

Edward certainly seems to have been successful in putting across his account of the origins of the war. The chroniclers are generally well informed about them and many give quite long, detailed, accounts which are on the whole accurate. There are inevitably a few variations from the official account as several chroniclers picked up rumours casting doubt on the purity of Edward's motives. Not all of them saw the connection between the naval disputes and the negotiations over Gascony,[2] while Langtoft suggests that Philip IV only took up the case of the Norman sailors to ensnare Edward once the marriage treaty had been arranged.[3] Many chroniclers also say that it was Philip's sister, Blanche, and not Margaret, whom Edward planned to marry.[4] Yet all, save the Bury St. Edmunds chronicler, agreed on the vital point that Edward had been acting in good

1. The practice of appointing shire knights as tax collectors may be an innovation of the 1290s. In 1275 only one out of the twenty-three known representatives was subsequently appointed to collect the tax which had been granted in parliament. In 1290 one of the two known collectors had been a shire knight, while in 1294 six of the eight known representatives became collectors. In 1295 twenty-two shire representatives collected the eleventh and in 1297 at least seventeen were appointed to collect the ninth. These figures are derived from the lists in Parl. Writs, pp. 3-4 (no.12), 21-24 (nos.5-24), 27 (no.4), 34-46 (nos.7-34), 57-61 (nos.16-39), 63-4(no.43), supplemented by Jenkinson, 'The First Parliament of Edward I', pp. 236-42, and Sayles, art.cit., pp. 112-4.

2. The two are not connected by Dunstable, pp. 376, 384, or Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 117-8, 118-20.

3. Langtoft, ii.200.

4. Worcester, p. 515; Langtoft, ii.196; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 118; Cotton p. 232.

faith and had been fraudulently deceived by Philip IV. The Bury chronicler, although showing some knowledge of the official explanation, preferred the story that Edward had surrendered Gascony in the hope of winning the hand of Philip's sister, Blanche, only to find that Blanche did not wish to marry him. However the writer of the Flores Historiarum said that Philip had acted to the great dishonour of the king, while Cotton explained that Philip had broken his faith. The Furness chronicler explained that Edward had wanted peace and concord, but that Philip had broken the treaty, and Langtoft spoke of Philip's great act of treachery and his premeditated deceit.[1] This virtual unanimity of opinion shows how successful Edward had been in explaining the reasons for the war, for the original secrecy surrounding the negotiations could easily have allowed a number of conflicting stories to arise. Edward also seems to have been successful in arousing interest in the Gascon war, for a number of chroniclers collected documents connected with it. The original summons of Edward to appear before Philip and his renunciation of his homage to Philip survive in a number of chronicles,[2] while a register of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, also contains some diplomatic items concerning the negotiations over the maritime dispute in 1293.[3] There were even two pieces of verse written about the loss of Gascony. The first is to be found in the Liber Custumarum of the city of London.[4] It is

1. Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 118-20; Flores Historiarum, iii.87; Cotton, p. 233; Cont. Newburgh, pp. 579-80; Langtoft, ii.200.

2. See below, p. 402.

3. B.L. MS Cotton Julius D ii, ff. 187^{r}-189^{r}.

4. Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis, ed. H. T. Riley, ii, pt i (Rolls Series, 1860), 164-6.

unfortunately incomplete, as a folio has been cut out, but as it stands it presents the familiar account of how it was proposed that Edward should temporarily surrender Gascony, but that the French retained the duchy and declared Edward disinherited. The manuscript ends with Edward's preparations to reconquer Gascony and a boast that the men of Picardy will feel his strength and ferocity. There is nothing to indicate who the author of the poem was, although he was clearly well informed about the whole episode. The second poem is a French versification of the embassy of William Gainsborough and Hugh de Manchester from Edward I to Philip IV in 1294 renouncing Edward's homage, entered into the Liber Niger of Christ Church, Dublin.[1] This manuscript was probably the property of Henry de la Warr, an Augustinian canon of Bristol who went to Dublin as prior of Christ Church in the winter of 1300-1301.[2] Bartholomew Cotton also recorded a prophecy of Joachim which was optimistic about the forthcoming campaign. It tells how the leopard banner, symbolizing Edward, will go from the west and will slaughter the French and ruin their cities, and that its ferocity will be such that it will gnash its teeth all the way to the walls of Paris.[3] Another copy of this is to be found in the P.R.O. amongst a collection of prophecies entered into Liber X.[4] This is a book of statutes and writs which possibly belonged to Hugh de

1. Liber Niger, f.63. See H. J. Lawlor, 'A Calendar of the Liber Niger and Liber Albus of Christ Church, Dublin,' Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy (3rd series, xxvii (c), 1908-9), 46. I have not seen the poem itself.

2. A. Gwynn, 'Unpublished Texts from the Black Book of Christ Church, Dublin,' Analecta Hibernica, xvi (1946), 285.

3. Cotton, pp. 239-40.

4. P.R.O. E164/9,f.227^{v}.

Cressingham or one of his clerks, for several writs relating to Hugh have been added to the book.[1] A lost manuscript from St. Augustine's, Canterbury, also contained two tracts or poems, De conflictu normanorum et anglicorum and De Normannis secundum barones portuum.[2]

At this early stage men seem to have been prepared to give practical effect to their interest in Gascony. The initial response of the lay magnates in June 1294 was certainly encouraging, for they all consented to go to Gascony, Walter of Guisborough adding that they promised to follow Edward 'in vitam et in mortem'.[3] Money, too, was forthcoming: Balliol, who was present at the June parliament, promised the revenue of his English estates for three years, and other magnates were so liberal that Edward was able to cite their generosity later in the year when he was trying to persuade the clergy to contribute to the war effort.[4] Cotton says that the June parliament continued for many days,[5] and certainly it was still in session about a fortnight after it began,[6] but the problem must have been the details rather than the principle of the campaign. Moreover when parliament met in November 1294 it was

1. ff.29^{v}, 30^{r}, 220^{r}.
2. See above, pp. 135-6, 136 n.1.
3. Guisborough, p. 243; Flores Historiarum, iii.88.
4. Flores Historiarum, iii.88; Guisborough, p. 249.
5. Cotton, p. 233.
6. Parliament began on 6th June and seems to have been in session about 18th-20th June: Handbook of British Chronology, p. 511.

prepared to grant an aid on the day it assembled,[1] and there seems to have been no real problem in raising either the taxation or troops.[2] The Hagnaby chronicle does contain an intriguing reference to opposition at the November parliament, for it records that Edward originally asked for a third and a sixth, but that this was opposed by the earl of Gloucester and other magnates, and only a tenth was granted.[3] This would make the lay subsidy more in line with the clerical moiety, but it would be rather uncharacteristic of Edward to give way so quickly. No other source mentions this demand, and it would perhaps be prudent to regard the chronicler's claim with caution. The only other hint of lay opposition in 1294 is in the postponement of the military muster from 1st September to the end of the month. The reason for this is unknown, but since the summons for military service had been a strictly feudal one and the army which left in October was composed entirely of paid men, it is possible that there had been opposition to a feudal levy involving service abroad.[4] Yet this need not have involved opposition to the expedition itself, and the mood of the time is probably more accurately indicated in the enthusiasm of the Guildhall song which talks about the 'perfidiam pessimam' of the French and the vows of vengeance of the clergy and knights, and boasts that Picardy will feel the strength and ferocity of the king of England.

1. Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 18. The commissions to the collectors are dated on this day.

2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 193; Beddoe, op.cit., pp. 245-6.

3. Hagnaby, f.36^{r}.

4. Prestwich, op.cit., pp. 75-6.

The feelings of the clergy on the Gascon war are harder to disentangle, for their opinions were bound to be coloured by the heavy financial liabilities which they incurred in 1294.[1] Yet their initial grant of two tenths in September was a generous one bearing in mind that it was double the annual rate to which they were accustomed.[2] It was natural that they should oppose the moiety for financial reasons, and that the scrutiny of the treasure in monastic houses should be called 'an unheard of sacrilege' and 'a wicked and unprecedented deed',[3] but it is noticeable that none of the chroniclers oppose the cause for which these exactions were taken. Indeed, despite the difficulty some clergy had in meeting their obligations, the moiety was collected surprisingly quickly.[4] Langtoft's comment perhaps reflects the opinion of many of the clergy: 'As a result of taxes given, England was much poorer. Nevertheless, all should pray to God that Edward be successful and that he may recover his right'.[5]

In 1295 Edward sought to build upon his success in winning support for the war by using the opportunity of a papal embassy to England to stress his commitment to peace and the part of Philip IV as the aggressor. Boniface VIII was anxious to restore peace between England and France, and in February 1295 appointed two cardinals to negotiate between the two countries. They arrived in England in June while Edward was in Wales and it

1. These are discussed by Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 60-80.
2. ibid., p. 74.
3. Dunstable, p. 390; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 122; cf. Flores Historiarum, iii.89.
4. Denton, op.cit., pp. 76-7.
5. Langtoft, ii.212.

was not until August that he could receive them. However when he did, he ensured that the negotiations received wide publicity, for he summoned to be present all the bishops, fifty-three abbots and priors, the masters of the Templars, Hospitallers and the order of Sempringham, all the earls and nearly one hundred other barons, royal officials and counsellors.[1] Clearly the presence of all these men was not necessary for the negotiations, and most would have been present merely to witness the proceedings.[2] These began with a Latin sermon from each of the cardinals on the virtues of peace, asking Edward to make peace with the king of France. William de Hothum replied, preaching another Latin sermon which explained that Edward was indeed zealous for peace and was ready to hear the papal mandates.[3] Then Edward ordered Edmund of Lancaster and John de Lacy to expound the origins of the war,[4] and the whole process was recited in French showing how war had arisen between the two kings and continued to the present day, 'so that the mediators and promotors of peace could see and understand which of the kings had justice in the cause and which supported injustice'. At the end of this long recitation the bishop of Durham rose and spoke in French on the virtues of peace and the duty of every Christian to seek it, but concluded by saying that Edward could not agree to the request of the cardinals because he was bound to the king of Germany to make neither treaties nor truces without his consent. After

1. Parl. Writs, p. 28 (nos. 1-3).
2. These are narrated in detail by Guisborough, pp. 256-8.
3. Hothum may have been something of an orator, for he had played an important part at Norham in 1291, demonstrating English suzerainty over Scotland: Guisborough, p. 235.
4. Flores Historiarum, iii.94.

further negotiations the bishop announced that Edward had agreed to send messengers to Germany to seek peace; but there could be no truce while peace negotiations took place for the French were inflicting much injury on Edward's men on land and sea, and it was not safe to order them not to defend themselves unless the French ceased their attacks. As soon as that happened Edward would immediately comply. During these discussions Edward turned what was potentially an embarrassing situation to his own favour, for clearly he would not have created a very favourable impression if he had refused outright the requests of the pope for peace. Indeed he probably did not really want peace at this stage, for he had made little progress in Gascony and he would have been negotiating very much from a position of weakness. He therefore took refuge in pointing out that he himself was in favour of peace and blaming the continuation of the war upon the injustice and agression of Philip IV, an assertion which was conveniently underlined by the French raid on Dover the day after parliament began.

Judging from the chronicle accounts of this parliament, Edward managed to arouse public interest and create the impression he desired. Some chroniclers indicated their interest by inserting into their accounts copies of the papal bull connected with the cardinals' visit.[1] Langtoft said that the English wanted a peace provided the Germans would agree, while the Worcester chronicler said that Edward was ready to agree to a peace which benefited him and the kingdom, but that no honourable peace could be made without the consent of the king of Germany.

1. See below, p. 402.

The Furness chronicler said that Edward told the cardinals that he wanted peace provided his lands which had been unjustly taken were restored and the king of Germany agreed. Likewise the continuator of Gervase of Canterbury said that Edward had declared himself a lover of peace, but had refused a truce until the king of Germany agreed and the king of France withdrew his forces, and the Dunstable annalist said that the cardinals had found Edward 'satis tractabilem', blaming Philip IV's attitude for the failure of the peace mission.[1]

Yet although Edward had been able to creat this favourable impression, there are some indications that already in 1295 the war effort was no longer running as smoothly as it had in the previous year. For some unknown reason in the summer of 1295 several leading barons refused to go to Gascony and were only persuaded to depart when the sheriffs began to distrain their lands to collect the debts they owed to the king.[2] There were also a few problems over the coastguard service which was organized that year. Earlier in the year the sheriff of Essex had been able to report that he could not hold an inquest to prove the age of Gilbert Mauduit, son and heir of John Mauduit, because all the knights and free tenants of his bailiwick who were capable of bearing arms were guarding the coast at Harwich and other ports in his shire.[3] Yet in July several vessels left their stations in Harwich and Yarmouth and returned home without

1. Langtoft, ii.226; Worcester, p. 522; Cont. Newburgh, p. 580; Gervase, ii.313; Dunstable, pp. 396-7.

2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 76.

3. Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench under Edward I, iii, ed. G. O. Sayles (Selden Society, lviii, 1939), 40.

licence,[1] and in August the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk and Essex were ordered to distrain those who resisted coastguard duty.[2] An official in Berkshire also had difficulty getting the clergy to assist the coastguard and was forced to distrain them.[3] The poor performance of the coastguard was perhaps becoming serious, for Thomas Turberville, who was acting as a spy for the French, wrote during the summer that there was little watch kept on the south coast and that the Isle of Wight was totally without a garrison.[4]

Growing opposition is also suggested by the fact that in November 1295 both laity and clergy were less willing to grant taxation than they had been the previous year. It was several days before the laity could be prevailed upon to make a grant,[5] while the clergy put up a stronger resistance to Edward's demands than previously. In the end they were prepared to offer Edward a tenth with the promise that they would make further contributions the following year if the war continued. Once more the question for the clergy was probably not so much whether they should contribute, but how much they could afford to offer. Archbishop Winchelsey pointed out to the clergy that without their aid Edward could not defend them or himself against the French, and the clergy agreed with him.[6] Yet it does seem that

1. Prestwich, 'Edward I's Wars', p. 241.

2. Parl. Writs, p. 269 (no. 11).

3. P.R.O. SC1/37/60. This letter is unfortunately not dated, but it probably refers to this year or the next.

4. Cotton, p. 305.

5. Cotton, p. 299; Beddoe, op.cit., pp. 20, 141. The tax seems to have been granted on 4th December, about a week after parliament met on 27th November.

6. Denton, op.cit., pp. 86-8; Worcester, p. 524.

the initial enthusiasm for the war was declining. This decline was perhaps encouraged by a letter which Winchelsey had written to the bishops in May 1295 requesting masses to be said for peace, explaining that the current discord between nations was a danger to the Holy Land and to men's souls. The bishops were enjoined to explain to their congregations the danger facing the church and the need for repentance, and to arrange two masses a week in their cathedrals, collegiate and parish churches for the Holy Land, for peace and for the king and kingdom. On Saturdays this mass was to be preceded by a solemn procession, with the ringing of bells and the singing of the Litany, an indulgence of ten days being prescribed for those who attended. Although this was not directed specifically at the Gascon war, it would not help to create an atmosphere conducive to the maintenance of the war effort.[1]

Although there is no evidence that any reasoned arguments were yet being put forward against the war, nevertheless Edward did feel that it was necessary to develop his original propaganda to show that not only was this a just war to recover Gascony, but also one which involved the interests of the whole nation. Otherwise he could not really expect his subjects to continue making large contributions to the war effort, for only 'a prince who fights for the interests of his country may make use of the resources of the community and make a charge upon the common business'.[2] At first Edward seems to have assumed that it was

1. Winchelsey, i. 26-30.

2. Aquinas, Selected Political Writings, ed. A. P. d'Entrèves (Oxford, 1968), p. 93; see Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, p. 22.

accepted that the war in Gascony involved the interests of the realm. One writ for example explained at length how Philip IV had confiscated Gascony to the manifest disinheritance of himself and the crown of England, and he could not recover it without the aid of his people, 'quod factum tangit communiter'.[1] In another writ the seizure of wool was justified by pointing out that danger would befall the king and realm if the man who sought the disinheritance of the king was further enriched with such merchandise.[2] Similarly the summons of the shire representatives in the autumn of 1294 claimed that the business of the meeting touched both the king and his kingdom.[3] All the while there was enthusiasm for the war there was no need to indicate exactly how the Gascon war involved the interests of the realm, but as the first signs of criticism began to appear in 1295 Edward had to start giving some explanation. Fortunately his task was made a little easier as Philip began to adopt a more aggressive attitude towards England itself.

During 1294 Philip began to build up his navy so that by the beginning of 1295 he already had a large fleet stationed at Rouen and Harfleur to which he continued to add.[4] He also entered into negotiations with the Scots which culminated in an alliance in October 1295, and at the same time reached an

1. Rôles Gascons, iii, nos. 3372-3, 3376.

2. ibid., nos. 2675, 3429-31.

3. Parl. Writs, p. 26 (no. 31); cf. also p. 25 (no. 1), summoning a number of individuals in June 1294.

4. C. de la Roncière, 'Le Blocus Continental de l'Angleterre sous Philippe le Bel', Revue des Questions Historiques, nouvelle série, xvi (1896), 401-441; Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 138.

agreement with Norway for considerable military and naval aid, although this aid never materialized.[1] Philip never in fact launched a full-scale invasion of England, but there were several raids which gave an indication of his intentions. In 1294 three hundred men were reported to have landed and burnt the towns of Kingsdon and Rydelingewealde.[2] The most famous however was the raid on Dover in August 1295 during which the monk Thomas de la Hale was killed, later to be canonized for his defence of the priory's treasures.[3] There were also at the same time raids on Hythe[4] and other towns along the Kent coast,[5] and on the Channel Islands.[6] Attempts to land at Winchelsea in 1295[7] and at Yarmouth in 1296[8] were however beaten off.

Such raids helped Edward to argue that the war was in the interest of the realm. As early as December 1294 he began to prepare the coastal defences against the danger of an invasion, widely publicizing the supposed intentions of the French over the following months. In December 1294 a proclamation was

1. R. Nicholson, 'The Franco-Scottish and Franco-Norwegian Treaties of 1295', Scottish Historical Review, xxxviii (1959), 115-8.

2. St. Augustine's,p. 103. Kingsdon may be Kingston-by-Sea or Kingston, both on the Sussex coast. Kingston in Devon is less likely. I have not been able to identify Rydelingewealde.

3. See P. Grosjean, 'Thomas de la Hale, Moine et Martyr à Douvres en 1295', Analecta Bollandiana, lxxii (1954), 167-191.

4. Flores Historiarum, iii.94; Cotton, p. 296; Lanercost, p. 165.

5. St. Augustine's, p. 105.

6. Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96, 427.

7. Cotton, p. 295.

8. Roncière, art.cit., p. 425.

issued to the coastal shires ordering that all should prepare to repel the French who were planning a hostile invasion to inflict great harm on the kingdom and people.[1] Writs were sent to many towns requesting ships 'for the defence of our kingdom and the security of the seas',[2] and the action of Richard Bolinere who refused to provide timber from his wood near Lynn was considered to be contemptuous towards the crown, detrimental to the ship building programme and hence a danger to the whole realm.[3] In September 1295 the writs summoning the clergy to parliament recounted how Philip IV had fraudulently taken Gascony, and that not content with this deceit was preparing a large fleet for the invasion of England with the intention of wiping the English language from the face of the earth.[4] The writs which postponed the parliament at the beginning of November explained that this was because Edward was busy preparing the defence of the realm,[5] and when parliament finally met, Edward explained that he needed aid to provide for the safety of the realm.[6] In the following April the men of Devon and Cornwall were ordered to be vigilant 'lest danger come to the realm through the malice or invasion of the enemy in those parts', and the sheriff of Devon and Somerset was ordered to ensure his coastal defences were adequate 'against those who are of the

1. P.R.O. E159/68, m. 79d.
2. ibid., m. 77.
3. ibid., m. 80, cited Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 72.
4. Parl. Writs, p. 31 (no. 5).
5. Parl. Writs, p. 32 (nos. 1-3).
6. Flores Historiarum, iii.95.

power of the king of France and who inflict every enmity they can upon us and our whole realm.[1] Finally in July 1296 it was reported by Brian de Jay, the master of the Templars, that a French invasion was actually being prepared, and the exchequer rushed a copy of the report to the men of Yarmouth, warning that a thousand of the French king's subjects were preparing to come disguised as fishermen to attack Yarmouth and other neighbouring ports to burn, plunder, murder and commit other atrocities.[2]

Perhaps the most effective illustration of the danger to the realm was the trial and execution of Thomas Turberville. He was a household knight who had gone to Gascony in 1294 but had been captured the following year at Rioms. However he obtained his release in return for promising to act as a spy, and by August 1295 was back at Edward's court. A letter which he sent to France giving advice about the projected French invasion was intercepted and he was arrested in late September. He was then tried in the Great Hall at Westminster and publicly executed in the streets of London.[3] The trial and execution were clearly designed to draw public attention to the case. On the day of his trial he was brought from the Tower on a wretched hackney, his head covered with a hood, his feet tied under the horse and

1. P.R.O. E159/69, m.77.

2. ibid., m.26. This was presumably the raid which was beaten off Yarmouth.

3. For Thomas de Turberville see J. G. Edwards, 'The Treason of Thomas de Turberville, 1295', Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 296-309.

his hands tied before him, accompanied by torturers dressed as devils. Following his trial he was laid on an ox hide with sharp stones around his body, and was dragged by six horses from Westminster to Cheapside and then to the gallows which were probably at Smithfield. With him rode four masked executioners wearing leather trousers with figures on them, who insulted and beat him. He remained hanging on the gallows after his death as a reminder of his treason,[1] and a reminder to the parliament which met the following month of the danger from France.

The case of Thomas de Turberville certainly made a considerable impact upon the public, and it was reported by most of the chroniclers. Cotton included in his account the treasonable letter of Turberville which had been intercepted, and all agreed on the essential point which Edward was trying to put across, that Turberville had been helping the French to invade England. The Dunstable chronicler said that he was working to subject the kingdom to the power of the French, while Langtoft said that he had pledged that all England, Wales and Scotland would be subject to Philip IV. Similarly the Bury St. Edmunds chronicle recorded that he had agreed with Philip to raise all England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales in war at once so that the French would be able to land without opposition and rule and organize the country as they wished.[2] The episode also inspired a French poem which was recorded in B.L. MS Cotton

1. Cotton, p. 306; Flores Historiarum, iii.282; Anglo-Norman Political Songs, p. 52.

2. Cotton, pp. 304-6; Dunstable, p. 399; Langtoft, ii.226; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 128. See also the comments of Worcester, p. 522, and the later Guisborough, p. 252. Hagnaby, f.38^{r-v}, contains an Anglo-Norman letter recounting the treason of Turberville and the attempted French invasion of Dover.

Caligula A xviii.[1] The poem recounts the treason of Thomas de Turberville, telling how he plotted a French invasion but was captured and executed. It ends with an account of the failure of the French fleet to invade, mentioning their raid on Dover, and asserting that the French will never successfully make war on England. It is quite likely to have been written in the autumn of 1295 following Turberville's execution, although nothing in the poem allows us to establish a date with any precision. The poet is well-informed about his execution, and may have been an eye-witness of the event, although the account in Cotton's chronicle shows that the details were widely known. The Merton Flores also included a Latin epitaph on the traitor which dwells upon the satanic aspects of the case.[2] However there is nothing to indicate that it is a contemporary composition, and indeed its flamboyant style and use of religious ideas suggest that it may be the work of the chronicler himself, who was writing at the end of Edward's reign. Edward probably continued to use this case to illustrate the danger of a French invasion. In the P.R.O. is a government memorandum listing documents which proved the bad faith of the king of France, including a letter of Thomas de Turberville undertaking to fight with the Welsh against Edward and a copy of his confession.[3] There is no indication what the list was used for, but it seems as if a

1. This manuscript consists of two orginally separate tracts bound together. The second, of unknown provenance, is written in a hand of the first half of the fourteenth century and contains only this song and the Song of Caerlaverock: Anglo-Norman Political Songs, p. 49. The song on Thomas Turberville is printed ibid., pp. 51-3.

2. Flores Historiarum, iii.282.

3. P.R.O. C47/27/3, printed Edwards, art.cit., pp. 302-3. The other letters are from Philip saying that he would aid the Welsh against Edward, that he would not help Edward against the Irish, and promising French aid to the Scots to continue the war against Edward.

clerk was preparing a case against Philip IV, perhaps to be presented to parliament as an inducement to give further aid, or to be produced before a peace commission.

The autumn of 1295 was not the only occasion when there was speculation about a French invasion. As early as 1293 Wykes feared that the French fleet gathered to fight the men of the Cinque Ports was intended for an invasion of England, while the following year Cotton warned that Philip IV was building up his navy for that same purpose.[1] The Barnwell chronicler explained that Edward had the English coasts watched because the French were preparing a large invasion force to devastate the country, while the Lanercost and Hagnaby chroniclers said that in 1295 Philip IV sent a large fleet respectively to burn and occupy England.[2] The vita of Thomas de la Hale, who was killed in the raid on Dover in that year, likewise explained that the purpose of the French king was the subjection of England to his power.[3] The fifteenth century Bermondsey annalist remembered that there was a panic at Harwich on 21st September 1295 because it was said that the French had invaded, and on account of this it was known as Wode Thursday.[4] Warin of Northampton may also have been playing upon public fear of a French invasion when he took advantage of a proclamation in September 1295 that the French were invading the land to

1. Wykes, p. 335; Cotton, p. 295.
2. Liber Bernewelle, p.235; Lanercost, p.195; Hagnaby, f.38^{r}.
3. Nova Legenda Anglie, ii, ed. C. Horstmann (Oxford, 1901), 555.
4. Annales Monasterii de Bermundeseia, in Annales Monastici, iii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1866), 468. Wode means mad.

settle a score with the prior of St. Neots. He responded to the proclamation by publicly claiming that the prior had raised the French king's standard over his priory door and on his church belfry and was expelling from the priory and his service all those who spoke the English language.[1] Finally the excitable Langtoft explained the consequences of a French invasion at length. He claimed that:

> 'The church of England would be reduced to such an ill condition that neither clerk nor layman would find wherewith to live. The new conqueror who would come upon us would deprive of honour the earls and barons; archbishop and bishop would change his condition, abbot and prior would lose his lands; parson and vicar would be deprived of his rent and the freeman would remain a villein; neither citizen nor burgher would go anywhere to make his market as he did before. The proud Frenchmen would bring us so low, and cause us to be honoured no more than dogs'.[2]

Yet Langtoft was perhaps rather exceptional amongst the chroniclers. He was writing not so much a chronicle as an epic poem with the object of entertaining rather than merely informing his readers. Moreoever his chronicle displays a marked dislike of the French which was not generally shared by his contemporaries.

Despite this awareness of French plans for invasion, it is difficult to show that men were seriously disturbed by them. On the contrary the continuing problems of desertion from the coastguard suggests that not a great deal was expected to come of them. In 1296 the troops deputed to guard the Hampshire

1. Sayles, Select Cases in King's Bench, iii, pp. lxv, 50-1.
2. Langtoft, ii.212-4.

coast failed to turn up,[1] while there was resistance in London to the king's order that they should contribute to the defence of the Kent coast.[2] Furthermore the chroniclers do not express any particularly strong feelings against the French, which one might expect if their threats were taken seriously. It is interesting that Thomas de la Hale, the monk who was killed during the raid on Dover in 1295, was regarded as a martyr not because he had been killed by the French, but because he had been defending the priory's treasures.[3] His vita, which seems to be the work of a contemporary, displays no sign of national feelings, and it could not even be known from this source that the French invaders had been defeated.[4]

A possible reason for this lack of concern is suggested by the poem on the treason of Thomas de Turberville which ends with this confident reflection:

> 'Lord Charles, noble knight, have done with your fighting, make peace with your cousin and consider the outcome. If you make war on England you will never achieve success. Neither did your ancestors do so, who considered themselves such great champions: Duke Louis, your relative, Eustace the Monk, likewise, and many other Frenchmen not named here'.[5]

The poet is remembering the past failures of French invasions,

1. P.R.O. E159/60, m. 78d, cited Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 249.

2. Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis, ii, pt i, 72-3; Cal. Letter-Book C, p. 27.

3. See, for example, Nova Legenda, p. 557, ll.13 et seq., recording the reaction of the monks to his death. See also the indulgence offered by the bishop of Winchester to those who visited Thomas' tomb: Reg. Pontissara, ii.845.

4. Grosjean, 'Thomas de la Hale', pp. 172-3.

5. Anglo-Norman Political Songs, pp. 53-5.

the invasion of Louis in 1216-17, the defeat of Eustace the Monk off Sandwich in 1217 and perhaps too the destruction of the French invasion fleet off Damme in 1213. There may well also have been men alive who remembered the serious threat of invasion in 1264 which had never materialized. There was not really any reason why 1295 should be any different. Moreover those raids which did take place in 1295, although terrifying at the time, were on a scale which was insufficient to raise a general alarm especially when compared with the Welsh and Scottish raids. Indeed such raids may not have appeared much different from the usual acts of piracy which could be expected along the sea coast, even from one's own countrymen. For example a piratical raid had been launched by French sailors on Dover in 1291,[1] while the rivalry between the Cinque Ports and Yarmouth had in the past led to frequent raiding.[2] The presence of Englishmen on the French raids of 1294 and 1295 must have made them less distinguishable from normal raids.[3] Indeed the government's own actions may have contributed to this air of confidence, for it had allowed most French monks to buy exemption from the order of September 1295 that they were to be moved inland away from the coasts.[4]

By the end of 1296 the Gascon war was beginning to meet

1. Chroniques de London, ed. G. J. Aungier (Camden Society, xxviii, 1844), p. 23.

2. Murray, Cinque Ports, pp. 32-33.

3. The presence of Englishmen is recorded in St. Augustine's, p. 103, and implied in Reg. Winchelsey, i.41-2, which treats the Dover raid of 1295 very much as an act of piracy.

4. D. Matthew, The Norman Monasteries and their English Possessions (Oxford, 1962), pp. 82-3; Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 160.

serious resistance, but until this time Edward's propaganda had had a measure of success. He had been able to blame Philip IV for the outbreak of the war and its continuation and initially to obtain enthusiastic support for its prosecution. This success owed much to Edward's awareness of the need to explain his actions to the men of the shires. Not only did his military writs contain detailed explanations of the war, but also his use of parliament to disseminate information, a practice developed during the Welsh wars, was successfully continued. He also began to use requests for prayers as a means of engaging the support of the church and spreading information. Above all Edward's propaganda showed an awareness of the need to reflect public concerns and interests: it was not inflexible, but responded to the changing public mood. Yet in the end Edward failed to maintain the war effort, not because he did not appreciate the need to court public opinion, but because he was trying to persuade men to undertake something to which they were naturally opposed. Men did not want to fight for Gascony and did not take seriously the threat of invasion. Indeed it is perhaps a measure of Edward's success that he was able to win any support for the war at all.

Chapter 6

THE CLERGY AND THE CRISIS OF 1297

The crisis of 1297 was the result of the heavy financial and military demands which Edward had made upon his subjects since 1294. The force of these demands had perhaps been lessened by the diversion of much of the war effort to a more acceptable cause, the defence of the realm from the serious threat of the Welsh and Scottish rebellions; but in late 1296 and 1297 they were made solely for the Gascon war, an objective which no longer received general approval. The constitutional and political arguments generated by these demands, which led to the drawing up of the Remonstrances in July 1297 and the granting of the Confirmatio Cartarum in October, have been much discussed,[1] and it is not intended to repeat or re-examine them here, except to consider how each side sought to publicize and win support for their arguments.

Both the clergy and the laity were involved in the opposition to Edward I, and although there was some co-operation between the two, it is probably more helpful to treat them

1. For the constitutional background see H. Rothwell, 'The Confirmation of the Charters, 1297', E.H.R., lx (1945), 16-35, 177-191, 300-315; J. G. Edwards, 'Confirmatio Cartarum and the Baronial Grievances in 1297', E.H.R., lviii (1943), 147-171, 273-300; Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 247-61; Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, pp. 149-74; Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 80-176.

separately. The dispute with the clergy began in November 1296, when they refused to make a further grant to the king. They were financially exhausted and were unwilling to contribute further towards the waging of what they considered an unnecessary war. They justified their refusal on the grounds that the recent papal bull, Clericis laicos, forbade the taxation of the clergy without the pope's permission upon pain of excommunication, but agreed to reconsider their position in the following January. Edward immediately began to put pressure upon the clergy to make him a grant, and when the second council in January also refused he declared them to be outlaws and began to seize their lands, goods and chattels. Faced with this prospect, a number of the clergy began to pay fines to the king to recover his protection, and at an assembly which met in March the archbishop allowed the clergy to follow their own consciences in the matter. As a result many more submitted, and further pressure was put on those remaining firm by beginning the sale of their goods. However by June it became politically necessary for the king to seek a reconciliation with the clergy, for his relations with the laity were deteriorating and he was anxious to lead an expedition to Flanders. A reconciliation was reached in July, but this proved to be shortlived for Edward still needed money. A clerical assembly was held in August to consider the king's request, and when this was again refused Edward was compelled to try and tax the clergy by his own authority. The crisis was only resolved in September when the Scottish victory at Stirling Bridge threatened the renewal of the Scottish war.[1]

1. For an account of the crisis see Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, pp. 434-448; Powicke, Thirteenth Century, pp. 673-677.

The whole crisis revolved around one dominant issue, the relevance of the Gascon war to the interests of England. Edward had tried to show that this war was necessary to protect England from French aggression, but by the end of 1296, after many heavy exactions with little apparent result and still no sign of a French invasion, enthusiasm for the war was probably wearing very thin. Therefore when the clergy assembled in November 1296 to consider the king's request for taxation, they concluded that the interests of the realm were not being served by the war and refused a grant. Their discussion covered four topics: their promise in 1295 to give further aid if there was no hope of peace, the papal bull, Clericis laicos, the danger to the realm from France and the poverty of the clergy.[1] Unfortunately the details of their deliberations have not survived, but it seems that their refusal to grant an aid was not based on the provisions of Clericis laicos, but upon their assessment of the political situation. Clericis laicos itself was not particularly welcomed in England, for its rigid provisions took away the independent discretion of the English clergy in matters of clerical taxation, and it is clear that the archbishop was in no hurry to publish it.[2] However the clergy did not consider its provisions to be binding under all circumstances, or they would not have needed to extend their discussions beyond the bull. As the archbishop explained to the king in January, the papal bull forbade them to make a promise of financial aid, but it ought not to prevent

1. Cotton, p. 314.
2. Denton, op.cit., pp. 96-7.

them from helping in the defence of the realm if the danger was great enough.[1] Moreover this was shown in practice when the northern clergy, led, admittedly, by the royalist archbishop of York and bishop of Durham, felt free to grant a fifth in November 1296 to meet the danger of the Scots, despite the papal prohibition. Similarly the southern clergy were themselves able to grant an aid in October 1297, although the provisions of the bull were still technically in operation.

The crucial point was therefore the danger from France, for the clergy had promised an aid if there was no hope of peace. It seems that they recognized there was some danger, for a letter of the archbishop written shortly after the assembly showed a full awareness of it, and he himself pointed out the danger to the clerical assembly which met in January.[2] Yet it must have been concluded that, bearing in mind the poverty of the clergy, the danger was not sufficient to compel them to make a further grant. This was explained by Winchelsey in March 1297 in a private interview with the king, when he declared that he still did not see that the necessity was great enough for the clergy to be excused from the provisions of the bull.[3] There is even a suggestion that the November council criticized the war itself. A letter of Winchelsey written shortly after the meeting pointed to the serious consequences of the war upon the state of the country and declared that a new remedy should be found for this

1. ibid., p. 105; Councils and Synods, ii.1157-9.
2. Councils and Synods, ii.1158; Cotton, p. 317.
3. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', p. 572.

new situation. The suggestion of Denton, that the archbishop opposed the continuation of the war and favoured support being given to the papal peace negotiations, is certainly plausible.[1] As early as May 1295 he had written to the bishops requesting masses to be said for peace, explaining that the current discord was a danger to the Holy Land and to men's souls, a request which was renewed in February 1297.[2]

Although the conclusion of the council was not really affected by Clericis laicos, the bull could be used to justify and give additional authority to the conclusion. It spared the clergy the unwelcome task of criticizing the king and his policy in public and running the risk of appearing disloyal. It would give encouragement to those clergy who hesitated before the displeasure of the king to know that their position was backed up by divine authority, and it would help to deter those who were required to take aids and prises from the clergy. It was moreover a difficult argument for Edward to answer without appearing to challenge the pope and running the risk of papal disapproval or even excommunication, which he would want to avoid as he prepared for his Flemish campaign.

Whatever Winchelsey's reluctance to publish the bull when it first arrived in England, he sought to give it wide publicity immediately after the council of November 1296. During December and January letters were sent to the bishops ordering the publication of the bull throughout the country as soon as

1. Reg. Winchelsey, i. 147; Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 101-2.
2. Reg. Winchelsey, i. 26-30, 158.

possible, with the injunction that it was to be inviolably observed.[1] The bishops passed the order to their archdeacons and they in turn passed it on to the rural deans,[2] although the archbishop was clearly dissatisfied with the publicity it received and on February 17th issued further orders for its publication.[3] He probably knew that Edward had now decided to outlaw the clergy and seize their possessions,[4] and was no doubt anxious to stiffen the resolve of the clergy and keep the bull in the minds of the laity, especially those required to carry out the king's orders. In his letter to the bishops in February he complained that there were still those who went about taking clerical goods without permission and collecting and extorting tallages and taxes for which they incurred excommunication. Their perversity was bringing the statutes of the church into disrepute with a great many people, and this was blamed upon the prelates who made little or no effort to explain the dangerous consequences of such acts. Since the laity were ignorant of the law and would do many such illicit acts unless expressly forbidden, the bishops were to have the bull published as soon as possible on Sundays and feast days in every church and monastery in their dioceses during the mass, with sermons in the mother tongue explaining the statutes and the serious consequences of infringing them. He himself had begun the task of publicizing the bull a week earlier at the consecration of the bishop of Llandaff in Canterbury cathedral

1. ibid., i. 159-62; Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, 1283-1317, ed. W. W. Capes (Canterbury and York Society, vi, 1909), 342-3; Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland, ed. A. W. Hadden and W. Stubbs, i (Oxford, 1869), 620.

2. Cotton, p. 316.

3. Reg. Winchelsey, i. 154-9.

4. Cotton, p. 318.

by publicly excommunicating all those who contravened its provisions,[1] and followed this up by travelling about preaching that all who disobeyed the bull were automatically excommunicated.[2]

Edward was probably very worried by this propaganda. Not only did he need the financial support of the church, but he was also well aware that the spiritual support of the church would help to show that the king was fighting a just and divinely approved war. The opposite was also true: a hostile clergy would make the king appear in an unfavourable light, and this appears to have been happening early in 1297. His decision to outlaw the clergy led the writer of the Flores Historiarum to call him a second Nero,[3] and it was widely believed that it was divine disapproval which led to the defeat of the English army in Gascony on the day Edward made this decision.[4] Langtoft urged him to be reconciled to the church, for he would achieve nothing and be ruined if he did not have the help of God.[5] Such beliefs could be very damaging to the king's cause, and it is not surprising that he took steps to suppress them. He did not feel able to argue against Clericis laicos itself, but sought to prevent the clergy using it to support their position. He may even have tried to prevent the arrival of the bull itself, for on October 16th 1296 he had appointed John de Seaford to inquire

1. ibid., p. 320.

2. Guisborough, p. 288. Three manuscripts read mendicans instead of praedicans. Praedicans receives some confirmation from the annals of Hailes, f.53 (p. 107): 'et quasi mendicans ecclesiasticus predicabat'.

3. Flores Historiarum, iii.99.

4. Cotton, p. 319; Worcester, p. 530; Bury St. Edmunds, pp.137-8; Flores Historiarum, iii.100; also mentioned by the later Guisborough, p. 287.

5. Langtoft, ii. 284-6.

into some letters brought into England by a clerk, Nichodemus, which were prejudicial to the king and kingdom and which he wanted to prevent falling into the hands of his enemies.[1] He certainly took steps later to try and prevent further communication with Rome, no doubt fearing that appeals to Rome might bring more specific support for the clergy and papal condemnations of his own position. On January 31st 1297 he sent a writ to nearly one hundred ports throughout England ordering that no-one might leave the country without licence and that all letters were to be seized and sent to him for inspection.[2] Later, on March 1st, all passage overseas was prohibited save from certain ports where two men were appointed to watch night and day to ensure that no letters or messages left without the king's licence and to imprison all those carrying such unwarranted letters. All sailors were to be searched, and they and all merchants were to swear that they carried no letters or messages and would commit no act which would bring harm to the king and the realm.[3] Such efforts were not without success, for on March 9th a protest was issued by the proctor of the church of Canterbury, Richard de Clive, against the prevention of certain messengers carrying letters to Rome from leaving the country.[4]

1. Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 94-5; P.R.O. E159/70, m.99. The chronology here is suggestive, for the letter to the archbishops of Canterbury and York ordering the publication of the bull was dated in Paris on 10th October: Reg. Winchelsey, i. 159-161.

2. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 81.

3. ibid., 86-7.

4. H.M.C., Various Collections, i. 245-6.

Edward also took steps to prevent the publication of sentences of excommunication in accordance with Clericis laicos. On February 27th he sent a writ, probably to all the bishops, ordering them to cease issuing such sentences against his officials,[1] and attempted to enforce this by setting up a commission in each county on March 1st. This commission was ordered to inquire into and imprison all those who excommunicated the king's ministers, subjects and others aiding the king in executing his orders or those clergy who had paid him the fine for his protection.[2] When the clergy assembled to consider the question of taxation in March 1297, Edward tried to control the proceedings. Hugh Despenser was sent to proclaim letters forbidding the clergy to ordain or do anything or assent to any ordinance which was prejudicial or harmful to the king or his ministers or those in his peace and faith and in his protection.[3] In addition Itier de Angoulême, a royal clerk, was appointed to make an appeal to Rome against the bishops, lest they 'should attempt to order, admonish, cite, decree, ordain or determine, declare, denounce, publish, suspend, excommunicate, interdict or execute or otherwise undertake anything with or without legal process against the king, his kingdom, his subjects and his adherents.[4] This appeal was read before the bishops on the day the assembly opened, and similar

1. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', p. 571.

2. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 239; Foedera, p. 875.

3. Concilia, ed. Wilkins, i.224; Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 244; Worcester, p. 531; Flores Historiarum, iii.100.

4. The translation is from Denton, Winchelsey, p. 125. The document is printed in Documents Illustrating the Crisis of 1297-8 in England, ed. M. Prestwich (Camden Society, 4th series, xxiv, 1980), pp. 55-8.

procurations were made by Alan de Kent and John de Borham in various bishoprics.[1] There is no record that any appeal was ever sent to Rome,[2] and it would be most surprising if it had been dispatched. The pope's answer was a foregone conclusion and there was little point in seeking it. However the widespread publicity given to the appeal in England indicates that it was drawn up for domestic consumption, not only to try and prevent the bishops from issuing the excommunications but also to try and convince the laity that such excommunications were invalid.

Edward did more than publicly threaten and restrain the clergy, but also sought to persuade them of the need for taxation. This was after all the crucial point, for if he could persuade them of his necessity the problem of Clericis laicos would disappear. Therefore he sent his clerk John Berwick to the January council to explain the dangers of a foreign invasion unless the realm was defended with the help of the clergy.[3] Those clergy who did pay a fine to recover the king's protection were said to have given a fifth 'for the defence of themselves and their churches and to resist the machinations and invasions of enemies who, landing in some parts of the realm, have burned churches, carried off the sacred vessels and ornaments, barbarously murdered ecclesiastics and even decrepit persons therein, and are preparing to invade the realm again with new and unheard of ships and arms'.[4] In March, at a private meeting

1. B.L. Add. MS 7965, f.15^{v}.
2. Denton, Winchelsey, p. 125.
3. Cotton, p. 317.
4. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 237.

with Winchelsey, Edward explained that his necessity was now so great that it would not be wrong for him to draw upon the temporalities of the pope, if he had any in England, for the defence of the kingdom and the church.[1]

When the clergy failed to respond to such arguments it was a logical conclusion to regard them as enemies of the king and kingdom and no longer entitled to receive the king's protection. Not only did Edward declare the clergy to be outlaws, but he also made sure that it was known why, both in an attempt to win round the clergy themselves and to persuade the laity that the clergy were acting in a treacherous manner. It was important that the laity should be convinced of this, for they could easily be persuaded by the church's denunciations that it was the king who was acting dishonourably and would refuse to co-operate themselves. Edward justified his actions in a letter to the bishops in February which explained that the publication of the sentences of excommunication was forbidden because they would be to the harm and prejudice of the crown and his dignity, and could lead to his disinheritance and the subversion of the whole realm.[2] One of the main purposes of the Salisbury parliament of February 1297, which was composed entirely of laymen, was probably to convince the laity of the error of the clergy's ways. As the Evesham chronicler explained, Edward was striving to rouse the laity against the clergy,[3] and it was during this parliament that the king announced the sale of

1. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', p. 572.
2. ibid., p. 571; Documents of 1297-8, p. 44.
3. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', pp. 570-1.

clerical goods and the clergy's permanent loss of their lands unless they submitted before Easter.[1] Moreover the commission set up in each county on March 1st to collect the clerical fines and to inquire into and imprison all those who excommunicated the king's ministers, subjects and others aiding the king in executing his orders or those clergy who paid him the desired taxation was drawn mainly from those knights who had attended the parliament.[2] The commission's task was a delicate one, and the government no doubt preferred to appoint men who had just heard the king's grievances against the clergy explained. The appeal to Rome which was widely published at the end of March also treated the clergy's actions as disloyal. Edward's commission to Itier de Angoulême spoke of ordinances which the clergy were going to make which were prejudicial to the king and realm, while the appeal itself said that the state of the realm was being undermined chiefly because the clergy were publicly acting against the king, his realm and its inhabitants contrary to their oath of fealty.[3] A writ to the sheriff of Cumberland in April, asking him to act against those clergy who had not paid their fines, went as far as calling them rebels acting to the great harm and danger of the realm.[4] Similarly a writ to the barons of the exchequer

1. ibid., p. 570.
2. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 239. Twenty-four were appointed to assist the sheriffs of whom seventeen had been at the Salisbury Parliament: ibid., 239-40; Parl. Writs, p.51 (no.3).
3. Documents of 1297-8, pp. 56-7.
4. ibid., p. 66.

in the same month ordering the sale of the goods of the defaulting clergy explained that they had failed their liege lord and their own nation when there had never been a greater need.[1] Edward's intentions were certainly understood by the Dunstable annalist who said that those clergy who refused to pay were held to be outlaws and traitors because they refused to help him defend the land and the holy church against the enemy. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler also repeated Edward's claim that clergy found without the protection of the council were punished as public enemies, while the Evesham chronicler reported that Edward claimed the clergy were perjurors and unfaithful to him and the kingdom, for they had sworn fidelity to him but now deserted him in the hour of need when the kingdom was in great danger.[2]

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of this clerical and royal propaganda. Although the clergy were not united in their struggle against the king, it is hard to argue that many were persuaded by the merits of Edward's arguments. The king's clerks and officials and those who had benefited from his patronage would be naturally inclined to favour the king's views, and at the clerical assembly in January the opposition to the archbishop's views probably came from such quarters. Such men were certainly amongst the first to seek the king's protection.[3] However, the growing number of clergy who did submit later contained a number with no such connections, and although it is impossible to determine whether they had been

1. ibid., p. 68.
2. Dunstable, p. 406; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 139; Denton, 'Crisis of 1297', p. 568.
3. Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 104-5, 114.

persuaded by Edward's arguments or simply could not tolerate further oppression, there are a few indications to suggest the latter. The clerical assembly which met in August 1297 declared that the king's needs still did not exempt them from Clericis laicos,[1] and there is no reason to believe that anything had changed their minds since the spring. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler certainly interpreted the submissions as the result of oppression, explaining that 'many of the clergy forgot their own salvation and were but worldly-wise; they acted with the weakness of women'.[2] Cotton described how, at the clerical assembly in March, most of the clergy saw that they should give in to the king, saying that necessity excused them from the penalties of the bull since any other course would lead to hunger and penury. It was presumably royal pressure which had changed their minds since February, when only a few had answered the proclamation of the sheriff of Norfolk to appear before Robert de Tateshale to receive the king's protection. The Northampton chronicler certainly said that the majority of the clergy were compelled by necessity to seek protection, and the Evesham chronicler likewise said that many were compelled by necessity rather than will, fearing the temporal power rather than the eternal. Walter of Guisborough also claimed that the clergy submitted to avoid Edward's anger.[3] Many of the clergy who submitted also abstained from the celebration of mass because of

1. ibid., p. 145; Worcester, p. 533.

2. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 138.

3. Cotton, pp. 321, 323; Northampton, f.37^{v}; Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', pp. 570, 574; Guisborough, p. 288.

the sentence of excommunication,[1] something they would not have done if they had felt that the king's necessity exempted them from the provisions of the bull. There is evidence that a number of them went to the expense and trouble of appealing to Rome to secure absolution for infringing Clericis laicos.[2]

The clergy it seems remained generally unconvinced of the king's plea of necessity, even though he was able to compel many of them to submit. However he was not able to stifle all clerical opposition. Thirty-four clerks were imprisoned at Launceston and a further unspecified number in Norfolk and Suffolk for the publication of a papal letter, presumably Clericis laicos, and these are unlikely to have been isolated cases.[3] There are also references to forgers of papal bulls, who were perhaps working to support the clerical position. In early March we hear that one such forger has been arrested, possibly Walter de Maidstone who is later to be found imprisoned in the Tower for this offence.[4] A certain Adam de Berdseye was arrested for transcribing these bulls,[5] while in Lancashire Robert le Bel, chaplain, Walter de Mundham and his brother were

1. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', p. 575.

2. Examples are contained in Reg. Winchelsey, pp. 343, 371, 375, 392, 405; Register of Bishop William Ginsborough, 1303-1307, ed. J. W. Willis Bond (Worcester Historical Society, xix, 1907), pp. 31, 145-6; Two Chartularies of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath, ed. W. Hunt (Somerset Record Society, vii, 1893), pp. 106-7, 108, 111; Reg. Pontissara, i.106; Reg. Dalderby, many examples passim; B.L. MS Cotton Vitelius C viii, f.103^{r}; C.U.L. Ee v 31, f.85^{v}; Worcester, p. 541. Many of the appeals repeat a standard explanation that the tax had been given against the papal bull for fear of loss of temporal goods to the king's messengers, servants and collectors. There was no doubt an element of truth in this, otherwise there would have been no real need to seek papal absolution.

3. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 26-7.

4. Documents of 1297-8, pp. 44, 77.

5. ibid., p. 77.

arrested 'pro suspicione falsarum bullarum'.[1] The suspicion against Robert le Bel was evidently upheld, for he was held in Newgate prison until 1300 together with Robert de Blida and William de Gildford,who had also been counterfeiting bulls and other letters.[2] We also hear about clergy who were not afraid to excommunicate those who invaded their property. Adam de Bray, who was in charge of the king's horses, went to a manor in Hertfordshire belonging to the Hospitallers to purvey grain for the horses. This was resisted, and some chaplains and deacons pronounced sentence against those who took such prises, and were subsequently summoned before the exchequer to answer for their actions.[3] Edward also ran into trouble when he tried to collect the arrears of the crusading tax, for a number of clergy in Kent, Sussex, Essex and Norfolk resisted the collectors and did not hesitate to excommunicate them.[4]

It is difficult to assess what effects the dispute had upon the laity. Edward does not seem to have had much trouble securing their co-operation against the church. The Salisbury parliament apparently backed his policy against the clergy,[5] and there seems to have been little trouble enforcing the seizure of their goods and estates except in South Wales where, amongst others, Roger Bigod and Humphrey de Bohun both held lands.[6] A chronicle of St. Albans contains the story of a

1. ibid., p. 78 n.1.
2. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 347, printed W. Prynne, Exact Chronological Vindication of our King's Supreme Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (London, 1668), p. 864.
3. Documents of 1297-8, p. 82.
4. ibid., p. 100.
5. Denton, Winchelsey, p. 115.
6. ibid., pp. 130-131.

knight who tried unsuccessfully to take the horse of a rector which was better than his own, claiming that it was the will of the king.[1] Winchelsey's register also tells how he was besieged in the rectory of Maidstone by his own tenants and their accomplices, who treated him and his familia like thieves and public enemies.[2] Yet in the absence of any lay records it is difficult to tell whether the clerical case received any covert sympathy from the laity or helped to encourage their growing dissatisfaction. However, it is noticeable that Edward was anxious to come to terms with the church before he embarked upon his Flemish campaign, no doubt feeling that his claim to be fighting a just war against one who was inspired in his evil acts by the devil would be much tarnished if he remained in dispute with his own clergy.[3]

The reconciliation which was reached in July 1297 was however shortlived, and Clericis laicos became an important issue once again in August when Edward sought further taxes from the clergy. The council which met in August to consider his request concluded after careful consideration that the needs of the king were still not sufficient to excuse them from Clericis laicos.[4] As before Winchelsey drew attention to the authority behind this decision by ordering the excommunication of those who attacked ecclesiastical property in accordance with the bull. September 1st was fixed for the publication of the sentence, and all the

1. Annales Regis Edwardi Primi, p. 474.
2. Reg. Winchelsey, i.217.
3. For the ceremony of reconciliation see below, pp. 263-6.
4. Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 145-6.

bishops and ministers were required to announce it in person in their cathedrals and churches, with the ringing of bells and dousing of candles, accompanied by explanations of the excommunication. In order to make this more effective men were to be named in the parish where they had infringed the bull and in neighbouring places, and solemnly denounced with sentences of major excommunication. Those who persisted were to be denounced daily.[1] The archbishop himself issued the sentence as planned on September 1st in Canterbury cathedral,[2] and the register of the bishop of Lincoln contains a detailed account of the sentence which he promulgated in the prebendal church of Buckingham on the same day.[3] He was assisted on this occasion by the archdeacons of Buckingham and Stowe and his official, Master Nicholas of Whitchurch. After the gospel reading he preached in English explaining that it was his duty to denounce as excommunicate those who had invaded church property so that they should be able to mend their behaviour. He specifically excluded Edward himself from the sentence, for by papal privilege he was exempt from all but papal sentences of excommunication, but did it in such a way which suggested that the bishop felt the king should be included: 'It seems relevant to say out of reverence for the king that if perhaps he conscientiously believes that he has an excuse for his mandates and does not expect to incur the danger to souls which may arise from them, or if perhaps he believes that he is protected by some

1. Cotton, pp. 328-9.
2. ibid., p. 335.
3. Reg. Sutton, vi. 24-7.

privilege or reason on account of which he believes he will not incur these sentences, we do not wish to prejudice him in our declaration and publication'. In other words the bishop believed the king to be excommunicate, but left it entirely to the king's conscience whether he regarded this to be so or not. He then proceeded to show that the clergy were not in any way acting unreasonably, explaining that they desired to help the king if at all possible and that they had sent envoys to the pope asking for permission to make a grant. Although no envoys are known to have been sent, the clergy had offered on several occasions to send such messengers, no doubt confident that their request would be refused. It helped to make them appear ready to help the king, and not disloyal as Edward claimed, and passed responsibility for their refusal onto the pope. Following his sermon the bishop then proceeded to excommunicate all those who attacked ecclesiastical property, and on September 3rd wrote to all his archdeacons asking that they arrange for similar sentences to be announced within their archdeaconries.[1]

As in the previous March Edward drew up an appeal to Rome to try and prevent the clergy from reissuing their sentences of excommunication. He initially wrote to all the bishops on August 19th forbidding the publication of the sentences,[2] but perhaps realizing that this would not be sufficient appointed Hugh of Yarmouth and Thomas de Boyvill on 31st August to renew the citations and appeals which had been made to Rome the previous March.[3] On the following day, the day when Winchelsey

1. ibid., vi.27. The mandate of the bishop of Salisbury for publication of the excommunication is in Reg. Gandavo, i.1-2.

2. Foedera, p. 875; Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 124.

3. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 307-8.

issued the sentences, Hugh of Yarmouth, accompanied by Itier de Angoulême and other royal clerks and officials, interrupted the archbishop while he was preaching and read out the appeal before the high altar of Canterbury cathedral.[1] Furthermore on September 12th Alan de Kent was appointed to go to the sees of Canterbury, Rochester, Chichester, Winchester, Exeter, Bath and Wells, Salisbury, Hereford, Llandaff and St. David's and John de Borham to go to London, Norwich, Ely, Lincoln, Coventry and Lichfield, Worcester, Bangor and St. Asaph to make the appeals known there.[2] Once again, there is no record that the appeal was actually sent to Rome, and it was probably drawn up as before solely to influence domestic opinion. Edward would not want to risk strengthening the clergy's case in any way by sending an appeal to Rome which was almost certain to be rejected.

Edward as before backed up his threats with arguments to show the justice and necessity of his actions if the interests and welfare of the realm were to be properly defended. For example, when he wrote to the bishops and other prelates on August 7th requesting prayers for his forthcoming expedition to Flanders, he explained that God had ordained that peace should be kept amongst his subjects, 'but the unbridled greed of certain of them has wickedly schemed to acquire and illegally retain the rights of others, and it is right that the evil attempts of such people should be suppressed by force of arms and their bold presumption met with fitting remedies'. He then

1. Documents of 1297-8, pp. 142-4.

2. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, p. 308; P.R.O. E159/70, m. 117d; E405/1/11, m.11.

explained how Philip IV had deceived him over Gascony and refused to assent, as he himself had done, to the discussions for peace organized by the pope through the cardinals to settle the dispute and spare the shedding of Christian blood. Instead Philip had made war on Edward's friends and allies, and therefore Edward was going abroad to their aid and to recover his hereditary rights.[1] On August 19th Edward justified his actions further in the letter sent to the bishops prohibiting them from issuing their sentences of excommunication. He explained that he had been compelled by urgent necessity to take corn and goods in order to defend the kingdom, the church and the people from the invasions of the king of France and other enemies, but that proper restitution would be made for these goods. If the bishops went ahead with their excommunication of the purveyors it would bring great harm to the crown and people, and could indeed lead to the destruction of the church and the subversion of the realm.[2] The following day he issued his ordinance for the taxation of the clergy which declared that there was a real danger that the kingdom would be subverted and the church destroyed because the king of France and his allies, who had disinherited him, were seeking with all their power to destroy the realm. He had therefore made alliances with the count of Flanders and other grantz seignours for the defence of

1. Foedera, p. 872. This request was issued before Edward taxed the clergy by his own authority later in the month, which probably explains why bishop Sutton of Lincoln was ready to order the prayers to be made, when on September 1st he all but excommunicated the king: Reg. Sutton, vi.21-3.

2. Foedera, p.875.

the realm, but if Philip IV destroyed them, as he threatened to, Edward would not be able to recover his inheritance or prevent the destruction of the kingdom, church and people. The clergy therefore should contribute to the defence of his allies.[1] This writ is particularly interesting for it is the only surviving explanation of Edward's claim that his Flemish expedition was necessary for the defence of the realm. The argument was ingenious, but apparently unconvincing, for this tax was certainly never collected, and there is no evidence that the exchequer was even able to put the orders for collection into effect.[2]

However in August 1297 Edward did not take his arguments to their logical conclusion and declare the clergy to be unfaithful and outlawed for their rebellion. That course had had limited success and would be far too damaging to contemplate undertaking a second time. Instead he seems to have tried to undermine Clericis laicos itself. He still did not challenge it directly but rather sought to limit its application. In a manifesto sent to all the shires on August 12th Edward declared that all those who disturbed the realm, in whatever manner and whoever they were, were excommunicated by reason of a bull of Clement IV, presumably that originally directed at Simon de Montfort and his supporters.[3] Since Edward had made it quite clear that clerical enforcement of Clericis laicos undermined the peace and welfare of the realm, he presumably considered that the enforcement of Clericis laicos was now superceded at

1. Documents of 1297-8, p. 134.
2. Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 151-2.
3. ibid., p. 148; Documents of 1297-8, pp. 128-9.

this time of danger by the prior requirement to preserve the peace of the realm, which would involve its defence against foreign invasion. Furthermore, Edward declared in his ordinance for the taxation of the clergy on August 20th that he had received the government of the realm by the ordinance of God and that he was bound to defend all his people.[1] Therefore, he implied, no papal bull such as Clericis laicos could stand in the way of the execution of this duty. This was put more explicitly in the appeal to Rome in September which said that the clergy's sentences of excommunication were based upon bulls which, according to the canons of the saints and other divine laws, were invalid when the realm was in a state of emergency.[2] Yet in the end such arguments could not solve the fundamental problem that the clergy were unconvinced that there was indeed a state of emergency. All Edward could do was to hope to weaken their resolve by removing the cloak of legitimacy given to their position by Clericis laicos. He may have had some success,for there is some evidence that the excommunications ordered in September were not carried out everywhere. Cotton notes that some published them, but others hesitated because of the royal prohibition and others did little or nothing at all.[3] The bishop of Worcester was one of those who hesitated when he received the royal prohibition, ordering the priory not to issue the sentences, although his disquiet was apparently settled subsequently, for the sentence was published there on September

1. Documents of 1297-8, p. 134.
2. ibid., p. 143.
3. Cotton, p. 336.

22nd.[1] However this crisis in September was shortlived, for in late September arrived news of the Scottish victory at Stirling Bridge. This much more serious threat to the realm led to the constitutional settlement of October 1297.

Edward's dispute with the clergy was played before a wide audience. The king was anxious that his opposition to the clergy should not be misinterpreted by those subjects whom he was calling upon to support his Flemish campaign, a concern which became particularly acute as a parallel dispute developed with the laity. He would not want to have been regarded as the oppressor of the church, especially at a time when he claimed to be fighting a holy war against the king of France. The clergy, on the other hand, also needed the support of the laity. Such support would not only jeopardize Edward's war effort, but would also relieve the pressure being placed on them through outlawry and confiscation of their lands and goods. Although we have no evidence of what was said in the parishes, it is likely that the clergy were able to disseminate their views widely through sermons and announcements from the pulpit, which they followed up with the spiritual weapon of excommunication. Yet Edward had equally effective ways of spreading his views through parliament, writs to sheriffs and announcements in the dioceses. Although the clergy remained unconvinced, it seems that for much of the summer he was able to retain the support of the laity against the clergy, for it is not until July and the Remonstrances that there are any signs of co-operation between the lay and clerical opposition. Moreover the temporal pressures he was

1. Worcester, p. 533.

prepared to apply to compel co-operation seem to have outweighed the spiritual sanctions which the clergy employed, for the laity were prepared to enforce Edward's sanctions against the clergy, many of whom in the end were forced to submit regardless of the spiritual consequences.

Chapter 7

THE LAITY AND THE CRISIS OF 1297

The conflict with the laity began after that with the clergy. The first clear indications of a dispute occurred at the Salisbury parliament of February 1297 when the barons led by Bohun and Bigod, the earls of Hereford and Norfolk, refused to go to Gascony without the king. Edward allowed the question to drop, but throughout the spring and summer continued preparations for his expedition to Flanders. Matters came to a head again in July when the army mustered in London. Bohun and Bigod again led the opposition to the proposed expedition, and under their leadership a collection of Remonstrances ~~were~~ was drawn up seeking the redress of the grievances of the community. Nevertheless Edward went ahead with his plans, imposing an eighth at the end of July and attempting to answer the opposition's complaints with assurances of his good intentions. He departed for Flanders on 22nd August, and the growing threat of civil war was only averted by the news in late September of the English defeat at Stirling Bridge, which led the way to the constitutional settlement of October.[1]

Although there are no clear signs of a crisis until

1. For an account of the crisis see Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, pp. 438-448; Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, pp. 678-683.

February 1297, there does seem to have been some unease at the parliament of November 1296, for it was some while before the laity were prevailed upon to grant a twelfth.[1] We have no record of their discussions, but it is possible that the laity were beginning to doubt that the Gascon war was in the interests of the realm. This concern was certainly behind the famous outburst of the earl of Norfolk in the Salisbury parliament of February 1297 when Edward raised the question of reinforcements for Gascony. He seems to have met a general refusal, for according to Guisborough 'each began to make his excuses'. Edward retorted with a threat to disinherit the barons if they did not go, presumably for the same reason that he outlawed the clergy and seized their lands, that if they refused to co-operate in the defence of the realm they would have to be treated as rebels against the king. The two earls, Roger Bigod of Norfolk and Humphrey Bohun of Hereford, were able to take refuge behind their privilege as Marshal and Constable of owing no service save in the presence of the king. Bigod declared that he would gladly fulfil his duty, but emphatically refused to go without the king.[2] The two earls also questioned the necessity of the expedition, pointing out that the safety of the realm really required them to stay in England since it was surrounded by so many enemies.[3] This was not the first time that opposition to the Gascon war had been expressed, but it was

1. Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 21, points out that parliament met on 3rd November, but that the grant was not made until 29th November.

2. Guisborough, p. 290.

3. Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 138-9.

now expressed far more vociferously than before and received more widespread support than hitherto. In 1295 Edward had persuaded several magnates to go to Gascony by threatening to distrain them for their debts, but in 1297 he was sufficiently alarmed to withdraw his feudal summons and quietly drop the question of reinforcements.

The opposition which Edward had aroused seems to have been based upon a small group of Marcher lords for whom this summons to Gascony was but the latest of a number of grievances, not all of them connected with the war. Since the conquest of Wales Edward had not had such an interest in maintaining the strength and independence of the Marcher lordships,and his tough attitude towards their privileges must have aroused much resentment.[1] Both Bohun and Bigod were Marcher lords. Bohun in particular had suffered the king's hostility when he was temporarily imprisoned in 1290 following his celebrated dispute with the earl of Gloucester, an event which left him in bitter mood.[2] He and Bigod also had a long-standing dispute with Edward over their offices of Marshal and Constable.[3] For both the question of overseas service was merely an additional grievance, but as the Salisbury parliament showed, it was an issue which brought them the sympathy of other barons and raised the possibility of serious opposition to the king. Edward defused the situation by dropping the matter of the Gascon reinforcements, for a while isolating the small group of discontented barons.

1. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 232-3.
2. Beddoe, op. cit., p. 225.
3. Prestwich, op. cit., p. 249.

This was never a very large group. Only three names were of sufficient importance to mention in the pardon issued to the rebels in October, the two earls of Norfolk and Hereford, and John Ferrers,whose father, the earl of Derby, had been disinherited by Edward after the baronial wars. For a while the earls of Arundel and Warwick were involved,[1] but their part is obscure and Edward was able to conciliate them. Even at the height of the crisis in August the impression remains that the earls were leading a small but tightly-knit group. The pardon granted to the earls referred to 'aliaunces' which they had made,[2] and a draft of the pardon preserved in the Evesham chronicle mentioned more explicitly a pardon to all 'de societate et confederacione eorum'.[3] Cotton, too, spoke of the earls 'cum suis complicibus et alligatis'.[4] This impression is strengthened by the account of the earls' invasion of the exchequer on August 22nd which says that they were accompanied by Robert fitz Roger, Alan la Zouche, John de Segrave, Henry le Tieys and John Lovel. Of these five only Henry le Tieys was not a member of Bigod's household.[5] Yet, as the Salisbury parliament and events in August showed, the issue of the war with France could easily arouse much sympathy. Given effective

1. Documents of 1297-8, p. 14.
2. ibid., p. 156.
3. ibid., p. 155.
4. Cotton, p. 325.
5. Documents of 1297-8, p. 31.

leadership this could turn into a formidable problem.

This potentially dangerous situation in 1297 was made more serious by the growing unrest in the country. Three years of heavy taxation and purveyance, with the accompanying oppressions and hardships caused by the king's officials, cannot have endeared the population to the Gascon war. Discontent was not confined to the peasants. The maltolt, for example, severely disrupted the wool trade, and wool was for many of the greatest landowners, including the earl of Norfolk, a major cash crop. Property taxes also fell heavily upon those lords who practised direct management of their lands and could only be avoided by those who drew most of their income from rents and the profits of lordship.[1] Of course landowners were more able to bribe collectors and purveyors than the peasantry, but nevertheless they were not able to avoid the war burdens completely. The main complaint of the Marcher lords when they met at Montgomery in the spring was the level of the king's financial exactions, while the earl of Warwick actually took his complaint of poverty to the king.[2] It is likely, too, that the poverty of their peasantry affected them through unpaid rents and dues. The earls were therefore not simply acting in a public-spirited manner when they began to champion the grievances of the community later in the year. Yet for the time being opposition was generally passive. Purveyance and other preparations for the

1. E. Miller, 'War, Taxation and the English Economy in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', War and Economic Development, ed. J. M. Winter (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 15-16.

2. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', p. 576.

expedition seem to have been made fairly efficiently with no real opposition,[1] and only the wool prise of Easter was disappointing.[2] A hint of the growing unrest is contained in the orders to inquire into those who spread rumours which could lead to discord between the king and prelates, earls, barons and other great men, which were given to the commissioners appointed in March 1297 to receive the fines of the clergy.[3] But in March the three main strands of opposition, the earls, the clergy and the people, were still not united.[4] Should the earls begin to champion the interests of the community, as Simon de Montfort did in the baronial wars and as Lancaster was to do under Edward II, Edward I would face a serious problem.

There is no evidence that the earls were yet appealing for general support. Guisborough says that they were joined by a number of magnates and more than thirty chosen bannerets, and built up a force of 1,500 armed cavalry.[5] Although the idea of banerettis electis is suggestive, it is likely that he is overestimating the strength of the earls, projecting their strength of the summer back into the spring. Rather it seems that the earls withdrew from public life,[6] and, apart from a meeting of their followers at Montgomery to discuss their grievances[7], made little effort to influence political affairs.

1. Documents of 1297-8, pp. 7-8, 21-2. However Guisborough, p. 290, says that the earls resisted the purveyors.
2. Documents of 1297-8, pp. 10-11.
3. Foedera, p. 875; Denton, 'Crisis of 1297', p. 572.
4. Documents of 1297-8, p. 16.
5. Guisborough, p. 290.
6. ibid., p. 290; Flores Historiarum, iii.101, cited by Rothwell, 'Confirmation of the Charters', p. 24.
7. Denton, 'Evesham Chronicle', p. 576.

Edward, on the other hand, was working hard to win support for the Gascon war. At this stage, apart from a few general admonitions to officials not to oppress the poorer people,[1] he did little to alleviate popular grievances. He probably did not have the officials to spare until the crisis of August forced him to promise to inquire into their grievances. Instead he concentrated on building up support for the forthcoming expedition by showing that it was for the defence of the country. The men of Ireland were summoned to go abroad with the king 'for the defence and salvation of the whole realm'.[2] The twenty-librate landholders were required to prepare themselves to fight whenever necessary for the defence of themselves and the realm, for sudden invasions of enemies were expected which would be harmful and dangerous to them and the whole realm. This was such a serious task involving all the king's subjects that none could refuse.[3] Ten days later they were ordered to come to London ready to go overseas for the salvation of the honour of God, the king and themselves, and for the common welfare of the realm.[4] Throughout May a number of writs were issued in similar terms.[5] In order to overcome the objections of the previous February the magnates did not receive feudal summons, or even a summons which referred to the fealty and esteem which

1. See,for example, A Lincolnshire Assize Roll, p. cxxvi.
2. Parl. Writs, p. 280 (no. 2).
3. ibid., p. 281 (no. 4).
4. ibid., p. 281 (no. 5).
5. ibid., pp. 282-4 (nos. 7-13).

the magnates owed to the king as was normal in a non-feudal summons. Instead they were merely 'affectionately required and requested' to come.[1] An interesting feature of these writs is that the destination of the expedition was deliberately kept vague, the writs only saying that it was to go overseas.[2] Clearly it was difficult to reconcile the destination of Flanders with the notion that this was purely a defensive war, and rather than attempt an explanation the government preferred to remain silent. In the long run this probably merely added to the general unease and suspicion of the government's intentions, making the explanation of aggressive defence seem rather lame and awkward when it did come.

When the army mustered in London on July 7th it was clear that Edward had not been successful in winning support for his expedition. The earl of Arundel complained that he could only find men to go overseas with him if he rewarded them with land,which he was unwilling to do.[3] As late as July 28th Edward wrote a desperate appeal asking the sheriffs to send to Winchelsea all those who had promised to serve and any others who had a horse and arms and were able to serve. Two returns survive which are probably indicative of the mood of the country. The sheriff of Devon replied that he could not find anyone to serve with the king, while the sheriff of Hereford could only produce Miles Pychard, who was a household knight, although a squire from Hereford, Roger Freeman, did subsequently join the

1. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 85.
2. Documents of 1297-8, p. 4.
3. ibid., pp. 141-2.

royal army in October.[1] This poor response to Edward's appeals may well reflect a spontaneous disenchantment with the Gascon war, for there is no indication, either in the chronicles or the royal records, that the earls had been deliberately making their views generally known during the early summer before the muster of July.

Both sides seem to have been fairly guarded in their statements at this early stage. The earls of Norfolk and Hereford were both present at the muster but refused to perform their duties as Marshal and Constable on the grounds that they had merely been requested, not summoned,to serve. Clearly they had no relish for an overseas expedition but were not ready yet to give an outright refusal. Similarly, according to Langtoft, many of the barons refused to come to the muster because they were suspicious of the novel form of the summons.[2] They had good reason to be suspicious,for Edward had already made several attempts to extend the system of military obligation.[3] But on this occasion it seems to have been a way of refusing to serve in Gascony without appearing disloyal, for Edward's offer of payment to show that no new obligations were intended made little difference. Just as the barons in 1258 had insisted upon their loyalty, now in July 1297 they refrained from making an explicit refusal to serve. Edward too was anxious to avoid a break with his opponents and on July 14th held an important public meeting at Westminster. A special platform was built within the palace

1. ibid., pp. 108-9; Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 86 (where the returns are confused).
2. Langtoft, ii.286-8.
3. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 251.

from which he could address the assembly.[1] Here he asked forgiveness for his faults, saying that he had ruled as well and peacefully as a king ought; he apologized for taking prises and money from his subjects, blaming the excesses on his officials and explaining that it was necessary if he was going to fight the war, a war which was not his personal war but was undertaken to protect and defend the whole people from the aggressions of their enemies. Such expenditure was justified as then men would be able to enjoy what remained to them in peace. He added that he was about to expose himself on their behalf, and asked them to pray for him. Edward was accompanied at this assembly by a number of bishops and barons who swore fealty to the young Edward,who was entrusted with the government in the king's absence and designated his heir should he not return.[2] The following day the aldermen and citizens of London did the same.[3]

This ceremony was intended to be, amongst other things, a symbol of reconciliation with the church and the magnates, for there seems to have been a quite understandable feeling that the king should not contemplate an overseas expedition while he was in conflict with the church and the magnates.[4] The official record on the memoranda rolls[5] suggests that it was not entirely successful. Although the nine bishops present included the

1. B.L. Add. MS 7965, f.30^{v}.
2. Flores Historiarum, iii.101-2, 295; Guisborough, p. 291.
3. Documents of 1297-8, p. 107.
4. Guisborough, p. 291.
5. Documents of 1297-8, pp. 106-7.

archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of Lincoln and Norwich, who had previously been opposed to the king,[1] the absentees included the bishops of Salisbury, Hereford, Exeter and Rochester who were opposed to the king later in the summer.[2] Moreover the magnates named included only one earl, the earl of Warwick, together with John Hastings, William de Breouse, Thomas de Berkley, Geoffrey de Geneville, Aymer de Valence and Hugh Despenser, all of whom were royalists. The king's opponents had clearly stayed away, although the earls of Norfolk and Hereford and some others did take the oath two days later.[3]

The assembly was also intended to appeal directly to the king's subjects for their support, for it was probably attended by the Londoners and others present for the military muster.[4] Hitherto Edward had paid little attention to the complaints of his subjects. His instructions that people were not to be oppressed had been half-hearted, and no real attempt had been made to meet their grievances. That Edward should make this appeal now is perhaps an indication that the earls were at last beginning to champion the grievances of the community in order to widen and strengthen their opposition to him. There is unfortunately very little evidence to show what they were doing during these weeks, but there are indications that they were

1. The position of the bishop of Norwich is however not completely certain: Denton, Winchelsey, p. 138.

2. ibid., pp. 149, 159.

3. Documents of 1297-8, p. 107.

4. This would seem to be the interpretation of Guisborough's 'coram omni populo', p. 291.

broadening their appeal by the last two weeks of July. Guisborough tells us that they argued with the mediators sent to them after this ceremony in mid-July that they were not acting on their own behalf but for the whole community. Not only they but the whole community had been excessively burdened with unjust oppressions, tallages and prises and in particular with the non-observance of Magna Carta.[1] Edward's speech to the Londoners suggests that the earls had already adopted this position in public, for Edward is answering these very points. The prises and taxation were necessary for the safety of the realm, and the excesses were not of his doing but were done without his knowledge by his officials. Although people were suffering now, in the long run it would all be to their advantage. He also promised to confirm Magna Carta.[2] Edward's appeal however was not entirely successful, for Guisborough reports that although some were prepared to support him, 'alii autem maledicunt in occulto'.[3]

The Londoners were probably already giving the earls close support. Their relations with Edward had been particularly strained since he took the city into his hands in 1285, and in 1295 they had presented him with a long list of grievances concerning the administration of the city.[4] As merchants many

1. Guisborough, p. 291. Note also the chronicle of St. Augustine's, p. 108: 'Ipsi vero comites se habebant pro libertatibus rehabendis tam pro populo quam pro clero'.

2. Reg. Winchelsey, i.189, shows this promise to have been carried out by July 16th.

3. Guisborough, p. 291.

4. Williams, Medieval London, p. 255; G. A. Williams, 'London and Edward I', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, xi (1961), 95.

of them would also have been seriously affected by the maltolt and wood seizures since 1294. One Londoner in 1297 even declared that Edward's head should be set up on a pike next to that of Llywelyn.[1] It is likely that they responded enthusiastically to the earls when they appealed to them 'tanquam amicos et confratres' for assistance in seeking and maintaining the liberties of Magna Carta. The earls, no doubt in return for such assistance, obtained the reading of a proclamation in the city against the taking of prises without just payment.[2] They also seem to have put pressure on the young Edward to restore the mayoralty and confirm the liberties of the city, which he did in November.[3]

The Remonstrances, drawn up before the end of July,[4] are a clear indication that the earls were now seeking to broaden their support as much as possible. The petitions were presented on behalf of 'the archbishops, bishops, earls, barons and the whole community of the land', and put forward grievances with which the different sections of the community could associate. The specific grievances of the military classes were met in the clauses about the Flemish expedition which claimed that since the writs of summons did not give the destination of the expedition they did not know how to prepare themselves; that they did not owe service in Flanders, if that was the destination

1. M. C. Prestwich, The Three Edwards (London, 1980), p. 41.
2. Guisborough, p. 294; Documents of 1297-8, p. 141.
3. Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, Letter-Book B (c. 1275-1312), ed. R. R. Sharpe (London, 1901), p.244, associates Bohun and Bigod with this restoration.
4. For the date see Denton, Winchelsey, p. 138. For the text see Documents of 1297-8, pp. 115-117.

of the expedition;[1] and that even if they did owe service there they could not perform it because they were too poor. The reference to the maintenance of franchises in clause four was perhaps included for the benefit of the Marchers, while the complaint about the maltolt met what was probably a general grievance[2] and also a particular grievance of the London merchants. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler says that the earls also demanded the restoration of all property unjustly seized, which would have met a particular grievance of the clergy, although this was not actually put forward in the Remonstrances.[3] The grievances of the community in general were represented in complaints at taxation and the oppressions which accompanied them, and in the assertions that the laws and customs of the realm were not maintained and Magna Carta and the Forest Charter were not observed as they should be. Yet the Remonstrances were presented as a loyal petition, avoiding direct criticism of the king, a device which would help to broaden support for the opposition. It asked that their grievances should be amended 'to the honour of God and the Holy Church, and the king and all his people and the land'. Even now the war with France was not attacked directly, excuses being presented on technical grounds implying that,but for these,men would be ready to serve. The only hint of criticism of the king's policy comes in the suggestion at the end that,in order to maintain the honour and

1. Even as late as July Edward had clearly been unwilling to disclose the destination of his expedition.

2. Miller, 'War, Taxation', pp. 13-14; Cotton, p. 338.

3. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 140.

safety of the king,he ought to be more certain of the support of the men of Flanders before he crossed over, and that the Scots might rebel once he had departed. Yet even here it is the timing and details of the policy which are being criticized, not the policy itself: this is loyal advice, not disloyal opposition. The Remonstrances were also conservative, not seeking to change the traditional way of life but to preserve it: there was to be no unprecedented service; taxes and prises were not to become precedents; Magna Carta and the Forest Charter and the customs of the realm were to be maintained. Such conservatism was no doubt appealing at a time when the king's demands and the activities of his officials seemed to be threatening to undermine the accepted political conventions. Indeed the Remonstrances claimed that such demands would lead to the people entering into servitude, a claim repeated by the earls at the exchequer on August 22nd.[1] It was finally a document which dealt with practical rather than theoretical matters. References to the doctrine of necessity, even if the earls were conversant with it, would have been out of place in a document designed to have a wide appeal. The Remonstrances probably circulated fairly widely. Cotton and Guisborough both had copies and the author of the Flores Historiarum clearly had a copy before him when he wrote.[2] A further text has recently been found in the register of the bishop of Worcester who was too ill to play any part in the politics of 1297,[3] while the wide

1. Documents of 1297-8, p. 138.

2. Cotton, pp. 325-7; Guisborough, pp. 292-3; Flores Historiarum, iii.102.

3. Printed by J. H. Denton, 'A Worcester Text of the Remonstrances of 1297', Speculum, liii (1978), 520-1.

variations between the versions and the fact that Edward felt the need to issue a detailed reply in his manifesto of August 12th point to the document's circulation.

Although we have no evidence to show how the earls circulated their arguments, it does seem that they were receiving widespread support. At the end of July Edward felt it was necessary to back up his demands for an eighth with lengthy explanations, which he had not needed to do before. It is true that the circumstances of the tax were rather unusual, for, unlike all previous Edwardian taxes, the knights of the shire had not been summoned to hear the reasons for the grant. Indeed there had not been a parliamentary grant of the usual kind, although the account of the Flores Historiarum, which talked about the eighth being granted by a handful of men in the king's chamber,[1] is probably more a reflection of current baronial rhetoric than what actually happened. Everything we know about Edward would indicate that such a step would be out of character: he realized the value of publicizing his financial needs and would not have willingly departed from his customary practice at this moment of crisis. Some sort of parliament certainly did take place in July. A large number of prelates and magnates were in London when the ceremony of reconciliation took place on July 14th, while both the Bury St. Edmunds chronicle and Cotton refer to the meeting of a parliament at this time.[2] Cotton says that the baronial grievances were discussed there and that Edward made several concessions before the earls withdrew. The

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.102.

2. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 140; Cotton, pp. 327, 330.

memoranda rolls also refer to a parliament being in session on July 8th and July 22nd.[1] It would therefore seem that a parliament had indeed been held, that the earls refused to make a grant unless their grievances were met and had withdrawn leaving only the king's supporters. By July 30th Edward could wait no longer for the barons to return, but had to go ahead with the eighth without them. This was not 'a piece of constitutional legerdemain',[2] but a necessity which Edward had sought to avoid. The absence of shire knights is surprising, but can probably be explained by the fact that the preparations for the expedition were rushed[3] so that there was no time to organize their summons to Westminster.

Understandably, under these circumstances, Edward was very concerned to give the justification for the eighth as much publicity as possible. The exchequer was ordered to appoint people 'qui sachent beau parler au pueple'. They were to explain 'en la plus beale e la plus curteise manere quil sauront ou porront' that the king realized that his people had been much burdened by the aids granted for the defence of the realm and them against their enemies, but through his efforts would come alleviation and everlasting profit. The king was exposing himself and giving all he had and all he took from the realm in order to

1. P.R.O. E368/69, m.16, cited by Denton, Winchelsey, p.132 n. 135; E159/71, m.6, and E368/68, m.58, cited by Beddoe, 'Aspects of the Crisis of 1297', p. 373.

2. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, p. 442.

3. Documents of 1297-8, p. 5.

save them and the realm. Since the king was giving his body for them, the greatest thing he could give, they in return should do their duty in this great necessity.[1] This concern for the opinions of the taxpayers was unprecedented and indicates the hostility of public opinion in the summer of 1297. The collection of the twelfth, granted in November 1296, had proceeded smoothly during the year without any such publicity, but now that the earls were championing the interests of the community the situation was transformed. In an attempt to alleviate the hostile climate Edward also made concessions. The collectors were told to announce that he had promised to confirm~~ed~~ Magna Carta and the Forest Charter,[2] while in each county men were appointed specifically to ensure that the form of the taxation was observed and that people were not oppressed in any way by the sheriffs or other royal officials.[3]

Some attempt was made to collect the eighth. The collectors were appointed and later paid expenses.[4] Between August 1st and 17th certain men were also given their expenses for visiting virtually all the counties 'pro negotiis regis'. Their task is not specified, but it may have been connected with the tax.[5] Yet for the first time during these years we hear of opposition to the tax. One of the collectors appointed

1. ibid., pp. 120-122.
2. ibid., p. 121.
3. ibid., p. 112.
4. P.R.O. C62/73, mm.1, 2; C62/74, mm.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8; C62/75, m.7.
5. P.R.O. E405/1/11, mm.7,8. These officials are not those appointed who 'sachent beau parler', for their appointment was not ordered until 4th August.

[Please see correction sheet, fol. i]

in Bedfordshire was distrained for not taking up his duties,[1] while on August 22nd the rebel earls entered the exchequer to protest on behalf of the community of the realm at the levy of the eighth. At Worcester the county court, presumably led by the knights and gentry, told the collectors that Henry III had promised to confirm the charters in return for taxation, but had forgotten his promise once the grant was made. Therefore the county would pay nothing until the charters were confirmed.[2] It was such opposition which led to the issue of letters on August 28th that this tax was not to be a precedent,[3] and of writs on September 15th summoning knights to London to receive the confirmation of the charters.[4]

By August 12th Edward was sufficiently concerned about the hostile state of public opinion to issue a manifesto in French to be proclaimed in all the counties.[5] Each sheriff was to read and expound the letter in each city, borough and market, not waiting until the next assembly but specially convoking the people. Anyone who wanted a copy of the letter was to be allowed to have one.[6] This is an extremely interesting document, for it sets out to answer the allegations being made against him, the very fact that such an answer was considered necessary showing

1. Documents of 1297-8, p. 146.
2. Worcester, p. 534. News of the confirmation in mid-July had clearly not reached Worcestershire, or was not believed.
3. Foedera, p. 877.
4. Parl. Writs, p. 56 (no. 12).
5. Printed in Documents of 1297-8, pp. 125-129.
6. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 123.

how successfully the earls had been able to disseminate their views. It had apparently been claimed that Edward had rejected the Remonstrances to the great dishonour and harm of his people. Edward denied that these had ever been presented to him,[1] and explained at length the history of his relations with the earls to show that it was they and not he who were being unreasonable. The king was only too willing to negotiate with the earls over their grievances, but they had failed to take up his offer. He then went on to explain how he did indeed have the welfare of his people uppermost in his mind. He admitted that he had recently burdened his people with aids, and promised to make amends when he returned from Flanders, but explained that these aids had been necessary so that he could defend his kingdom. None of the money had been spent upon himself, but only on the defence of the kingdom. The expedition to Flanders was necessary, for should the king's allies be defeated then the kingdom would be exposed to great danger. He himself was sparing neither his person nor his possessions and thus shared in their hardships for the good of the realm. Moreover an end was in sight, for this expedition would remove the source of the danger, and peace and tranquillity would be restored. The letter concluded with a salutary reminder of the troubles which had arisen between Henry III and his subjects and declared that all who disturbed the peace of the realm in whatever manner were excommunicate by virtue of a bull of Clement IV. Like the Remonstrances, this appeal was drawn up with the whole community in mind. It omitted both the theoretical justifications which might have been made to the clergy and the more particular grievances of the

1. This may technically have been correct, but as the letter shows he was certainly aware of their contents.

military classes, but dealt with the general grievance of the burdens caused by his policies. He explained that they were ultimately for their own good, that all oppressions would be remedied and that Magna Carta would be confirmed.

This letter had little noticeable effect and on August 22nd Edward departed from a very unsettled land. He took with him a paid cavalry force of only 100 knights and bannerets and 570 squires, and of these 475 were from his own household. The force did increase a little more, but reached a maximum of only 140 knights and 755 squires, of whom 527 were from the household. There were in addition a few contingents of unpaid troops and an infantry force which never numbered more than 8,000.[1] The response of the twenty-librate landholders was particularly poor, for of 713 who were listed as eligible in the returns surviving from thirteen countries, only 63 appeared on the roll of those who received protection to go to Flanders.[2] It would be interesting to know how many had arrived at the muster in July and had subsequently changed their minds. Certainly the earl of Warwick had his horses valued for the campaign, but remained at home.[3] We also hear about Walter de Burnham who was given lands by Roger de Mowbray in return for service, but who in the end did not go.[4]

1. N. B. Lewis, 'The English Forces in Flanders, August-November 1297', Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 311-4.

2. Documents of 1297-8, p. 7. In his earlier book, War, Politics and Finance, p. 86, Prestwich gives the figure of 76.

3. Documents of 1297-8, p. 6.

4. ibid., p. 146.

Edward therefore departed from a country in which discontent was being voiced by all sections of the community. In his absence preparations were made to prevent an armed rebellion: on 20th and 28th August 226 armed knights were summoned to young Edward at Rochester, and on 9th and 16th September further summons of armed knights were made.[1] On September 16th William Botenelyn was sent to Northampton to secure the town and castle and to prevent the holding of assemblies of certain people no longer mindful of their oath of fealty and the peace and tranquillity of the realm.[2] Similar measures had to be taken by the sheriff of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire, and a number of towns were warned not to allow such assemblies and coventicles to be held whereby danger might arise to the king and them through the presence of spies and other enemies.[3] At the end of the month the earls arrived in London to attend parliament with a large armed force, and placed their own guards on the city gates before going in.[4] Civil war was clearly threatening to erupt. It was probably diverted by the arrival late in September of news that the English army had been heavily defeated at Stirling Bridge and that the Scots threatened to invade England. Here was something which both government and opposition agreed was a genuine threat to the safety of the realm, and the way was open to a settlement. By October the Confirmatio Cartarum had been agreed and the ruling classes were once again co-operating in the defence of the realm. Deprived of baronial leadership,

1. Parl. Writs, pp. 296-7 (nos. 37-8), 298-9 (nos.41-3), 300 (no. 48).

2. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 129; Foedera, p. 878. An assembly was in fact held in Northampton on 21st September: Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 141-2.

3. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 129, 131.

4. Guisborough, p. 308.

the opposition in the country also died down.

This was to all intents and purposes the end of the Gascon war. Edward achieved little in Flanders and in October 1297 made a truce with Philip IV which was repeatedly extended until peace was agreed in 1303 with the restoration of Gascony in full. It was a war which had never aroused much enthusiasm and in 1297 had nearly caused a civil war. The interest of the clergy was clearly waning by the end of 1295, but the magnates were prepared to support the war until the beginning of 1297. Although severely hit, they had generally suffered less than the clergy from financial exactions, and were more able to evade the burdens of purveyance. They too had the chance of profiting from their war service and indulging their love of war.[1] Yet there were limits to their willingness to fight and pay for a war which brought few results and offered no chance of rich rewards from confiscated lands. Nor could they ignore for ever the increasing burden being placed on the lower classes, who were probably opposed to the war long before the rebellion of the earls gave them an outlet for their frustrations. They had borne the brunt of the war effort, while those who went to fight received poor pay.[2] They could not be expected to welcome a war in Gascony which concerned them so little and cost them so much.

The crisis of 1297 reveals the extent to which the political community had grown during the century. Although the

1. Strayer, 'The Costs and Profits of War', pp. 278-9.
2. ibid., p. 279.

earls had led the country into active opposition to the king, the actions of the county of Worcester and the twenty-librate landholders do have a ring of spontaneity about them. Moreover the earls felt the need to pay continued attention to the maintenance of the support they had received. Their methods are unfortunately obscure, but Edward's appeals point to the widespread dissemination of their views. Edward himself reacted to this political crisis in a different manner from his father in 1258-65. Instead of simply attacking his opponents on the grounds that they were undermining the duty of fidelity to the king, Edward took more trouble to explain his views to the men of the shires to show them how his policies were in their best interests. Yet his claims did not ring true. In its impoverished state, the community could not agree that further financial and military burdens in support of a war in Flanders to recover Gascony were indeed in the interests of the realm.

Chapter 8

THE POLITICAL CRISIS OF 1299-1301

Although the French war was to all intents and purposes over by the spring of 1298, the political crisis lingered on and came to a head again in 1299-1301. In particular it centred around demands for a perambulation of the forests and the implementation of its findings, the confirmation of the charters and assurances that prises would be paid for. By the spring of 1299 there were signs that discontent was becoming less restrained. At the beginning of April Edward felt it was necessary to order the mayor and aldermen of London to arrest, try and punish those persons congregating by day and night and speaking ill of the king and his subjects.[1] At the same time he submitted to growing pressure for the confirmation of the charters and had them proclaimed in St. Paul's churchyard for fear of public sedition. Yet any hopes of calming fears and suspicions were destroyed by the final clause, 'saving the rights of our crown', which Guisborough says brought the curses of the Londoners upon his head.[2] The following month Edward also promised a perambulation of the forest. However these

1. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 403.
2. Guisborough, p. 330.

concessions did not go far enough to still the growing opposition to the king, and consequently no military campaign against the Scots took place that year. Edward therefore made further concessions at the parliament of March 1300, reissuing the charters and granting the Articuli super Cartas which met some of the grievances over purveyance. In the following month he also ordered a perambulation of the forests, the findings being reviewed at the Lincoln parliament of January 1301. Here further petitions were presented to the king by Keighley, including the promise that if all the demands were met by Michaelmas a grant of a fifteenth would be implemented. The subsequent collection of the fifteenth at Michaelmas indicates the political crisis was passing.[1]

This crisis had arisen only partly from the continuing war effort, which, despite the concessions of 1297, was still placing a heavy burden on the country. For most purveyance remained oppressive and military service offered few attractions. Yet the magnates were probably no longer so severely affected. Direct taxation, which seems to have fallen fairly evenly upon magnates and peasants,[2] ceased after 1297, while the magnates were more easily able to protect themselves from and absorb the

1. For the background see Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, pp. 98-106; Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 262-273; Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, passim; H. Rothwell, 'Edward I and the Struggle for the Charters, 1297-1305', Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 319-32.

2. Miller, 'War, Taxation', p. 17.

burden of purveyance. As landowners they could also benefit from rising wool and grain prices. The accounts of Canterbury cathedral priory, for example, show that it was quickly able to recover from the deprivations of 1294-7 and those of 1297 in particular.[1] Moreover, warfare in Scotland was not without its attractions for those who were able to indulge their military inclinations with the prospect of winning new lands. Indeed the Song of Caerlaverock of 1300 suggests that spirit was high amongst the barons.[2] Rather the main concern of the barons was probably not so much the continuing military and financial burdens, but the question of the perambulation of the forest and their inability to trust the king to keep his promises.

The remarkable feature of the crisis of 1299-1301 is the unity of the community against Edward. Although there is insufficient evidence to show how and to what extent the barons were deliberately seeking the support of the shires, it is clear that they were leading the community from the first. It was they who put pressure on Edward to make concessions at the parliament of March 1299.[3] The earl of Norfolk attended the parliament of May 1299 with an armed following,[4] and it was probably the opposition of the magnates which forced the repeated postponement and the final cancellation of the expedition to Scotland originally planned for June 1299. Yet

1. Mate, 'The Impact of War', pp. 66-7.
2. See below, pp. 352-3.
3. Guisborough, p. 329.
4. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 152.

when their specific demands are examined it can be seen that their personal grievances played little part and that they were championing the grievances of the community as a whole to force concessions from the king. For example, the Articuli super Cartas were granted at the request of the prelates, earls and barons and, in the words of the writ ordering their publication, were 'for the alleviation of those grievances which the people of our realm have borne on account of the wars and to improve their well-being'.[1] The various clauses fulfilled this claim, not only dealing with matters arising out of the war such as prises, but also introducing extensive judicial and local reforms. There was little that could be considered to meet specifically baronial grievances in these concessions, and indeed the one petition which did concern the barons, that military service should be on feudal grounds alone, was not included in the final statute.[2]

Similarly the bill of grievances presented by Keighley in January 1301 shows the magnates to have been working on behalf of the local communities.[3] Although Keighley was only a knight, the barons were closely involved in drawing up the petitions. The Flores Historiarum says it was the barons who were seeking redress of grievances, while the bill itself claimed to be presented on behalf of the realm and to be the petitions of the prelates and magnates of the realm, probably those who formed the committee of twenty-six set up to discuss grievances.[4] Furthermore the

1. Foedera, p. 920.
2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 88.
3. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 269, takes the opposite view.
4. Flores Historiarum, iii.108; Parl. Writs, p. 104 (no. 45).

individual petitions, although primarily of benefit to the local communities, also reveal close baronial involvement. One petition asked that the powers of the justices appointed to enforce the charters should be defined by the counsel of the prelates, earls and barons. Auditors were also to be appointed from amongst the prelates, earls and barons to deal with the transgressions of ministers. In addition, the conditional grant of taxation promised in the petitions would have been impossible without baronial support. The Lincoln parliament of January 1301 also saw a demand for the removal of Langton and, according to Langtoft, the appointment of his successor by common consent. Edward certainly felt that the barons were behind these two demands. He responded angrily, maintaining that it was his right to order his household as he felt fit, and pointing out that since the barons appointed their own servants they were not to tell him what to do.[1]

Edward's response to the crisis shows that he realized the extent to which the shires were supporting the baronial demands, for not only did he protest at the barons' actions, but also sought to contain the discontent in the localities. For example, his proclamation of 7th May 1299, announcing the postponement of the military muster planned for June, shows that he was anxious to make it appear that there were no differences between him and his magnates which might fuel popular discontent.[2] It was a proclamation of exceptional length for what was a

1. Langtoft, ii.330; Annales Regis Edwardi Primi, p. 460.
2. Parl. Writs, p. 322 (no. 19).

relatively straightforward matter, explaining that Edward was waiting for a message from the pope in connection with the peace negotiations with France. Although hardly a matter sufficient to prevent his moving from the south, the proclamation nevertheless continued to outline at some length the state of the negotiations and the need for the king's presence there. Moreover, as if to demonstrate that unity prevailed, it explained that the prelates, earls, barons and other counsellors had taken part in the negotiations and that their presence was also needed in the south. The following month a further proclamation was sent to all the counties to answer those who went about saying that Edward did not intend to keep the charters or have the perambulation of the forest made.[1] It announced that the perambulators were to assemble at Michaelmas, and explained that the reason for the delay was ~~because~~ that the king had been held up by the peace negotiations with France which would not be over until early July, and that,since little could be done in August on account of the season, Michaelmas was the earliest possible date for the meeting. This excuse seems rather lame, and it is not surprising that on July 16th Edward had to postpone the Scottish expedition a second time.[2] The strength of the feelings against Edward is perhaps indicated by his lack of trust in the sheriffs themselves, for when he ordered this proclamation in June he required each sheriff to be accompanied by a religious as he made the prolamation,and both were ordered to certify under their own seals that it had been made.

1. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 424.
2. Parl. Writs, p. 323 (no. 21).

Unfortunately the chroniclers are silent about the political crisis during the summer of 1299, but it was undoubtedly this rather than the negotiations with France which led to successive postponements of the Scottish expedition. On 3rd August the Anglo-French treaty was finally ratified, and on 4th September Edward was married to Margaret of France. Yet the expedition was postponed again on 17th September, and not until 20th November was the date of the muster finally fixed for 13th December 1299.[1] No explanations are given, but it can only have been the continuing political crisis which led Edward to contemplate a winter campaign. Even now he had still not overcome the opposition, for the dissident barons failed to attend the muster, claiming the perambulation of the forest had not been performed as promised.[2] The response from the infantry was also very poor,[3] and in the end the planned campaign was cancelled. Clearly, unless Edward could satisfy popular opinion, he stood little chance of mounting another successful Scottish expedition. This explains why he ordered the writs for a parliament in March 1300 and for the muster in June to be made 'as strong as possible'.[4]

The parliament of March 1300 was probably intended to clear the air, for it was one of the largest assemblies of the reign. Eleven earls and 137 barons and other individuals were summoned, together with the bishops, cathedral deans and priors,

1. ibid., p. 324 (no. 23); Cal. Chancery Warrants, p. 104.
2. Langtoft, ii.320.
3. See below, p. 323.
4. See below, p. 323.

archdeacons, diocesan and capitular proctors, 73 abbots and priors, the masters of the Templars, Hospitallers and order of Sempringham, and two representatives from each shire and borough.[1] It is unfortunate that no narrative account of this parliament and the negotiations which led to the issue of the Articuli super Cartas in April has survived. Yet it is apparent that Edward was inspired by the need to meet the grievances of the community. On 1st March he took the unusual step of appointing commissioners to negotiate with the county communities for a prise of victuals.[2] Then on 26th March a proclamation was issued withdrawing pollards and crockards 'ad commodum regni'.[3] This was followed two days later by a writ to all the sheriffs ordering the charters to be proclaimed four times a year,[4] and on 15th April the sheriffs were ordered to publish the Articuli super Cartas.[5] Three representatives from each shire were subsequently required to attend the king in May to receive instructions in person regarding the charters.[6] Although there is no evidence to show how the barons had appealed to, and built up, the support of the shires, it is clear that Edward realized the strength of that support and was anxious to contain it.

In the last years of his reign Edward was no longer troubled

1. Parl. Writs, p. 82 (nos. 1-4).
2. See below, p. 330.
3. Foedera, p. 919.
4. ibid.
5. ibid., p. 920.
6. Parl. Writs, p. 87 (no. 13).

by such opposition. This was partly because he was successfully asserting his authority over his opponents, continuing a policy followed since the beginning of his reign of reducing the independent power of the comital families.[1] Yet not only were the magnates less able to oppose the king, but the popular grievances which they had sought to alleviate were probably becoming less marked anyway as Edward reduced the demands he made upon his subjects. In 1294-7 he had had to fight simultaneously against Wales, France and Scotland, but after 1298 he was effectively only fighting in Scotland. Moreover he reduced the size of his operations, abandoning the massed infantry attacks of the 1290s which had not proved particularly effective.[2] He now contented himself with his traditional feudal rights, abandoning attempts to extend military obligations, and relying on feudal aids and tallages rather than further aids on moveables. As a result he ran up a debt which was perhaps into six figures by the end of the reign,[3] but this gradual accumulation of debt was perhaps more acceptable than more occasional but heavier demands for taxation.

By 1306 Edward was strong enough to have a bull absolving him from his concessions published while he was preparing his Scottish expedition to avenge the murder of Comyn. Indeed it was read out at St. Paul's on the same day as the papal bull excommunicating Robert Bruce.[4] The only hint of protest at the bull comes from a macaronic

1. For this policy see K. B. McFarlane, 'Had Edward I a Policy towards the Earls?', History, 1 (1965), 145-59; Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 243-5.

2. Prestwich, op.cit., pp. 107, 110.

3. ibid., p. 221; Miller, 'War, Taxation', p. 21.

4. Annales Londonienses, pp. 146-7.

political poem in Anglo-Norman and English, On the King's Breaking his Confirmation of the Magna Carta, which survives in St. John's College, Cambridge, MS E59/112.[1] It protests that 'Rome can do and undo', and that the 'purveyances' have been destroyed, so that 'all goes out of joint, court and law, hundred and shire, it all goes the way of the devil'. Aspin believed that the poem must refer to the bull of 1306 since Henry Woodlock, who was bishop of Winchester between 1305 and 1316, is mentioned and Rome was not involved on the only other possible occasion, the breaking of the Ordinances in 1311.[2] Yet it is possible that this poem is in fact a protest at the bull of absolution issued in 1261 which has only been partially revised to meet the situation of 1311. It is entitled in the same hand as the remainder of the poem 'De Provisione Oxonie', a title which applied only to the reforms of 1258-9 and was never used in connection with those of 1297-1301. Moreover the poem refers to 'la purveance', or provision, a word again associated with the baronial wars rather than the political crisis of Edward's reign. The phrase 'all goes out of joint, court and law, hundred and shire' also seems more applicable to the earlier period than to Edward's reign when the main concern was the alleviation of financial burdens and the forest law. Furthermore there is a second version of this poem in the Auchinleck manuscript which can be ascribed with more certainty

1. This is a late thirteenth century collection of theological works from Durham priory which ends with a large collection of miscellaneous pieces, including this poem. The poem is printed in Anglo-Norman Political Songs, p. 62.

2. ibid., pp. 59-60.

to 1311,[1] strengthening the suggestion that the St. John's poem is a song originally written in 1261 and only partially revised to criticize the breaking of the Ordinances. There is certainly no other evidence that the papal bull of 1306 aroused such opposition.

The crisis of 1299-1301 reveals that, stimulated by Edward's demands, the political community was continuing to develop. The presentation of the articles of 1301 by Keighley is an indication that the shires are becoming a more powerful force in politics, a fact appreciated by the barons who were more ready to champion the grievances of the community than they had been earlier. Edward too had learnt the lesson of 1297. He showed his awareness of the changing situation by moving cautiously and being more careful to explain his position and at least appearing to be making concessions. This awareness helps to explain why the crisis could be resolved in 1301 and did not lead to the complete political breakdown of 1297, and why after 1301 Edward preferred to resort to feudal forms of taxation rather than put further pressures on the shire communities.

1. Printed ibid., p. 63, and Political Songs, pp. 253-8.

Chapter 9

EDWARD I AND SCOTLAND

(i) 1291-1296

It is now necessary to turn back to consider the origins of Edward I's wars in Scotland. The concept of overlordship which lay behind the wars was long familiar at the end of the thirteenth century. It was a claim which had been made with varying degrees of success by the kings of England since the Conquest, and was ultimately derived from the claims of the Anglo-Saxon kings of the tenth century to be kings of Britain.[1] Such claims were perhaps strengthened in the twelfth century by the popularity of Geoffrey of Monmouth's history which showed how Scotland was once part of the kingdom of Britain.[2] In the more immediate past Henry III had been successful in obtaining a practical authority in Scotland during the minority of his son-in-law, Alexander III, but this had had no lasting effects.[3] Edward I's policy towards

1. For a general discussion see Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1174-1328: Some Selected Documents, ed. E. L. G. Stones (2nd edn, Oxford, 1970), pp. xx-xxiv; G. W. S. Barrow, Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm in Scotland, (2nd edn, Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 16-19.

2. W. Ullmann,'On the Influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth in English History', Speculum Historiale: Geschichte im Spiegel von Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsdeutung, ed. C. Bauer, L. Boehm and M. Müller (Munich, 1965), pp. 258-65.

3. Powicke, Thirteenth Century, pp. 585-96.

Scotland was at first little different from his predecessors'. He took the claim to overlordship for granted, but probably did not think it expedient to press the matter. For example, in 1278 he obtained a declaration of homage from Alexander III, but its vagueness meant that it was of little practical value.[1] Moreover, in 1286, following the death of Alexander III who left only the infant daughter of the king of Norway as his heir, Edward made no serious effort to involve himself in Scottish affairs, but departed for a three-year stay in Gascony.[2] It was not until his return from Gascony in 1289 that he began to take an interest in Scottish affairs, seeking to establish some sort of guardianship over the infant Margaret of Norway.[3] But for Margaret's death in September 1290 this limited authority might well have proved transient like his father's before him, leading Edward to depart on crusade in the early 1290s rather than embark on the conquest of Scotland.[4] Yet after Margaret's death he was invited to intervene in Scotland to help keep the peace and settle the succession.

It is well known how Edward began by extracting a recognition of his feudal authority from each of the claimants to the Scottish throne, and how, following the coronation of John

1. Barrow, op.cit., pp. 17-18.
2. Anglo-Scottish Relations, p. xxiv.
3. Powicke, op.cit., pp. 598-600.
4. E. L. G. Stones and G. G. Simpson, Edward I and the Throne of Scotland (Oxford, 1978), i. 9-10.

Balliol, he sought to give practical expression to this authority, entertaining pleas from Scotland, summoning the king of Scotland to his parliaments and in June 1294 even summoning the Scottish king and nobles to perform military service in Gascony. By 1295 the Scots' anxiety to preserve the independence of their kingdom led them to conclude an offensive alliance with France, and early in 1296 in accordance with the terms of this treaty the Scottish army was assembled. Yet Edward was well prepared and had already summoned his army. In March 1296 he invaded Scotland, inaugurating the Scottish wars which lasted for the remainder of his reign. The campaign of 1296 was short and a triumphant success. Balliol was compelled to resign his kingdom and Edward established his direct authority over Scotland. This, however, was challenged the following year when the Scots revolted under William Wallace and defeated Edward's lieutenant in Scotland, John de Warenne, at Stirling Bridge in September. A series of campaigns followed before Edward could fully restore his authority in Scotland in 1304. Yet once again his success was shortlived,for Robert Bruce rose in revolt in 1306 and was crowned as king of Scotland. Edward was on his way north in 1307 to crush this rebellion when he died at Burgh-on-Sands, his Scottish ambitions unrealized.[1]

The wars against Scotland were fought in an atmosphere very different from that surrounding the French wars. We have seen how there was a general lack of concern for the fate of Gascony and a lack of hostile feelings towards the French which made it

1. For a general account see Powicke, op.cit., pp. 602-617, 683-719; Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, passim.

difficult for Edward to wage an effective war. Feelings towards the Scots were, however, very different, for like the Welsh they had long been regarded as members of a wild and barbaric civilization, an attitude which frequent border warfare had done little to eradicate.[1] In the mid-twelfth century the Gesta Stephani had said that the Scots 'are barbarous and unclean, neither subdued by bitter cold nor stunted by severe hunger.... among strangers they surpass all in cruelty'. Later William of Newburgh described the Scottish army as 'barbarous and thirsting for blood'.[2] Such attitudes were modified a little during the thirteenth century, a period of generally peaceful relations which saw greater social intercourse between the two countries and the adoption of more anglicized ways by the southern Scots. Yet the tradition still lingered and continued to be applied to the wilder elements of Scottish society. Matthew Paris, for example, recorded with distaste a blood ceremony of the men of Galloway. Bartholomew Anglicus, writing in the late 1240s, acknowledged that many Scots had changed their ways for the better as a result of intercourse with Englishmen, but said that the wild Scots still followed uncivilized manners of dress and speech and delighted in war and cruelty to their enemies.[3] Despite the improvement in Anglo-Scottish relations during the thirteenth century, such attitudes were never far below the surface, and they revived under the impact of Edward's wars to be applied once again to the whole

1. For the Welsh see above, pp. 155-8.

2. For these and similar comments see Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers, 500-1286, ed. A. O. Anderson (London, 1908), pp. 177, 248 and passim.

3. Paris, iii. 364-6; Medieval Lore from Bartholomew Anglicus, pp. 98-9.

Scottish nation. Langtoft, writing about the end of 1296, said that there was never any truth in Scotland and claimed that the Scots had planned an invasion of England which would have left no man alive. He called them 'raskayle' and considered their deeds to be worth nothing. The Lanercost chronicler, writing about the same time, said that the Scots should have learnt from Alexander III whom he claimed was struck down for their sakes. Yet they had failed to take advantage of the ten years' grace which they had been allowed, but persisted in their bad ways.[1] Similarly a tract on the origins of the Picts and Scots which was probably written around 1307 said that the Scots had degenerated from the noble Britons and had become robbers and thieves, and that they had become so debased that they had lost their name and were no longer called Albanenses, but Scots after Scota, the daughter of the Pharaoh.[2]

Not only did the English generally dislike the Scots, but the Scots also posed a very real threat to England in a way which the French never did. Few people seem to have believed that a French invasion was a serious possibility, and those raids which did take place were not on a large enough scale to create a general fear of the French. The Scots, however, did invade on more than one occasion and inflicted substantial damage on widespread areas in the north. Some evidence of their depredations is contained in bishops' registers. The archbishop of York, for example, complained in 1297 that the chief manor of

1. Langtoft, ii.220, 244, 246, 254; Lanercost, pp. 171-2.

2. Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, ed. W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1867), p. 304, from B.L. MS Harley 1808. For its date of composition see M. O. Anderson, Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland (2nd edn, Edinburgh, 1980), p. 67.

his see had been destroyed by the Scots and that he would receive hardly any income for the next two years.[1] The diocese of Carlisle seems to have been particularly badly affected. A number of churches had their assessments for the papal tenth of 1302 substantially reduced, including seventeen which were to pay nothing at all as they had been totally destroyed and were still undergoing raids.[2] Furthermore in 1307 the archbishop of York issued an indulgence to those contributing to the restoration of Carlisle cathedral which had been destroyed by the Scots.[3] Lands held by the laity were also affected. For example, accounts of the lands that had been confiscated from Balliol are for the years 1298-9 full of references to the devastation wrought in Northumberland by the Scottish raids, and several manors were reported as entirely deserted as a result of the war.[4] Similarly an inquisition post mortem in 1303 found that the chief messuage of the lands of Walter de Corri in Laxington, Cumberland, had been wasted and burned by the Scots and was worth nothing.[5] Clearly the case for defence against the Scots was more compelling than it was against the French. Moreover the Scottish wars offered men the chance of rewards in a way that the French wars did not. The French wars were not launched to gain conquests, but simply to recover authority over the Gascons from the French king. In Scotland, however, there was the prospect of lands and riches to be won in a war of

1. Historical Papers and Letters from Northern Registers, ed. J. Raine (Rolls Series, 1873), pp. 133-4.

2. ibid., pp. 161-3.

3. Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, 1306-15, ed. W. Brown and A. H. Thompson, v (Surtees Society, cxlv, 1931), 64-5.

4. Prestwich, 'Edward I's Wars', p.61, citing P.R.O. E372/146, m.23.

5. Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, ed. J. Bain, ii (Edinburgh, 1884), no. 1402.

conquest. The earls of Pembroke, Warwick and Hereford were all heavily endowed with Scottish lands, and many lesser barons such as the Percies benefited from the confiscation of Bruce's estates in 1306.[1]

Men were not only inspired by feelings of self-interest and traditional hostility towards the Scots, but were also sympathetic towards Edward's claim that he was the superior lord of Scotland, a claim which had been fully rehearsed at Norham in 1291 and widely publicized throughout England. For some reason Edward had sent a copy of the submission of the Scottish competitors to a number of monasteries and secular cathedrals accompanied by an order that it was to be inserted into their chronicles 'ad perpetuam gestae rei memoriam'. How many of these letters were sent out is not known, but evidence for over thirty survives, and no doubt there were more.[2] Few chroniclers seem to have been particularly interested in Scottish affairs in 1291, but those chroniclers who do mention the events at Norham, and who were writing before the belief in Edward's supremacy was reinforced by later events, do seem to have absorbed and accepted it. It was after all an old claim, although it had not been expressed so forcefully before. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler said that when Edward saw that the Scottish succession was disputed, he asserted that the overlordship of the kingdom belonged to him. Then the chronicles were reviewed, and it was clear to one and all that the overlordship of Scotland belonged and ought to belong to the king. The Oseney chronicle said that

1. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 284; Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster, p. 69.

2. See below, pp. 403-5.

Edward had it recorded that he had been accepted as 'dominus regni Scotiae principalis', while the continuation of Gervase of Canterbury said that Edward claimed 'primum et summum dominium' over Scotland.[1] Neither chronicler gave any personal opinion on the matter, but the absence of any comment together with the tone of the statements suggest that they accepted the claim. Clearly the events of 1291 and the letters sent to the monasteries meant that in 1296 when Edward was preparing to go to war with his rebellious vassal, the king of Scotland, his claims to overlordship were widely known and accepted. Edward was therefore seen to be fighting a just war in which his interest coincided with the natural inclinations and interests of his subjects. Under such circumstances it was far easier to wage war against the Scots than against the French.

Preparations for the first Scottish campaign began in earnest in December 1295. The writs summoning the cavalry, which were issued before the Scots had invaded England, explained the need for the campaign in rather formal terms, for king John of Scotland had done things contrary to his fealty, to the harm of the crown of the kingdom which men were bound by their oath to defend and keep whole and unharmed. Similarly Irishmen were summoned 'to help maintain the rights of our realm and the honour of our crown'.[2] Since the crown was a symbol of the authority wielded by the king in the interests of the realm, matters which affected the crown therefore concerned both king

1. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 98; Oseney, p. 333; Gervase, ii.297.

2. Parl. Writs, pp. 275 (no. 7), 277 (no. 9). The writs summoning the infantry do not survive.

and community.[1] It is interesting that Edward made no real attempt to show how the realm would be affected if the honour of the crown was not maintained, for it illustrates the difference between the French and Scottish wars. Edward had used this argument in 1294, but being unable to convince men that Gascony was indeed part of the realm which they had an obligation to defend he had quickly abandoned it in favour of more persuasive arguments. His return to it at the end of 1295 when he was already aware of its limitations shows that Scotland was regarded as part of the realm in a way that Gascony never was. Edward was confident that his summons would be answered,and in this he was justified, even though there had not yet been a Scottish invasion to demonstrate exactly how Balliol threatened the realm. Although he had ambitiously envisaged an army of 60,000 infantry, the 25,000 who probably assembled formed one of the largest infantry forces raised during the reign.[2] In Durham the shire assembly expressed the readiness of the men of Durham to follow their bishop to the wars at their own expense, in contrast to their later reluctance to go to Scotland.[3] It is true that the prior had to fine the men of Pittington 2s. for failing to contribute to the war effort,[4] but such

1. Harriss,King, Parliament and Public Finance, p. 129.

2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 94. The size of the cavalry in 1296 is not clear,for there are no full accounts surviving. J. H. Ramsay, 'The Strength of the English Armies in the Middle Ages', E.H.R., xxix (1914), p. 202, suggested 500-800 cavalry, although he considerably underestimated the infantry at 5,000-8,000.

3. C. M. Fraser, A History of Antony Bek, 1283-1311 (Oxford, 1957), p. 180, and see below, pp. 321, 356-7.

4. Halmota Prioratus Dunelmensis, ed. J. Booth and W. H. Longstaffe (Surtees Society, lxxxii, 1889), p.1.

disobedience seems to have been exceptional.

Edward's triumphant Scottish campaign of 1296 aroused much interest and enthusiasm in England. The chroniclers, hitherto rather silent about Scottish affairs, wrote at great length about the campaign. They clearly accepted Edward's claim that war had arisen because the Scots had rebelled against his lordship, for their accounts are unanimous in regarding the Scots as rebels. The Worcester chronicler, for example, explained that Balliol had allied with the king of France contrary to his homage to Edward and sought to throw off Edward's overlordship. Similarly the annalist of Hailes said that Balliol treacherously allied with the king of France against his lord, while the Dunstable chronicler explained that Edward went to Scotland to defeat the king and kingdom which had rebelled against him.[1] Their interest is also shown by the presence of documents relating to the wars in their chronicles. Apart from the submission of the competitors in 1291, copies are also found of Balliol's oath of allegiance in 1292, his renunciation of that homage in 1296 and his subsequent submission to Edward. It would be interesting to know where they came from, but this is a problem upon which little light can be shed.[2]

Such interest was probably aroused by the war's outstanding success, and a spirit of jubilation pervades their accounts. The Dunstable annalist noted with pride that the victory at

1. Worcester, p. 526; Hailes, f.51 (p. 101); Dunstable, p. 402.
2. See below, pp. 393-7, 403-6.

Berwick occurred on the first day of the siege. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler claimed that such victories in so short a time were unheard of and described how even the elements helped the king at the siege of Edinburgh: through the air came an insupportable rain of metal which battered the walls; the ground itself did not seem solid and offered no foothold to the Scots, while a spring within the fortress dried up leaving the Scots without water. The Lanercost chronicler likewise claimed the elements had played a part, explaining that the wind, snow and rain were so great that the half-naked Scots could only avoid the cold under rocks, cliffs, thickets and trees. Langtoft was similarly delighted at this victorious campaign over the Scots, and it may well have encouraged him to begin his history for his patron, Scaffeld. He praised Edward's achievements at some length and claimed that 'throughout all the counties of England there will always be talk of [the Scots']presumption; they will be mocked for their deed as long as the world lasts'. He called for Edward to show no mercy to the traitors so that they could not rebel again.[1] Like a number of other chroniclers Langtoft also reported the heavy casualties suffered by the Scots at the sieges of Berwick and Dunbar as if he was proud of the ease with which such a defeat was inflicted upon them. To prove the point he also added for comparison, as did several others, the small English casualties, claiming that at Berwick 4,000 Scots were killed and only one English knight.[2] Significantly, save

1. Dunstable, p. 403; Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 132-133; Lanercost, p. 170; Langtoft, ii.252, 256, 264-8.

2. Langtoft, ii.232.

for the even greater casualties at Falkirk in 1298, the chroniclers do not give the casualty figures for any other campaign. They were motivated by pride in the success of the English armies rather than by historical interest.

Langtoft was also full of admiration for Edward's achievement because he had fulfilled a prophecy of Merlin that England and Scotland would be reunited into one kingdom. Moreover he felt that the king now held his lands more securely than Arthur did, and all that remained was to complete the fulfilment of Merlin's prophecy by recovering Gascony. Other chroniclers also compared Edward to Arthur. The Lanercost chronicler noted that no other king had been as far as Moray since king Arthur. The Bury chronicler was almost certainly thinking of Arthur or one of the other former kings of Britain when he praised Edward who now ruled over England, Scotland and Wales, the former kingdom of Britain which had been so long divided.[1]

Contemporary chronicle accounts of the 1296 campaign contain a number of stories about the atrocities of the Scots, showing that traditional attitudes towards the Scots were already reviving. No doubt they contained an element of truth, but they are very reminiscent of the stories told when the Scots had invaded in 1138 and 1173.[2] The chroniclers were recording not so much historical facts as a mixture of rumour and the conventional picture of what a Scottish invasion should be like. The Lanercost chronicler, for example, wrote at length about

1. ibid., 264-8; Lanercost, p. 182; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 133.
2. Scottish Annals, ed. Anderson, pp. 176-90, 247-51.

their misdeeds, describing how they surpassed the heathen in their cruelty, and that when men escaped they avenged themselves on the infirm, the old women, on women in labour and even on small children whom they raised aloft on their spears. They destroyed churches and violated nuns, women and girls, and burnt some scholars in their schoolroom at Hexham.[1] Bartholomew Cotton wrote that the Scots had burnt many villages, killed men, women and children and perpetrated many other crimes, including the burning of Corbridge, Hexham and Hexham priory. The Flores Historiarum also spoke of the burning of Hexham and Corbridge and claimed that the Scots perpetrated murders without any love for mankind. Finally the Bury chronicler wrote that the Scots had invaded England, laying waste and depopulating large areas, not sparing any churches or ecclesiastical property, and burning more than 120 villages in terrible fires. They had also burnt the priory and village of Hexham, where it was reported that an image of the crucified saviour had cried out vengeance in a terrible voice when a Scot irreverently tore away the pedestal attached to his feet.[2]

Further evidence of the triumphant feelings which were aroused comes from the 'Itinerary of king Edward in Scotland in the year 1296'. Its conclusion that Edward 'conquered and toured the kingdom of Scotland.....in no more than twenty-one weeks' shows the tone of admiration in which it was written. It is in Anglo-Norman and narrates without comment the day to

1. Lanercost, p. 174.

2. Cotton, p. 310; Flores Historiarum, iii.97; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 131.

day movements and deeds of Edward I while he was in Scotland. Its immense detail suggests that its anonymous author was probably someone who was present on the campaign, perhaps as a clerk in the king's entourage. It survives in three manuscripts in the original Anglo-Norman and in several more in a later English version.[1] Unfortunately none of the surviving copies are earlier than the end of the fourteenth century, so that a study of the context in which they are found will yield little about the type of person to whom this itinerary originally appealed.

This Anglo-Norman diary was probably composed by a literate member of Edward's army, but the snatches of English songs preserved in Langtoft's chronicle represent a very different type of composition. At least nine fragments survive, eight of them relating to the 1296 campaign. It has sometimes been suggested that Langtoft himself was the author of these songs, but a study made by G. E. Morris[2] of the variant readings in eight different manuscripts of Langtoft's chronicle makes this seem unlikely. Although many of the variations are simply those which a scribe would introduce to make the text conform to his own dialect,[3] some are far more substantial and suggest that

1. The three Anglo-Norman manuscripts are Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Lats 6049, B.L. MSS Cotton Nero D vi and Dom. xviii. The English version survives in B.L. MS Cotton Vesp. C xvi, Add. MSS 5758, 29901 and 32097, and Harley 1309. No doubt other copies survive. The two texts are printed in Itinerary of Edward I, ed. H. Gough (Paisley, 1900), ii.279-83.

2. Morris, 'Soldiers' Songs'.

3. Morris, op.cit., p. 42.

different versions of the same song were known, and that the individual scribes have substituted the version they knew.[1] It is likely that these are soldiers' songs, sung by the men on campaign. Their content suggests a personal familiarity with the war, while the obscurity and crudity of a number of words suggests an origin in a non-literary form of English.[2] Some scribes were perhaps puzzled or shocked by the words before them, for some alterations seem to have been made to improve clarity or remove offensive words.[3] Langtoft presumably learnt these songs from soldiers who had been conscripted from his neighbourhood, for the grammar and phonology are that of the Bridlington area.[4]

The content of the songs indicates that the soldiers shared the feelings expressed by the chroniclers. The Scots themselves are mocked and insulted. They are 'skiterande', which literally means 'voiding thin excrement',[5] they are fools, and the English have 'bared their buttocks' leaving them 'nothing but [their] rough shoe[s] to hop in'. At Berwick the Scots had mocked Edward when he began to dig a dike around the castle, and the English soldiers now turned this taunt against their enemies: 'Let him pick and let him dyke in scorn said they; he dykes and he picks at length as it pleases him....and [the Scots] have tumbled into the sea'.[6]

1. ibid., p. 50. See e.g. Langtoft, ii.248.
2. Morris, op.cit., pp. 105-6.
3. ibid., pp. 83-4, 107.
4. ibid., pp. 95, 104, 118.
5. Langtoft, ii.236 n.4; Morris, op.cit., p. 156.
6. Langtoft, ii.252, 248, 264, 234-6.

The soldiers rejoiced in their victory over the Scots, for 'never had dogs been hurled out of the door' as the Scots were at Dunbar.[1] The Scots had been taught a lesson and divine vengeance was called for. Balliol himself was mocked, 'for he has overhopped, his tippet is tipped, his tabard is empty',[2] a taunt which referred to a ceremony which had taken place at Balliol's resignation in July 1296.

Unfortunately details of the ceremony of Balliol's resignation do not appear in contemporary chronicles,and it is not mentioned until John of Fordun and Andrew of Wyntoun wrote about it in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century.[3] John of Fordun says that Balliol was stripped of his royal trappings while holding a white rod which was perhaps a symbol of peace. Andrew of Wyntoun supplied further details, saying that the fur was removed from his tabard (the coat on which his arms were blazoned) and that his sceptre, sword, crown and ring were removed. Ever after this he was called 'Toom Tabard' or empty coat, a taunt which is reflected in the soldiers' song.[4] Balliol's humiliation was completed on this occasion by the public admission he had to make that he had sealed pacts with the king of France contrary to the homage and fealty he owed to Edward.[5] Balliol also issued letters patent acknowledging

1. Political Songs, p. 318.

2. Langtoft, ii.264, 248, 258.

3. For the ceremony see G. G. Simpson, 'Why was John Balliol called "Toom Tabard"?', Scottish Historical Review, xlvii (1968), 196-9.

4. Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scottorum, ed. W. F. Skene, i (Historians of Scotland, i, 1871), 327; The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun, ed. F. J. Amours, v (Scottish Text Society, 1914), 295.

5. Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland, 1286-1306, ed. J. Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1870), ii.59.

his guilt, which were perhaps read out at the same time.[1] These contained not only the more legal argument that Balliol had grievously offended against his lord by making an alliance and collaborating with his lord's enemy, the king of France, but also referred to the evil deeds committed by the Scots. He had broken his homage to Edward by sending men into England to commit arson, pillaging, homicides and much other damage, whilst fortifying Scotland against his lord. Edward is here for the first time drawing upon the popular image of the Scots, an image which as we shall see was developed in his later propaganda.[2]

Edward's first campaign against the Scots in 1296 was clearly a triumphant success. Not only were the Scots defeated, but also an enthusiastic response had been elicited from Edward's subjects. They delighted in his triumph and praised his achievements, viewing the Scots with new hatred and contempt. Here were the makings of a sound partnership upon which Edward could try and build in future campaigns. But for the time being Scotland was quiet, and Edward could turn his attention back to Gascony.

(ii) 1297-8

By the summer of 1297 there were distinct signs of growing unrest in Scotland, yet, contrary to the advice of his magnates,[3]

1. Foedera, pp. 841-2.

2. For an early example see Documents, ed. Stevenson, ii.170-1. It is interesting to note that later notarial accounts of the resignation stress this aspect much more than the contemporary documents. See Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland, ed. F. Palgrave (Record Commission, 1837), pp. 141-51, discussed by Stones and Simpson, i.93-5, and printed ii.288.

3. Documents of 1297-8, p. 117.

Edward decided that his hold over Scotland was sufficiently secure to allow him to go overseas. The Scottish campaign of 1296 contributed only indirectly to the political crisis which followed,for although its success had brought much prestige to the king, it had also meant further military and financial burdens being placed on his subjects. Yet it was events in Scotland which broke the political deadlock in late September when news arrived that the English had been heavily defeated at Stirling Bridge and that the Scots were preparing to invade. This was a major blow to the pride and confidence of the English which had recently been reinforced by the success of the 1296 campaign. No English army had been beaten by the Scots on this scale since the eleventh century, and, even worse, the defeat had been inflicted on English magnates by the socially inferior Wallace and his peasant infantry.[1] The king and magnates who had been arguing whether the Flemish campaign was really in the interests of the nation could now unite to avenge this insult and repel the Scottish invasion, a task which was without a doubt in the interests of the realm: the Scottish ravages in 1296 amply demonstrated that. When parliament met in October 1297 both sides were prepared to make concessions, and the political crisis was ended with the grant of the Confirmatio Cartarum by prince Edward and the regency council and the grant of a ninth by the laity and a tenth by the clergy.

This unanimous agreement that the Scots posed a serious threat to the interests of the realm is revealed in the language both sides employed in their correspondence over the next few

1. Barrow, Bruce, p. 124.

months. For example, in October 1297 the government issued a writ for military service, explaining that the Scots had broken their homage and fealty 'and disturb the peace of our land of Scotland, killing our men and committing many other crimes there against us and our men, contrary to our peace. They have already invaded our kingdom of England with hostile intent and perpetrate murders, pillaging, arson and many other crimes, and daily propose to do worse'.[1] A similar writ was sent in December to the army assembled at Newcastle announcing the appointment of John de Warenne as captain, explaining that 'the Scots, enemies and rebels of our kingdom, have invaded in different places with hostile intent and committed plundering,murders, arson and other enormities, and still do so daily'.[2]

The letters of archbishop Winchelsey show that he too considered that there was a serious threat to the welfare of the realm. In October he wrote to the bishop of London ordering him to summon the bishops and clerical representatives to a meeting of convocation in November to discuss what measures should be taken to deal with the Scottish invasion. He explained that a recent and unexpected event which threatened danger to the realm, church and clergy compelled him to seek their advice. For news had recently come that a great army of Scots had occupied Scotland and had invaded England with great slaughter, sparing neither age nor sex. The danger was so great that most of the county of Northumberland as far as Newcastle had fled

1. Parl. Writs, p. 302 (no. 1).

2. P.R.O. E159/71, m.105. See also Parl. Writs, p. 301 (no. 49); Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 141.

south with their belongings.[1] At the ensuing convocation an aid was granted, and it was decided that the first instalment would be due by January 13th, indicating how urgent the clergy felt the situation to be. The full yield of the tax is unfortunately not known, but it may well have been high if all followed the example of Guisborough priory, which was sufficiently alarmed to overcome its poverty by paying part of the tax in corn.[2] The archbishop's concern was further made clear by the commission he issued in December for the collection of the tenth in his diocese. This spoke of the just and necessary defence of the church and realm of England against the hostile Scots who had inhumanely and indiscriminately slaughtered Englishmen and devastated a large part of the kingdom, and still continued in their work of devastation and depopulation. He also wrote to other clergy urging prompt payment of the subsidy in view of the urgent necessity, and refused to allow exempt monasteries and alien priories and nunneries to escape payment,on the grounds that the defence of the church and realm was more important and involved their own safety.[3] Clearly Winchelsey considered that the Scots presented a very real danger to the realm, for earlier in the year he had preferred to lose the protection of the king rather than contribute to a cause which he felt was not in the public interest.

The bishop of Lincoln was equally clear about the need for the subsidy when he ordered its collection in his diocese. His mandate explained at length that the Scots had forgotten their

1. Reg. Winchelsey, i.198-9.

2. R. Graham, 'An Ecclesiastical Tenth for National Defence in 1298', English Ecclesiastical Studies (London, 1929), p. 319, citing Registers of John le Romeyn, Lord Archbishop of York, 1286-1296, and of Henry Newark, Lord Archbishop of York, 1296-9, ii, ed. W.Brown (Surtees Society, cxxviii,1917), 294.

3. Reg. Winchelsey, i.211, 213-5, 229-30, 232-3.

fealty and had seditiously embarked upon hostile raids into England, spilling the blood of the innocent people they met without any regard for sex or age, condition or rank. They were devastating the fields, plundering the villages and towns and burning whatever they could not take away, including churches, monasteries and other holy places after having removed their ornaments and sacred vessels. He explained that the convocation held at London had decided that the evident danger of the invasion and the immediate and inevitable necessity of the church and realm meant that an aid would have to be granted without consulting Rome.[1] This belief that the Scots presented a threat in a way that the French never had was shared by the bishop of Worcester who wrote to his official in December about the collection of the tenth. He rehearsed at length the danger posed by the Scottish invasion and explained that a grant could be given without fear of the provisions of Clericis laicos because there was not time to consult the pope.[2] Two chronicles also agreed that the danger presented by the Scottish invasion allowed the clergy to ignore the provisions of Clericis laicos. The Worcester chronicler spoke of the horror of the Scottish invasion, and justified the grant of a tenth by explaining that where there was a necessity for defence the king could seek aid from the clergy without consulting the pope. The Bury St. Edmunds chronicler said that some people commented on the fact that the clergy now gave a grant voluntarily whereas before it had been

1. Reg. Sutton, vi.46; cf. Reg. Gandavo, i.9-10.

2. W. Wake, The State of the Church and Clergy of England (London, 1703), pp. 26-7, calendared Reg. Giffard (Worcester), ii.491; cf. the letter of the archbishop and bishops to the pope justifying their action: Reg. Winchelsey, ii.528-31.

refused even under compulsion. This he explained was because this was a justified defence as the safety of the realm and the public interest were threatened by the Scottish invasion.[1] Indeed all the chroniclers agreed that the Scottish invasion was particularly barbarous and they wrote about it with all the usual stories concerning the behaviour of the Scots. For example, the Furness chronicle said that they had first put the English to flight from Scotland, killing those whom they were able to catch. They had then invaded England, devastating Northumberland, burning villages and manors and committing great slaughter over an area fifty miles deep as far south as Newcastle and more in width, returning home at Christmas with an immense booty of vessels, plate, victuals, animals and plough-teams. Bartholomew Cotton described how a great Scottish army had occupied the whole of Scotland and invaded England with much slaughtering of the English without regard for age or sex. The excitable Langtoft recounted how Hugh de Cressingham had been killed by the Scots, his body cut up into pieces and his skin taken off in small thongs which Guisborough tells us were taken away as souvenirs. The Scots then vowed to destroy England without any pity and bring down the church and clergy, beginning by burning and destroying the houses and crops in Northumberland. Finally the Bury St. Edmunds chronicler said that the Scots invaded virtually the whole of Northumberland, Cumberland, Coupland and Westmorland devastating them with plunder and fire, killing the old and the young, the women and the children, and destroying, so it was said, a total of 715 villages and hamlets.[2]

Such hostility was not the result solely of royal propaganda.

1. Worcester, p. 534; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 147.

2. Cont. Newburgh, p. 582; Cotton, p. 339; Langtoft, ii.300; Guisborough, p. 303; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 142.

The chroniclers' accounts are more detailed than the king's writs and probably reflect the independent circulation of such stories. Walter of Guisborough, for example, obtained his story from a canon of St. Andrews who had fled from the Scots, and his detailed knowledge of events at Hexham suggests a local informant.[1] Far from being responsible for such stories, royal propaganda was merely reflecting and reinforcing the public mood.

Not only the clergy but also the laity were ready to agree that the Scottish invasion amounted to a national emergency which required their aid and co-operation. The earls' opposition to an aid was ended and a ninth was granted, whereas just over a month before they had refused to consent to an eighth and had physically tried to prevent its collection. Similarly, those who had earlier refused to go overseas to fight in Flanders but had come armed to parliament in September ready for civil war, were now prepared to go north to fight the Scots. The leading rebel earls, Norfolk and Hereford, both answered their summons to go north, joining what the Hagnaby chronicle called 'a great multitude' of earls and barons.[2] They still had their suspicions and doubts about royal intentions, and in mid-December required the charters to be proclaimed again and a sentence of excommunication to be issued against those who infringed them. But for the time being they were prepared to support the war effort.[3]

There is no reason to suppose that the other laity were any less alarmed, although we have no literary evidence of their opinions. There is no evidence that they opposed the collection

1. Guisborough, pp. 295, 305-6.
2. Hagnaby, f. 41^{v}, printed in Documents of 1297-8, p. 201.
3. Denton, Winchelsey, pp. 183-4; Powicke, Thirteenth Century, p. 697.

of the ninth. It is true that its yield was not very high, and there is a suggestion that there were more disputes over assessment than was usual,[1] but this probably reflects the financial exhaustion of the country which had been leading to steadily declining yields since 1294 rather than outright opposition to the tax itself. The response to the demands for foot soldiers was also fairly satisfactory. Some 29,000 were summoned, a rather optimistic figure, but about 18,500 did eventually arrive,[2] a large number considering that it was the middle of winter. Desertions may have been expected, for in June 1297, before the Scottish invasion, Henry de Percy and Robert de Clifford had had to promise to the men of Northumberland and Westmorland that they would obtain royal letters patent for them that their service against the Scots would not be used as a precedent against them.[3] Now John de Warenne was authorized to arrest and punish all those who resisted military service in Scotland.[4] Yet not until late February and early March 1298, when the danger had passed, did desertions from the army take place on a large scale.[5]

It is therefore clear that the government's request for assistance in October 1297 met with a ready response. Royal propaganda no doubt played a part, but its success at the end of 1297 compared with its failure to launch the Flemish expedition earlier in the year cannot be attributed to any more subtle or

1. Hadwin, 'Medieval Lay Subsidies', p. 203 and n. 21.
2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 94.
3. Documents, ed. Stevenson, ii. 186 and n.1.
4. P.R.O. E159/71, m.105.
5. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 94.

persuasive arguments. Rather the government was now making claims which seemed quite plausible and for which there was concrete evidence. The wicked Scot was a very real figure, whereas there was little evidence for, or belief that, the French posed any such danger.

Edward returned from Flanders in March 1298 and immediately began to prepare a military expedition to Scotland. The writs for this expedition were worded differently from those of the previous year. In 1297 they had dwelt upon the image of the evil Scot, but the writs issued in March 1298 simply summoned men 'to suppress the malice of the Scots, our enemies and rebels', or some such similar phrase.[1] This simplicity suggests that Edward was confident that the country would support his summons, and he was not mistaken in this assumption. Even though many had already served in Scotland the previous winter, all the earls answered their summons with their contingents of cavalry, smaller than during the winter but now at their own expense rather than at that of the crown.[2] A total of some 2,400 paid and unpaid cavalry were present on the campaign,[3] indicating the support of the upper classes for the war. Edward also had an impressive number of infantry with him, amounting to some 25,700 at the time of Falkirk,[4] perhaps the largest force of the whole reign.

The campaign which resulted in victory at Falkirk on 22nd July brought an enthusiastic response from Edward's subjects.

1. Parl. Writs, pp. 310-312 (nos. 31-34).
2. Morris, Welsh Wars, pp. 285, 290; Prestwich, op.cit., p. 73.
3. Morris, Welsh Wars, pp. 290, 292.
4. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 95.

Interest was probably stimulated by the reports of those returning from the war. The Hagnaby chronicler, for example, was informed of events in Scotland by John de Pothenovere,[1] about whom, unfortunately, no other information appears to survive. An example of what must have been a common type of newsletter is, however, recorded in one of the London letter-books It was not received directly from Scotland, but was sent by Walter Langton to the mayor, aldermen and barons of London announcing the news of the defeat of the Scots at Falkirk and the slaughter of two hundred Scottish cavalry and more than twenty thousand infantry. The Londoners showed their delight at this news by giving the messenger 20s.[2] The individual London crafts then arranged celebrations, the most splendid being the pageant mounted by the fishmongers. They organized a procession through the city to Leadenhall led by four horses bearing gilded sturgeons, followed by four silver salmon borne upon four more horses. Behind them came forty-six armed knights riding upon luces,together with St. Magnus on whose day, 19th August, the procession took place, and a total of 1,000 horsemen.[3] The Scottish casualties at Falkirk were also triumphantly reported by many of the chroniclers, estimates ranging upwards from 20,000 recorded by the Canterbury chronicler to 100,000 mentioned by the Furness chronicle and Langtoft.[4] The scribe of

1. Hagnaby, f.47^{r}.

2. Corporation of London Records Office, Letter-Book C, f.24, calendared London Letter-Book C, p.26.

3. R. Withington 'The Early Royal Entry', Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, xxxii (1917), p. 621, citing B.L. MS Harley 530, f.7^{v}, a chronicle of Little Dunmow copied by Stow.

4. Gervase, ii.316; Cont. Newburgh, p. 583; Langtoft, ii.312.

a French Brut of the early fourteenth century which recorded that 32,000 were killed and no more than twenty-eight English was sufficiently impressed to write the figure 32,000 in the margin.[1]

Several pieces of verse survive which illustrate popular feelings about the war in 1298. The first is a Latin poem, On the Deposition of Balliol,[2] which survives in three manuscripts.[3] It was probably written in 1298 or not long after, for the only events it mentions are the exile of Balliol and three battles, presumably Berwick, Dunbar and Falkirk. It was a challenge to the Scots to consider the hopelessness of their task. They have lost their prince, the French have failed to provide any help, and they have lost three battles. By the next battle they will be reduced to such extremities as Troy suffered after it was conquered. Their land will be laid waste, ravaged by war and bereft of Scotsmen. Merlin himself has foretold the fall of the Scottish kingdom, and the poem ends by confidently asserting that this hour has now come, that the Scottish will all be slaughtered, and assigning them to the devil deprived of the support of St. Andrew. We do not know who the author of this poem was, but

1. C.U.L. MS Ee i 20, f.139^{v}.

2. Printed in Political Songs, pp. 180-1.

3. (i) B.L. MS Cotton Julius A v, f.2^{r}: a copy of Langtoft's chronicle of the first quarter of the fourteenth century of unknown provenance. The poem is entered in a different hand on the flyleaves. It is accompanied by a rather beautiful full page illumination of some men in a boat, no doubt intended to represent Balliol coming by sea to London in 1296, although Wright believed the scene represented Balliol's exile to France in 1299.
   (ii) B.L. MS Royal 20 A xi, f.140^{r-v}: a copy of Langtoft's chronicle of unknown provenance, written throughout in a hand of the second quarter of the fourteenth century. The poem is entered amongst a collection of prophecies.
   (iii) B.L. MS Lansdowne 762, f.51: an imperfect version included in a sixteenth century collection of verse and prophecies of unknown provenance.

his classical allusions show him to have been an educated man, probably a clergyman. Whoever he was he certainly gave his full support to the war and was confident that it would be successful.

A second Latin poem, the Song on the Scottish Wars, was probably written about the same time.[1] It survives in the unusual number of five manuscripts[2] indicating that this was once a popular composition, and was probably written shortly after the battle of Falkirk with which the Song ends. The author was undoubtedly a clergyman, and possibly the prior of Alnwick as stated by one manuscript,[3] for the author does have some knowledge of the effects of the Scottish raid upon Alnwick in 1297. Bale believed the author to have been Robert Baston,

1. Printed in Political Songs, pp. 160-79.

2. (i) B.L. MS Cotton Titus A xx, ff.67^{v}-69^{v}: a collection of verse written in a number of hands in the latter part of the fourteenth century, probably from a large monastery in the London area. This version has a continuation of 48 lines.
   (ii) Bodleian MS Rawlinson B.214, ff.126^{r}-130^{r}: a late fifteenth century collection of verse written at Waltham abbey, showing a close textual relationship with the Titus manuscript. For these two manuscripts see A. G. Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (1)', Medieval Studies, xxxix (1977), 285.
   (iii) Clare College, Cambridge, MS N.2.5/14, ff. 96^{v}-97^{v}: an early fourteenth century manuscript. Documents relating to St. Albans have been added by a later hand to the flyleaves, but documents in the main text relating to Coventry and Lichfield and in particular to Burton abbey (ff. 93^{r}-94^{v}) may indicate its earlier ownership.
   (iv) Belvoir Castle, MS Add. 2: a late fifteenth and early sixteenth century ecclesiastical formulary from Welbeck priory. I have not seen this manuscript. There is an eighteenth century transcript in B.L. MS Sloane 4932, ff. 103^{r}-106^{v}. For these two manuscripts see H. M. Colvin, 'The Registrum Praemonstratense: A Lost Manuscript Rediscovered', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, viii (1957), 96-7.
   (v) B.L. MS Cotton Claudius D vi, ff. 184^{v}-186^{r}: a St. Albans manuscript of the early fourteenth century, containing the Rishanger chronicles and the Abbreviatio Chronicorum of Matthew Paris. Twelve lines of the Titus continuation have been added by a later hand.

3. MS Sloane 4932.

the prior of Scarborough,[1] but he is not known to have been writing so early,[2] while there is no good reason for preferring the attribution of the poem by another manuscript to the prior of Blythe.[3] The theme of the poem is the malice of the world, and the poet traces the conflict between the evil Scots and Edward I who is striving to perform God's work, often interrupting his account to include some moral lessons. He relates how in 1296 the Scots overthrew holiness and ended the rule of law, destroying the peace by their frequent sedition. Edward intervened to restore order and revive the law, but the Scots failed to learn their lessons and treacherously rose again under Wallace and committed all manner of evil deeds. Once more Edward restored order at Falkirk justly depriving Wallace of his dominion, but the poet prophesied that he would not have learnt his lesson. A later continuation extolled the justice of Edward's repression in 1298, before relating how the Scots refused obedience and clashed with the illustrious king again, until at last a truce was granted in October 1300. This, the poet believed, was the best thing for the Scots because they could never expect to be successful. He shared many of the prejudices of his contemporaries, describing the Scots as a kilted rabble, barbarous, fools tormented by vainglory, deceitful, proud and treacherous. They are unfaithful and have raised up Satan, overthrowing holiness. Wallace is a leader of savages, a robber who has become a knight, 'just as a swan is made out of a raven'. The English on the other

1. Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies', p. 292.
2. Dictionary of National Biography, i.1308-9.
3. Clare MS N.2.5/14.

hand are men of great valour, led by a worthy prince, a noble king who 'labours to devote himself entirely to Christ'. Since the poet seems to have first hand experience of the Scottish ravages at Alnwick it is not surprising that he approves of Edward's expeditions. Indeed he repeats Edward's claim that it is necessary to suffer war now and conquer Scotland, rather than be 'troubled with lasting strife'. This approving tone and the scorn shown towards the Scots is clearly summed up in the last four lines of the continuation: 'as though a swine should resist the valour of the lion, so the filthy Scots attack England; and the king for that reason reduces them to slavery: he will ever be a slave, who cannot be content with the little which providence has given him'.

A small collection of verse in the Lanercost chronicle which was probably written around this time by Henry de Burgo, canon and later prior of Lanercost, displays a similar attitude. Henry pours scorn on the Scots who have been defeated in three battles and whose hope in the French treaty has proved worthless, and lavishes praise on Edward who is a prince without equal. He bewails the destruction committed by the Scots on the church and complains that the rise of Wallace has led to the degeneration of the Scottish nobility. Under a degenerate leader the Scottish people have become debased, and he warns that treason, slaughter, fire, fraud and pillage can only end unhappily.[1] A poem which describes the arms of the soldiers going to Scotland may also date from Edward's campaigns, although it is not possible to say which in particular it relates to. It is entered in a

1. Lanercost, pp. 192-3.

thirteenth century hand on pp. 320-1 of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 234/120, a collection of religious works of unknown provenance. The poet announced to his listeners in the first verse that he was going to compile a list of the arms carried by the English who are going to defeat the Scots. He then described the arms, beginning with those of the cavalry and ending with the knives and axes of the infantry. Although this is little more than a list of weapons, the poet was clearly* confident that the Scots would be overcome and a number of them killed and wounded. Similar feelings may have been expressed by a lost poem or tract entitled 'De laude regis Angliae et victoria Scocia et ingressu in Flandriam', entered in a lost manuscript from St. Augustine's, Canterbury.[1]

These surviving pieces of literature make it clear that the suppression of two Scottish invasions had revived and strengthened traditional feelings of hostility towards the Scots. Men had recognized Edward's needs and responded to his appeals for aid, rejoicing when he came home victorious. Yet Edward could not afford to be complacent and count on the continuing whole-hearted support of his subjects, for although the news of Falkirk was welcomed, the response was less enthusiastic than that of 1296. Moreover, although the earls had responded to their military summons, it seems that they had not given their complete support to the campaign, for some of them came with rather small contingents. Hereford and Lincoln brought fourteen knights each, Warwick thirteen and Arundel only four, almost a token force when compared with the fifty provided by Norfolk,

1. See above, pp. 135-6, 136 n.1.

* [see correction sheet, fol. i]

forty-nine by Pembroke and forty-six each by Gloucester and Surrey.[1] Furthermore, the political problems of the previous summer were still not resolved, for the earls of Hereford and Norfolk requested confirmation of Edward's promises before they would take part. They also departed from the army after Falkirk, refusing to take part in further operations in Scotland on the grounds that they had not been consulted as was their right.[2] Clearly there was a danger that the political crisis which had undermined the Flemish campaign of 1297 might revive to the detriment of the Scottish war. The infantry of Durham also deserted at the end of the campaign,[3] an indication that Edward could not continue to count automatically on the whole-hearted support of the lower classes. The church, too, seemed to believe that the danger was passing, for the convocation of June 1298 decided against handing over the remainder of the subsidy they had granted in November 1297 on the grounds that the tax was for the defence of the church and realm against the Scots and would be kept until it was needed for this purpose.[4] In a way the Falkirk campaign had been too successful, for it had removed the immediate danger from the Scots and the urgent necessity to defend the realm, yet had not been sufficiently successful to make a further expedition unnecessary. Clearly Edward would have to work hard to keep the war effort going.

1. Morris, Welsh Wars, p. 290; Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 64.
2. Prestwich, op.cit., pp. 262-3.
3. Morris, Welsh Wars, p. 296.
4. Reg. Winchelsey, i.261; Bury St. Edmunds, p. 147; Denton, Winchelsey, p. 189.

(iii) 1299-1307

(a) Writs

Not surprisingly, in the light of the signs of waning enthusiasm in the summer of 1298, Edward tried to make his case more persuasive when he issued writs in September for a campaign the following summer. He explained that he proposed to lead an expedition against the Scots, the enemies of the crown and kingdom, in order to restrain their disobedience and malice, for they sought nothing but the subjection of the crown and the realm to their power. Such an expedition would therefore be to the honour of the king and crown and the profit and salvation of the whole realm and people.[1] Now that the immediate danger had passed Edward was anxious to show that his expeditions were still very much in the interests of the realm by claiming that unless the Scots were defeated they would continue to be a serious danger to the whole realm. He clearly had in mind the view of the clergy expressed in the summer, and perhaps shared by others as well, that since the immediate danger had passed further expeditions were not in the interests of the realm.

However such arguments were not sufficient to overcome the growing political opposition, as the barons felt that the removal of the immediate danger enabled them to return to their political grievances. The political crisis which developed in the spring of 1299 meant that the muster planned for 7th June had to be postponed four times, so that the army did not assemble until 13th December, and even then the crisis was not fully resolved. Even allowing for the time of year, the poor response to the summons in December is an indication that the

1. Parl. Writs, p. 317 (nos. 1, 2); cf. pp. 320 (no. 17), 323 (no. 22) and passim.

threat from Scotland was not felt as acutely as the political grievances. A number of magnates failed to attend the muster as the perambulation of the forest had not been performed as promised.[1] Some 16,000 infantry were summoned, but only 2,500 appeared, despite the offer of extra wages, and they quickly deserted after receiving their preliminary pay.[2] The Durham contingent claimed that they were bound to serve only in defence and could not be forced to cross their frontiers.[3] Edward eventually abandoned the expedition and recognized the need for political concessions before he could mount a successful Scottish expedition.

It is not surprising that when on January 1st 1300 Edward ordered chancery to issue writs summoning men to parliament and the army, he commanded that they should be made 'as strong as possible'.[4] This in itself is interesting, for it is evidence that although the actual wording of the writs was left to the chancery, the king might concern himself with their tone. The writs issued for a military muster the following summer stressed that the expedition was in the common interests of all. The king was going to Scotland for the salvation of the crown and the common profit of the magnates and the whole people of the realm. The damage and dangers which arose from the rebellion of the Scots would be met by suppressing their rebellion, perfidy and evil. In this way men would be delivered from the distress and injuries which they had long sustained on account of the

1. Langtoft, ii.320.

2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 95; Parl. Writs, pp. 326 (no. 6), 329 (no. 12), 339 (no. 22).

3. Morris, Welsh Wars, p. 298; Fraser, Antony Bek, p. 139.

4. 'Si expresses e si chargeantes come vous porrez selont la forme usee en cas semblable avant ces houres': P.R.O. C81/21/2013, calendared in Cal. Chancery Warrants, p. 115.

perfidious rebellion of their enemies.[1] Edward thus demonstated that the expedition was indeed necessary, for a successful expedition was the only way that the current hardships which arose from Scottish actions could be ended.

This writ is typical of much of Edward's propaganda against the Scots during the remainder of his reign. His purpose continued to be to stress the defensive nature of the wars and the benefit they would bring to the whole realm. The blame for the continuing war was put firmly upon the Scots in terms which perhaps reflected increasingly bitter feelings towards people who had deprived him of his victory. Men were summoned because the Scots 'persisted in their preconceived malice',[2] in order to crush the pride of the Scots,[3] or to crush the insolence of the enemy perversely striving to disturb the kingdom,[4] and to deal with the wicked machinations of the Scots who inflicted atrocious injuries on the English realm and people.[5] He stressed that these expeditions were not in his interests alone, but would also benefit the whole community. They were to bring peace and honour to the kingdom, the crown and the king, and to be for the benefit and honour of the king and his people and the peace and tranquillity of the realm,[6] for the common utility of the realm,[7]

1. Parl. Writs, p. 327 (no. 8). Although dated 30th December, they are presumably the result of this command.
2. ibid., pp. 347 (no. 1), 358 (no. 13), 370 (no. 14).
3. ibid., p. 357 (no. 9).
4. ibid., p. 366 (no. 1).
5. Foedera,p. 928.
6. Parl. Writs, p. 363 (no. 11).
7. ibid., pp. 366 (no. 1), 367 (no. 4).

for the safety and salvation of the lands,[1] and their benefit, honour and salvation.[2] The image of the wicked Scot also continued to be used to illustrate their malice, but more sparingly than in the past, perhaps as Scottish raids in England began to decline. One writ of 1303, for example, quoted a report from John de Segrave in Scotland that the Scots were invading the lands held by the English, occupying the castles, villages and other places and inhumanely perpetrating murders, plunder, arson and other atrocities, and that unless they were stopped they would invade England as they had done before.[3] Later in the year the men of the northern counties were required to assemble to repel the Scots who were invading the Scottish Marches and daily committing murders, arson, robbery and many other evils.[4] The outbreak of war again in 1306 following the rebellion of Robert Bruce saw little change in the style of military writs. The war continued to be blamed upon the Scots, for Bruce and other traitors had broken their oaths of homage and fealty and risen in rebellion. Moreover his attempt to usurp the lordship of Scotland was shown to be a serious danger to all because of the threat of hostile invasions into England by Robert and his accomplices.[5] One writ addressed to the barons, knights, bailiffs, officials and faithful of Yorkshire, Northumberland and the Scottish Marches described at length how Bruce had treacherously killed Comyn in the Franciscan church at

1. ibid., p. 369 (no. 11).
2. ibid. (no. 12).
3. ibid.
4. ibid., pp. 372-3 (nos. 23-7); Foedera, p. 957.
5. Parl. Writs, pp. 374-5 (esp. nos. 4, 7).

Dumfries and then waged war against the king, imprisoning his sheriffs, officials and men, occupying his castles and lands and attempting to usurp the lordship of Scotland to the scandal of the church and kingdom and the disinheritance of the king and crown. It announced the appointment of Aymer de Valence as captain to suppress such evil and iniquity and to meet the dangers which might arise in England and Scotland from the hostile attacks of Bruce.[1] Edward's writs thus continued to blame the war upon the Scots and to seek the support of his subjects by telling them what they expected to hear, stressing the evil nature of the Scots and their wicked designs upon the English kingdom and people.

(b) Relations with the local communities

Although military writs are probably the best surviving evidence of the nature of Edward's propaganda, they were by no means his only method. We have earlier seen how parliament was an important means of communication between the king and his subjects, and it continued to serve this purpose during the Scottish wars. Unfortunately our knowledge of the proceedings at these later parliaments is poor. This is partly because of the decline in chronicle writing during the 1290s, but also because these parliaments dealt with few matters which were of immediate concern to the monastic chroniclers. Yet large parliaments were being held frequently and the shire representatives summoned fairly regularly, and not only for the purpose of granting taxation. In 1300, 1301 and 1306 taxation was requested, but the shire representatives were also present in 1298, 1302, 1305 and 1307 when as far as we know no such

1. Foedera, pp. 982-3.

requests were made. Their main function on these occasions was probably more to watch and witness the proceedings than anything else. The meeting of parliament in March 1300, for example, was probably intended to be a time of political reconciliation between Edward and his subjects. It was certainly one of the largest parliaments Edward ever held and saw the publication of the Articuli super Cartas and the confirmation of the charters.[1]

One of the purposes of the 1305 parliament, which also seems to have been larger than usual,[2] was probably to celebrate Edward's triumph as undisputed ruler of Britain following the Scottish peace in 1304 as well as his final recovery of Gascony in 1303. Here the preparations for the 'form of peace' in Scotland were begun, and arrangements were made for the restoration of royal administration in Gascony.[3] The shire representatives were present for three weeks, but there is little evidence of anything they did despite the unusual fullness of the records.[4] They were probably present merely to see Edward at the height of his powers, making arrangements for the government of his new conquests. The parliament of 1301 was certainly an occasion for propaganda. We do not know what arguments were put forward to justify the grant of a fifteenth, but this parliament was also used to rehearse publicly the historical claims for overlordship over Scotland. Edward's rights had been established in 1291 and as we have

1. See above, pp. 285-6.
2. Memoranda de Parliamento, 1305, ed. F. W. Maitland (Rolls Series, 1893), p. xxxv, estimates that over six hundred people were present.
3. Powicke, Thirteenth Century, pp. 712, 308.
4. Memoranda de Parliamento, p. lxxv.

seen were generally accepted when war broke out in 1296. Occasionally brief references were made to these rights in royal writs as a reminder that Edward had justice on his side,[1] yet as far as is known no detailed exposition of his rights in Scotland was made until the papal bull Scimus fili arrived in September 1300.[2] This challenged Edward's claims and set out historical arguments to show that Scotland was really a papal fief. It was possibly felt that a public refutation of this bull would help both to rally the flagging war effort and to divert attention away from the current political grievances. Accordingly when writs went out the following month summoning parliament to meet at Lincoln in January 1301, representatives of the two universities and a number of individual scholars were also summoned specifically to discuss the king's rights in Scotland. A number of writs were also sent to monasteries asking them to search their chronicles for historical evidence and to send their findings to parliament in the hands of someone knowledgeable in the matter.[3] A search of the royal archives for relevant material was also ordered in November.[4] At parliament the papal bull was produced and explained, and, presumably after a review of the historical evidence, a reply was drawn up in the name of seven earls and ninety-seven barons. It described how the barons were much amazed at its claims, for it was well known that the kings of England had always held superior lordship over Scotland, and how the barons were determined that the rights of

1. For example see Parl. Writs, pp. 327 (no. 8), 329 (no 13), 330 (no. 15).

2. But see a reference in Anglo-Scottish Relations, p. 177, to some historical writings.

3. Parl. Writs, pp. 91 (no. 8), 92 (no. 11).

4. Cal. Chancery Warrants, p. 120.

the crown would be maintained as they were bound to do.[1] The king also drew up a letter which rehearsed at length the historical arguments for his claims, presumably based on the evidence reviewed in parliament, although it was not ready until May 1301. Finally there was propaganda of a different kind at the parliament of May 1306. This was held following the revolt of Robert Bruce, and Edward used the occasion to knight his son together with a large number of other knights in a ceremony designed to build up support for another expedition to Scotland.[2]

It was not only in parliament that Edward sought to establish personal contacts with his subjects. The political crises following 1297 had shown that many of them found the burdens of war more intolerable than the dangers it was trying to prevent, reinforcing the lesson which Edward had learnt from the baronial wars of his father's reign that the opinions and welfare of his subjects could not be ignored. In 1298 he launched an inquiry into the maladministration of royal officials, resuming an earlier concern which had been halted by the wars. He also began to pay more attention to explaining the reasons for these burdens, particularly where purveyance was concerned.

Purveyance had hitherto been taken as a royal right, and it had been felt that there was little need to explain the reasons for it. Yet purveyance was one of the main grievances in 1297 and greater care was taken thereafter to justify it, largely

1. Foedera, pp. 926-7. The barons' letter was in the end not sent, despite the effort made to collect their seals (B.L. Add. MS 7966A, f.37^{r}). Diplomatic arguments, printed in Anglo-Scottish Relations, p. 187, possibly led to this decision. For the distribution of this and the other letters see below, pp. 406-7.

2. See below, pp. 333-5.

by inserting explanations of the kind we have seen in the military writs into the writs for purveyance.[1] In March 1301, after the Articuli of 1300 had severely restricted the right of purveyance, a new experiment was tried when clerks were sent out into the shires to address the county communities.[2] They took with them letters addressed to the communities explaining that the granting of purveyance now would lead eventually to the restoration of peace and an end to their troubles. They were told that an army was going to Scotland to put an end to the serious damage which the Scots had done and were still doing to the king, people and whole realm. Therefore they were asked to provide specified amounts of food to assist this task, which was common to all who were bound to the salvation and defence of the crown and who wanted the peace and welfare of the king, people and whole realm. Moreover, all purveyance taken would be paid for from the proceeds of the fifteenth recently granted. It was only with such aid that their honour and the common profit of the realm would be saved and they would be delivered from the great disturbance they had hitherto suffered.[3] This has been called a negotiation for purveyance,[4] but since in all cases the quantities suggested by the government were agreed by the counties[5] it seems more of a propaganda exercise than genuine negotiation. In December 1301 royal clerks were again sent out into the shires in connection with purveyance, the sheriffs being ordered to

1. See, for example, Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 314, 344; Documents, ed. Stevenson, ii.355-6; Foedera, p. 917.
2. Parl. Writs, p. 348 (no. 5).
3. P.R.O. E101/552/4, calendared Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301,578-9.
4. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 132.
5. ibid.

assemble before them all the principle taxers and collectors, knights and good men of the shire and any others they thought fit to hear what they had to say. The clerks were provided with a schedule to read, announcing that the king was remaining in Scotland at great expense to oppress his enemies and, with the aid of God, to bring the whole affair to a good conclusion. They were thanked profusely for their earlier contributions and asked for further contributions which would again be paid for from the proceeds of the fifteenth.[1]

This experiment of national negotiation was not repeated again, the decline of political tensions probably making purveyance a less emotive issue, although on occasion some local negotiations did take place.[2] However, royal clerks were sent out over other matters. In August 1301 several of them were sent to a number of towns throughout the country to induce them to grant a loan to the king. They were to explain that the king was in difficult straits in Scotland, where he was for their profit and that of the whole realm, and that he could not bring this affair to a good conclusion without their aid. If he were successful it would bring great honour to the realm and everlasting peace and quiet. The clerks were also to mention that certain towns had already been approached and had granted aid, realizing the expense of the task and the great profit which could arise from it. The clerks themselves were told that they should not confine themselves to these words, but were to add whatever they thought suitable.[3] Clerks were also sent to each county in late 1301 to hasten the

1. Parl. Writs, pp. 403-6 (nos. 46-9), 404 (no. 51).
2. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 132.
3. Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302, 461-3.

collection of the fifteenth in ways which they deemed fit.[1]

In 1303 royal clerks were also sent out to encourage men to serve in the army, no doubt because in 1300 and 1301 there had been serious problems from desertion. Efforts were now made to combat this problem. Not only were fewer infantry requested to serve than in the past, but also a harsh new ordinance was drawn up to punish deserters.[2] The appointment of clerks to assist the military levy would also help to improve the standard and reliability of the infantry. Early in the year Ralph de Manton was sent to expound certain things to the community of Northumberland for the safety and salvation of those parts and the king's lands in Scotland, while in March Robert de Clifford was sent to induce men in various towns 'by all means which he sees fit' to serve against the Scots. In April John of Brittany and others were sent to address the county community of Durham, and they were followed in May by Richard de Brun who was sent to Cumberland to explain the military summons.[3] These efforts seem to have met with some success, for most of the infantry, unusually, appeared at the date specified and the problem of desertion was not so great as in previous years.[4] Clerks were also sent out at the same time to secure naval service, to which there had been some resistance in the previous year.[5] Peter de Dunwich and Walter Bacun were sent in March to various towns to secure the service of a number of ships and to overcome the

1. Parl. Writs, p. 110 (no. 1), says they were sent in November, but Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1292-1301, 614, prints October.

2. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 97.

3. Parl. Writs, p. 369 (no. 11); Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-7, 76; Parl. Writs, p. 372 (nos. 20-21).

4. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 97.

5. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, 52-3, 61-2.

resistance of men who refused to contribute.[1] They may have encountered problems, for William de Walmesford was sent in April to give assistance to Walter Bacun.[2] Such activities were of course not new; but the evidence does suggest that necessity was driving Edward to reinforce the arguments of his writs with occasional meetings of parliament and the dispatch of officials into the towns and shires to put his needs across more persuasively.

(c) Visual propaganda

Not only did Edward place more importance upon personal contacts in these later years, but he also made greater use of more visual forms of propaganda. The most splendid and most famous occasion was the knighting of prince Edward in 1306, which all those wishing to be knighted with him were invited to attend. This was not the only occasion when a large number of knights were dubbed together,[3] but it was undoubtedly the largest and the only one to attract contemporary comment. About three hundred men came to Westminster to be knighted with prince Edward, such large numbers of men with their relations and followers requiring fifty carpenters to be employed for a month beforehand making preparations.[4] Orchards and walls had to be knocked down at the New Temple to make room for their tents, and such was the crush at the ceremony itself that many fainted and two were said to have been killed. The clangour of bells and the sound of

1. Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-7, 78; Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, 121.
2. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, 131.
3. N. Denholm-Young, History and Heraldry, 1254-1310 (Oxford, 1965), p. 25.
4. C. Bullock-Davies, Menestrellorum Multitudo: Minstrels at a Royal Feast (Cardiff, 1978), p. xviii. Each candidate was said to be accompanied by at least three knights: Flores Historiarum, iii.131.

voices were so great that the choir could not be heard. The ceremony was followed by the famous Feast of Swans, a lavish banquet presided over by Edward. Gold threaded cloth hung on the wall behind the king and his son, and nearly two hundred minstrels performed during the festivities at a cost of £165 6s. 4d.[1] Two swans, prepared and decorated by Geoffrey, the king's papillionarius,[2] and brought into the hall with pomp and glory, gave the feast its name. Their precise significance is obscure, but they probably referred to the story of the chivalrous Swan Knight.[3] Edward vowed before God and the swans that he would go to Scotland, dead or alive, to avenge the injury done to the church, the death of John Comyn and the perjury of the Scots. Those present did the same, the prince swearing not to sleep two nights in the same place until he had reached Scotland.[4] Although the making of vows was an essential part of the knighting ceremony,[5] Edward used the occasion to give them a special political significance and to arouse enthusiasm for another Scottish expedition.[6] It may indeed have been a deliberate imitation of the Whitsun festivities held by king Arthur at which his men pledged to follow him to war against

1. Bullock-Davies, op.cit., pp. xxviii n. 3, 7-9.
2. P.R.O. E101/369/11, f.68^{v}. For this and other purchases he was paid 79s. 6d.
3. A. R. Wagner, 'The Swan Badge and the Swan Knight', Archaeologia, xcvii (1959), 127-38.
4. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, pp. 509-10; Trevet, pp. 408-9.
5. Bullock-Davies, op.cit., p. xxxvi.
6. The size of the army which eventually went to Scotland in 1306 is unfortunately unknown: Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 80.

Lucius Hiberius.[1]

A different type of visual propaganda at the end of the reign, the public executions of the Scottish leaders, not only allowed Edward to vent his increasing feelings of bitterness and frustration towards those who would not submit to his authority, but also gave him an opportunity to build up support for the Scottish wars. A great crowd gathered to meet William Wallace when he was brought to London on 22nd August 1305 and also on the following day when he was taken through the street of London to Westminster Hall, accompanied by the mayor, sheriffs and aldermen of London.[2] A laurel crown was placed on his head to fulfil the boast he was supposed to have made that he would one day wear a crown in Westminster Hall. At the trial which followed it was recounted how he had revolted against the oath he had taken in 1296 and encouraged others to revolt. He had invaded England and felonously killed in different ways all those whom he had found there faithful to the king of England. He had slaughtered monks and nuns dedicated to God and burnt and destroyed churches which had been built to the honour of God and his saints, together with the bodies of saints and other relics which had been honourably placed in them. He spared none who spoke English but

1. Geoffrey of Monmouth, ed. Griscom, pp.451-67; cf. also Edward's Arthurian festivities described by Ludewijk van Velthem, at which through the use of dramatic interludes Edward's men were persuaded to pledge themselves to avenge the injuries inflicted upon the king: G. Huet, 'Les Traditions Arturiennes chez le Chroniquer Louis de Velthem', Le Moyen Age, 2nd series, xvii (1913), 173-97; T. M. Chotzen, 'Welsh History in the Continuation of the "Speigel Historiael" by Lodewijk van Velthem', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, vii (1933-4), 50; R. S. Loomis, 'Edward I, Arthurian Enthusiast', Speculum, xxviii (1953), 118-121.

2. The following details are from Annales Londonienses, pp. 139-142, and Barrow, Bruce, pp. 193-4. The whole execution was to cost £11 10s. (Lanercost p. 523), including 15s. for the carriage of the body to Scotland by John de Segrave (Documents, ed. Stevenson, ii.485).

delivered to a worse death than can be imagined all old and young men, brides, widows and maidens, infants and suckling babes. Every day and every hour he had plotted the king's death and the decrease and annihilation of his majesty. These charges were skillfully constructed,for they reflected clearly the public conception of a wicked Scot. He was then sentenced for his treason to be dragged from Westminster to the Tower, from there to Aldgate and then through the city to the Smithfield Elms, a distance of over four miles, where he was to be hanged for his various crimes. He was then cut down, beheaded because he was still an outlaw, disembowelled for his crimes against the church, and his entrails burnt. His head was placed on London bridge where it was joined in 1307 by the head of his brother,[1] and the four quarters of his body were sent to Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Berwick, Stirling and Perth as a warning to all who passed by.

The ability of the government to reflect and stimulate public feelings is shown by the response of the chroniclers, who recorded Wallace's execution in far more hostile terms than his rise to power in 1297-8. The Flores Historiarum described him as lacking in piety, a robber, a violator of sacred buildings and an arsonist and murderer who copied Herod in his cruelty, was more savage in his evil deeds than Nero and who underwent a cruel and fitting death. The Worcester chronicler also believed that Wallace merited his death, while Langtoft declared 'O how God is good in his righteous rewards, who so often has revenged us on felons'. Later, after the execution of Wallace's brother

1. Annales Paulini, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1882), 255.

in 1307, he proclaimed 'May everywhere be honoured the high true God, by whose holy grace Edward our king has destroyed the thief and all his puny line'. The Lanercost chronicler included a short epitaph, presumably written by Henry de Burgo, showing how Wallace merited such a death for his misdeeds. The Annales Angliae et Scotiae, which were written after this execution, spoke with hindsight about the rise of Wallace in 1297, declaring him to be of ignoble stock, a mere archer who sought victory through the bow and arrow, a robber turned knight, like a swan made from a raven. An epitaph on Wallace, which was probably once part of this chronicle, described his deserved execution.[1]

The execution of Wallace was the first of a number of brutal executions which took place at the end of Edward's reign. In 1306 Simon Fraser was brought to London with his legs fettered underneath his horse, his hands bound together and a garland of leaves upon his head. He too was drawn as a traitor through London from the Tower, through Cheapside to the place of execution, where he was hanged, beheaded and disembowelled. His head was set up to the sound of a horn next to Wallace on London bridge as a reminder of the execution.[2] The earl of Atholl met a similar fate in London, except that Edward met the plea that the earl was his kinsman not with clemency but with the order that he should be hanged from a higher gallows than everyone else to reflect his superior status. Executions of other Scottish

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.123-4 (embellished by the Merton Flores, iii.321); Worcester,p.558;Langtoft, ii.362, 378; Lanercost, p. 203; Annales Angliae et Scotiae, pp. 383-4, 408; cf. the milder comments made in 1297 in Lanercost, p. 190; Hagnaby f. 41^{v}, printed in Documents of 1297-8,p. 201; Langtoft, ii.298, 300.

2. Political Songs, pp. 218-22; Annales Londonienses, p. 148.

leaders also took place outside London at Berwick, Dumfries, Newcastle and Carlisle. Robert Bruce's sister, Mary, and the countess of Buchan were spared execution but suffered public humiliation by being placed within cages of iron and wood at Roxburgh and Berwick castles where they could be mocked by passers-by.[1] Publicity was clearly an important element in these punishments, not only to deter the Scottish rebels but also to encourage the English war effort. This seems to have been successful, for many chroniclers reported in detail and with satisfaction the executions of the Scottish leaders. Even the chronicle of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, which paid very little attention to Scottish affairs, described the execution of the Scottish prisoners in detail unusual for that chronicle. Likewise the chronicle of St. Mary's, York, which scarcely mentioned anything but domestic matters, also noted the execution of Wallace, the earl of Atholl and the dean of St. Andrews.[2]

An English song was composed on the execution of Fraser which illustrates the feelings generated by this event. It seems to have been written very shortly after the execution on September 7th 1306.[3] Although it is clearly to be distinguished from the cruder verse of Langtoft's soldiers' songs,[4] the poet is addressing himself to a wide audience. He begins with the conventional invitation, 'Listen, lordings, a new song I shall

1. Barrow, Bruce, pp. 228-231; Powicke, Thirteenth Century, p.716.

2. St. Augustine's, p. 301; Chronicle of St. Mary's, pp. 39-41.

3. It was written before the arrival of news in the same month of the capture of the earl of Atholl, for which see Barrow, Bruce, p. 229.

4. It survives in the literary collection of B.L. MS Harley 2253. The Midlands dialect noted by Brook, Dialects of the Harley Lyrics, p. 60, may simply reflect the provenance of the scribe rather than the poet himself.

begin', calls Edward 'longshanks' and uses the slang word 'tprut', all expressions which would be out of place in a purely literary work.[1] It is perhaps the work of a minstrel,[2] but more possibly that of a friar, for the poem includes a number of moral sentiments and lessons, stressing in particular the inevitable fall of the mighty. The poet points to the lesson of those Scotsmen who had tried to set themselves up as kings, whose heads are now on London bridge. He warns too that Robert Bruce, 'a king of summer', will pay for his ambitions. Fraser himself was a powerful man who paid little heed to the future and was brought down by his falseness and treachery. The moral is clear: 'he who loves falseness, and will never leave it, sore may he dread the life that he is in'. Whether the poet was a minstrel or a friar his song would have reflected the mood of the public for whom it was written, and it is interesting to see that sentiments expressed a decade earlier in Langtoft's soldiers' songs were still current. There is still that same scorn and hatred of the Scots and Scotland. The poet exclaims 'Tprut, Scot, for thy strife! Hang up thy hatchet and thy knife while life lasts to him with the long shanks'. Bruce is criticized as a king who does not know how to rule and mockingly called king Hobbe, while Scotland is described as 'that false country.... much hath Scotland lost....and little praise won'. Such sentiments were of course not created by the executions. Nevertheless the interest shown in them shows how Edward was able

1. 'Tprut' is an expression of contempt: G. C. Coulton, Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation (Cambridge, 1919), pp. 317-8.

2. Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries, ed. R. H. Robbins (New York, 1959), p. 253.

to use them to reinforce his propaganda and build upon existing attitudes to help the war effort.

(d) Religious propaganda

The final element in Edward's propaganda was the claim that he was fighting a holy war against an irreligious people. This claim reflected the traditional belief that the Scots were a godless nation, while as rebels against their anointed king they would automatically be regarded in an irreligious light. It was a belief which seems to have gained fairly widespread acceptance and which Edward encouraged, not so much through his writs but by enlisting the support of the church to pray for his success and excommunicate his enemies.[1] It was presumably on the grounds that this was a holy war that he could justify obtaining a bull in 1306 absolving all those who had incurred excommunication for their actions during the Scottish wars.[2]

Edward also underlined the holy nature of his Scottish expeditions by carrying saints' banners with him, perhaps deliberately emulating Athelstan who had taken the banner of St. John of Beverley to Scotland and thereby obtained the saint's help in conquering Scotland.[3] In 1296 Edward also took the banner of St. John to Scotland,[4] and in 1298 and on a number of subsequent expeditions the banner of St. John and St. Cuthbert of Durham were both carried to Scotland.[5] Standards bearing the arms of

1. For this see below, pp. 368-73, 385-7.

2. Register of John de Halton, bishop of Carlisle, 1292-1324, i, ed. W. N. Thompson (Canterbury and York Society, xii, 1913), 261-2.

3. Foedera, p. 771, calendared by Stones and Simpson, ii.308.

4. Foedera, p. 848.

5. B.L. Add.MSS 35291, ff.30^{v}, 31^{r}, 35^{r}, 72^{v}; 7966A, ff.27^{r},39^{r},39^{v}, 68^{v}, 69^{v};P.R.O.E101/361/13, f.1^{r}; E101/370/16, f.16^{r}. No doubt other references could be found.

various saints were also made for the army, a practice familiar from Edward's Welsh wars. In 1300 three standards bearing respectively the arms of St. George, St. Edmund and St. Edward were made, perhaps the three standards bearing those saints' arms which were placed on Caerlaverock castle when it was captured in that year.[1] In 1303 the prince's army was provided with twelve standards each of the arms of St. Edmund, St. Edward and St. George as well as eight hundred pennons bearing the arms of St. George.[2] Similarly in 1306 three standards each of the arms of St. Edward and St. Edmund were made, together with nine standards and ten thousand pennons bearing those of St. George.[3] There was also an interesting incident in 1300 when Edward sent his standard to Bury St. Edmunds, asking that the prior and convent say the mass for St. Edmund over it and that it should be touched by all the relics in the monastery.[4]

It was certainly widely believed that Edward was fighting a holy war. Langtoft, for example, considered that God supported Edward in Scotland, seeing the battle of Dunbar as God's judgement upon the Scots and their defeat at Falkirk as God's vengeance on them for making war against their oath. Perhaps because of the presence of their holy banners, he also ascribed the victories of 1296 to the aid of saints John, Cuthbert and Thomas.[5] The Hailes annalist also believed that the victories

1. B.L. Add. MS 35291, f.34^{r}; Siege of Caerlaverock, ed. N. H. Nicolas (London, 1828), p. 86.

2. P.R.O. E101/363/18, f.9^{v}.

3. P.R.O. E101/369/11, f.67^{r}.

4. Bury St. Edmunds, p. 157.

5. Langtoft, ii.238, 248-50, 266, 312. The banner of St. Thomas is however not known to have been present.

at Berwick and Dunbar were signs of God's favour.[1] The Lanercost chronicle,reflecting the strong moral and spiritual concerns of its Franciscan author, strongly emphasized that the Scots had brought their misfortune upon themselves and were being punished by God for their sins.[2] It also reported a number of divine portents of Edward's victories in Scotland. The chronicler claimed that in July 1295 a religious from Lothian had seen the whole sky filled with clouds. Presently he had seen red shields bearing the arms of the king of England advancing from the north-east until they filled the sky. Then a handsome person seated on an ass had appeared, bearing the marks of crucifixion dripping with blood on his hands, feet and side, a symbol of the divine nature of Edward's expedition. He also reported another vision seen at Haddington of a raging fire coming from the south which destroyed Berwick before going on to destroy Lothian. Furthermore some children on the way to school in Berwick saw a vision of the crucified Christ, his face turned towards the city as a portent of the punishment to come. Finally, he said that a voice had been heard in the heavens during the invasion of the Scots in 1296 calling for divine vengeance. This, the chronicler believed, was granted at Dunbar.[3] Religious feelings were also present in some of the contemporary political verse. One of Langtoft's soldiers' songs ended with a curse on the Scots that 'the rough fiend tear them in hell'.[4] The Song on the Execution of Sir Simon Fraser saw the Scottish rebels as breaking God's law

1. Hailes, f.51^{r-v} (pp. 102, 104).
2. Lanercost, pp. 165-6, 171, 173, and passim.
3. ibid., pp. 162-3, 167, 175.
4. Langtoft, ii.248.

and, perhaps prompted by Fraser's disembowelling for his crimes against the church, saw him in particular as motivated by wickedness and sin.[1] Indeed a later French Brut said that Fraser's body was eventually burned because devils were seen dancing on his gallows and tormenting his body, and it was feared for the safety of those who guarded it at night, of whom several had died. Some support is given to this story by the fact that Fraser's body together with the gallows were burnt at the king's command in late September 1306, whereas such felons were usually left to hang.[2]

Not only was it believed that the Scots were being punished for their sins, but it was also felt that God was rewarding the English for their virtues. Langtoft, for example, said that the capture of Wallace was a reward for a just people. The Lanercost chronicler, speaking of the Scottish invasion in 1296, said that just as God had come to the aid of the Israelis in Egypt, so he had also helped the English.[3] This parallel between the English and the Israelites, God's chosen race, was also made by bishop Dalderby of Lincoln. In 1301, as part of his services for victory in Scotland, he ordered the chanting of psalm 79 which has as its theme the invasion of Jerusalem by the heathen.[4] Similarly the Song on the Scottish Wars suggested that the English were a special people, for the poet pleaded 'may the Governor of the universe whom we address as God, who protected the Hebrew people through many difficulties, give the English

1. Political Songs, pp. 212, 220.
2. C.U.L. MS Ee i 20, f.41^{v}; Annales Londonienses, p. 149.
3. Lanercost, p. 166.
4. Reg. Dalderby, f.32^{v}.

victory over their enemies'. Later he claimed that 'the English, like angels, are always conquerors'.[1]

As the king of this favoured race, Edward too was considered to have received special protection from God. The Flores Historiarum reported that he was miraculously unharmed at the siege of Stirling in 1304 when hundreds of missiles had passed to his left and right, one even going between his legs.[2] The Song on the Scottish Wars considered that Edward had been chosen by God who had endowed him with his strength and vigour,[3] while the Lanercost chronicler, writing after the outbreak of the Scottish wars, believed that he had been specially protected by the Virgin ever since he had sought her help in Wales in 1283. The chronicler also recorded earlier a miracle which befell Edward in Gascony when he survived a flash of lightning entering his chamber.[4] In his use of religious imagery Edward was again reflecting and stimulating popular opinion to build up support for his wars. By developing the traditional view that the Scots were a godless people he had helped to create the belief that his wars were a holy undertaking and that he and his people were especially protected by God in this enterprise.

(e) Historical research

The response of the chroniclers to Edward's religious claims

1. Political Songs, pp. 163, 179.
2. Flores Historiarum, iii.119, embellished in the Merton Flores, iii.317.
3. Political Songs, pp. 163, 169.
4. Lanercost, pp. 181-2, 124. Edward's favoured status seems to have developed further after his death. See, for example, Trevet, pp. 313, 359-60; Annales Angliae et Scotiae, pp. 374, 376-8, 386-7, 423, 439, 444.

is just one way in which they revealed their continuing interest in his Scottish wars. They were also interested in the historical inquiries made to prove his claim to suzerainty following the arrival of the papal bull Scimus fili. Copies of one or more of the letters exchanged between England and Rome in 1299-1301 have been found in nearly twenty manuscripts, and no doubt there are many more.[1] There is no evidence that these were distributed officially, and their circulation on this scale is a clear indication of a continuing interest in the Scottish wars. Two further manuscripts contain versified copies of the letters,[2] and although the versification of official documents was not an entirely unknown literary genre,[3] the choice of subject is revealing.

These historical inquiries seem to have stimulated a growing interest in the historical relationship between England and Scotland. Some historical research had been made in 1291 when Edward originally justified his claims to suzerainty at Norham, but the chroniclers seem to have paid little attention to it at the time. Yet memories of this research may have encouraged further inquiries once the wars began. For example, Langtoft, who probably began writing in 1296, showed an interest in his chronicle in the previous occasions when Scottish kings had

1. See below, pp. 406-7.

2. B.L. MS Royal 20 A xi, ff. 129^{r}-137^{r}, and Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, MS 43, ff. 173-183. I have not seen the latter manuscript.

3. The Statute of Gloucester is versified in Bodleian MS Douce 139, ff. 116^{v}-124^{v}, 130-9, a manuscript of the thirteenth century.

performed homage to English kings.[1] A copy of the Bury chronicle made around 1295-6 for Peterborough incorporated the reply which Peterborough had made in response to Edward's historical inquiries in 1291.[2] Walter of Coventry, too, seems to have been interested in the history of Anglo-Scottish relations. The chronicle ascribed to him was probably written in the diocese of York soon after 1293.[3] It was prefaced by a small collection of historical material concerning Anglo-Scottish relations, including a short chronicle which from 901 shows marked similarities to John of Caen's Great Roll.[4] Since Walter had probably ceased working before May 1297 when the Great Roll was completed,[5] this raises the intriguing possibility that a draft of the Roll was circulating in the north.[6] A small section of the Roll was also copied by the Lanercost chronicler into his account of the Great Cause, although whether he was using a draft or a copy of the Roll itself is not clear, for this section of the chronicle was not finished before 1297.[7]

1. Langtoft, i.xix.

2. Florentii Wigorniensis Monachi Chronicon ex Chronicis, ii. ed. B. Thorpe (English History Society, 1849), pp. 250-3. This reply is no longer preserved in the P.R.O.

3. Russell, Thirteenth Century Writers, p. 176.

4. Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1872), 3-26.

5. The latest date in Walter's historical miscellany is a prophecy for 1293 on p. 26 which Cotton knew by 1294 (Cotton, p. 239). He does not mention the resignation of Balliol in 1296, even though he had already continued his chronicle to 1291 after the Great Roll ceased in 1251. For the date of the Great Roll see Stones and Simpson, i.49-50.

6. A second copy of Walter's historical tract, copied not from Walter but from a common source, is in B.L. MS Harley 3860, ff. 3^{r}-11^{v}, a manuscript of the early fourteenth century.

7. Little, 'Authorship of the Lanercost Chronicle', p. 274. The relevant passage is Lanercost, pp. 145-6, from the section of the roll printed by Stones and Simpson, ii. 301-9.

John of Caen's Roll was also used later by some monastic writers. One historical work, which survives in three fourteenth century manuscripts, used the Great Roll as its main source.[1] It added to it a brief account of the succession of Edward I followed by the events at Norham. Two writers preserved a summary of John of Caen's Roll, one in Latin and the other in Anglo-Norman.[2] A further manuscript recorded an account based on Edward's letter to the pope in 1301.[3] The Northampton chronicler also obtained a letter of Edward I guaranteeing upon penalty of £100,000 that he would hand over the kingdom and castles of Scotland to the successful competitor, and inserted this into his chronicle between folios dealing with the events of 1294-5 together with a genealogy of the Scottish kings.[4]

Other writers recorded the fruits of their own labours. The material discovered at St. Albans in response to Edward's inquiry of 1301 was recorded in one of their chronicles.[5] Some research carried out at Glastonbury abbey and preserved in one of the abbey's registers may have been for the same purpose.[6]

1. (i) B.L. MS Arundel 220, ff.278^{r}-281^{v}, a collection of Latin chronicles from Norwich priory written shortly after 1322: Pseudo-Turpin, ed. I.R.Short (Anglo-Norman Text Society, xxv, 1973), pp. 10-11.
   (ii) B.L. MS Cotton Julius D vi, ff.67^{r}-72^{r}, a fourteenth century collection of chronicles and religious items from Durham priory.
   (iii) Bodleian MS Laud.720, ff. 245^{r}-250^{r}, a manuscript of Geoffrey of Monmouth and Gerald of Wales' Topographia Hiberniae of the early fourteenth century.

2. Willelmi Rishanger Chronica, in Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales, ed. Riley, pp. 123-4; Bodleian MS Bodley 233, f.107^{v}, a late thirteenth century manuscript of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

3. Bodleian MS Rawlinson D.329, ff.123^{r}-130^{r}, a fourteenth century Brut.

4. Northampton, ff. 35^{r}-37^{v}, printed Stones and Simpson, ii.98-9.

5. Annales Regis Edwardi Primi, pp. 455-60.

6. The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, ed. A. Watkins, i (Somerset Record Society, lix, 1944), i-iv.

The information is drawn from chronicles found in the abbey and concerns the occasions when English suzerainty over Scotland was demonstrated. Apologetically the compiler noted that 'about king Richard, who succeeded the said king Henry, although many notable things are recounted in our books, nothing can be found about Scotland'. A third independent account has survived in a register of St. Augustine's, Canterbury,[1] recounting the history of Anglo-Scottish relations from Athelstan to Henry I, drawing upon old chronicles and William of Malmesbury in particular. Finally two further manuscripts contain another account of Anglo-Scottish relations which begins with the supposed Egyptian origins of the Scottish people and extends as far as the marriage of Alexander III to Henry III's daughter in 1251.[2] Such academic pursuits are an indication that the monasteries at least were enthusiastic supporters of Edward's claim to suzerainty over Scotland.

(f) The end of the reign

In a number of ways, through the use of visual display and religious and historical arguments, Edward had been putting forward and developing claims which were enthusiastically taken up by his subjects. They were not new but played upon existing prejudices and beliefs so that they were easily accepted, helping to maintain support for the war. Yet the increasing use of such arguments towards the end of the reign suggests that Edward was finding it harder to raise the necessary men and money to fight

1. B.L. MS Cotton Julius D ii, ff. 211^{v}-213^{v}.

2. Bodleian MS. Lat.hist. d.4, f.187^{v}, a version of the Flores Historiarum written in the first quarter of the fourteenth century by 1314; Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicorum Robertus de Avesbury De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardii Tertii, ed. E.M. Thompson (Rolls Series, 1889), pp. 286-90. For other, later, accounts see Stones and Simpson, i.159-60.

the war. The war itself, which had begun dramatically with the campaigns of 1296 and 1298, no longer generated sufficient enthusiasm to maintain the war effort unaided. In 1304 the Flores Historiarum responded to the siege of Stirling by telling how Edward returned home 'victoriosissimus' to spend Christmas at Lincoln, 'splendide et permagnifice', as the monarch and lord of two kingdoms,[1] but such opportunity for celebration was rare and found little echo in other chronicle accounts. Only the murder of Comyn by Bruce in 1306 aroused a general interest in the war itself during these last years of the reign. The Westminster Flores accused Bruce of parricide and disparagingly called him a pseudo-rex. Langtoft mockingly called him king Robin on several occasions.[2] The Merton Flores likened the murder of Comyn to that of Abel, while the St. Augustine's chronicler commented that Bruce killed Comyn 'dei timore postposito'. The chronicle of St. Mary's, York, said that Comyn's only crime was his faithfulness, and the continuation of Gervase of Canterbury said that he was murdered merely because he refused to join Bruce's treacherous rebellion. Even Walter of Guisborough, whose priory was patronized by the Bruce family, dwelt upon the sacriligeous aspect of the murder. He related how Comyn was wounded before the altar of the Franciscan church in Dumfries and how, after he had been taken to the vestry by the friars to have his wound dressed, Bruce had brought him back before the high altar to be killed, the blood going over the altar itself.[3]

1. Flores Historiarum, iii. 120-1.

2. Flores Historiarum, iii. 129, 133; Langtoft, ii. 370, 372. One Flores manuscript calls Bruce a 'fatuus rex': iii.133n.

3. Flores Historiarum, iii. 323; St. Augustine's, p. 121; Chronicle of St. Mary's, p. 40; Gervase, ii.321; Guisborough, pp. 366-7.

The revolt of Robert Bruce was the occasion of the writing of the Passio Scotorum Perjuratum, which survives in a manuscript of the second half of the fourteenth century in the library of Reigate Church, Surrey. It is a prose narrative of events between February 1306 and February 1307 in a style parodying the gospels, a fairly popular form of satire.[1] The author was evidently a well informed clergyman, and it is possible that he was a monk at Westminster. It was a literary genre which was probably practised there, for the Flores Historiarum refers to one such passion, that of the monks of Westminster according to St. John.[2] Moreover the Westminster Flores also draws upon the Passio Scotorum, while further passages are in the Merton Flores.[3] The passio begins with a parody of a discussion amongst the disciples. The Scottish leaders were disputing which of them was greatest in his wickedness, for they wanted a king of their own. They would then break the ancient laws and their oath of fidelity and become involved in innumerable evil deeds. The earls of Buchan, Ros and Dunbar declined to become king because of the faith they had sworn before God to Edward, but Bruce accepted, claiming the throne by hereditary right. He now emerges in the passio as an anti-Christ. His John the Baptist was William Wallace, who prepared the way for Bruce and his followers and was

1. I have not seen this manuscript which is now MS 1117. The end is unfortunately missing. It is printed by P. Lehmann, Die Parodie im Mittelalter (Stuttgart, 1963), pp. 205-11. For a similar parody see J. A. Yunck, The Lineage of Lady Meed: The Development of Medieval Venality-Satire (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1963), pp.76-8.

2. Flores Historiarum, iii.117.

3. ibid., iii.130, 133, 134, 135, 323-5. The passages are also quoted by the Marquess of Bute, 'Notice of a Manuscript of the latter Part of the Fourteenth Century, entitled Passio Scotorum Perjuratum', Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, xix (1884-5), 186-9, who also prints the passio with a translation on pp. 167-184.

hanged in fulfilment of the scriptures which said that all who humbled themselves would be raised up. Bruce invited all those who were indifferent to peace and desired war to follow him, offering them the chance to become perjurors and be hanged and to be refreshed with the blood of slaughtered men. He sent out his men as wolves amongst lambs bearing a sword and a spear instead of a scrip and a bag. He murdered Comyn because of his blasphemy in rejecting Bruce's offer of live on earth to make him poorer than he was. Bruce ignored his wife's advice to seek peace with the king of England, who was more powerful and would overcome him, and her warning that his power was like the grass which flourishes today but is thrown into the oven tomorrow. When the battle did come he fled, leaving his people to be slaughtered. In contrast to Bruce, Edward was the Caesar who sent his army to Scotland to perform the will of heaven. His angels of trailbaston sentenced the Scots for their crimes. He despised the Scottish bishops, hypocrits who had broken their oaths to God and spurned him; he condemned Fraser who entered into damnation, for he was like Saul, persecuting the followers of the king of England.

Much of the passio is taken up with an account of Edward's executions. It shows that as late as 1307 feelings against the Scots were as strong as ever and that, if anything, they had been strengthened by a decade of war. Yet the triumphant spirit of 1296 has largely evaporated; men have become inured to the war and are less willing to translate their hatred of the Scots into practical action. The clergy continued to pray for Edward's success, the bishops pointing out in their requests for such prayers the dangers faced by the kingdom from the evil Scots,[1]

1. See, for example, Register of Thomas Corbridge, Lord Archbishop of York, 1300-1304, i, ed. W. Brown (Surtees Society, cxxxviii, 1925), 6; Reg. Dalderby, f.32^{v}; Reg. Ginsborough, pp. 45-6; Reg. Gandavo, i. 176-7.

but they were no longer prepared to give him financial aid. As early as 1298 they refused to hand over the residue of the tenth, judging that the national danger had passed and they were no longer obliged to contribute to the war effort. Similarly in 1301 they refused a further request for taxation on the grounds that they were bound by Clericis laicos not to make a grant without papal authority.[1]

The lay aristocracy seem to have remained committed to the war for much longer. The burdens of war, especially purveyance, probably fell more lightly on them than it did on the lower classes, and war offered them the prospects of booty and rewards. Although their support in 1299-1301 was made conditional upon political concessions, they do seem to have had a genuine interest in the wars. The Annales Angliae et Scotiae, which, although a later compilation, does seem to be an accurate chronicle, says that at the end of 1299 one of the earls urged Edward to continue the war against the Scots and advised a new campaign to be launched the following autumn. The Flores Historiarum also reports that in 1302 Edward considered going to France to continue peace negotiations with Philip, but that his magnates thought he should first settle Scotland.[2] These scraps of information receive some support from the Song of Caerlaverock, which was written to celebrate the capture of Caerlaverock castle in 1300. This campaign took place in the middle of a political crisis and was preceded by a claim from some barons that they did not owe service in Scotland, but was nevertheless well attended

1. Flores Historiarum, iii.109.
2. Annales Angliae et Scotiae, pp. 402-3; Flores Historiarum, iii.111.

by some 2,000 cavalry.[1] The Song is the work of a herald who was probably writing for Robert Clifford[2] and is really a metrical roll of arms. The connecting narrative shows that one of the herald's main purposes was to praise the barons and their personal prowess at the siege. The song itself does not tell us a great deal about the war, but the choice of the Scottish setting for this adulatory verse indicates a certain pride in the capture of the castle and a general approval of the Scottish wars. Furthermore, in the Lincoln parliament of January 1301 at which Keighley's bill was presented, the barons showed their wholehearted approval of the Scottish war despite the continuing political problems. Here 104 earls and barons were prepared to put their seals to a letter strongly condemning papal interference with the king's rights in Scotland and announcing their determination to defend these rights to the utmost of their ability.

Yet the support of the aristocracy, like that of the clergy, was not unlimited. They were not prepared to allow Edward to exhaust the country in the interests of the Scottish wars, and in 1299 placed their political grievances before the prosecution of the war. They were prepared to grant a fifteenth in 1301 in return for political concessions, but Edward found it more expedient to abandon the attempt to pay his way thereafter. Instead he relied on tallage and feudal aids and preferred to allow perhaps a six figure debt to develop by 1307. He also

1. Morris, Welsh Wars, p. 299. Full cavalry lists unfortunately do not survive: Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 89.

2. Printed, Siege of Caerlaverock. See also Denholm-Young, 'The Song of Carlaverock', pp. 255-6.

ended his attempts to extend the obligations for military service and contented himself with strictly feudal summonses.[1] Moreover it is likely that the enthusiasm generated at the Feast of Swans in 1306 masks a growing war weariness. The feast was held under exceptional circumstances, Bruce's murder of Comyn no doubt having provoked anger at his temerity in upsetting the settlement of Scotland. Many young men were involved, anxious to prove themselves on their first military campaign. Yet it is noticeable that there was more commutation of service in this year than before,[2] while several men were accused of non-service[3] and twenty-one, including some of those knighted at Whitsun, had their lands seized for leaving Scotland without the king's permission.[4] The following year when Edward died on the way to Scotland the campaign was quickly abandoned and the army returned home.

For many of the laity war weariness must have set in long before this, for the opportunities for celebration were few and far between after 1298. The London crowds were able to turn out to see Wallace's execution in 1305, and in 1307 Langtoft tells us that they set up his brother's head 'with shouts'.[5] The Song on the Execution of Sir Simon Fraser, which was probably aimed at a lay audience, also reveals something of their continuing feelings of hostility towards the Scots. Yet the evidence suggests

1. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 89, 184-5, 269-70; Prestwich, 'Edward I's Wars', pp. 412-8.
2. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 80.
3. Rotuli Parliamentorum, i (Record Commission, 1783), 216.
4. Parl. Writs, p. 378 (no. 24).
5. Langtoft, ii.376.

that despite these feelings men were increasingly reluctant to fight. The war offered few rewards to any but the magnates, and after 1298 there were no great compensating triumphs. Instead there were the burdens of purveyance and military service, which affected both those who fought and those who remained behind. Many must have shared the opinion of the clergy that the immediate danger from the Scots had passed and no further assistance was necessary. The desertion of southerners far removed from the Scottish borders is not surprising,[1] but there was equal difficulty securing the service of northerners. As early as 1298 the Durham contingent deserted at the end of the campaign,[2] and in subsequent campaigns the problem of desertion became chronic.[3] In 1300, for example, a total of 16,000 infantry were summoned, of whom only 9,000 ever assembled,and by early September all but 500 had deserted. Earlier in the war it had been possible to raise infantry forces of over 20,000. In 1300 and 1301 it seems that some infantry were even able to bribe officials in order to be allowed to remain at home.[4] From 1303 Edward was forced to recognize this problem and the number of infantry requested for subsequent campaigns was much reduced.[5]

It is likely that this unwillingness to serve was not confined to the peasantry alone, for occasionally we hear of negotiations for service taking place within the shires. In 1299, for example, a year when it was difficult to recruit troops and

1. Men from Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Sussex and Hampshire deserted in 1302: Cal. Chancery Warrants; p. 167.

2. See above, p. 321. In 1297 the infantry of Northumberland and Westmorland were clearly unwilling to go to war: see above, p. 313.

3. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 95-8.

4. Parl. Writs, pp. 344 (no. 38), 359 (no. 22).

5. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, pp. 97-8.

extra pay had to be offered, the commissioner of array in Nottingham and Derby had to negotiate for the service of the men of the shire.[1] In Northumberland the leading men of the shire community were themselves involved in such negotiations for service, for in December 1302 an agreement concerning the service of the county was reached between Walter Langton and the barons, knights, prodeshommes and the whole community. The cavalry were to serve at their own expense for the first eight days after they had crossed the Tweed and at the king's expense thereafter, while the infantry were to serve at the king's expense immediately they crossed the Tweed.[2] In February 1303 Edward also had to grant letters patent to the knights, good men and others of the community of Durham that their assent to the service of men-at-arms and infantry in Scotland was not to be a precedent.[3] Later in the month the men of the shire,led by Ranulph de Neville and John fitz Marmaduke,presented a charter of liberties to the bishop of Durham for confirmation which included the provision that no service beyond the Tyne and Tees was to be exacted from them.[4] Although the clause concerning military service was omitted from the final charter issued in May 1303,[5] Edward did have to withdraw his commission of array for the county in April and reissue it with a clause safeguarding the privileges of the franchise, and assure the knights and other men of Durham that there would be no

1. B. C. Keeney, 'Military Service and the Development of Nationalism in England, 1272-1307', Speculum, xxii (1947), 540; Parl. Writs, p. 326 (no. 5).

2. Parl. Writs, p. 369 (no. 10).

3. Fraser, Antony Bek, p. 185; Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, 112.

4. Fraser, op.cit., pp. 185-6; Parl. Writs, p. 405 (no. 55). Both men were of sufficient standing to have sealed the letter of the barons to the pope in 1301.

5. Fraser, op.cit., p. 187.

prejudice to their liberties.[1] It was probably such intransigeance which necessitated the sending of John of Brittany in the same month to expound certain things to the knights, free men and community of Durham.[2]

Naval service, too, seems to have been becoming difficult to exact. In August 1302 it was necessary to punish a number of towns for failing to send ships to the war as they had promised,[3] and it was probably for this reason that more care was taken in raising a navy in the following year.[4] Even so Edward had to issue a commission in December 1303 to inquire into those sailors from the Cinque Ports and other ports of Kent, Sussex and Hampshire who had withdrawn from Scotland without permission.[5]

Another sign of the increasing opposition in the shires to the war effort is the growing resistance to purveyance. Although this had always been deeply unpopular and had played an important part in the crisis of 1297, evidence of actual resistance to it comes from the later years of the reign. In 1300 returns from the sheriffs survive indicating the growing problems.[6] They had been asked to send merchants from their shires to Carlisle to provision the army and to provide other victuals from their counties, but many replied that they could find no merchants to go and could not provide the victuals requested because of the shortage of coin. It was no doubt because of such problems that Edward arranged for officials to negotiate with the shire

1. Parl. Writs, pp. 371 (no. 14), 372 (nos. 18, 19).
2. ibid., p. 372 (no. 20).
3. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, 52-3, 61-2.
4. See above, pp. 332-3.
5. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, 203.
6. Foedera, pp. 917-8.

communities in 1301. Even so there were still difficulties, for on 4th April 1301 Edward wrote to the mayor, aldermen and good men of London saying that merchants were refusing to provide provisions because of the risk of not being paid and asking if they would become surety for payment to the sum of £500.[1] In 1302 grievances were so strong in Lincolnshire that an agreement had to be made that no prises would be taken unless immediately paid for.[2] In 1303 William of Wetwang, a purveyor in Yorkshire, was threatened with a drawn sword and only escaped by hiding in the house of the prior of Kirkham,[3] while the following year the sheriff of Norfolk was instructed to bring those who resisted the purveyors in Lynn before the exchequer.[4] Although the necessary provisions were generally raised in the end it does seem that the task of the purveyors was becoming increasingly difficult in these later years.

Edward's wars against Scotland are a good illustration of the strengths and weaknesses of royal propaganda. He had successfully explained that the Scots were rebels against his authority and had strengthened the traditional feelings of hatred and contempt towards them. This he had done through the development of the traditional means of communication, through royal writs, parliaments, itinerant officials and visual display. In the process he had interested men sufficiently in the course of his war to rejoice at his successes and share his hatred of the leaders whom he executed, and to collect historical information and contemporary documents about the war. Men prayed for his

1. Cal. Letter-Book C, p. 90.
2. P.R.O. SC1/27/15, but dated 1303 by Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p. 132.
3. Prestwich, op.cit., p. 133.
4. Cal. Pat. Rolls,1301-7, 207.

success and wrote poems and sang songs about his achievements.

Yet despite this success the practical support which men were prepared to offer dwindled. Although royal propaganda had been firmly based on popular beliefs,it had in the long run failed because continued war gradually came to be seen to be in the king's interests alone rather than those of the realm. There had been at first ample evidence that the Scots were a threat to the realm, but after their invasion of 1298 was defeated men became increasingly unconvinced that the danger was still sufficiently serious to require further aid. Edward's later campaigns relied more on financial credit and the strength of his authority than the active co-operation of his subjects.

Chapter 10

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA AND THE CHURCH

In a society where all belonged to the church and the influence of the church pervaded daily life and thought, the approval of the church's ministers was regarded as an important means of winning both human and divine support for the king's undertakings. Such support was felt to be incumbent upon the church. The king was considered to be endowed with both secular and spiritual qualities to fit him to rule God's people on earth, a rule which gave him responsibilities in both church and state. In return the church helped him to carry out those responsibilities by praying for his spiritual and material welfare and preaching on his behalf.

Occasional references show that the clergy believed they had a duty to offer such spiritual support. Matthew Paris mentions two occasions in 1242 and 1256 when a Cistercian assembly refused to give financial aid but offered prayers instead. On the second occasion the assembled abbots protested that it was more fitting for a king to seek their prayers than their money, and the abbot of Buildwas claimed that they would not be able to pray at all if Henry took all their money.[1] This duty to perform spiritual service is also implied in a plea involving the abbey of St. Werburgh's, Chester, whose abbot in 1292 successfully claimed that

1. Paris, iv.234-5, v.553-4.

the abbey held its property by the service of prayers alone.[1] Several bishops' letters also recognized this duty of prayer. In 1282, for example, archbishop Peckham wrote to the chancellor, bishop Burnell, saying that it was the custom of his predecessors to give spiritual aid to the king when he was on an expedition and asking for the bishop's advice what to do on this occasion.[2] Similarly in 1286 archbishop Romeyn of York pointed out in a letter to his official that it was the practice of the church to pray for all the faithful, especially for the king and for princes.[3]

The importance of such support is one of the reasons why kings valued their rights of patronage in the church and sought to place their own nominees in positions of influence. Over a quarter of Henry III's bishops were also royal officials,[4] while a number of Edward's leading royal officials, including Robert Burnell, Walter Langton, William of Louth, Antony Bek and William of March, also held bishoprics. Other bishops had also served Edward at some time during their careers.[5] The use of regalian rights, which interestingly Edward was expanding from about 1290,[6] meant that royal influence also penetrated the cathedral chapters and diocesan clergy. In 1291, for example, seven of the sixteen canons at St. David's were royal clerks,

1. J. H. Tillotson, 'Pensions, Corrodies and Religious Houses: An Aspect of the Relations of Crown and Church in Early Fourteenth Century England', Journal of Religious History, viii (1974-5), 129.

2. Reg. Peckham, i.389.

3. Reg. Romeyn, i.16.

4. M. Gibbs and J. Lang, Bishops and Reform, 1215-72 (Oxford, 1934), p. 3.

5. Denton, Winchelsey, p. 37.

6. P. C. Saunders, 'Royal Ecclesiastical Patronage in England, 1199-1351' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978), p. 251.

although none of these were actually presented by the king.[1] By 1321 sixteen of the fifty-two archdeacons in England were also royal clerks,[2] and, although the majority would have been non-resident, they were probably able to exert considerable local influence on behalf of the crown.[3]

Both Henry and Edward in particular were anxious to increase their influence within the Welsh church, which was part of the province of Canterbury and whose prelates owed allegiance to the king.[4] During the thirteenth century royal contacts with the monasteries were strengthened as houses sought royal confirmation of their lands and privileges, and Henry III in particular made them a number of grants. Henry was also probably the first king to appoint abbots and priors from south Wales as administrators and commissioners.[5] Both kings also made use of their powers of patronage in the Welsh church. In 1245 Henry III secured the election of a royal administrator, William de Burgh, to the see of St. David's, and in 1280 Edward showed how highly he valued influence within the Welsh church by obtaining the same bishopric for Thomas Bek, the keeper of the wardrobe, an unusual appointment for a Welsh see. As the example of the canons of St. David's shows, the king's influence extended further to

1. G. Williams, The Welsh Church from Conquest to Reformation (revised edn, Cardiff, 1976), p. 62.

2. J. S. Roskell, 'A Consideration of Certain Aspects and Problems of the English Modus Tenendi Parliamentum', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 1 (1967-8), p. 429. Further such examples are given, pp. 425-8.

3. Saunders, op.cit., pp. 222, 225-6, 387.

4. Episcopal Acts and Cognate Documents relating to Welsh Dioceses, 1066-1272, ed. J. Conway Davies, i (Historical Society of the Church in Wales, i, 1946),47.

5. Cowley, Monastic Order in South Wales, pp. 210, 215-6, 218.

benefices which were not actually in his gift. Edward's efforts to remove the influence of the earls of Gloucester from the see of Llandaff may have been an attempt not only to curb the power of the earl but also to increase his own authority in the Welsh church.[1]

Yet in practice effective influence was largely confined to the two southern sees of St. David's and Llandaff. Edward's presentations to benefices were mainly in these dioceses, although some attempts were made to exploit St. Asaph after 1277.[2] Royal influence in the north was very limited. Despite the theoretical powers of the king, the princes of Gwynedd were able to exercise an important influence on the choice of the bishops of St. Asaph and, in particular, Bangor, whose lands fell entirely within the princes' territories. He and his dean and chapter inevitably had little freedom of action. Bishop Anian (1267-1306) was in fact Llywelyn's confessor, and clergymen from both Bangor and St. Asaph were employed by the princes as secular officials.[3] Counsellors and envoys were also provided by the Cistercian order, of whom the princes were important patrons,[4] and the monks were prepared to give help to their patrons and protectors during the Welsh wars of the thirteenth century.[5] Yet as Edward extended his control within Wales

1. For the conflict with the earl of Gloucester over the temporalities of Llandaff and the influence of the earl in the diocese see D. Walker, 'The Medieval Bishops of Llandaff', Morgannwg, vi (1962), 10-13, and F. G. Cowley, 'The Church in Medieval Glamorgan, I', Glamorgan County History, iii, ed. T. B. Pugh (Cardiff, 1971), 108-113.

2. Williams, Welsh Church, pp. 62-3.

3. ibid., p. 6; D. Stephenson, 'The Governance of Gwynedd under the Thirteenth Century Princes' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1977), pp. 50, 52, 55-7, 220; Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940 (London, 1959), p. 11.

4. Williams, op.cit., pp. 19-20; Stephenson, op.cit., pp. 52-4.

5. Cowley, Monastic Order, pp. 211-4; D. H. Williams, The Welsh Cistercians: Aspects of their Economic History (Pontypool, 1969), pp. 23-4.

such loyalty to the princes diminished.[1] There is no evidence that any of the higher clergy continued to resist after the fall of the princes, although the lower clergy, who were drawn almost exclusively from amongst Welshmen,[2] are less likely to have been so easily reconciled.

Edward was also anxious to extend his influence to the Scottish church. Originally it had been part of the province of York, but late in the twelfth century the de facto situation had been recognized and the pope had declared the Scottish sees, with the exception of Whithorn, independent of York and directly subject to Rome.[3] However from October 1296 Edward ordered that only English priests should be presented to vacant benefices in Scotland, and in 1304 ensured that two episcopal appointments in Sodor and Caithness were made with his approval.[4]

The value of ecclesiastical support is illustrated by the competition between Henry III and his barons to secure the church's favour during the baronial wars. In 1258, for example, the barons were anxious to retain the support of Fulk Basset, bishop of London, and were angry with him when he failed to support their reforms, fearing that this would allow Henry to justify himself to the people.[5] Similarly the barons were very anxious to prevent the return of Aymer de Valence, bishop-elect of Winchester. This

1. For the example of Aberconway see Stephenson, op.cit., p. 232, and R. W. Hays, The History of the Abbey of Aberconway, 1186-1537 (Cardiff, 1963), p. 56.

2. D. Walker, 'The Welsh Church in the Middle Ages', History of the Church in Wales, ed. D. Walker (Glamorgan, 1976), p. 36.

3. R. Brentano, York Metropolitan Jurisdiction and Papal Judges Delegate (1279-1296) (Berkeley, 1959), p. 37.

4. R. Nicholson, Scotland: The Later Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1974), p. 52; G.W.S. Barrow, 'The Scottish Clergy in the War of Independence', The Kingdom of the Scots (London, 1973), p. 236.

5. Paris, v.705.

was not only because he was unwelcome as a person, but also because of the harm he could do as a hostile ecclesiastic, especially if consecrated by the pope. They wrote to the pope and urged his deposition, Rishanger explaining that if the pope consecrated Aymer, he would then be in a better position to harm the barons.[1] The importance of the moral support of the prelates is also shown by the anxiety of the barons to secure the return of the archbishop of Canterbury in 1265.[2] Apart from the practical difficulties arising from his absence, it also created a bad impression for the baronial government if the archbishop was in exile for political reasons. Similarly in June 1265 Montfort summoned several bishops to Gloucester, explaining that since his enemies were preaching lies he longed for the arrival of the prelates so that through their testimony the truth could prevail.[3]

Above all both sides in the baronial wars were anxious to secure the support of the papacy. One of the first acts of the baronial government in 1258 was to send a long letter to the pope justifying their actions and asking for a legate to help them to reform the realm.[4] Similarly, as the king began to reassert himself, both sides sent their proctors to Rome to try and secure papal approval of their respective positions. Indeed in September 1261 there were two proctors at Rome both claiming to represent Henry, one of whom had obtained papal letters confirming Henry's obligations to the Provisions and the other letters confirming Alexander's bull absolving Henry from his obligations.

1. Foedera, p. 373; Rishanger, p. 9.
2. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, ii.461 n.2; Foedera, p. 438 (wrongly dated March 1264 instead of March 1265).
3. Close Rolls, 1264-68, 67.
4. Treharne, Baronial Plan, pp. 104-5.

Sensibly, Urban refused to seal either of the letters until he had established who was really Henry's proctor.[1] The importance of papal influence was also one of the reasons why the two sides strugged to gain control of the Cinque Ports. In 1261, for example, Henry made great efforts to secure the loyalty of the men of the Cinque Ports to ensure that his envoy would be able to enter with the papal bull of absolution.[2]

The prayers of the church were an important indication of ecclesiastical support, and the holding of special services and the saying of prayers to support the king and his causes is a practice which can be traced back to the early Anglo-Saxon church.[3] Unfortunately there is little detailed evidence about prayers and other services held by the church before the end of the thirteenth century when bishops' registers begin to survive in greater numbers, but contemporary service books show them to have been a standard part of the church liturgy. Here we find not only votive masses for the king, but also masses in time of war, against invaders, against the enemy and in pursuit of peace.[4]

On a few occasions during his reign Henry III had himself asked the clergy for their prayers. In 1236, for example, he wrote to several Gascon prelates requesting that they arrange for

1. Royal Letters, ii.188-192; Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 276. This is possibly the papal letter which Montfort produced in October 1262 supporting the Provisions.

2. Treharne, Baronial Plan, p. 257. For the Cinque Ports see above, pp. 112-116.

3. For some early examples see The Laws of the Earliest English Kings, ed. F. L. Attenborough (Cambridge, 1922), p. 24; Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, iii. 375, 453; P. H. Sawyer, Roman Britain to Norman England (London, 1978), p. 192; S. Keynes, The Diplomas of King Aethelred 'The Unready' (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 217-9.

4. The Sarum Missal, ed. J. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1916), pp. 395-6, 397, 408, 411-2; Missale ad Usum Insignis Ecclesiae Eboracensis, ii, ed. W. G. Henderson (Surtees Society, lx, 1872), 169-70, 174, 177-8.

prayers to be said throughout their dioceses asking God that his marriage to Eleanor of Provence be to the joy and well-being of himself, the kingdom and his subjects.[1] In 1242 he wrote from France to several abbots and priors asking that they say special prayers for him and his men.[2] Prayers were also offered for him while he was away in Gascony in 1254, but we do not know if this was at his request.[3] Furthermore in 1247 when the Lord Edward fell ill Henry asked the religious communities to pray for his recovery,[4] and in 1271 the monks of Westminster were asked to offer similar prayers on the king's behalf.[5]

During Edward's Welsh wars there is likewise evidence that the church was praying for his success. In 1277 Bury St. Edmunds made arrangements for over 3,000 masses, eight hundred psalters and other prayers to be said for the king and queen, their children, and the king's familia, especially those who were in Wales fighting against Llywelyn.[6] In 1282 we do not know how the chancellor advised archbishop Peckham to give spiritual aid to the king,[7] but in August the minister of the Franciscans wrote to Edward saying that the recent general chapter had decided that every priest in the order throughout the world would say four special masses for the king, his queen and their children and for

1. Close Rolls, 1234-7, 329.

2. Rôles Gascons, i, ed.Francisque-Michel (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 1885), no. 8.

3. Paris, v.485.

4. Paris, iv.639. The reply from the prior of Bolton is P.R.O. SC1/2/68.

5. Flores Historiarum, iii.22.

6. Foedera, p. 604. Rymer assigns the letter from 'S., minister' to 1282. But in 1277 the abbot was Simon de Luton and in 1282 John Northwold: V.C.H. Suffolk, ii.72.

7. See above, p. 361.

the welfare of the kingdom and the king's person. The provincial chapter of London also decided that every priest in England would say a further four masses for the king and his family.[1] A letter of the arcbhishop of Dublin ordering all the clergy of his province not only to pray for the king and the peace of the kingdom, but also to arrange processions and suitable sermons on Sundays and feast days probably relates to the expedition of 1282;[2] while the bishop of Worcester may also have arranged prayers, for he attributed Edward's victory in Wales to the intervention of the Virgin Mary and the two patron saints of Worcester, Oswald and Wulfstan.[3] Finally in 1287 the bishop of St. David's also ordered a mass to be offered in every church once a week 'pro salute populi' with daily prayers for the church, king and queen.[4]

Although it is quite possible that Edward had specifically requested some of these prayers to be said, there is no evidence for this. The letter of the archbishop of Canterbury in 1282 requesting advice how to arrange prayers for the king indicates that the responsibility still lay primarily with the church. Moreover there is no evidence that such prayers were ever arranged on a national basis. Edward's first prayer letter of 1294 seeking the support of the whole church during his absence from England therefore seems to be an innovation. Between 1294 and 1307 prayers were arranged throughout the church each time the king departed on an expedition, and on most occasions the initiative can be shown to have come from Edward himself. It is likely that

1. P.R.O. E36/274, f.244^{r}.
2. Liber Epistolaris, no. 522.
3. Worcester Record Office, BA 2648/1 (i), f.184^{r}, calendared in Reg. Giffard (Worcester), ii.203.
4. Bodleian MS Auct. F.5.25, f.154^{v}.

the few occasions when no prayers were ordered may be accounted for simply by the failure of the evidence to survive.[1]

The royal writs which initiated these national prayers took advantage of the opportunity to explain the king's needs and policies, helping to place the proposed expeditions in a religious setting. Occasionally this religious aspect was particularly stressed. For example, in 1297 Edward prefaced his request by explaining that God had ordained that peace should be kept amongst his subjects and that his expedition to Flanders was to fulfil that very purpose. Similarly in 1299 he explained that since his power came from God it was right that he should strive to punish the sacrilegious, suppress the rebellious, rescue the weak from the hands of the strong and bring peace into the kingdom. For this reason he needed the prayers of his subjects as he went to Scotland so that God could direct his actions.[2]

Yet although not unaware of the political advantages which could be obtained from these requests, Edward seems to have valued the prayers themselves equally highly. In June 1294, for example, he requested that people pray for him since man is weak and has to be sustained by God's helping hand. Similarly in 1296 he wrote that man's impotence made it necessary for him to be sustained by the hand of God, while in 1297 he said that he had greater need of the prayers of the devout than of military numbers, and more need of divine assistance than his own power.[3] These were more than pious platitudes, for the number of private offerings he made to the church on receipt of good news about the progress of

1. For full details of the prayers arranged between 1294 and 1307 see appendix 3.

2. Foedera, p. 872; Annales Angliae et Scotiae, p. 399.

3. Foedera, pp. 802, 834, 872.

the war indicates that he felt God as much as man to be responsible.[1]

The king's writ requesting prayers would have become widely known. Generally it was sent to all the bishops, although in 1298 and 1299 the request for prayers was made through the archbishop at a provincial council.[2] Sometimes other prelates were also involved: in June 1294 the prior provincial of the Dominicans, the minister general of the Franciscans and the chancellor of Oxford university received writs, and in 1297 the abbot of Westminster also received a copy.[3] Upon receipt of the king's writ the bishops would send his request to each of their archdeacons, sometimes enclosing the king's writ, sometimes merely paraphrasing it, ordering them to have it observed in all the churches in their archdeaconries. The archdeacons in turn would have passed the request on to the parish clergy. In 1295 archbishop Winchelsey ordered national prayers of his own to be passed on in writing,[4] but it is possible that some of them preferred to make known the king's request through deanery meetings.[5] To encourage participation in these supplications bishops occasionally offered an indulgence of forty days,[6] and

1. Many examples can be found in the wardrobe accounts.

2. Reg. Winchelsey, i.261; Annales Angliae et Scotiae, p. 399.

3. Foedera, p. 802; Westminster Abbey Muniments, MS 12201. See also the interesting personal request made by Edward to St. Albans in 1299: Annales Angliae et Scotiae, pp. 397-8.

4. Reg. Winchelsey, i.27-8.

5. Such meetings to pass on information are mentioned in C.U.L. MS Ee v.31, f.63, and Concilia, ed. Wilkins, pp. 201-2 (meetings of the deanery of Shoreham and archdeaconry of Canterbury to hear a report of the convocation of September 1294); Cant. D. & C., Chartae Antiquae A.20[a] (a meeting of the deaneries of Sandwich, Dover and Elham in November 1294) and Sede Vacante Scrap Book I, p. 105 (a meeting of the deanery of Bergavenny in the diocese of Llandaff, July 1293).

6. Liber Albus of the Priory of Worcester, ed. J. M. Wilson (Worcester Historical Society, xxxiii, 1919), p. 11; Registrum Radulphi Baldock, Gilberti Segrave, Ricardi Newport et Stephani Gravesend, Episcoporum Londoniensium, 1304-1338, ed. R. C. Fowler (Canterbury and York Society, vii, 1911), pp. 10-11.

through such means the king's needs and policies would have been widely disseminated throughout the dioceses.

Sometimes the form of prayers to be used was prescribed by the bishops. Although the details vary the pattern was often the same, suggesting that such prayers were a familiar practice. The brief order of prayer was usually to be inserted into the mass and to be said daily. It would begin with some psalms and be followed by the Kyrie, the Lord's Prayer and several responses, and end with one or more prayers. The purpose of this short service was not primarily political, to praise and glorify the king, but rather to commit him and his expedition to God's protection. Archbishop Corbridge of York wrote in 1301 and again in 1303 that such affairs would have a more prosperous outcome when they were entrusted to God. Similarly in 1303 bishop Gainsborough of Worcester repeated Edward's earlier assertion that he had more need of the prayers of the faithful than ranks of soldiers and of divine assistance than his own power.[1] Such concerns are apparent in the psalms and prayers they selected. Psalm 21, for example, which was chosen by the bishop of Salisbury in 1298 and 1306, looks to God for aid and protection against evil. Psalm 67, which he also used in 1298, asks God to be gracious to his people and give them guidance and praises him for the benefits of his government on earth. In 1301 the bishop of Lincoln prescribed this psalm together with psalms 79 and 123. Psalm 79 is a plea for the mercy of God, seeking deliverance from his anger, while psalm 123 is similarly a psalm of repentance. The bishops' purpose was to encourage penitence as a means to

1. Reg. Corbridge, i.6, 15; Reg. Ginsborough, p. 47, perhaps reflecting the lost royal writ. Edward used a similar phrase in 1297: Foedera, p.872.

deliverance from the evils of the Scots. Only psalm 21, which was selected by the bishop of Lincoln in 1294 and perhaps again in 1296 and 1297, represented a different mood, rejoicing that God has given strength and glory to the king and will destroy all his enemies.[1] The penitential mood would have been continued in the Kyrie prescribed in all the orders of service. The collect which concluded this brief order of prayer was often that from the mass for the king, which asked God to strengthen the king with virtue so that he might avoid evil and overcome his enemies, although a similar alternative was sometimes prescribed.

Some bishops also required processions to be held with the intention of further encouraging penitence. The procession was a standard part of church ritual which preceded the mass on certain feast days and on other special occasions. Those held on Edward's behalf were perhaps similar to the procession held to petition for peace, which was itself closely based on the penitential procession made on Lenten weekdays. The processions for peace would begin from the choir and be led by the priests and clergy dressed in their albs and amices, followed by the choir, either to an altar within the same church or to another church. As they went they sang the seven penitential psalms[2], and antiphons seeking God's mercy, and prayed for peace. They would make a station at the second church and sing an antiphon for the saint to whom the church was dedicated, followed by the saint's collect. All would then prostrate themselves to say the Kyrie and prayers

1. Reg. Gandavo, i.10; Reg. Corbridge, i.6, 15; Reg. Dalderby, f.32^{v}; Reg. Sutton, v.14, 125, vi.22.

2. Psalms 6, 31, 37, 50, 101, 129, 142.

seeking forgiveness, before kissing the ground and rising to return, singing the Litany as they went.[1] The processions ordered by the bishops before Edward's military expeditions certainly had a penitential tone, for the seven penitential psalms and the Litany were often prescribed. In 1301 the bishop of Lincoln also ordered the fifteen psalms of ascents, which look to God as the source of mercy, protection and peace.[2]

These services probably made a considerable impression. There is no suggestion in the bishops' registers that there was any difficulty persuading the clergy to hold them, so large numbers of people throughout the country would have been involved. Although the service would have been in Latin, the church was generally aware of the need to explain its services, while the elaborate ritual would have compensated for any lack of comprehension. These services were valued by Edward not because they glorified his person or gave him added political support, but because he believed that it was important to gain God's approval and aid for his undertakings. Yet he cannot have been unaware of the political advantages of having his need publicized in the church and his expeditions set in a religious context, for the prayers helped to strengthen his claim that his expeditions were holy undertakings.

The church could not only offer prayers but also preach sermons in support of the king. No English political sermons appear to survive before the fourteenth century although it is

1. Processionale ad Usum Insignis ac Praeclarae Ecclesiae Sarum, ed. W. G. Henderson (Leeds, 1882), pp. 164-6, 32, 104.

2. Psalms 120-134.

clear that they were being preached. It may have been usual, for example, for a sermon to accompany a sentence of excommunication, for in June 1265, when the bishops were asked by Montfort to excommunicate the Marcher barons, they were requested to make public the detailed reasons for this sentence.[1] Archbishop Godfrey Ludham of York (1258-65) also on one occasion ordered one of his archdeacons to have read on every Sunday in all churches throughout his archdeaconry a specified denunciation of those who molested and oppressed the church, which was to be expounded clearly in the vulgar tongue. The accompanying order for prayers for the peace and tranquillity of the church and kingdom suggests that this may relate to the political troubles of the time.[2] The meeting of parliament also offered an opportunity for the preaching of sermons. This was to be a common practice in the fourteenth century, but the earliest evidence of a sermon in an English parliament is on the occasion of the visit of two cardinals to England in 1295 to seek peace with France.[3] However Montfort's parliaments of 1264-5 would have made an admirable setting for such sermons, while it was certainly a customary practice in Europe at this time to preach sermons in parliament.[4]

There is however no doubt that during the baronial wars such sermons were being preached outside parliament. In May 1262 Henry ordered his sheriffs to arrest all those who preached against him and his honour, and in December 1263 issued a long

1. Foedera, p. 456.

2. Register of Walter Giffard, Lord Archbishop of York, 1266-1279, ed. W. Brown (Surtees Society, cix, 1904), pp. 229-30.

3. See above, p. 214.

4. H. G. Richardson, 'The Origins of Parliament', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, xi (1928), 158-9.

letter to all the shires denying those things which preachers were saying against him.[1] In September 1265, before he knew of the death of Montfort, Clement IV wrote to his legate that certain religious were publicly preaching that Montfort was led by zeal for the cause of justice and were commending his works: such sermons were to cease, and the bishops, religious and clergy concerned were to retract their statements in public, and together with all other clergy urge men to renounce their support for Montfort in favour of Henry and Edward.[2] Finally, in 1267 when an eyre was launched to inquire into the rebellion, the articles of inquiry included the order to investigate 'archbishops, bishops and all men of religion, of whatever order, as well as all persons, priests, clergy and other people whoever they are' who openly worked for the earl of Leicester and won people to his side with lies and false statements.[3] During the course of this eyre the jurors of Fawsley claimed that Walter Hyldeburn' had preached to the assembled community of the shire at Northampton, justifying Simon de Montfort and detracting from the king, although the justices were unable to decide this particular case and it was respited until parliament. They did however amerce Roger Sparewe, a chaplain from Hemington, 100/- for preaching in favour of Montfort.[4] The Berkshire Assize Roll records that the towns of Aylesbury, Dorton and Walton were accused of opposing Henry III by sending men to work and preach against the king.[5] A clergyman named Nicholas was also presented by the jury of Lambourn

1. Close Rolls, 1261-4, 123; Foedera, p. 433.
2. Foedera, p. 461.
3. Cronica Maiorum, p. 96.
4. Rotuli Selecti, pp. 194-5, 207.
5. Jacob, Studies, p. 410.

in Berkshire as an official of Montfort who seized lands and committed robberies on his behalf and 'procuravit parte comitis et detraxit parte regis'. He defended himself by saying that he was Montfort's man and was acting under compulsion, which was accepted by the justices who cleared him.[1] We also hear from another source of Walter de Grey, rector of Landford in Nottinghamshire, and Walter Bapster his reeve, who were said to have been against the king and the Lord Edward in word and deed.[2]

It was not only baronial supporters who preached political sermons and speeches. Trevet tells us that the archbishop of Canterbury preached on the conflict in Paris, presumably against the barons, although his sermons would not have been very effective at that distance.[3] In the early summer of 1265 several orders went out from the chancery, at that time controlled by Montfort, against preachers. On 10th May an order went to all the sheriffs explaining why the king's army was being directed against William de Warenne and William de Valence and the Marchers, and ordering the arrest of all those who preached false and contrary statements. Ten days later a second letter was sent in the king's name by Montfort to all sheriffs and keepers of the peace, ordering the arrest of any of the Marchers, their supporters and others who preached false statements. In June another letter complained that Edward had joined the rebels who were preaching that it was really they who were zealous for the royal honour and the peace and tranquillity of the realm.[4]

1. P.R.O. JUST 1/42, m. 2d.
2. Cal. Inq. Misc., no. 851.
3. Trevet, pp. 253-4.
4. Close Rolls, 1264-8, 119; Foedera, p. 455; Close Rolls, 1264-8, 67.

Unfortunately, since there was never an inquest into those who had supported Henry, these details must remain rather impersonal.

In a similar manner the king's cause could be strengthened by the spiritual weapon of excommunication to show that the enemies of the king, who was God's representative on earth, were also the enemies of God. For example, Alexander III's bull of absolution in 1261 provided for its executors to excommunicate those who did not comply with its terms. On the strength of this papal bull the archbishop of Canterbury wrote to John Mansel in August 1261 ordering him to secure the return of the castles of Scarborough and Pickering from Hugh Bigod to the king, and to threaten him with excommunication and interdict if he failed to comply within fifteen days. Bigod initially refused to return the castles, although we do not know if he subsequently suffered excommunication.[1] In October 1263 the archbishop of Canterbury wrote from exile in France to his bishops ordering them to excommunicate all those who were involved in attacks upon the church, excommunicating several of them, including Montfort and his sons, by name.[2]

Similarly in March 1264 Urban wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury, who was then in exile in France, ordering him to excommunicate all those who refused to comply with the Mise of Amiens or to renounce their oath to the Provisions.[3] There is some evidence that he did this, for in March 1265 it was made a condition of his return that he revoke all sentences of excommunication promulgated during the disturbances.[4]

1. Foedera, pp. 408, 409.
2. Bodleian MS Bodley 91, f.136^{r-v}.
3. Foedera, pp. 436-7, 438, 438-9.
4. ibid., p. 438. See above, p. 365 n.2.

It is difficult to see how the archbishop's sentences could have been very effective. The barons had the support of the men of the Cinque Ports,which made it very difficult to get the letters of excommunication into the country. The archbishop's former treasurer, Peter de Cressiaco, did cross over from France, but was arrested at Dover and imprisoned, perhaps because he had been trying to smuggle in letters of excommunication. He was finally released and sent back to the archbishop with a letter warning him and his men not to try and enter England.[1] In January 1265 when the archbishop consecrated Walter Giffard, the bishop-elect of Bath and Wells, he ordered him to issue a sentence of excommunication against Montfort and his supporters. This he did, and it was probably because of this that the barons destroyed his lands.[2]

Guy Foulquois, the papal legate who was appointed to settle the English civil war, had equal difficulty in getting any sort of message into England. Several of his messengers were arrested when they got to Dover and were deprived of the letters they were carrying and told that they would be executed if they brought letters which were against the kingdom or any of the barons.[3] In October 1264 he gave letters of excommunication to the bishops of Winchester, London and Worcester to carry back to England, with the instruction to distribute copies amongst the other bishops as soon as possible. Yet when they arrived at Dover, their baggage was searched, perhaps with their connivance, and the

1. Gervase, ii.233-4.
2. Wykes, p. 164; Bémont, Simon de Montfort, p. 226.
3. Heidemann, nos. 12 (p. 198), 18 (p. 206).

letters found, torn up and thrown into the sea.[1] There is no evidence that the legate's excommunication was ever pronounced in England.[2] Indeed it is doubtful that the sentence would have received widespread publication had it been allowed to enter England, for the majority of the bishops were baronial supporters. Moreover, the barons had threatened to execute anyone who published papal bulls of excommunication, so that, as the Annales Londonienses said, no-one dared to publish the legate's sentence.[3] Not until after the battle of Evesham did the situation ease, for then a papal legate was able to enter England and issue a number of sentences against the baronial rebels.[4]

The barons, too, made use of the weapon of excommunication. The issue of the Provisions of Oxford and Westminster in 1258 and 1259 were both accompanied by an excommunication of all who infringed them.[5] This was repeated in March 1265 when at the end of parliament nine bishops pronounced an excommunication against all those who contravened the Provisions and Magna Carta.[6] In June 1265 the barons wrote to the bishops asking them to repeat this sentence which they had made in general terms against those who contravened the Provisions. This time it was to be made in

1. ibid., nos. 43, 44; Gervase, ii.239; Wykes, pp. 156-7; Flores Historiarum, ii.156.

2. There is a badly burnt copy of the legate's letter in the Cotton collection (B.L. MS Cotton Charters, xvi.48), but it is addressed to the archbishop of Narbonne and probably came to England at a later date.

3. Gilson, 'Parliament of 1264', p. 500; Wykes, p. 157; Annales Londonienses, p. 65.

4. See, for example, Waverley, p. 367; Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 35, 37.

5. See above, pp. 37, 42.

6. Cronica Maiorum, p. 71; Annales Londonienses, p. 66.

their respective dioceses against individually named rebels, with an explanation of the reasons for this sentence.[1] The efforts made to pronounce and to prevent sentences of excommunication show how seriously they were taken. Their possible effectiveness is shown by a letter in the Tewkesbury chronicle. The anonymous writer of this letter pointed to the dilemma faced by the barons in the summer of 1264: either they admit the legate and see their whole cause brought to nothing, or they prevent his entry and run the risk of excommunication and interdict.[2]

When Edward used the weapon of excommunication against the Welsh it was by no means an innovation, and indeed was something the Welsh were well used to. Already in 1202 the Welsh princes had complained to the pope that whenever the English invaded their lands and they were forced to defend themselves, the archbishop of Canterbury laid their lands under interdict and excommunicated the Welsh people.[3] It is possible to trace this practice throughout the reign of Henry III, who can sometimes be shown to have asked for the excommunication himself.[4] Yet what is of particular interest about Edward's Welsh wars is that it is possible to study the process of the excommunications in some detail and to see the extent of Edward's personal involvement.

In 1276 the decision to excommunicate Llywelyn was probably taken at the royal council which met in November and decided to declare war, for the following day the bishops wrote to Llywelyn threatening to excommunicate him within fifteen days if he did not

1. Foedera, p. 456.

2. Tewkesbury, p. 179.

3. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, iii, ed. J. S. Brewer (Rolls Series, 1863), 245, cited Stephenson, 'The Governance of Gwynedd', p. 212 n.3.

4. Royal Letters, app. 34; Foedera, p. 258.

cease disturbing the peace.[1] Edward's interest in this process is shown by the fact that a copy of the letter was recorded in an exchequer manuscript.[2] In fact Llywelyn was allowed more than six weeks grace before a clerical assembly was summoned in February 1277 to excommunicate him in response to the urgings of Edward himself.[3] Edward would also have wanted this sentence proclaimed in Wales where it might deter some potential rebels. Since the bishop of Llandaff and the proctor of the bishop of St. David's were present it is likely that it was indeed made known in their dioceses. The bishop of St. Asaph was also present, and,since he and his canons were taken under royal protection,[4] he too is likely to have given his support to Edward. The bishop of Bangor confirmed that he had carried out the sentence.[5] The support of the bishops of St. Asaph and Bangor is perhaps surprising, but in 1277 both were struggling against the encroachments of Llywelyn on the liberties and jurisdiction of their churches,[6] and they seem to have taken this opportunity of furthering their cause. The bishop of Bangor, however, judged it prudent to leave his diocese and passed the remainder of the war at St. Albans.[7]

In 1282 the king's concern to secure the rapid excommunication

1. Foedera, p. 536.
2. Littere Wallie, no. 186, from P.R.O. E36/274, f.363^{r-v}.
3. Littere Wallie, p. 173.
4. Williams, Welsh Church, p. 12.
5. Cal. Anc. Corr. concerning Wales, no. xv.6.
6. Williams, op.cit., pp. 9-13; Stephenson, 'The Governance of Gwynedd', pp. 221-8; T. Jones-Pierce, 'Einion ap Ynyr (Anian II), Bishop of St. Asaph', Flintshire Historical Society Journal, xvii (1957), 26-30.
7. Williams, op.cit., p. 13.

of his enemies is even more apparent, for on 28th March, only six days after the rising began, he wrote to the archbishops of Canterbury, York and Dublin asking that they have the Welsh excommunicated throughout their provinces.[1] Archbishop Peckham wrote to his bishops on 1st April, and, realizing that speed was of importance, sent the letters to the king for distribution by royal messenger, rather than following the usual practice of writing to his bishops through the bishop of London.[2] Peckham also asked to be informed how the bishops published the sentence, but was clearly dissatisfied, for on 2nd May he ordered the sentence to be repeated.[3] This time the response was satisfactory, for in October 1282 the bishop of St. Asaph was summoned to explain why he was the only one not to have excommunicated the rebels.[4] This was despite the fact that the treaty of Conway in 1277 had removed much of his diocese from Llywelyn's jurisdiction. Yet the bishop was not guided by political motives alone, for he considered the welfare of his church to be threatened more by the English troops who had burned his cathedral than the Welsh. He wanted instead to excommunicate the English,[5] but prudently decided to go into exile. Despite the pleas of the archbishop, Edward prevented his return before 1284, clearly angered by the bishop's action.[6] The bishop of Bangor, however, whose relations with Llywelyn were still strained, did excommunicate the Welsh rebels, again going into exile until the death of Llywelyn.[7] At

1. Foedera, p. 603.
2. Reg. Peckham, i.323.
3. ibid., ii.352-3.
4. ibid., ii.422-3.
5. ibid., i.367-9.
6. ibid., ii.705, 724-5, iii.773.
7. Williams, Welsh Church, p. 14; Dictionary of Welsh Biography, p. 11.

the end of 1282 archbishop Peckham also ordered the excommunication of Llywelyn and David in person.[1]

In 1287 it is not possible to see any government pressure for the issue of a sentence of excommunication, and it is tempting to explain this by Edward's absence in Gascony. Instead the initiative in excommunicating Rhys ap Maredudd was taken by Thomas Bek, bishop of St. David's, who probably announced his sentence on 15th August after three warnings to Rhys had gone unheeded.[2] He appealed to his fellow bishops in the provinces of Canterbury and York to follow his example,[3] but the only evidence that this was heeded is an undated letter in the register of the archbishop of York ordering the excommunication of Rhys.[4] The bishop of St. David's also issued a general sentence against all disturbers of the peace, which was probably announced soon after the rising began in June,[5] but there is no suggestion that this was in response to an archiepiscopal or royal mandate and no evidence that his example was followed elsewhere.

Yet in the war of 1294-5 it seems that Edward was once again closely involved. Archbishop Winchelsey ordered the excommunication of Madoc ap Griffith in 1295 while he was staying

1. Oseney, p. 290; Reg. Peckham, ii.483-4.
2. Bodleian MS Auct. F.5.25, ff.154^{v}, 155^{v}.
3. ibid., f.155^{r}.
4. Historical Papers and Letters, p. 89, calendared Reg. Romeyn, i.23,amongst documents of July-August 1287.
5. Bodleian MS Auct. F.5.25, ff.154^{v}-155^{r}. Unlike sentences of major excommunication which required usually three warnings, lesser sentences could be issued without warning: F. D. Logan, Excommunication and the Secular Arm in Medieval England (Toronto, 1968), p. 15.

with the king at Conway, and it was later at Edward's request that the excommunication was lifted. The only information about the execution of the archbishop's mandate comes from a letter of the bishop of St. Asaph saying that he had personally proclaimed the sentence at Oswestry, Welshpool, Wrexham, Mold and Caerwys before a great multitude of people.[1]

The surviving details of these sentences show them to be more than a mere formality. There was a concern that they be made known in as many places as possible. In 1277 the archbishop wanted Llywelyn's excommunication to be made known throughout the individual dioceses in the cathedral, collegiate and parochial churches, and in 1282 his letter to the dean of Hereford ordered that that of David was to be announced in every church in the diocese.[2] Sundays or feast days were often prescribed, for more people would hear the sentences on those days,[3] while in 1287 the bishop of St. David's ordered that the sentence was to be announced during the mass at those times and places when a larger number of people were present.[4] There was also a concern to know how the sentences were carried out.[5] Edward's involvement in the whole process is apparent, and indeed in 1277 the bishop of Bangor wrote to him rather than the archbishop to confirm that he had excommunicated Llywelyn.[6] Clearly Edward believed that it was a valuable demonstration of the holy nature of his expeditions.

1. Reg. Winchelsey, i.1-5.
2. Foedera, p. 541; Reg. Peckham, ii.483.
3. Reg. Peckham, ii.324; Historical Papers and Letters, p. 89.
4. Bodleian MS Auct. F.5.25, f.154^{v}.
5. Reg. Peckham, i.325; Reg. Winchelsey, i.3.
6. Cal. Anc. Corr. concerning Wales, no. xv.6.

There is no evidence that any excommunciations were issued during the French wars, for only the pope could authorize the excommunication of a fellow monarch, and Boniface VIII, who was anxious to arbitrate and restore peace between the two kings, was hardly likely to agree to such a request. Nor is there any evidence that an attempt was made to secure the excommunication of Balliol and the Scots in 1296, no doubt because this too would have involved an application to the pope. Yet in 1298, as direct ruler of Scotland, Edward had no such obstacle in his way. In June 1298 the clerical convocation agreed to his request that they excommunicate the Scots who were attacking the church and disturbing the peace, and on July 15th the archbishop ordered the excommunication to be made throughout his province.[1] The timing of this excommunication is of interest, for during the Welsh wars excommunication had always been a matter of some urgency. Now in 1298 it appears almost as an afterthought, not being ordered until the expedition was under way. The explanation probably lies in the different status of the Welsh and Scottish churches. The Welsh church was subject to the archbishop of Canterbury, and it was therefore possible to have a sentence of excommunication made through much of Wales, where it could act as a deterrent to potential rebels. For this reason speed might help to reduce the size of the rebellion. The Scottish church however was independent, and consequently Edward could not have sentences of excommunication proclaimed there, removing much of the urgency from the situation. The excommunication of 1298 was therefore primarily to stimulate hostility to the Scots at home.

1. Reg. Winchelsey, i.261, 271-2.

Yet Edward perhaps hoped that the excommunication of Robert Bruce following his rebellion in 1306 might also be made effective in Scotland. His secular authority in Scotland had not been annihilated by Bruce's rebellion as it had been by Wallace's in 1297-8, and he may have hoped to retain the support of some of the Scottish bishops. Two were his nominees, although in the rather remote dioceses of Sodor and Caithness, and for a while it seemed that Lamberton, the bishop of the pre-eminent Scottish diocese of St. Andrews who had been made president of Edward's council in Scotland, would also remain loyal. He did in fact desert shortly before Bruce's coronation, but only two or three other bishops joined him at the ceremony.[1] In order to secure the excommunication of Bruce, Edward sought the papal bull necessary if the sentence was to have any authority in the Scottish church. Clement V was a former royal clerk in Gascony and would be likely to look favourably upon Edward's request.[2] Edward acted very promptly to obtain the bull. News of the murder did not reach him until 23rd February,[3] but within twelve weeks a bull had arrived from Rome and was on its way to Scotland, for on 13th May Andrew de Stamford was paid his expenses for carrying various papal bulls and royal letters to Scotland authorizing the excommunication.[4] Subsequently on 18th May the archbishop of York and the bishop of Carlisle were made responsible for the execution of the bull throughout England,

1. Barrow, Bruce, pp. 211-2.

2. See J. H. Denton, 'Pope Clement V's Early Career as a Royal Clerk', E.H.R., lxxxiii (1968), 303-14.

3. Ramsay, Dawn of the Constitution, p. 508, perhaps citing P.R.O. E101/369/11, f.100^{r}.

4. P.R.O. E101/369/11, f.55^{v}.

Wales, Scotland and Ireland.[1] This proceeded at a more leisurely pace outside Scotland. The bull was read at St. Paul's on 5th June, and it was not until the end of August that royal messengers were paid for taking the bull across to Ireland and to thebishops of St. David's and St. Asaph.[2] The excommunication was subsequently repeated by cardinal Peter at Carlisle in March 1307, who at the request of bishop Gainsborough of Worcester also granted an indulgence of one year to those who prayed for the soul of Comyn while he remained in England and for one hundred days after he had left.[3]

Edward's use of excommunication was not an entirely new development. It had long been the practice of kings to place their undertakings in a religious setting and to seek the support of the church. Yet under Edward such spiritual support appears to have been deliberately exploited, perhaps as a result of the baronial wars when competition for ecclesiastical support had been intense and the value of such support demonstrated. During the Welsh wars excommunication became a regular weapon in which Edward himself took a close interest, while in the 1290s there began a systematic exploitation of the prayers of the church. Edward was certainly keen to receive the spiritual benefits of such services, but he cannot have been unaware that his requests for prayers and excommunication also had important political consequences, helping to publicize his needs widely and show the justice of his undertakings.

1. Foedera, p. 987.

2. P.R.O. E101/369/11, f.146^{r}. On 8th July the bishop of Meath acknowledged receipt of an unspecified bull and royal letter from a royal messenger on 1st July: P.R.O. E39/100/101. The P.R.O. list says this bull released those excommunicated for fighting rebels, but the bishop's letter is not specific.

3. Lanercost, p. 206; Guisborough, p. 370.

CONCLUSION

This thesis began with two potentially conflicting themes, the development of the power of the Angevin monarchy and the growth of the concept of the community of the realm. By the reign of Henry III it was becoming clear that increasing royal power had to be accompanied by a greater sense of responsibility towards a realm which was beginning to see itself as a community with interests of its own. Henry's reign was one of political conflict largely because he failed to reconcile these two trends and to present his demands and policies in a way which showed that his concerns were also those of the community. In 1258 the barons took over the king's government in an attempt to force him to accept his responsibilities. His unwanted Sicilian schemes were brought to an end, a treaty made with the king of France and reforms introduced to make the burdens of government more tolerable. The ensuing political conflict and civil war allowed the knightly classes to emerge as a political force. Already increasingly politically aware, they became caught up in national politics as reforms were enacted in their interests and as the barons consulted them and appealed to them for support. Once involved in national affairs, changes in government had to be made to accommodate them.

Edward I was conscious that such changes had to be made to avoid continued conflict. Not only did he inherit a community with a well-developed sense of its own identity, but it was also

stimulated into further growth by his own heavy military and financial demands. The scale of his military undertakings meant that demands were now made on all but the very poorest, unlike the feudal levies of the twelfth century. Political affairs concerned more men than ever before, and it was even more necessary that Edward should attempt to seek their co-operation. As the political awareness of the shire classes developed so the magnates felt less able to speak on their behalf. In 1290 they agreed to the feudal aide pur fille marier, but only 'quantum in ipsis est',[1] while a decade later the unity of action between knights and magnates in their quest for royal concessions is remarkable. In 1301 it was a knight, Keighley, who presented articles to the king on behalf of the community, an act which would have been unthinkable not many years earlier. During his reign Edward was prepared to recognize that the shire gentry were becoming confirmed members of the political community. He met them in parliament and allowed them to petition him there for redress of grievances. He took greater care to explain his policies to them and enlisted the church to help win wider support for his undertakings. Above all he framed his demands upon the community in a way which took account of their interests and concerns. His wars were fought for the protection of the community whereas Henry III's had been fought to recover his rights.

The outcome of Edward's wars depended on his ability to put across this message, and in this he was not without some success. He did this by developing the traditional means of communication between king and subjects. The royal writ, which towards the end

1. Parl. Writs, p. 20 (no.2).

of his father's reign was becoming more informative, was expanded to give additional explanations of the king's needs and policies and to demonstrate that they were framed in the interests of the nation. Parliament, the traditional meeting place of the king and magnates, was, following Montfort's example, expanded to include the shire representatives and to act as a means of communication with the wider community. The traditional support of the church for the king and his policies was also exploited to place his undertakings more firmly in a religious setting and to generate support throughout the dioceses. It was through such means that the reasons for Edward's wars in Wales, Gascony and Scotland were all clearly understood and approved. He was able to interest men sufficiently in the course of his wars to rejoice at his successes and to write about his achievements.

Yet despite this success the practical support which men were prepared to offer was limited. The power of the government was insufficient to create and change public opinion: it could only feed off and develop existing attitudes. The Welsh wars and, for the first few years, the Scottish wars were supported by Edward's subjects because there was ample evidence that the Welsh and the Scots were a threat to the realm and that it was in the interests of the community that they should be defeated. Support for the wars in France was, however, shortlived because there was no tradition of hostility towards the French and, despite Edward's claims, little convincing evidence that they were indeed a threat to the community. As the power of the king came into increasing conflict with the interests of the realm so political crisis developed in 1297, and civil war was only averted by fortuitous events in Scotland.

Moreover, Edward had to overcome several deep-rooted prejudices

before approval for his enterprises could be translated into practical support. The clergy, for example, who were perhaps more able to think in terms of the community of the realm than other sections of society, were particularly anxious that their money should not be spent unnecessarily on secular projects. It took several months to persuade them to grant taxation in 1283, while after 1298 they remained unconvinced that the danger to the realm was still sufficiently serious to require their further financial aid. The narrower concerns of the community of the shire and the local community were also powerful influences. It proved difficult to persuade men to remain in the coastguard in the mid-1290s, while desertion from the army in Scotland became a serious problem. Indeed the burdens of the Scottish war were such that the men of Durham were driven to claim that they owed no service beyond the Tyne and Tees, and the infantry of Northumberland would not serve beyond the Tweed except at the king's pay. The magnates, whose outlook was less localized than their tenants, also had personal needs and requirements which had to be met. They could offer little support to Henry's personal ventures which concerned them so little and offered little prospect of gain. Moreover, even though they approved Edward's undertakings, they resisted his attempts to extend their military obligations and stepped in when his demands threatened to bankrupt the realm. By 1307 even they had tired of the long-drawn out Scottish war which showed few signs of a successful conclusion.

The political nation underwent considerable expansion and development during the thirteenth century. In response royal propaganda developed, and could be extremely effective in

harnessing the strength of the realm behind the king's policies. Yet such success depended upon the king's making claims which his subjects wanted and expected to hear and which seemed to be borne out in reality.

Appendix 1

The Distribution and Collection of Documents

During the thirteenth century some quite extensive collections of documents were compiled, and the problem of how they were obtained is an interesting and important one. Only in one instance, the circulation of copies of the submission of the Scottish competitors in 1291, can it be shown that a document became widely known through official distribution. Why Edward I should have ordered this distribution is not clear, for it was an unprecedented act which was not repeated, and on no other occasion did he show any interest in influencing the contents of chronicles. Since Edward was careful to have records of the cause deposited in the royal archives and later ordered a notarial record of the proceedings to be drawn up, he cannot have been concerned simply to put the claimants' submission on record. Nor can publicity have been his sole motive, for although the letters would have become known to a large number of monks and clergy,[1] more people could have been reached with less effort by having the letters proclaimed throughout the shires.[2] Possibly this was simply an impulsive action, the result of Edward's annoyance that his recent request for historical information from

1. York Minster Muniments, MS M2/4g,f.3^{v}, says that the letter was produced before the dean and chapter on 21st September 1291, and it was presumably read out on that occasion (cited Stones and Simpson, ii.190).

2. The cost of writing and distributing the letters was 12s: Documents, ed. Stevenson, i.225.

the chronicles had produced little useful material.[1] Although there were later to be texts which might seem more worthy of preservation, such as Balliol's declaration of homage in 1292 and his submission to Edward in 1296, no trace of any similar distribution survives either in the royal records or in the chronicle accounts.[2]

Some chroniclers may have obtained copies of documents through contacts at court. Trevet, for example, seems to have had access to the royal archives and certainly had connections with the court which would have enabled him to see certain documents.[3] Walter of Guisborough also seems to have had similar connections, for his chronicle contains much official information,[4] while Matthew Paris certainly had his informants in the king's government.[5] Further evidence that monasteries had contacts at court through whom documents might be obtained is provided by the newsletters reporting on events at parliament which are preserved in their chronicles. The letter preserved in the Burton chronicle describing the Oxford parliament of 1258 is well known,[6] while the Tewkesbury chronicler's account of the Westminster parliament of April 1258 seems to be based upon a

1. E. L. G. Stones, 'English Chroniclers and the Affairs of Scotland, 1286-96', The Writing of History in the Middle Ages, ed. R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981), p. 331.

2. Stones, ibid., pp. 331-2, comes to the same conclusion.

3. Gransden, Historical Writing, p. 505.

4. Walter of Guisborough's contact may be the bishop of Durham, for he shows a marked interest in the activities of the bishop.

5. See above, p. 10.

6. Burton, pp. 443-5.

newsletter written by an eyewitness.[1] A letter sent to Gilbert de Rothbury, a justice of the king's bench, asking him to send news of parliament also survives in the letter-book of abbot John Sawtrey of Ramsay.[2] Abbots and priors returning from parliament might themselves have been able to bring back documents to their houses, and the government might well have been willing for them to do so. It would help to justify the Scottish war, for example, if Balliol's declaration of homage to Edward in 1292 became widely known.

Some monasteries were able to obtain unofficial documents not intended for publication, which further suggests they had their informants within the government. For example, three copies of the French draft of the Provisions of Westminster survive together with the administrative and political resolutions drawn up at the same time. One version of the forma pacis of August 1264 entered into Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.5.40/728 is also clearly a draft, for it has various additions and omissions, and the order of the clauses is different from that of the official version. The Provisions of Oxford is a particularly interesting document. It is indeed not really one document, but a collection of several documents and council memoranda relating mainly to the work of the Oxford parliament of June 1258. The three extant versions are not identical, differing not only in points of detail but also in the number of documents they contain. The errors in the texts and the apparent attempt to keep the collections up to date

1. Tewkesbury, pp. 163-5; Carpenter, 'What happened in 1258?', pp. 110-2.

2. Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis, no. 82.

by altering the names of the councillors and castellans suggest that they were derived from working documents rather than official compilations.[1]

It is not possible to say how such unofficial documents were obtained. They may simply be the private papers of baronial officials which have fallen into private hands[2] or have been obtained by monks from their contacts at court. Alternatively, it is possible that these unofficial documents from the baronial wars are an early example of a practice first noticed by Richardson and Sayles in connection with the parliaments of 1307 and 1327, the unofficial circulation, perhaps as part of a commercial enterprise, of collections of parliamentary documents. Whoever drew up the circulars of 1307 and 1327 did not have access to, or bother to seek out, the best documents, but used inferior versions, perhaps discarded drafts, in order to meet the desire for information about important political events.[3]

There is evidence that once documents were obtained they were circulated independently amongst the monasteries. One interesting letter in B.L. Add. MS 38821 enclosed copies of the letters exchanged before the battle of Lewes.[4] It began, without any address, 'however so that you may know about the battle which took place at Lewes between the king [and the barons] on 4th May, we are sending you a transcript of the letters by which the two

1. H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, 'The Provisions of Oxford: A Forgotten Document and Some Comments', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, xvii (1933), 291-317, discusses the texts of the Provisions of Oxford and the relationship between them.

2. F. M. Powicke, 'Some Observations on the Baronial Council (1258-1260) and the Provisions of Westminster', Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout, ed. A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke (Manchester, 1925), p. 123.

3. H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, 'The Parliament of Carlisle, 1307: Some New Documents', E.H.R., liii (1938), 425-37.

4. B. L. Add. MS 38821, f.44^{r-v}.

sides announced their mutual diffidation on the day before the battle'. The correspondent continued by giving some details of the battle and those killed and wounded or captured. He was clearly a baronial supporter, but no more than this is known about his identity.[1] The letters exchanged before Lewes may have arrived at Canterbury enclosed in a similar letter, for they now survive there on a single piece of parchment.[2] Similarly two documents in the Hailes chronicle relating to the surrender of Balliol appear to have come to the monastery as part of a newsletter. The same two documents were also summarized in the Hagnaby chronicle, suggesting that this newsletter perhaps had a fairly wide circulation.[3] Yet whatever the origins of these documents, they illustrate a widespread interest in contemporary events and an appetite for information about them. The avid collection of material illustrating the work of the baronial reformers and Edward's wars indicates that these were affairs with which men were much concerned.

The Location of Documents

A. The Period of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-65

1. Petitions of the Barons, May 1258

(i) Burton, pp. 438-43.

(ii) Bodleian MS Dugdale 20, ff.138^{v}-140^{r}.

1. This may have been a lay rather than a monastic manuscript. See above, p. 117.

2. Cant. D. & C., Chartae Antiquae, K. 2.

3. E. L. G. Stones and M. N. Blount, 'The Surrender of King John of Scotland to Edward I in 1296', B.I.H.R., xlviii (1975), 104-5; M. C. Prestwich, 'The English Campaign in Scotland in 1296 and the Surrender of John Balliol: Some Supporting Evidence', ibid., xlix (1976), 135-7.

2. Provisions of Oxford, June 1258

(i) Burton, pp. 446-453. The version in the Lichfield Magnum Registrum Album, ff. 72^{v}-74^{v}, is a copy of this.[1]

(ii) B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius B iv, ff.213^{r}-214^{v}.

(iii) B.L. MS Stowe 1029, ff.170^{v}-176^{r}, a seventeenth century abstract from the lost Coke Roll, printed from another copy in Inner Temple MSS Petyt 533/6, ff.53-6, with a note of the Stowe variations in Richardson and Sayles, 'The Provisions of Oxford', pp. 317-21.

(iv) Flores Historiarum, ii.473-4, a reference to a document now missing

3. Barons' letter to the Pope against the Poitevins, summer 1258

(i) Burton, pp. 457-60.

(ii) Tewkesbury, pp. 170-4.

(iii) Paris, vi.400-4.

(iv) B.L. MS Cotton Vespasian A xviii, ff.105^{v}-107^{v}.

4. Proclamation of October 18th 1258

(i) Burton, pp. 455-6 (French).

(ii) Oxford City Archives H 29, 1258, an original English version.

(iii) Bodleian MS Douce 137, f.95^{v} (French).

1. E. F. Jacob, 'The Complaints of Henry III against the Baronial Council in 1261', E.H.R., xli (1926), 559 n.3.

5. Ordinance of the Sheriffs, October 20th 1258

(i) Burton, pp. 453-5 (French).

(ii) Bodleian MS Douce 137, ff.94^{v}-95^{v} (French).

6. Provisions of the Barons, March 1259

(i) B.L. MS Cotton Nero D i, f.82, calendared Paris, vi.496.

(ii) Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 205/111, pp. 451 et seq.

(iii) C.U.L. MS Mm i 27, ff.73^{v}-74^{r}.

7. Provisions of Westminster[1]

Version of 1259:

(i) Burton, pp. 471-9 (French), 480-4 (Latin).

(ii) B.L. MS Cotton Nero D i, ff.139^{r}-140^{v} (French), calendared Paris, vi.512, and printed by Jacob, Studies, pp. 375-6.

(iii) Registrum Prioratus Beatae Mariae Wigorniensis, ed. W. H. Hale (Camden Society, old series, lxxxiv, 1865), pp. 163a-168a.

(iv) Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 205/111, pp. 438-49 (French), 490 et. seq. (Latin).

(v) C.U.L. MS Mm i 27, f.75 (Latin), a copy of (iv).

(vi) B.L. MS Stowe 386, ff.6^{v}-8^{r} (French).

Version of 1263 (Latin):

(i) Bodleian MS Bodley 91, ff.133^{r}-5^{r}.

(ii) Bodleian MS Douce 139, ff.103^{v}-5^{r}.

1. For a full discussion of these texts see Brand, 'Contribution of Baronial Reform', pp. 22-39.

Version of 1264 (Latin):

(i) B.L. Cotton Claudius D ii, ff.128^{v}-131^{r}.

(ii) Registrum Malmesburiense, i, ed. J. S. Brewer (Rolls Series, 1879), 42-50.

Version of 1265 (Latin):

(i) B.L. MS Cotton Otho D viii, ff.257^{v}-259^{v}.

8. Mise of Amiens, January 1264

(i) Tewkesbury, pp. 177-9.

(ii) Cronica Maiorum, pp. 59-61.

(iii) B.L. MS Cotton Julius D v, f.43^{r-v}.

(iv) B.L. MS Royal 10 B vi, f.132.

(v) B.L. Add. MS 38821, ff.43^{v}-44^{r}.

(vi) Bodleian MS Bodley 91, f.137^{r-v}.

(vii) St. Augustine's,pp. 81-2.

(viii) Cant. D. & C., Chartae Antiquae K. 2.

(ix) Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R 5.40/728, ff.76^{r}-77^{r}.

9. Letters exchanged before Lewes, May 1264

(i) Flores Historiarum, ii.492-3.

(ii) Worcester, p. 451.

(iii) Cronica Maiorum, pp. 63-5.

(iv) Rishanger, pp. 27-9.

(v) Chronicle of the Monastery of Abingdon, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Berkshire Ashmolean Society, 1844), pp. 17-18.

(vi) Cant. D. & C., Chartae Antiquae K.2.

(vii) B.L. MS Cotton Otho D viii, ff.260^{r-v}.

(viii) B.L. MS Royal 8 D iii, f.164^{v}.

(ix) B.L. MS Royal 5 F xv, f.2^{v}.

(x) St. Augustine's, pp. 84-5.

(xi) B.L. Add. MS 38821, f.44^{r}.

(xii) Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R 5.40/728, f.75^{r}.

(xiii) Bodleian MS Laud. Misc. 529, ff.67^{v}-68^{r}.

(xiv) B.L. MS Royal 13 C vi, f.63^{r}, cited Rishanger, p. 128.

(xv) B.L. MS Cotton Nero A ix, f.71^{v}, cited ibid.

(xvi) Bodleian MS Digby 168, ff.267^{v}-268^{r}, cited ibid.

(xvii) B.L. MS Cotton Julius D v, f.45^{r-v}, cited Gervase, ii.233.

(xviii) C.U.L. MS Mm i 27, ff.66^{v}-67^{r}.

10. Form of Peace, June-August 1264

(i) Cronica Maiorum, p. 65.

(ii) B.L. MS Cotton Claudius D ii, f.128^{r-v}.

(iii) B.L. Add MS 38821, f.44^{v}.

(iv) Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R 5.40/728, ff.75^{v}-76^{r}.

(v) Bodleian MS Bodley 91, f.139^{r-v}.

(vi) Cant. D. & C., Register I, f.457^{r}, a reference to a document formerly in the archives.

B. The Welsh Wars

1. Treaty of Conway, 1277

(i) Red Book of St. Asaph, f.28^{r}, cited W. Bullocke, 'Index to Llyfr Coch Asaph', Archaeologia Cambrensis, 3rd series, xiv (1868), 156.

The following chronicles include extracts and summaries of varying lengths:

(i) Annales Monasterii de Wintonia, in Annales Monastici, ii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1865), 124.

(ii) Worcester, pp. 472-3.

(iii) Cotton, p. 155.

(iv) Trevet, p. 297.

(v) Flores Historiarum, iii.49.

(vi) Wykes, p. 274.

(vii) Oseney, pp. 272-4 (French).

(viii) Chronicle of Abingdon, p. 24.

C. The Gascon Wars

1. Summons of Edward I to France, 1294

(i) Gervase, ii.302-5.

(ii) Cotton, pp. 228-32.

(iii) Hagnaby, ff.38^{v}-39^{v}.

(iv) Flores Historiarum, iii.87, a reference that Edward was summoned 'literatorie'. The document itself is only in the Merton Flores, iii.268-71.

(v) Reg. Pontissara, ii.405-8.

2. Edward I's renunciation of homage, 1294

(i) Gervase, ii.307.

(ii) Langtoft, ii.208-10.

(iii) Guisborough, p. 243.

3. Papal bull, 'Movet animum', brought by the cardinals in 1295

(i) Guisborough, pp. 254-6.

(ii) Cotton, p. 280-1.

(iii) Hagnaby, f.37^{r-v}.

(iv) Liber Epistolaris, no. 13.

(v) Reg. Halton, i.47-8.

(vi) B.L. MS Cotton Julius D ii, f.204^{r-v}.

(vii) B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius E iv, f.29^{r}.

(viii) Cant. D. & C., Register I, ff.176^{v}-177^{r}.

(ix) C.U.L. MS Ee i 1, f.273^{r-v}.

4. Papal bull, 'Dudum inter karissimos', 1298

(i) Guisborough, pp. 317-22.

(ii) Hagnaby, ff.45^{v}-46^{v}.

(iii) B.L. Add. MS 6159, ff.95^{v}-97^{r}.

(iv) Cant. D. & C., Register I, ff.183^{v}-184^{v}.

(v) Worcester, p. 538, gives an abridged version of the document.

D. The Scottish Wars

1. Submission of the competitors, 1291

The following monasteries and cathedral priories and chapters received copies of the submission of the competitors. Reference is given either to a printed notice or copy of the text, or the best manuscript where more than one survives. Copies which are not addressed to a specific house, such as those in the chronicles of Dunstable and Guisborough, are omitted.

(i) Battle: B.L. MS Cotton Claudius C ix, f.102^{v}.

(ii) Bury St. Edmunds: Bury St. Edmunds, pp. 100-3.

(iii) Canterbury cathedral priory: Cant. D. & C., Chartae Antiquae S.270.

(iv) St. Augustine's, Canterbury: Annales Londonienses, pp. 120-2.

(v) Coventry and Burton: Bodleian MS Bodley 302, f.140^{v}.

(vi) Chichester cathedral: Liber Niger of Christ Church, Dublin, f.202^{v}, cited by Lawlor, 'Calendar of the Liber Niger', p. 52.

(vii) Durham cathedral priory: B.L. MS Cotton Caligula B vii, f.322^{r}.

(viii) Ely cathedral priory: P.R.O. E39/100/111.

(ix) Fountains: Memorials of the Abbey of St. Mary of Fountains, i, ed. J. R. Walbran (Surtees Society, xlii. 1862), 183-5.

(x) Furness: Cont. Newburgh, pp. 576-8.

(xi) Glastonbury: Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, p.iv.

(xii) Guisborough: Bodleian MS Dodsworth 94, ff.119-20.

(xiii) Hailes: Hailes, ff.49^{v}-50^{r} (pp. 93-5).

(xiv) Holm Cultram: Register and Records of Holm Cultram, ed. F. Grainger and W. G. Collingwood (Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, Record Series, vii, 1929), pp. 60-1.

(xv) Lewes: P.R.O. E39/100/163.

(xvi) Lilleshall: Salop Record Office, Newport Parish Records, 1910/455, printed R. A. Griffiths, 'Edward I, Scotland and the Chronicles of English Religious Houses', Journal of the Society of Archivists, vi (1978-81), 198.

(xvii) Luffield: C.U.L. MS Ee i 1, ff.272^{v}-273^{r}.

(xviii) Merton: Flores Historiarum,iii.74 n.7.

(xix) Norwich cathedral priory: Cotton, pp. 180-2.

(xx) Oseney: Bodleian MS Oxford Charters (Oseney) 24^{a}.

(xxi) Peterborough: Florentii Wigorniensis, ii.247-50.

(xxii) Pipewell: P.R.O. SC1/13/187.

(xxiii) Rochester cathedral priory: Flores Historiarum, iii.72 n.1.

(xxiv) St. Albans: Paris, vi.511.

(xxv) St. Paul's cathedral: Flores Historiarum, iii.74 n.7.

(xxvi) Salisbury cathedral: Salisbury Dean and Chapter Muniments, Licentiae.

(xxvii) Waverley: Waverley, p. 411.

(xxviii) Wells cathedral: Wells Dean and Chapter Muniments, Liber Albus II, f.22.

(xxix) Westminster: Flores Historiarum, i.xxxi.

(xxx) Winchcombe: Landboc sive Registrum de Winchelcumba, ii, ed. D. Royce (Exeter, 1903), 132-3.

(xxxi) Worcester cathedral priory: Worcester, pp. 507-9.

(xxxii) York minster: P.R.O. E39/100/176.

(xxxiii) St. Mary's, York: P.R.O. E39/19.

2. Balliol's allegiance, 1292

(i) Worcester, p. 511.

(ii) Langtoft, ii.192-4.

(iii) Willelmi Rishanger Chronica, pp. 135-6.

(iv) Reg. Swinfield, p. 287.

(v) Bodleian MS Rawlinson D.329, ff.129^{v}-130^{r}.

(vi) B.L. MS Cotton Domitian A xii, f.34^{v}.

(vii) B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius E iv, f.29^{r}.

(viii) Trevet, pp. 324-5 (Latin).

(ix) Chronica Oxenedes, pp. 262-3 (Latin).

(x) B.L. MS Arundel 220, f.281^{r-v} (Latin).

3. Balliol's renunciation of homage, 1296

(i) Guisborough, pp. 275-6.

(ii) Hailes, f.51^{r-v} (pp. 102-4).

(iii) Willelmi Rishanger Chronica, pp. 158-9.

(iv) Reg. Halton, i.68-9.

(v) Trevet, pp. 344-6.

(vi) B.L. MS Cotton Domitian A xii, f.35^{v}.

(vii) B.L. MS Cotton Claudius E viii, f.261^{r-v}.

(viii) Flores Historiarum, iii.97, a reference that Balliol renounced his homage in writing.

4. Submission of Balliol, 1296

(i) Guisborough, pp. 280-1.

(ii) Trevet, pp. 348-9 (Latin).

(iii) Cotton, pp. 308-9.

(iv) B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius E iv, f.29^{v}.

(v) Bodleian MS Wood empt. 1, f.5^{r-v}.

(vi) B.L. MS Cotton Claudius E viii, ff.261^{v}-262^{r}.

(vii) Liber Niger of Christ Church, Dublin, f.208^{v}, cited Lawlor, 'Calendar of the Liber Niger', p. 53.

5. Papal bull, 'Scimus fili', 1299

(i) Guisborough, pp. 334-8.

(ii) Annales Londonienses, pp. 108-112.

(iii) Lanercost, pp. 194-8.

(iv) Reg. Winchelsey, ii.573-7.

(v) Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, p.iv.

(vi) Bodleian MS Laud. Misc. 529, ff.92^{v}-94^{r}.

(vii) Cant. D. & C., Register I, ff.223^{r}-224^{r}.

(viii) C.C.C.C., MS 292, ff.110^{v}-112^{v}.

(ix) Lambeth Palace MS 419, ff.103^{v}-104^{v}.

(x) Flores Historiarum, iii.110 n.4 (Luard's MS Cl.only).

(xi) B.L. MS Royal 20 A xi, ff.129^{r}-132^{r}, in verse, printed Langtoft, ii.388-400.

(xii) Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, MS 43, ff.173-7, in verse.

(xiii) Trevet, pp. 379-81, a summary only.

6. Reply of the barons to the pope, 1301.

(i) Guisborough, pp. 344-5.

(ii) Lanercost, pp. 198-200.

(iii) Annales Londonienses, pp. 122-5.

(iv) Trevet, pp. 392-4.

(v) Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, p.iv.

(vi) Flores Historiarum, iii.110 n.4 (see no.5 (x) above).

(vii) Bodleian MS Laud. Misc. 529, f.98^{r-v}.

(viii) Lambeth Palace MS 171, f.131^{v}.

(ix) Lambeth Palace MS 419, f.107^{r-v}.

(x) C.C.C.C., MS 292, ff.116^{v}-118^{v}.

(xi) Corporation of London Records Office, Liber Ordinationum, f.181^{r}.

(xii) B.L. MS Royal 20 A xi, ff.136^{r}-137^{r}, in verse, printed Langtoft, ii.420-424.

(xiii) Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, MS 43, ff.182-3, in verse.

(xiv) Hagnaby, f.52^{r}, a reference to a document to be inserted.

7. Reply of Edward I to the pope, 1301

(i) Guisborough, pp. 338-44.

(ii) Annales Londonienses, pp. 112-120.

(iii) Annales Angliae et Scotiae, p. 408n.

(iv) Trevet, pp. 381-92.

(v) Bodleian MS Laud. Misc. 529, ff.94^{r}-98^{r}.

(vi) B.L. MS Cotton Vespasian E xxii, ff.64^{r}-67^{v}.

(vii) Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, p.iv.

(viii) Lambeth Palace MS 104, ff.225^{r}-226^{r}.

(ix) Lambeth Palace MS 419, ff.104^{v}-107^{r}.

(x) C.C.C.C. MS 292, ff.112^{v}-116^{v}.

(xi) Flores Historiarum, iii.110 n.4 (see no.5 (x) above).

(xii) B.L. MS Royal 20 A xi, ff.132^{r}-136^{r}, in verse, printed Langtoft, ii.402-20.

(xiii) Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, MS 43, ff.177-182, in verse.

(xiv) Hagnaby, f.52^{r}, a reference to a document to be inserted.

Appendix 2

Gifts to the Dominicans and Franciscans, 1250-67

The table is compiled from the close and liberate Rolls to compare Henry III's gifts to the Franciscans with those to the Dominicans. So that a realistic comparison can be made between the two the total number of houses in each order is given in brackets. The gifts themselves are similar, including wood, clothes, food and small amounts of money. The table is almost certainly an incomplete record, but it does suggest that the Dominicans were perhaps only slightly favoured over the Franciscans before the baronial wars and that the Franciscans went out of favour after 1260. For the period 1263-5 the gifts are divided into royal and baronial according to who was in charge of the government at the time, although of course the king may have proposed a baronial gift.

Date	Franciscans	Dominicans
1250	3 (39)	5 (24)
1251	4	4 (25)
1252	9	10 (27)
1253	2 (40)	3 (28)
1254	3	4
1255	11	9
1256	14	14 (31)
1257	9 (42)	4 (32)
1258	10	5 (35)
1259	8	11 (36)
1260	7 (43)	11 (37)
1261	9	18
1262	1	7 (39)
1263	1 (royal gift)	9 (8 royal, 1 baronial)
1264	1 (baronial gift)	5 (40) (4 baronial, 1 royal)
1265	3 (2 baronial, 1 royal)	7 (41) (4 baronial, 3 royal)
1266	1	3 (43)
1267	3 (45)	6

Appendix 3

Requests for Prayers, 1294-1307

(1) February 14th 1294. A request from Edward to all the bishops that prayers be said for him as he went to negotiate with Philip IV: Foedera, p. 597. French and Latin drafts survive in P.R.O. SC1/37/169. A copy is entered without comment in Reg. Pontissara, ii.490. A request was also made on February 16th to Worcester priory by a royal clerk: Worcester, p. 514. Evidence for the implementation of these requests comes from:

(i) Reg. Romeyn, i.40, ii.124, letters from archbishop Romeyn of York to his archdeacons (undated) and to the bishop of Carlisle and the official of the bishop of Whithorn (March 1st) ordering prayers for the king.

(ii) Concilia, ed. Wilkins, ii.197, a letter of March 2nd from the prior of Canterbury acting during a vacancy in the see to the archdeacon of Canterbury, passing on the king's writ.

(iii) Reg. Sutton, iv.175, 176, letters of March 11th from bishop Sutton of Lincoln to the dean and chapter and the archdeacons specifying the prayers to be used.

(2) June 18th 1294. A request from Edward to all the bishops, the prior provincial of the Dominicans and all Dominican houses, the minister general of the Franciscans, and Roger de Martival, chancellor of Oxford University, asking for prayers for his French expedition: Rôles Gascons, iii.no. 3451, Foedera, p. 802. Copies are entered without comment in Reg. Swinfield, p.310 (where it is wrongly

dated 1293), Reg. Giffard (Worcester), ii.443, and Historical Papers and Letters, p. 107, from the register of bishop Halton of Carlisle. The letters in the bishops' registers are all dated 16th June. The chronicle of Worcester, p. 516, also notes the request, reflecting the words of the writ itself. Further evidence of the implementation of the writ comes from Reg. Sutton, v.14, instructions of June 30th from bishop Sutton of Lincoln to his archdeacons concerning the arrangements to be made.

(3) January 1296. A request from Edward on January 1st to the bishops, and on January 12th to seventeen abbots, the master of the order of Sempringham, the Dominican prior provincial and the Franciscan minister general asking for prayers to be said to support the military expedition to France: Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96, 506-7, Foedera, p. 834. A copy is entered in Reg. Halton, i.70, without further comment. Evidence for the implementation of this request comes from:

(i) Reg. Winchelsey, i.65-6, an undated letter from archbishop Winchelsey to his commissary passing on the request.

(ii) Reg. Sutton, v. 123-5, letters of January 27th from bishop Sutton of Lincoln to his archdeacons and the dean and chapter ordering prayers as previously arranged.

(4) August 7th 1297. A request from Edward to the archbishop of Canterbury (and presumably to the other bishops) ordering prayers for his expedition to France: Foedera, p. 872. Westminster Abbey Muniments MS 12201 is a similar request to the abbey. Evidence for the implementation of this request comes from Reg. Sutton, vi.21-3, a letter of September 21st from

bishop Sutton of Lincoln to his archdeacons ordering prayers as previously arranged.

(5) June 1298. A request from Edward to convocation that they pray for him and his Scottish expedition: Reg. Winchelsey, i.261. Evidence for the implementation of this request comes from:

(i) Reg. Winchelsey, i.271, a letter of July 15th from archbishop Winchelsey to the bishop of London ordering prayers to be offered.

(ii) Concilia, ed. Wilkins, ii.240-2, a letter of July 25th from bishop Gravesend of London to the dean and chapter of St. Paul's passing on the request.

(iii) Reg. Gandavo, i.9-10, an undated letter of bishop Ghent of Salisbury to his archdeacons ordering prayers to be made in response to the archbishop's letter which is also entered on pp. 17-21.

(iv) Reg. Sutton, vi. 187-8, an acknowledgement of the archbishop's letter from bishop Sutton of Lincoln, dated 30th June 1299.

(6) August 23rd 1298. A letter from archbishop Winchelsey to his suffragans in response to a request from Edward ordering them to give thanks for the success of the king's expedition to Scotland: Reg. Winchelsey, i.278-80. The letter is also entered without further comment in Reg. Giffard (Worcester), ii.493. Further evidence of the implementation of this request comes from Reg. Sutton, vi.107-9, letters of September 4th from bishop Sutton of Lincoln to his archdeacons and the dean and chapter passing on the request.

(7) c. October 31st 1299.

(i) A letter from Edward to the archbishop of Canterbury to assemble the bishops and abbots and request them to pray for

his Scottish expedition: Annales Angliae et Scotiae, p. 399 (undated).

(ii) A letter from Edward to the prior provincial of the Dominicans and the minister general of the Franciscans asking for prayers for his Scottish expedition: Foedera, p. 914.

(8) June 7th 1301. A warrant for a mandate to men of religion to pray for the king and his son and those going to Scotland: Cal. Chancery Warrants, p. 127. Evidence for the implementation of this request comes from:

(i) Reg. Corbridge, i.6, letters from archbishop Corbridge to his official and to the dean and chapter passing on the request, but dated June 6th. Undated letters to the dean and chapter of Beverley and the archdeacon of the East Riding are ibid., i.xi.

(ii) Reg. Dalderby, f.32^{v}, letters of June 16th from bishop Dalderby of Lincoln to his archdeacons and the dean and chapter prescribing the form of prayer to be used.

(9) The expedition of 1303.

(a) April 13th. Letter from archbishop Corbridge of York to the dean and chapter of Beverley requesting prayers for Edward's Scottish expedition: Reg. Corbridge, i.15. There is no evidence that this was at the request of the king. The writ is entered in the Chapter Act Book of Beverley without further comment: Memorials of Beverley Minster: The Chapter Act Book, i, ed. A. F. Leach (Surtees Society, xcviii, 1897), 10-12, where it is dated 5th April.

(b) July 4th. Letters from bishop Gainsborough of Worcester to the archdeacons of Worcester and Gloucester ordering

specified prayers to be offered for the king and his Scottish expedition: Reg. Ginsborough, pp. 45-6. This was perhaps in response to a royal request, for the bishop's letter repeated several phrases used in the royal request of 1297. On September 26th the bishop backed up this request with an indulgence for those who prayed for the peace of the church and realm: Liber Albus of Worcester, p. 11.

(10) c. June 1306. An undated letter from bishop Ghent of Salisbury to his archdeacons requesting specified prayers for the king and his Scottish expedition: Reg. Gandavo, i.176-7. No royal mandate survives for this or the indulgence of forty days issued by bishop Baldock of London about the same time for those who prayed for the prince of Wales and the peace of the church and kingdom: Reg. Baldock, p. 11.

Bibliography

A. Manuscript Sources

Manuscripts are described when their main content has been of use. Undescribed manuscripts have been used for their incidental entries only, and contain mainly chronicles and theological and other religious items.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS Auct. F.5.25 (Register of bishop Bek of St. David's)

MS Bodley 91 (Hyde chronicle)

MS Bodley 233

MS Bodley 302

MS Dodsworth 94 (Transcripts of charters in St. Mary's tower, York)

MS Douce 137 (Register of writs etc)

MS Douce 139 (Register of writs etc)

MS Dugdale 20 (Darley Cartulary)

MS Lat. hist. d.4 (Flores Historiarum)

MS Lat. misc. d.82 (Collection of statutes and law treatises)

MS Laud. 720

MS Laud. Misc. 529 (Evesham chronicle)

MS Oxford Charters (Oseney), 24^{a} (Letter of 1291)

MS Rawlinson B.214 (Collection of verse)

MS Rawlinson D.329

MS Wood empt. 1 (Register of Glastonbury abbey)

British Library

Add. MS 6159 (Register of Christ Church, Canterbury)

Add. MS 7965 (Wardrobe Book, 1296-7)

Add. MS 7966A (Wardrobe Book, 1300-1)

Add. MS 32085 (Register of writs and statutes)

Add. MS 35291 (Wardrobe Book, 1299-1300)

Add. MS 38821 (Register of writs and statutes)

Add. MS 46352 (Register of St. Augustine's, Canterbury)

MS Arundel 220

MS Cotton Caligula A xviii (Songs on Turberville and Caerlaverock)

MS Cotton Caligula B vii

MS Cotton Charters xvi.48 (Papal bull of excommunication, 1264)

MS Cotton Claudius C ix

MS Cotton Claudius D ii (Guildhall register of statutes and charters)

MS Cotton Claudius D vi

MS Cotton Claudius E viii

MS Cotton Domitian A xii (Anonymous chronicle)

MS Cotton Julius A v

MS Cotton Julius D v (Dover chronicle)

MS Cotton Julius D ii (Register of St. Augustine's, Canterbury)

MS Cotton Julius D vi

MS Cotton Otho D viii (Ramsay chronicle)

MS Cotton Tiberius E iv (Register of Winchcombe priory)

MS Cotton Tiberius E vi (Register of St. Albans abbey)

MS Cotton Titus A xx (Collection of verse)

MS Cotton Vespasian A vi (Collection of Montfort's miracles)

MS Cotton Vespasian A xviii (Register of Ramsay abbey)

MS Cotton Vespasian B xi (Hagnaby chronicle)

MS Cotton Vespasian B xiii

MS Cotton Vespasian E xxii (Register of Peterborough abbey)

MS Cotton Vitelius C viii

MS Harley 230 (Register of Bury St. Edmunds)

MS Harley 489 (Collection of statutes)

MS Harley 776

MS Harley 978

MS Harley 3860

MS Lansdowne 762 (Collection of verse and prophecies)

MS Royal 5 F xv

MS Royal 8 D iii

MS Royal 10 B vi

MS Royal 20 A xi

MS Sloane 4932 (Transcript of Welbeck ecclesiastical formulary)

MS Stowe 386 (Collection of statutes)

MS Stowe 1029 (Collections of John Anstis)

Cambridge: University Library

Add. MS 4407(19) (Elegy on Edward I)

MS Dd x 28 (Register of St. Catherine's, Lincoln)

MS Ee i 1 (Register of Luffield priory)

MS Ee i 20 (French Brut)

MS Ee v 31 (Register of Henry of Eastry, prior of Canterbury)

MS Kk iv 20

MS Mm i 27 (Manuscript of Robert Carpenter, junior)

Cambridge: Clare College

MS N. 2.5/14

Cambridge: Corpus Christi College

MS 281 (Northampton chronicle)

MS 292

MS 301 (Chronicle of St. Augustine's, Canterbury)

MS 385 (Tract on the state of England, 1264)

Cambridge: Gonville and Caius College

MS 85/167

MS 205/11 (Manuscript of Robert Carpenter)

MS 234/120

MS 349/542

Cambridge: St. John's College

MS E59/112

Cambridge: Trinity College

MS R 5.40/728

Canterbury Dean and Chapter Muniments

Chartae Antiquae, A.20[a], K.2, S.270

Register I

Sede Vacante Scrap Book I

Sede Vacante Scrap Book III

Corporation of London Records Office

Letter-Book C

Liber de Antiquis Legibus

Liber Ordinationum

Durham Dean and Chapter Muniments

Cartulary III

Locellus I 62 (Henry III's complaints against the barons, 1261)

Lambeth Palace

MS 104

MS 171

MS 419

Lincoln Record Office

Register of bishop Dalderby (III)

Oxford City Archives

H 29, 1258 (Proclamation of October 18th 1258)

Public Record Office

C47 (Chancery Miscellanea)

C62 (Liberate Rolls)

C81 (Chancery Warrants)

C255/3 (Writs for proclamations)

E36/274 (Liber A)

E39 (Scottish Documents)

E101 (King's Remembrancer, Accounts Various)

E159 (King's Remembrancer, Memoranda Rolls)

E164/9 (Liber X)

E405/1 (Jornalia Rolls)

JUST/1 (Assize Rolls)

SC 1 (Ancient Correspondence)

Westminster Abbey Muniments

MS 12201 (Prayer letter of 1297)

Worcester Record Office

BA 2648/1 (i) (Register of bishop Giffard)

York Minster Muniments

MS M2/4g (Dean and Chapter Misc. Register, 1290-1340)

B. Primary Sources

Abstracts of the Charters and other Documents contained in the Chartulary of the Priory of Bridlington, ed. W. T. Lancaster (Leeds, 1912).

Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum Robertus de Avesbury De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardii Tertii, ed. E. M. Thompson (Rolls Series, 1889).

Adami de Domerham Historia de Rebus Gestis Glastoniensibus, ii, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1727).

Anglo-Norman Political Songs, ed. I. S. T. Aspin (Anglo-Norman Text Society, xi, 1953).

Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1174-1328: Some Selected Documents, ed. E. L. G. Stones (2nd edn, Oxford, 1970).

Annales Angliae et Scotiae, in Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1865).

Annales Cestrienses, ed. R. C. Christie (Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, xiv, 1886).

Annales Londonienses, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1882).

Annales Monasterii de Bermundeseia, in Annales Monastici, iii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1866).

Annales Monasterii de Burton, in Annales Monastici, i, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864).

Annales Monasterii de Oseneia, in Annales Monastici, iv, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1869).

Annales Monasterii de Theokesberia, in Annales Monastici, i, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864).

Annales Monasterii de Waverleia, in Annales Monastici, ii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1865).

Annales Monasterii de Wintonia, in Annales Monastici, ii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1865).

Annales Paulini, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1882).

Annales Prioratus de Dunstaplia, in Annales Monastici, iii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1866).

Annales Prioratus de Wigornia, in Annales Monastici, iv, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1869).

Annales Regis Edwardi Primi, Fragmentum I, in Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1865).

Annales S. Pauli Londonienses, ed. F.Liebermann (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores, xxviii, 1888), 548-51.

The Apocalypse in Latin and French (Bodleian MS Douce 180), ed. M. R. James (Roxburghe Club, 1922).

Aquinas, Selected Political Writings, ed. A. P. d'Entrèves (Oxford, 1968).

Bartholomaei de Cotton Monachi Norwicensis Historia Anglicana, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1859).

Bracton's Note Book, ii, ed. F. W. Maitland (London, 1887).

Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales, ed. J. G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1935).

Calendar of Chancery Warrants, 1244-1326.

Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1257-1300.

Calendar of Close Rolls.

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, ii, ed. J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1884).

Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous.

Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem.

Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, Letter-Book B (c. 1275-1312), ed. R. R. Sharpe (London, 1901).

Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, Letter-Book C (c. 1291-1309), ed. R. R. Sharpe (London, 1901).

Calendar of Liberate Rolls.

Calendar of Papal Letters.

Calendar of Patent Rolls.

Calendar of Various Chancery Rolls, 1277-1326.

'The Camera Roll of the Prior of Norwich in 1283', ed. W. Hudson, Original Papers of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society, xix (1915-17), 268-313.

Cartulary of Darley Abbey, i, ed. R.R. Darlington (Kendal, 1945).

Cartulary of Oseney Abbey, iii, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford Historical Society, xci, 1931).

Chartulary of the High Church of Chichester, ed. W. D. Peckham (Sussex Record Society, xlvi, 1942-3).

Chronica de Mailros, ed. J. Stevenson (Bannatyne Club, 1835).

Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes, ed. H. Ellis (Rolls Series, 1859).

Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301, ed. A. Gransden (London, 1964).

Chronicle of Melrose, facsimile edn, ed. A. O. and M. O. Anderson (London, 1936).

Chronicle of St. Mary's Abbey, York, ed. H. H. E. Craster and M. E. Thornton (Surtees Society, cxlviii, 1933).

Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft, 2 vols, ed. T. Wright (Rolls Series, 1866-8).

Chronicle of the Monastery of Abingdon, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Berkshire Ashmolean Society, 1844).

Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, ed. H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 3rd series, lxxxix, 1957).

Chronicle of William de Rishanger, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Camden Society, old series, xv, 1840).

Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, ed. W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1867).

Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis, ed. W. D. Macray (Rolls Series, 1886).

Chronicon de Lanercost, ed. J. Stevenson (Maitland Club, 1839).

Chronicon Henrici de Silegrave, ed. C. Hook (Caxton Society, 1849).

Chronicon Petroburgense, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Society, old series, xlvii, 1849).

Chronicon Vulgo Dictum Chronicon Thomae Wykes, in Annales Monastici, iv, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1869).

Chroniques de London, ed. G. J. Aungier (Camden Society, old series, xxviii, 1844).

Close Rolls.

Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ii, ed. D. Wilkins (London, 1737).

Continuatio Chronici Willelmi de Novoburgo, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I, ii, ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1885).

Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britian and Ireland, i, iii, ed. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs (Oxford, 1869-71).

Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, II, 1205-1313, ii, ed. F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964).

'A Critical Edition of the Annals of Hailes (MS Cleopatra D iii, ff. 33-59^{v}) with an Examination of their Sources', ed. M. N. Blount (Manchester M.A. thesis, 1974).

Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, in De Antiquis Legibus Liber, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Society, old series, xxxiv, 1846).

Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland, i, ed. F. Palgrave (Record Commission, 1837).

Documents Illustrating the Crisis of 1297-8 in England, ed. M. Prestwich (Camden Society, 4th series, xxiv, 1980).

Documents Illustrating the Rule of Walter de Wenlock, Abbot of Westminster, 1283-1307, ed. B. F. Harvey (Camden Society, 4th series, ii, 1965).

Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland, 1286-1306, 2 vols, ed. J. Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1870).

Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67, ed. R. F. Treharne and I. J. Sanders (Oxford, 1973).

Durham Annals and Documents of the Thirteenth Century, ed. F. Barlow (Surtees Society, clv, 1940).

Early Computus Rolls of the Priory of Worcester, ed. J. M. Wilson (Worcester Historical Society, xxi, 1908).

Early Middle English Texts, ed. B. Dickens and R. M. Wilson (London, 1956).

Episcopal Acts and Cognate Documents Relating to Welsh Dioceses, 1066-1272, i, ed. J. Conway Davies (Historical Society of the Church in Wales, i, 1946).

'Extracts from the Barlings Chronicle', in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, ii, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1883), cxiii-cxviii.

Facsimile of British Museum MS Harley 2253, ed. N. R. Ker (Early English Text Society, old series, cclv, 1964).

Florentii Wigorniensis Monachi Chronicon ex Chronicis, ii, ed. B. Thorpe (English History Society, 1849).

Flores Historiarum, ii, iii, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1890).

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, i, ed. T. Rymer (Record Commission, 1816).

'Fragment d'une Chronique Rédigée à l'Abbaye de Battle sur la Guerre des Barons (1258-65)', in C. Bémont, Simon de Montfort (Paris, 1884), pp. 373-80.

Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia Regum Britannie, ed. A. Griscom (London, 1929).

Gesetze der Angelsachsen, i, ed. F.Liebermann (Halle, 1903).

Gesta Stephani, ed. K. R. Potter (2nd edn, Oxford, 1976).

Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, iii, ed. J. S. Brewer, vi, ed. J. F. Dimock (Rolls Series, 1863-8).

Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, i, ed. A. Watkins (Somerset Record Society, lix, 1944).

Halmota Prioratus Dunelmensis, ed. J. Booth and W. H. Longstaffe (Surtees Society, lxxxii, 1889).

Historical Manuscripts Commission:

5th Report, Appendix (1876).

14th Report, Appendix viii (1895).

Various Collections, i (1901).

Historical Papers and Letters from Northern Registers, ed. J. Raine (Rolls Series, 1873).

Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries, ed. R. H. Robbins (New York, 1959).

Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, ii, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1880).

Itinerary of Edward I, ii, ed. H. Gough (Paisley, 1900).

Itinerary of John Leland, i, ed. L. Toulmin Smith (London, 1957).

Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scottorum, i, ed. W. F. Skene (Historians of Scotland, i, 1871).

Landboc sive Registrum de Winchelcumba, ii, ed. D. Royce (Exeter, 1903).

Laws of the Earliest English Kings, ed. F. L. Attenborough (Cambridge, 1922).

Letters of John of Salisbury, i, ed. W. J. Millor and H. E. Butler (London, 1955).

Liber Albus of the Priory of Worcester, ed. J. M. Wilson (Worcester Historical Society, xxxiii, 1919).

Liber Epistolaris of Richard de Bury, ed. N. Denholm-Young (Roxburghe Club, 1950).

Liber Memorandorum Ecclesie de Bernewelle, ed. J. W. Clark (Cambridge, 1907).

Lincolnshire Assize Roll for 1298, ed. W. S. Thomson (Lincoln Record Society, xxxvi, 1944).

Littere Wallie, ed. J. G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1940).

The Mabinogion, ed. T. P. Ellis and J. Lloyd (Oxford, 1929).

Manners and Household Expenses of England in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, ed. H. T. Turner (Roxburghe Club, 1841).

Matthaei Parisiensis Chronica Majora, iii-vi, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1876-1882).

Medieval Lore from Bartholomew Anglicus, ed. R. Steele (London, 1905).

Memoranda de Parliamento, 1305, ed. F. W. Maitland (Rolls Series, 1893).

Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1872).

Memorials of Beverley Minster: The Chapter Act Book, i, ed. A. F. Leach (Surtees Society, xcviii, 1897).

Memorials of the Abbey of St. Mary of Fountains, i, ed. J. R. Walbran (Surtees Society, xlii, 1862).

Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, ii, ed. W. A. Wright (Rolls Series, 1887).

'The Miracles of Simon de Montfort', in The Chronicle of William de Rishanger, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Camden Society, old series,xv, 1840).

Missale ad Usum Insignis Ecclesiae Eboracensis, ii, ed. W. G. Henderson (Surtees Society, lx, 1872).

Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis, ii, pt i, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1860).

Nicholai Triveti Annales Sex Regum Angliae, ed. T. Hog (English History Society, 1845).

Nova Legenda Anglie, ii, ed. C. Horstman (Oxford, 1901).

Opus Chronicorum, in Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneforde Chronica et Annales, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1866).

The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun, v, ed. F. J. Amours (Scottish Text Society, 1914).

Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, i, ed. F. Palgrave (Record Commission, 1827).

Patent Rolls, 1225-32.

Placita de Quo Warranto (Record Commission, 1818).

Political Songs of England, ed. T. Wright (Camden Society, old series, vi, 1839).

Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, viii, ed. J. R. Lumby (Rolls Series, 1882).

Processionale ad Usum Insignis ac Praeclarae Ecclesiae Sarum, ed. W. G. Henderson (Leeds, 1882).

Psuedo-Turpin, ed. I. R. Short (Anglo-Norman Text Society, xxv, 1973).

Register and Chronicle of the Abbey of Aberconway, ed. H. Ellis (Camden Society, Miscellany i, old series, xxxix, 1847).

Register and Records of Holm Cultram, ed. F. Grainger and W. G. Collingwood (Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, Record Series, vii, 1929).

Register of Bishop Godfrey Giffard, 1268-1302, ii, ed. J. W. Willis Bund (Worcester Historical Society, xiv, 1902).

Register of John de Halton, bishop of Carlisle, 1292-1324, i, ed. W. N. Thompson (Canterbury and York Society, xii, 1913).

Register of Thomas Corbridge, Lord Archbishop of York, 1300-1304, i, ed. W. Brown and A. H. Thompson (Surtees Society, cxxxviii, 1925).

Register of Walter Giffard, Lord Archbishop of York, 1266-1279, ed. W. Brown (Surtees Society, cix, 1904).

Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York,1306-15, v, ed. W. Brown and A. H. Thompson (Surtees Society, cliii, 1940).

Register of Bishop William de Ginsborough, 1303-7, ed. J. W. Willis Bund (Worcester Historical Society, xix, 1907).

Registers of John le Romeyn, Lord Archbishop of York, 1286-96, and of Henry of Newark, Lord Archbishop of York, 1296-9, 2 vols, ed. W. Brown (Surtees Society, cxxiii, cxxvii, 1913-17).

Registers of Walter Bronescombe (1257-80) and Peter Quivil (1280-91), Bishops of Exeter, ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph (London, 1889).

Registrum Episotlarum Fratris Johannis Peckham Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, 3 vols, ed. C. T. Martin (Rolls Series, 1882-5).

Registrum Johannis de Pontissara Episcopi Wyntoniensis, 1282-1304, 2 vols, ed. C. Deedes (Canterbury and York Society, xix, xxx, 1915-24).

Registrum Malmesburiense, i, ed. J. S. Brewer (Rolls Series, 1879).

Registrum Prioratus Beatae Mariae Wigorniensis, ed. W. H. Hale (Camden Society, old series, lxxxiv, 1865).

Registrum Radulphi Baldock, Gilberti Segrave, Ricardi Newport, et Stephani Gravesend, Episcoporum Londoniensium, 1304-1338, ed. R. C. Fowler (Canterbury and York Society, vii, 1911).

Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield Episcopi Herefordensis, 1283-1317, ed. W. W. Capes (Canterbury and York Society, vi, 1909).

Registrum Roberti Winchelsey Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, 1294-1313, 2 vols, ed. R. Graham (Canterbury and York Society, li, lii, 1952-6).

Registrum Simonis de Gandavo Diocesis Saresbiriensis, 1297-1316, i, ed. C. T. Flower and M. C. B. Dawes (Canterbury and York Society, xl, 1934).

Roberti Grosseteste Epistolae, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1861).

Rogeri de Wendover Flores Historiarum, iii, ed. H. G. Hewlett (Rolls Series, 1889).

Rôles Gascons, i, ed. Francisque-Michel, iii, ed. C. Bémont (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 1885-1906).

Rolls and Register of Bishop Oliver Sutton, 1280-99, iv-vi, ed. R. M. T. Hill (Lincoln Record Society, lii, lx, lxiv, 1958-69).

Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londoniensis Asservati, ii, ed. T. D. Hardy (Record Commission, 1844).

Rotuli Parliamentorum (Record Commission, 1783).

Rotuli Selecti ad Res Anglicas et Hibernicas Spectantes, ed. J. Hunter (Record Commission, 1834).

Royal and Other Letters Illustrative of the Reign of Henry III, ii, ed. W. W. Shirley (Rolls Series, 1886).

Royal Letters Addressed to Oxford, ed. O. Ogle (Oxford, 1892).

Sarum Missal, ed. J. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1916).

Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers, 500-1286, ed. A. O. Anderson (London, 1908).

Select Cases in the Court of the King's Bench under Edward I, iii, ed. G. O. Sayles (Selden Society, lviii, 1939).

Select Cases of Procedure without Writ under Henry III, ed. H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles (Selden Society, lx, 1941).

Siege of Caerlaverock, ed. N. H. Nicolas (London, 1828).

Song of Lewes, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1890).

Statutes of the Realm, i (Record Commission, 1810).

Thomas de Eccleston, De Adventu Fratris Minorum, in Monumenta Franciscana, i, ed. J. S. Brewer (Rolls Series, 1858).

Treaty Rolls, i (1234-1325), ed. P. Chaplais (London, 1955).

Two Chartularies of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath, ed. W. Hunt (Somerset Record Society, vii, 1893).

Vita Edwardi Secundi, ed. N. Denholm-Young (London, 1957).

Willelmi Rishanger Chronica, in Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1865).

C. Secondary Sources

Altschul, M., A Baronial Family in Medieval England: The Clares, 1217-1314 (Baltimore, 1965).

Anderson, M. O., Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland (2nd edn, Edinburgh, 1980).

Barrow, G. W. S., 'The Scottish Clergy in the War of Independence', Kingdom of the Scots (London, 1973).

Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland (2nd edn, Edinburgh, 1976).

Bartlett, R. J., 'Gerald of Wales' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978).

Bean, J. M. W., The Decline of English Feudalism, 1215-1540 (Manchester, 1968).

'"Bachelor" and Retainer', Medievalia et Humanistica, new series, iii (1972), 117-131.

Beddoe, D., 'Some Financial and Political Aspects of the Constitutional Crisis of 1297' (Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1969).

Beechings, H. C.,and M. R. James, 'The Library of the Cathedral Church of Norwich', Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society, xix (1915-17), 67-116.

Bellamy, J. G., The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1970).

Bémont, C., Simon de Montfort (Paris, 1884).

Simon de Montfort, trans. E. F. Jacob (Oxford, 1930).

Brand, P. A., 'The Contribution of the Period of Baronial Reform (1258-67) to the Development of the Common Law in England' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974).

Brentano R., York Metropolitan Jurisdiction and Papal Judges Delegate, 1279-1296 (Berkeley, 1959).

Brook, G. L., 'The Original Dialects of the Harley Lyrics', Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages, ii (1933), 38-61.

Bullock-Davies, C., Menestrellorum Multitudo: Minstrels at a Royal Feast (Cardiff, 1978).

Bullocke, W., 'Index to Llyfr Coch Asaph', Archaeologia Cambrensis, 3rd series, xiv (1868), 151-66, 329-336.

Cam, H. M., Studies in the Hundred Rolls: Some Aspects of Thirteenth Century Administration (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, vi, 1921).

'The Quality of English Feudalism', Law-finders and Law-makers in Medieval England (London, 1962), pp. 44-58.

Carpenter, D. A., 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff in England, 1194-1258', E.H.R., xci (1976), 1-32.

'What happened in 1258?', War and Government in the Middle Ages, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 106-119.

Chambers, E. K., Arthur of Britain (London, 1927).

Chaytor, H. J., From Script to Print (Cambridge, 1945).

Cheney, C. R., 'The Paper Constitution Preserved by Matthew Paris', E.H.R., lxv (1950), 213-21.

Chotzen, T. M., 'Welsh History in the Continuation of the "Spiegel Historiael" by Lodewijk van Velthem', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, vii (1933-4), 42-54.

Clanchy, M. T., 'Did Henry III have a Policy?', History, lii (1968), 203-216.

From Memory to Written Record (London, 1979).

Colvin, H. M., 'The Registrum Praemonstratense: A Lost Manuscript Rediscovered', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, viii (1957), 96-7.

Coulton, G. C., Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation (Cambridge, 1919).

Cowley, F. G., 'The Church in Medieval Glamorgan, I', Glamorgan County History, iii, ed. T. B. Pugh (Cardiff, 1971), 87-135.

The Monastic Order in South Wales, 1066-1349 (Cardiff, 1977).

Cox, D. C., 'Battlewell, Evesham', Transactions of the Worcester Archaeological Society, new series, xli (1964), 1-9.

Davies, R. R., 'Race Relations in Post-Conquest Wales: Confrontation and Compromise', Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (1974-5), 32-56.

Lordship and Society in the March of Wales, 1282-1400 (Oxford 1978).

De la Roncière, C.,'Le Blocus Continental de l'Angleterre sous Philippe le Bel', Revue des Questions Historiques, nouvelle série, xvi (1896), 401-441.

Denholm-Young, N.,'Documents of the Barons' War', E.H.R., xlviii (1933), 558-75.

'The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle', E.H.R., xlix (1934), 85-91.

'Robert Carpenter and the Provisions of Westminster', E.H.R., 1 (1935), 22-35.

'The Paper Constitution attributed to 1244', E.H.R., lviii (1943), 401-23.

'Thomas de Wykes and his Chronicle', E.H.R., lxi (1946), 157-179.

Richard of Cornwall (Oxford, 1947).

'The Song of Carlaverock and the Parliamentary Roll of Arms as found in Cott. MS Calig. A xviii in the British Museum', Proceedings of the British Academy, xlvii (1961), 251-262.

History and Heraldry, 1254-1310 (Oxford, 1965).

Denton, J. H., 'Pope Clement V's Early Career as a Royal Clerk', E.H.R., lxxxiii (1968), 303-14.

'The Crisis of 1297 from the Evesham Chronicle', E.H.R., xciii (1978), 560-579.

'A Worcester Text of the Remonstrances', Speculum, liii (1978), 511-521.

Robert Winchelsey and the Crown, 1294-1313 (Cambridge, 1980).

Dictionary of National Biography

Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940 (London, 1959).

Douie, D. L., Archbishop Pecham (Oxford, 1952).

Easterling, R. C., 'Anian of Nanneu, O.F.P., Prior of Rhuddlan, Bishop of St. Asaph, 1268-93', Flintshire Historical Society Journal, v (1914-15), 9-30.

Edwards, J. G., 'Confirmatio Cartarum and the Baronial Grievances in 1297', E.H.R., lviii (1943), 147-171, 273-300.

'Edward I's Castle Building in Wales', Proceedings of the British Academy, xxxii (1946), 15-81.

'The Treason of Thomas Turberville, 1295', Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 296-309.

The Principality of Wales, 1267-1967: A Study in Constitutional History (Denbigh, 1967).

Ellis, A. J., 'On the Only English Proclamation of Henry III', Transactions of the Philological Society (1868),1-135.

Emden, A. B., A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to 1500 (Oxford, 1957-9).

Donors of Books to S. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury (Oxford Bibliographical Society, Occasional Pbns, iv, 1968).

Finucane, R. C., Miracles and Pilgrims (London, 1977).

Fraser, C. M., History of Antony Bek (Oxford, 1957).

Gibbs, M.,and J. Lang, Bishops and Reform, 1215-72 (Oxford, 1934).

Gilson, J. P., 'An Unpublished Notice of the Battle of Lewes', E.H.R., xi (1896), 520-2.

'The Parliament of 1264', E.H.R., xvi (1901), 499-501.

Graham, R., 'An Ecclesiastical Tenth for National Defence in 1298', English Ecclesiastical Studies (London, 1929), pp. 317-323.

Gransden, A., Historical Writing in England, c. 550-1307 (London, 1974).

'The Continuation of the Flores Historiarum from 1265-1327', Medieval Studies, xxxvi (1974), 472-492.

Griffiths, R. A., 'Edward I, Scotland and the Chronicles of English Religious Houses', Journal of the Society of Archivists, vi (1978-81), 191-9.

Grosjean, P., 'Thomas de la Hale, Moine et Martyr à Douvres en 1295', Analecta Bollandiana, lxxii (1954), 167-191.

Gwynn, A., 'Some Unpublished Texts from the Black Book of Christ Church, Dublin', Analecta Hibernica, xvi (1946), 281-337.

Hadwin, J. F., 'Medieval Lay Subsidies and Economic History', Economic History Review, 2nd series, xxxvi (1983), 200-217.

Handbook of British Chronology, ed. F. M. Powicke and E. B. Fryde (Royal Historical Society, Guides and Handbooks, ii, 2nd edn, 1961).

Harcourt, L. W. V., His Grace the Steward and Trial of Peers (London, 1907).

Harriss, G. L., 'Parliamentary Taxation and the Origins of Appropriation of Supply in England, 1207-1340', Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'Histoire Comparative des Institutions, xxiv (1966), 165-179.

King, Parliament and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369 (Oxford, 1975).

Harvey, S., 'The Knight and the Knight's Fee in England', Past and Present, xlix (1970), 3-43.

Hays, R. W., History of the Abbey of Aberconway, 1186-1537 (Cardiff, 1963).

Heidemann, J., Papst Clemens IV, Eine Monographie, i: Das Vorleben des Papstes und Sein Legationsregister (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, VI, iv, 1903).

Hill, R., Ecclesiastical Letter-Books of the Thirteenth Century (privately printed).

Hinnebusch, W. A., The Early English Friars Preachers (Rome, 1951).

Holt, J. C., The Northerners, (Oxford, 1961).

Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1965).

'A Vernacular-French Text of Magna Carta, 1215', E.H.R., lxxxix (1974), 346-64.

'The End of the Anglo-Norman Realm', Proceedings of the British Academy, lxi (1975), 223-65.

'The Pre-History of Parliament', The English Parliament in the Middle Ages, ed. R. G. Davies and J. H. Denton (Manchester, 1981), pp. 1-28.

Huet, G., 'Les Traditions Arturiennes chez le Chroniquer Louis de Veltham', Le Moyen Age, 2nd series, xvii (1913), 173-197.

Jacob, E. F., Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67 (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, viii, 1925).

'The Complaints of Henry III against the Baronial Council in 1261', E.H.R., xli (1926), 559-71.

James, M. R., Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover (Cambridge, 1903).

List of Manuscripts formerly in Peterborough Abbey (Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, supplement v, 1926).

Jeffrey, D. L., The Early English Lyric and Franciscan Spirituality (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975).

Jenkinson, C. H., 'The First Parliament of Edward I', E.H.R., xxv (1910), 231-42.

Jolliffe, J. E. A., Angevin Kingship (London, 1955).

Jones, J. A. P., King John and Magna Carta (London, 1971).

Jones, W. R., 'England against the Celtic Fringe: A Study in Cultural Sterotypes', Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, xiii (1971), 155-171.

Jones-Pierce, T., 'Einion ap Ynyr (Anian II), Bishop of St. Asaph', Flintshire Historical Society Journal, xvii (1957), 16-33.

Kaeuper, R. W., 'Royal Finance and the Crisis of 1297', Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer, ed. W. C. Jordan, B. McNab and T. F. Ruiz (Princeton, 1976), pp. 103-110.

Keen, M. H., The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1975).

Keeney, B. C., 'Military Service and the Development of Nationalism in England, 1272-1307', Speculum, xxii (1947), 534-49.

Ker, N. R., 'Liber Custumarum and other Manuscripts formerly at the Guildhall', The Guildhall Miscellany, i (1952-9), no. 3, 37-45.

Keynes, S., The Diplomas of King Aethelred 'The Unready' (Cambridge, 1980).

Knowles, C. H., 'The Disinherited, 1265-80: A Political and Social Study of the Supporters of Simon de Montfort and the Resettlement after the Barons' War' (Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1959).

Knowles, D., The Religious Orders in England, i (Cambridge, 1948).

Labarge, M. W., Simon de Montfort (New York, 1963).

Lapsley, G. T., 'John de Warenne and the Quo Warranto Proceedings in 1279', Crown, Community and Parliament in the Later Middle Ages, ed. H. M. Cam and G. Barraclough (Studies in Medieval History, vi, 1951), pp. 35-62.

Lawlor, H. J., 'A Calendar of the Liber Niger and Liber Albus of Christ Church, Dublin', Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, 3rd series, xxvii (c) (1908-9), 1-93.

Lawrence, C. H., 'The University of Oxford and the Chronicle of the Barons' War', E.H.R., xcv (1980), 99-113.

Lefferts, P. M., 'Two English Motets on Simon de Montfort', Early Music History, i (1981), 203-25.

Lehmann, P., Die Parodie im Mittelalter (Stuttgart, 1963).

Legge, M. D., 'Anglo-Norman and the Historian', History, xxvi (1941-2), 163-175.

Lewis, N. B., 'The English Forces in Flanders, August-November 1297', Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 310-18.

Ley, J., 'Waldron: Its Church, its Mansions, and its Manors', Sussex Archaeological Collections, xiii (1861), 80-103.

Linder, A., 'John of Salisbury's Policraticus in Thirteenth Century England: The Evidence of MS Cambridge Corpus Christi College 469', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, xl (1977), 276-82.

Little, A. G., 'The Authorship of the Lanercost Chronicle', E.H.R., xxxi (1916), 269-279.

'Thomas Docking', in Little, Franciscan Papers, Lists and Documents (Manchester, 1943), pp. 98-121.

Logan, F. D., Excommunication and the Secular Arm in Medieval England (Toronto, 1968).

Loomis, R. S., 'Edward I, Arthurian Enthusiast', Speculum, xxviii (1953), 114-27.

'The Legend of Arthur's Survival', Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1959), ed. R. S. Loomis, pp. 64-71.

'The Latin Romances', ibid., pp. 472-479.

McFarlane, K. B., 'Had Edward I a Policy towards the Earls?', History, 1 (1965), 145-59.

Maddicott, J. R., Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-22 (Oxford, 1970).

The English Peasantry and the Demands of the Crown (Past and Present, Supplement no. 1, 1975).

'The Mise of Lewes, 1264', E.H.R., xcviii (1983), 588-603.

'Magna Carta and the Local Community, 1215-59', Past and Present, cii (1984), 25-65.

Maitland, F. W., 'A Song on the Death of Simon de Montfort', E.H.R., xi (1896), 314-8.

Marquess of Bute, 'Notice of a Manuscript of the latter Part of the Fourteenth Century, entitled Passio Scotorum Perjuratum', Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, xix (1884-5), 166-92.

Mate, M., 'The Impact of War on the Economy of Canterbury Cathedral Priory, 1294-1340', Speculum, lvii (1982), 761-778.

Matthew, D., The Norman Monasteries and their English Possessions (Oxford, 1962).

Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, ed. N. R. Ker (Royal Historical Society,Guides and Handbooks, iii, 1964).

Meekings, C. A. F., 'More about Robert Carpenter of Hareslade', E.H.R., lxxii (1957), 260-69.

Miller, E., 'War, Taxation and the English Economy in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', War and Economic Development, ed. J. M. Winter (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 11-31.

Miller, E.,and J. Hatcher, Medieval England: Rural Society and Economic Change, 1086-1348 (London, 1978).

Morris, G. E., 'Soldiers' Songs of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries' (Sheffield M. A. thesis, 1947).

Morris, J. E., The Welsh Wars of Edward I (Oxford, 1901).

Morris, W. A., The Early English Court (Berkeley, 1926).

Murray, K. M. E., Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports (Manchester, 1935).

Nicholson, R., 'The Franco-Scottish and Franco-Norwegian Treaties of 1295', Scottish Historical Review, xxxviii (1959), 114-132.

Scotland: The Later Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1974).

Owst, G. R., Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (2nd edn, Cambridge, 1961).

Palmer, C. F. R., 'The King's Confessors', Antiquary, xxii (1890), 114-120.

Piper, A. J., 'Writs of Summons of 1246, 1247 and 1255', B.I.H.R., xlix (1976), 284-6.

Powicke, F. M., 'Some Observations on the Baronial Council (1258-1260) and the Provisions of Westminster', Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout, ed. A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke (Manchester, 1925), pp. 119-134.

'Loretta, Countess of Leicester', Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait, ed. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith and E. F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), pp. 247-72.

'England and Europe in the Thirteenth Century', in Independence, Convergence and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought and Art (Harvard Tercentenary Pbns, 1937), pp. 135-150.

'Master Simon the Norman', E.H.R., lviii (1943), 330-43.

King Henry III and the Lord Edward, 2 vols (Oxford, 1947).

The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307 (2nd edn, Oxford, 1962).

Powicke, M., Military Obligations in Medieval England (Oxford, 1962).

Prestwich, M. C., 'Edward I's Wars and their Financing, 1294-1307' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1968).

War, Politics and Finance under Edward I (London, 1972).

'The English Campaign in Scotland in 1296, and the Surrender of John Balliol: Some Supporting Evidence', B.I.H.R., xlix (1976), 135-8.

The Three Edwards (London, 1980).

Prothero, G. W., The Life of Simon de Montfort (London, 1877).

Prynne, W., Exact Chronological Vindication of our King's Supreme Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (London, 1668).

Ramsay, J. H., The Dawn of the Constitution (Oxford, 1908).

'The Strength of English Armies in the Middle Ages', E.H.R., xxix (1914), 221-7.

Revard, C., 'Richard Hurd and MS Harley 2253', Notes and Queries, ccxxiv (1979), 199-202.

Reynolds, S., An Introduction to the History of English Medieval Towns (Oxford, 1977).

Richardson, H. G., 'The Origins of Parliament', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, xi (1928), 146-78.

Richardson, H. G., and G. O. Sayles, 'The Provisions of Oxford: A Forgotten Document and Some Comments', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, xvii (1933), 291-321.

'The Parliament of Carlisle, 1307: Some New Documents', E.H.R., liii (1938), 425-37.

Richter, M., Giraldus Cambrensis: The Growth of the Welsh Nation (2nd edn, Aberystwyth, 1976).

Rigg, A. G., 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (1)', Medieval Studies, xxxix (1977), 281-330.

Roberts, G., 'Wales and England: Antipathy and Sympathy, 1282-1485', Welsh Historical Review, 1 (1960-3), 375-96.

Roskell, J. S., 'A Consideration of Certain Aspects and Problems of the English Modus Tenendi Parliamentum', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 1 (1967-8), 411-42.

Rothwell, H., 'The Confirmation of the Charters, 1297', E.H.R., lx (1945), 16-35, 177-91, 300-15.

'Edward I and the Struggle for the Charters, 1297-1305', Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 319-32.

Russell, F. H., The Just War in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1975).

Russell, J. C., 'The Canonization of Opposition to the King in Angevin England', Anniversary Essays in Medieval History, by Students of Charles H. Haskins, ed. C. H. Taylor and J. L. LaMonte (Boston, 1929), pp. 279-90.

A Dictionary of Thirteenth Century Writers (B.I.H.R., Special Supplement, 3, 1936).

Sanders, I. J., 'Some Political Activities of the Franciscan Friars in England in the Thirteenth Century' (Wales M.A. thesis, 1935).

Feudal Military Service in England (Oxford, 1956).

Saunders, H. W., Introduction to the Obedientiary and Manor Rolls of Norwich Cathedral Priory (Norwich, 1930).

Saunders, P. C., 'Royal Ecclesiastical Patronage in England, 1199-1351' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1978).

Sawyer, P. H., Roman Britain to Norman England (London, 1978).

Sayles, G. O., 'Parliamentary Representation in 1294, 1295 and 1307', B.I.H.R., iii (1925-6), 110-115.

Shields, H., 'The Lament for Simon de Montfort', Medium Aevum, xli (1972), 202-7.

Simpson, G. G., 'Why was John Balliol called "Toom Tabard"?', Scottish Historical Review, xlvii (1968), 196-9.

Skeat, W. W., '"Elegy on the Death of King Edward I" from a New MS', Modern Language Review, vii (1912), 149-52.

Smalley, B., The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Notre Dame,Indiana, 1964).

Snyder, E. D., 'The Wild Irish: A Study of Some English Satires against the Irish, Scots and Welsh', Modern Philology, xvii (1919-20), 687-725.

Southern, R. W., 'England's First Entry into Europe', Medieval Humanism and Other Studies (Oxford, 1970), pp. 135-57.

Stephenson, D., 'The Governance of Gwynedd under the Thirteenth Century Princes' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1977).

Stones, E. L. G., 'English Chroniclers and the Affairs of Scotland', The Writing of History in the Middle Ages, ed. R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981), pp. 323-348.

Stones, E. L. G.,and M. N. Blount, 'The Surrender of King John of Scotland to Edward I in 1296: Some New Evidence', B.I.H.R., xlviii (1975), 94-106.

Stones, E. L. G.,and G. G. Simpson, Edward I and the Throne of Scotland, 2 vols (Oxford, 1978).

Strayer, J. R., 'The Costs and Profits of War: The Anglo-French Conflict of 1294-1303', The Medieval City, ed. H. A. Miskimin, D. Herlihy and A. L. Udovitch (New Haven, 1977), pp. 269-91.

The Reign of Philip the Fair (Princeton, 1980).

Stubbs, W., Constitutional History of England, ii (3rd edn, Oxford, 1883).

Suggett, H., 'The Use of French in England in the Later Middle Ages', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, xxviii (1946), 61-83.

Taylor, A. J., 'The Death of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, xv (1952-4), 207-9.

'The King's Works in Wales, 1277-1330', History of the King's Works, i, ed. R.A.Brown, H. M. Colvin and A. J. Taylor (London, 1963), 293-408.

Tillotson, J. H., 'Pensions, Corrodies and Religious Houses: An Aspect of the Relations of Crown and Church in Early Fourteenth Century England', Journal of Religious History, viii (1974-5), 127-43.

Tout, T. F., 'Communitas Bacheleria Angliae', E.H.R., xvii (1902), 89-95.

France and England: Their Relations in the Middle Ages and Now (Manchester, 1922).

'Wales and the March in the Barons' Wars', Collected Papers, ii (Manchester, 1934), 47-100.

Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, iv (Manchester, 1937).

Treharne, R. F., 'An Unauthorized Use of the Great Seal under the Provisional Government in 1259', E.H.R., xl (1925), 403-11.

The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-63 (Manchester, 1932).

'The Significance of the Baronial Reform Movement, 1258-67', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, xxv (1943), 35-72.

'The Knights in the Period of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67: A Critical Phase in the Rise of a New Class', B.I.H.R., xxi (1946-8), 1-12.

'The Battle of Northampton, 5th April 1264', Northamptonshire Past and Present, ii (1954-9), 73-90.

'The Constitutional Problem in Thirteenth Century England', Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson, ed. T. A. Sandquist and M. R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969), pp. 46-78.

Tristram, E. W., English Medieval Wall Painting, ii, pt i (Oxford, 1950).

Ullmann, W., 'On the Influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth in English History', Speculum Historiale: Geschichte im Spiegel von Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsdeutung, ed. C. Bauer, L. Boehm and M. Müller (Munich, 1965), pp. 257-76.

Vaughan, R., Matthew Paris (Cambridge, 1958).

Victoria County History of Rutland, ii (London, 1935).

Victoria County History of Suffolk, ii (London, 1907).

Victoria County History of Sussex, vi, pt i (Oxford, 1980).

Victoria County History of Yorkshire, iii (London, 1913).

Wagner, A. R., 'The Swan Badge and the Swan Knight', Archaeologia, xcvii (1959), 127-38.

Wake, W., The State of the Church and Clergy of England (London, 1703).

Walker, D., 'The Medieval Bishops of Llandaff', Morgannwg, vi (1962), 5-32.

'The Welsh Church in the Middle Ages', History of the Church in Wales, ed. D. Walker (Glamorgan, 1976), pp. 24-53.

Walker, R. F., 'The Anglo-Welsh Wars, 1217-67' (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1953).

Williams, D. H., The Welsh Cistercians: Aspects of their Economic History (Pontypool, 1969).

Williams, D. T., 'Aspects of the Career of Boniface of Savoy, 1241-70' (Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1970).

Williams, G., The Welsh Church from Conquest to Reformation (revised edn, Cardiff, 1976).

Williams, G. A., 'London and Edward I' Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, xi (1961), 81-98.

Medieval London (London, 1963).

Wilson, R. M., 'English and French in England, 1100-1300', History, xxviii (1943), 37-60.

The Lost Literature of Medieval England (2nd edn, London, 1970).

Withington, R., 'The Early Royal Entry', Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, xxxii (1917), 616-623.

Wood, S., English Monasteries and their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century (Oxford, 1955).

Yunck, J. A., The Lineage of Lady Meed: The Development of Medieval Venality-Satire (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1963).

Zumthor, P., Merlin le Prophète (Lausanne, 1943).