

D79829/92

Please use block capitals.

Surname	WAIT
First names (in full)	HILARY ANNE
Faculty board	MODERN HISTORY
Title of thesis	THE HOUSEHOLD AND RESOURCES OF THE LORD EDWARD, 1239-1272

N.B. The title stated here must be precisely the same as that stated on the title page of the thesis submitted.

A candidate wishing to amend the title previously approved by the faculty board must apply to the faculty board for permission to do so.

**Declaration by the candidate as author of the thesis.**

1. I understand that I am the owner of the copyright of this thesis and that the copyright rests with me unless I specifically transfer it to another person.
2. I understand that the University requires that if I am granted leave to supplicate I shall deposit one copy of my thesis in the Bodleian Library where it shall be available for consultation and that photocopies of it may be made available to those who wish to consult it elsewhere. I understand that the Library, before allowing the thesis to be consulted either in the original or in a photocopy, will require each person wishing to consult it to sign a declaration that he recognises that the copyright of the thesis belongs to me and that no quotation from it and no information derived from it may be published without my prior written consent.
3. I agree that my thesis shall be available for consultation in accordance with paragraph 2 above.

Signed Hilary Wait

Date 27/5/88

M. S. Phil. c. 7501

**Notes**

(a) If, for good reason, you do not wish your thesis or part of it to be made available for consultation or to be photocopied, you may apply to the relevant faculty board for dispensation for a limited period from this requirement. Any such application should state, with full reasons, both the nature and the period of the dispensation requested, and should be sent with this form to the Graduate Studies Office. If you are applying for dispensation, please tick this box:

- (i) Dispensation will always be granted in cases where confidentiality has been made a condition of access to material which is subsequently incorporated in a thesis.
  - (ii) Where confidential material forms only a small part of a thesis and the force of the thesis will not be seriously impaired by the removal of such material, the faculty board may grant permission for the confidential material to be deposited separately from the thesis, on the understanding that the thesis will be available for consultation or photocopying but access to the confidential material will be restricted.
- (b) You may discover the names of persons who have consulted your thesis by writing to the Keeper of Western Manuscripts at the Bodleian Library requesting this information.
- (c) You are requested to sign the declaration above even if you are applying for dispensation from the consultation requirement. If dispensation is granted, your thesis will *not* be made available for consultation or photocopying before the expiry of the dispensation period.

Do not forget to sign under Section 5 opposite.

502178724

ABSTRACT

**THE HOUSEHOLD AND RESOURCES OF THE LORD EDWARD, 1239-72**

Hilary Wait, St. Hilda's College, Oxford

Submitted for the degree of D.Phil. Trinity Term, 1988

The first part of the thesis examines the resources available to the Lord Edward during the life-time of Henry III, their scope and limitations, and the opportunities they afforded him. It addresses itself particularly to the availability and value of the disparate resources as a means of maintaining his affinity, and to the question of tension between Edward and his father over management and exploitation. The various elements of the resources are examined, with the changes which tilted the balance away from the less flexible returns of the landed estates to those giving greater liquidity. Edward's preference for the latter and his wide-ranging use of credit form a precedent for the financial expedients which characterise his reign. Also examined are the acquisitions which exemplified his military and political successes; the fruits of victory over the Montfortians, and the strategic commissions which culminated in the mass transfer of 1270, epitomising the dominant position Edward had achieved in the kingdom since 1265.

The second part considers the structure of Edward's household departments, and their operation and interaction with his estate administration and wider activities. The backgrounds and associations of the members of the household are analysed, with a discussion of their contributions to Edward's operations. While this evidence throws light on aspects such as the alien element within the household, and the political alignments of Edward and his affinity, a full analysis of the ideological ferment and political vicissitudes has not been attempted. Instead the study of Edward's material and human resources is intended to provide a firmer basis for the general interpretation of the period.

LONG ABSTRACTTHE HOUSEHOLD AND RESOURCES OF THE LORD EDWARD, 1239-1272

Hilary Wait, St. Hilda's College, Oxford

Submitted for the Degree of D.Phil. Trinity Term, 1988

This thesis sets out to examine the resources available to the Lord Edward during the life-time of his father, Henry III. It is concerned with their scope and limitations, and the opportunities and facilities they afforded Edward. It addresses itself particularly to the availability and value of the disparate resources as a means of attracting and maintaining his affinity, and to the question of tension between Edward and his father on the issues of his management and exploitation of his estates, and in the composition and activities of his household. While appreciating the constraints of Edward's rôle as heir to the throne, particular stress is placed on the value of Edward's fifteen-year preparation for rule, in terms of the experience in government and the opportunity, which it afforded him, to build up his own team of loyal and experienced friends and servants.

The thesis is divided into two sections; Resources and Household, although it will be apparent that the separation is for convenience only, and does not lose sight of the interdependence of the three elements of resources, management and manpower. Studies of the arrangements made for Edward during his childhood, and the background to the 1254 settlement, and of the personnel and associations of his formative years (Chapters One and Seven) are used as introductions to the period from 1254-72 which is principally under examination here.

Chapter Two is a descriptive analysis of the lands formally granted to Edward in 1254, encompassing their strengths and weaknesses, geographical, financial and political, together with an assessment of their influence on and contribution to the political fluxes and tensions of the day, particularly in Edward's relations with his father, and with individual magnates. The past history of the estates is briefly traced, with a view to demonstrating the legacy of thwarted ambitions and

resentments, which Edward acquired with his new territories. Particular attention is given here to the Welsh rising of 1256, in view of its implications for Edward's finances and his relations with Marcher lords, and because of the parallel between the aggressive and innovative government of Edward's Gascon administration and that attributed to his ministers in Wales. The utilisation and involvement of Edward's territories in the English civil war is also considered in some detail.

With the supplementary grants (Chapter Three), the main focus has been on the fulfilment of the king's promise to supplement Edward's income by 30%, principally achieved through grants of wardships, and the enhanced flexibility of his resources. Attention is then drawn to the erosion of the settled estates described in the previous chapter, and their replacement and reinforcement by non-territorial grants, such as the lease of the Jewry and the customs levy, offering still greater liquidity and potential for credit arrangements with the mercantile communities. Edward's preference for this type of grant over landed revenue is seen also in the allocation to him of large cash sums by the king to discharge his military expenses, past and future.

Chapter Four examines Edward's opportunities for adding to his estates by conquest or purchase. His activities and those of his agents in the confiscations and occupations which followed the royalist victory at Evesham are examined in some detail, with an analysis of the properties which came into his hands by seizure or royal grant. Attention has also been focused on the fate of the London citizens granted to Edward and to his share of the city's corporate fine. Edward's conduct, except with regard to two personal enemies, is found to have been both moderate and magnanimous. His attention was directed to the recovery of strongholds and the restoration of peace, rather than to personal profit. With the exception of the London fine, which was principally utilised for the discharge of his campaigning expenses, scarcely any of the properties or redemption fines acquired by him during the pacification remained in his possession, but were instead

distributed among his affinity. This moderation, or perhaps lack of interest in territorial expansion, may be compared with his reluctance to enter the land market on his own behalf. Here too, his preference for ready cash over real estate is demonstrated.

Chapter Five focuses on a little-known aspect of Edward's resources, his acquisition of custodies of counties and castles, not for financial gain but for their strategic value. The king's readiness to surrender these strongholds is indicative of Edward's growing political stature and influence on government. This policy gathered pace after Evesham, culminating in the transfer to his control in May 1270 of virtually all the counties and royal castles, intended to ensure his control of the country while he was absent on crusade. Edward was enabled to leave local government and all the kingdom's strong points in the hands of his personal nominees, securing his position in the event of his father's death or renewed unrest in England.

Chapter Six draws these various elements together, assessing their financial value and Edward's methods of exploitation. The peaks and troughs in his income are examined, with a discussion of the expedients he employed to bridge the gap between income and expenditure, making use of the compilation of Edward's loans set out in Table One. The vexed question of Edward's freedom to exploit and manage his estates and maintain his household and affinity is considered, focusing on the occasions when his freedom of action was apparently challenged. The major threat to his independence is not found in the terms of the settlement of February 1254, and lies less in the conventional relations between his administration and his two suzerains of England and France, than in the contemporary developments of political theory. The elaboration of the concept of conciliar government was initially directed against him by the reformist groups of 1258-9, then exploited by the conservative reaction which his father orchestrated, and used once more by the Montfortian regime to strip him of power and possessions. The inconsistencies, and the virtual disappearance of

interference, both in appointments and grants, after August 1265 demonstrates the artificiality of the earlier constraints. A more serious restriction on Edward's ability to reward his followers may have been a shortage of suitable land, especially outside Ireland and Gascony, with the additional problem that grants could only be achieved at a cost of further erosion of Edward's already depleted income.

In Part II, Chapter Eight attempts a descriptive analysis of the structure of Edward's household, examining the ways in which the various departments were modelled on the royal household, but with a greater degree of flexibility and informality, for example, in the work of the chancery and wardrobe. The domestic offices are shown to have been of significance, not only as support for the wider household, but to have made a positive and valuable contribution to the operation of Edward's administration and activities. The military household receives particular attention, being set in the context of Edward's military and quasi-military activities. Its flexibility, capacity for expansion and adaption for the particular demands of campaign or the tournament, or administrative work, is reviewed. The status and significance of the continental knights who entered the household in the 1260's is examined in some detail.

The examination of the domestic household reveals a tendency to employ professional buyers for the specialised tasks of wine and cloth supply. In the administration and government of Edward's territories the need for specialist advice was also felt, being partly met by the utilisation of professional lawyers. More frequently though, the existing members of the household and estate administration possessed the expertise and experience required to advise Edward, and administer his domains. A reconstruction of the elements in the composition of Edward's council and entourage demonstrates the capacity of the household and affinity to cooperate and meet their lord's needs.

Chapter Nine is concerned with patterns of recruitment and association within the household, drawing on the tabular analysis of all

known members of the household, which is presented in Appendix Two. It considers particularly the groupings, English, alien, territorial and personal, within the household, and attempts to relate these to a political interpretation. Changes in composition and political alignments during the civil war period are analysed, testing and largely confirming the thesis of the virtual exclusion of Montfortian supporters from Edward's service in the post-Evesham period. Appendix Two is also utilised, in combination with Tables 2-6, for a discussion of the rewards and future opportunities made available to the pre-accessional household and affinity.

Appendix One is a study of the financial and managerial crisis in Edward's estate administration in 1261-2, and its catalytic effect on the composition of his household and the stability of the country.

Overall, the thesis concentrates on the minutiae of property, structure and personnel, rather than seeking to impose general conclusions on selected evidence. It establishes that Edward's resources, far from being static, were flexible and changing, and adapted over the period, by necessity or design, to a sophisticated credit-based economy. His household too displayed a versatility which coped with the changing shape of his resources and commitments, and with the demands made by his rôle in political life and government. His resources were stretched by the demands of his affinity, but virtually all his long-serving knights and clerks received grants of land, while more transient retainers were maintained by money-fees and wages.

Many aspects of Edward's reign may be understood in terms of the attitudes he developed and the experiences he passed through during these formative years. The value of his fifteen-year apprenticeship to government lay not only in his hard schooling in war, politics and administration, but in the groups of administrators and military leaders he attached to himself, who, having proved their abilities and loyalties in such testing times, were available and qualified to support and implement his policies and projects after his accession.



THE HOUSEHOLD AND RESOURCES OF THE LORD EDWARD, 1239-1272

HILARY WAIT

St. Hilda's College, Oxford

Thesis submitted for the degree of D.Phil. in  
the University of Oxford, Trinity Term, 1988

[re 1989] HT

### Acknowledgements

This thesis has been a labour of years during which I have incurred many debts of gratitude for kindnesses received. I have benefited greatly from the knowledge and skills of historians and fellow research students, at lectures, seminars and general discussions. Individual instances of advice are acknowledged more fully in the foot-notes. My debt to my supervisor, Mr. JO Prestwich, extends far beyond the many instances of assistance on specific points. His wide-ranging knowledge of the sources, historical accuracy and sense of period have profoundly influenced the shape and direction of the work, although the errors which remain are mine alone. I am deeply grateful also to his patience and encouragement over the protracted duration of my research.

I would also like to thank the staff of the History Faculty Library, and of the Library and Sub-Faculty of Philosophy for their kindness and support. Particular thanks are due also to Dr. AM Chippindale for her long-standing friendship and skills as a proof-reader, although she is not responsible for the occasional misprints which eluded her. My greatest debt is to my husband, Dr. SJ Hibble, for his support and encouragement, in acknowledgement of a successful collaboration between history and science.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Abbreviated References	v
Preface: The Sources and their Limitations	1
PART ONE: THE RESOURCES	
Chapter One: Introduction to Edward's estates and revenues	6
i) Childhood Maintenance, 1239-1254	6
ii) The Settlement of February, 1254	10
Chapter Two: The History of the Settled Lands, 1254-1272	25
i) Gascony	25
ii) Ireland	29
iii) Chester and the Welsh Estates	37
iv) The English Estates	56
Chapter Three: The Supplementary Estates	67
i) Wardships and other Custodies	67
ii) Leases	84
a) The New Forest	84
b) Ellesmere	84
iii) Escheats and Permanent Additions to the Endowment	86
iv) Fiscal Revenues	89
a) The Jewry	89
b) The "New Aid"	95
Chapter Four: Private Enterprise	100
i) War Acquisitions	100
a) Seizures of Rebel Lands	100
b) Formal Grants of Rebel Lands, and Redemption Fines according to the Dictum of Kenilworth	107
c) Edward's London Prisoners	112
d) Corporate Fines and other Cash Gains	118
ii) Private Leases and Purchases of Land	125
Chapter Five: Commissions during Pleasure	128
i) Commissions of Castles before May 1270	128
ii) Commissions of Counties before May 1270	134
iii) The Award of May 1270	136
Chapter Six: The Exploitation and Significance of Edward's Revenues	154
i) Finance and Estate Management	155
ii) Alienation and Attitudes to the Endowment	168
iii) Policy and Politics	196

## PART TWO: THE HOUSEHOLD

Chapter Seven: The Household, 1239-1254, a Preliminary Study	203
Chapter Eight: Household Offices and Departments	213
i) Size and structure of the Household	213
ii) The Chancery	216
iii) The Wardrobe	225
iv) The Domestic Household	236
a) The Butlery and Wine Supplies for the Household	242
v) The Military Household	251
vi) "Foreign Service": The Household at Large	275
Chapter Nine: Some Aspects of Household Composition, Associations and Achievements	287
i) Political Influences on the Composition of the Household	287
ii) Patterns of Recruitment and Associations within the Household	298
iii) Opportunities and Rewards	311
Conclusion	317
Appendix One: The Extraordinary Audit of 1262	330
Appendix Two: Analysis of Household and Administrative Personnel	332
Table One: Loans and advances obtained by Edward	374
Table Two: Grants made by Edward	382
Table Three: Benefices awarded by Edward	392
Table Four: Those in Receipt of a Fee or Wages from Edward	393
Table Five: Senior officials of Edward's Household	399
Table Six: Constables, Bailiffs and Officials of Edward's Administration	400
Bibliography	417

ABBREVIATED REFERENCES

- Abbr.Plac. Abbrevatio Placitorum in domo capitulari Westmonasterii asservatorum
- AbbrRO Rotulorum Originalium in curia scaccarii abbrevatio,  
Volume I, Henry III-Edward I
- AC Annales Cambriae
- A.Ces Annales Cestrienses
- AHG Archives Historiques de la Gironde
- A.Hib Analecta Hibernica
- A.Lond Annales Londonienses, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II
- AM Annales monastici, Volumes I-IV
- Anselme P de Guibours, Histoire généalogique et chronologique de de la maison royale de France ... par le père Anselme
- AOL Archives de l'orient latin
- BIHR Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research
- BL British Library
- Brown et al. The History of the King's Works, ed. RA Brown, HM Colvin, AJ Taylor
- Byerly Records of the Wardrobe and Household, ed. Byerly & Byerly, Volume I (1285-6), II (1286-9)
- Cal.AC.Wales Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales
- C.Bury The Chronicle of Bury St.Edmunds, 1212-1301
- CChR Calendar of Charter Rolls
- CCR Calendar of Close Rolls (1272-)
- CDI Calendar of Documents relating to Ireland, Volume II (1252-84)
- CDS Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland, Volumes, I-V
- CFR Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1272-1307
- CIM Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous,  
Volume I, Henry III and Edward I
- CIPM Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem
- CJRI Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls of Ireland
- CLR Calendar of Liberate Rolls
- CPEJ Calendar of the Plea rolls of the Exchequer of Jews,  
Volumes I-III
- CPR Calendar of Patent Rolls

CR	<u>Close Rolls of the reign of Henry III</u>
C.Ramsey	<u>Chronicon Abbatiae Ramseiensis</u>
C.Reg.Alen	<u>Calendar of Archbishop Alen's Register</u>
C.St.Mark	<u>Cartulary St.Mark's Hospital, Bristol</u>
Curtis	'Sheriffs' Accounts of the Honour of Dungarven and Twescard'
Cuttino GR A	<u>Gascon Register A</u> , ed GP Cuttino & JP Trabut-Cussac
dALL	<u>Liber de Antiquis Legibus; Chronica maiorum et vicecomitum Londoniarum</u>
DD	<u>Diplomatic Documents</u> , ed. P Chaplais
EHR	<u>English Historical Review</u>
ExeRF	<u>Excerpta e Rotulis Finium in Turr. Londonensis asservatis</u> , Volumes I-II, 1216-72
Facs II	<u>Facsimiles of the National Mss of Ireland</u> , ed. Gilbert, II
Flores	<u>Flores Historiarum</u> , Volumes I-III
Foedera	<u>Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et Acta Publica</u> , ed. Rymer, Record Commission, I-IV, ed. 1816-69
GC	<u>The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury</u> , Volumes I-II
GEC	GE Cockayne, <u>Complete Peerage</u>
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
Hunter RS	<u>Rotuli selecti ... cura Joseph Hunter</u>
IHS	<u>Irish Historical Studies</u>
JRSAI	<u>Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland</u>
LW	<u>Littere Wallie preserved in the Liber A</u> ed. JG Edwards
Lydon	'Three Exchequer Documents from the reign of Henry III'
Martène & Durand,	<u>Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicum dogmaticorum moralium. Amplissimus Collectio</u> ed. Martène and Durand
<u>Collectio,</u> <u>Thes</u>	<u>Thesaurus novus anecdotorum</u> , ed Martène and Durand
Paris, CM	Matthew Paris <u>Chronica Majora</u> , Volumes I-VII
PlacQW	<u>Placita de Quo Warranto</u> ed. W Illingworth
PRIA	<u>Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy</u>
PRO	Public Record Office
R&S admin	HG Richardson and GO Sayles, <u>The Administration of Ireland</u>
RecFeod.	<u>Recogniciones Feodorum</u>
RegTC	<u>Registrum Thome de Cantilupo</u>
RG	<u>Rôles Gascons</u> , Volumes I, I ii, II, III
R.Giffard	<u>The Register of Walter Giffard, Lord Archbishop of York</u>
R.Glos	<u>The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester</u>

- RH Rotuli Hundredorum, Volumes I-II
- RHB Revue Historique de Bordeaux
- RHGF Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France
- Rishanger CA Willelmi Rishanger, Chronica et Annales, ed. HT Riley, (Rolls Series, 1865)
- Rishanger CDB The chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Baron's wars, ed. JO Halliwell, Camden Society, 1840
- Rot.R.Gravesend Rotuli Ricardi Gravesend, diocesis Lincolniensis, 1258-79
- R.Peckham Registrum Epistolarum Johannis Peckham
- SCR Close Rolls (supplementary) of the reign of Henry III
- SS Selden Society
- Shirley Royal and other historical letters illustrative of the reign of Henry III, Volume II, 1236-72
- SJ Extente, 1274 Extente des îles de Jersey, Guernsey, Aurigny et Sark 1274 (Societe Jersiasie 1877)
- Stewart-Brown, Chester in the Pipe Rolls, ed. R Stewart-Brown (Lancashire Pipe Rolls and Cheshire Record Society, 92)
- Stewart-Brown, Calendar of county court, city court and eyre rolls of Plea Rolls Chester, ed. R Stewart-Brown (Chetham Society, 84)
- Studd A Catalogue of the Acts of the Lord Edward, 1254-72, JR Studd, Leeds University Ph.D. thesis, 1971
- T-C admin L'Administration Anglaise en Gascogne, ed. J-P Trabut-Cussac
- T&S Documents of the baronial movement of reform and rebellion, selected RF Treharne, ed. IJ Sanders
- THSLC Transactions Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire
- TJHSE Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England
- TRHS Transactions of the Royal Historical Society
- YAJ Yorkshire Archaeological Journal
- 2 RepRCI Report of the Commissioners respecting the Public Records of Ireland, 2nd. Annual Report
- 35 RepDKI Thirty-Fifth, Thirty-Sixth, Report of the Deputy Keeper
- 36 RepDKI of the Public Records for Ireland

Full references may be found in the Bibliography. Further abbreviations have been necessitated in the Tables, generally logical contractions. 'Studd:number', or an isolated number in the Tables, are references to Studd's Catalogue of Acts of the Lord Edward. PRO references appear without any preamble e.g. 'E372/125 m.3'.

PREFACE: THE SOURCES AND THEIR LIMITATIONS

This study is principally based on the surviving records of Edward's own administration, correlated and supplemented by the administrative, financial and judicial records of the central government.

A detailed survey of the records of Edward's chancery and estate administration may be found in the introduction to Dr. JR Studd's edition of the acta of the Lord Edward, obviating the need for a detailed account here. It will be apparent that this thesis is heavily indebted to Dr. Studd's work, especially to his comprehensive edition of the acta <sup>1</sup>. This has been supplemented by other letters patent and charters issued by Edward, or in his name, which have since come to light, principally in Chancery Miscellanea <sup>2</sup>, Assize and Plea Rolls <sup>3</sup> and in cartularies <sup>4</sup>, or transcribed from foreign repositories <sup>5</sup>. Hitherto unknown or neglected sources, such as the final accounts of two keepers of Edward's wardrobe, John le Breton and Antony Bek, and the account of the corporate fine of the citizens of London, have thrown additional light on Edward's household and finances <sup>6</sup>.

A full list of sources and secondary works consulted will be found

1) regrettably unpublished. JR Studd, A Catalogue of the Acts of the Lord Edward, Leeds Ph.D. 1971.

2) e.g. C47/9/1 m.4, 9/52 m.8d, 10/13/16b, 35/14/54.

3) e.g. Just1/59 m.5: KB26/182 m.21d, 198 m.17, KB27/130 m.4; printed Select Pleas before the court of Kings Bench, SS, 57 pp.63-4.

4) e.g. The Beauchamp Cartulary Charters; BL Add.Ms 28024 ff.41,43, Cartulary of Blyth Priory; BL Add.Ms. 3759 f.96v; Cartulary of St.Mark's Hospital, Bristol; copy consulted, Bodleian Ms.Top.Glouc. c.9, ff.161-2.

5) e.g. AHG III 39-40: H Stein, Annales de la société historique et archéologique du Gatinais, IX 1891, p.210: Layettes du trésor des chartes, ed. Teulet, V 804.

6) Registrum Thome de Cantilupo, Hereford Diocesan Record Office; Canterbury and York Society, 2, 1907; C62/52 m.4; E372/120 m.22: E36/274: Letter-book C of the corporation of London; Calendar of Letter-books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of London, C, ed. RR Sharpe.

in the Bibliography. Some comments on policy are appropriate here. With regard to the records of the king and the central administration, all the published and calendared records of the period, such as the Patent, Close, Charter and Liberate Rolls, and the Inquisitions Post Mortem and Miscellaneous, have been examined, with reference to the originals wherever necessary. Of the uncalendared series of rolls, the two sequences of Memoranda Rolls and the Originalia Rolls have been examined for the period 1254-74 <sup>1</sup>. The former have supplied valuable details of Edward's financial administration and relations with the crown, besides much information on individual members of the household and affinity. The latter were of particular value in elucidating the transfer of castles and counties to Edward and his affinity, culminating in the mass transfer of 1270, which has been misunderstood by successive historians.

The Pipe Rolls <sup>2</sup> have been examined for 1250-77, 80-81, for accounts relating to individual estates and counties, wardrobe and other foreign accounts, and much information on individuals. The Liberate Rolls for the first thirteen years of Edward I's reign proved a valuable source for retrospective entries concerning Edward's finances and administration, and for evidence of his continued favours to members of his pre-accessional household. It was not feasible to carry this search further forward than 1285, but this omission is compensated by the availability for comparison of editions of wardrobe books for 1285-6, 1286-9, 1294-5, 1299-1300, and for Eleanor of Castile for 1290 <sup>3</sup>. The assorted documents held in Chancery Miscellanea, Exchequer Accounts and the Special Collections have also been searched, some systematically, some speculatively, producing some additional material.

1) supplemented by the Fine Rolls for 1268-72.

2) supplemented by occasional reference to the Chancellor's Roll.

3) Byerly I, II; Book of Prests, Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobe, and Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile.

With the judicial records, a more selective approach was adopted. It was accepted that an examination of all the rolls of the central courts and assize rolls over two decades was not feasible. In the first instance the rolls of the special eyres of 1258-60 and those of the justices de terris datis were examined, supplemented by the Curia Regis rolls, noted by Jacob and by Knowles as particularly valuable for cases arising from the "tempus turbacionis"<sup>1</sup>. It was thus possible to derive some idea of the nature and scale of the activities of Edward and his affinity over 1265-7 and their gains from the Disinherited. Other Plea Rolls were then examined on a speculative basis, so far as time allowed. There was a bias towards the central courts, on the assumption that most contentious and interesting cases tended to surface there. A complete survey was not possible, but most of the KB26 class have been examined for 1265-70, besides many for the period 1258-65. Outside these limits, individual Assize and Plea Rolls were consulted, where other evidence, or citations in compilations or secondary works, suggested relevant material might be found. The remaining Plea Rolls of the exchequer for Henry III and early Edward I were also examined.

One difficulty in this ransacking of the judicial records for material of political or personal interest, is that it was not always possible to trace a case through a series of courts and rolls. My comparative ignorance of legal history and procedures has doubtless led to many blunders and distortions which a more experienced legal scholar would have avoided. However, the value of the legal records, perhaps the most neglected source of evidence for the period, justified the

1) Jacob, Studies in the period of baronial reform and rebellion, pp.156-66; CH Knowles, The Disinherited (University of Wales, Ph.D. 1959), Part IV, Chapter 2.

disregarding of this handicap. A great deal of material on Edward, his administration and members of his household, thus came to light, besides many otherwise-unknown letters issued by him, and produced in court proceedings. Further study in this area would undoubtedly be well worthwhile.

Chronicle accounts and local cartularies, mostly in published editions, have been used to supplement the government records. For Edward's outlying territories, only source material published or readily accessible in the original, has been consulted. Great reliance has been placed on the work of specialist scholars, such as Trabut-Cussac for Gascony, and Richardson and Sayles and Lydon for Ireland. These and valuable studies of individual documents, such as Dr. Ridgeway's analysis of the Durham version of the 1261 Gravamina, and Dr. Carpenter's account of Edward's agreement with Simon de Montfort, are cited in the text and Bibliography.

Among secondary works, a special acknowledgement must be made to three other theses, which, besides that of Dr. Studd cited above, have been of particular value, i.e. those of Dr. CH Knowles on the Disinherited, of Dr. HW Ridgeway, on Court politics and aliens in the reign of Henry III, of Dr. RF Walker on the Anglo-Welsh wars. Reference is made to these works in the text where appropriate, but a general debt should also be acknowledged for their marshalling of source material and general interpretation <sup>1</sup>.

A cautionary note must be sounded. The most valuable source for any study of Edward remains the four chancery rolls, which survive among the Gascon rolls, and which form the backbone of the compilation of Edward's Acta. It may seem unreasonable to cavil at the limitations of these

1) op.cit; Oxford D.Phil.1984, 1954.

vital rolls, but their drawbacks must be noted. The three rolls for 1254-5 represent the early, almost experimental stages of Edward's separate establishment and partial emancipation. The overlap with his father's administration in Gascony until October 1254, his own immaturity, and the special circumstances of his residence in Gascony, mean that these rolls cannot be seen as typical of the period 1254-72.

The single patent roll of 1259-60 is in many ways more interesting, as evidence of the scope of Edward's administration and activity, especially at a time of political reappraisal. However, the great problem with this roll is its uniqueness. Lacking a predecessor or successor, or even its complementary Close Roll, it is easy to be misled into viewing the measures taken by Edward and there enrolled as a new departure e.g. Dr. Ridgeway, "suddenly his (Edward's) administration sprung into an independent life of its own" <sup>1</sup>. It may well be that Edward's new alliance with Leicester was catalytic, but it is unsound to base any argument on a roll which only began in October 1259. In this specific instance, the new policy almost certainly began earlier, since various new appointments such as Clifford's to the Three Castles and Berkeley's to Carmarthen and Cardigan do not appear on the roll. It may be felt that this thesis is sometimes over-cautious in assessing the political implications of fragmentary pieces of information. However, it is often more valuable to accept that there are occasions when the nature of the evidence precludes the establishment of sweeping conclusions.

1) Ridgeway, *op.cit.* p.345.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO EDWARD'S ESTATES AND REVENUES

i) **Childhood Maintenance, 1239-1254**

As a child Edward lived principally at Windsor, in an establishment maintained for him, his siblings and various wards of the crown, which was not subject to the itineration of the court. This household was financed by periodic grants from the exchequer and incidental revenues. Food and other necessities were supplied from the royal estates and stores <sup>1</sup>. The queen was also involved in the maintenance of the children's household, as her wardrobe accounts show <sup>2</sup>. In recognition of her share in their expenses, payments were made to her from the exchequer and she was granted additional revenues "in auxilio ad sustentacionem Edwardi filii regis" <sup>3</sup>. Large sums were also paid to her from the revenues of the lands later set aside for Edward <sup>4</sup>. The maintenance of the children's household was thus haphazard, but this piecemeal maintenance ran parallel to a more self-sufficient system.

The loss of Normandy had at least compensated the king this far, in that the lands held by Normans or others in the fealty of the king of France could be confiscated and used to supplement the revenues or sustain the perpetual claims for patronage. Lands of this type had been moving in and out of the king's hands since 1204, but the inquisitions of 1244 initiated a sweeping series of confiscations <sup>5</sup>. In January 1244, when Edward was not yet five, he was granted "for the maintenance of him and his" half the confiscated lands <sup>6</sup>. The lands were not named

1) CLR 1226-40, 40-45, passim.

2) E101/349/18.

3) CPR 1247-58, p.113; CR 1247-51, p.44.

4) E372/98 m.6.

5) Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, p.105n: Liber Feodorum 1142-3.

6) CPR 1232-47, p.418.

individually in this grant, but writs of seisin and appointments of keepers identify his allocation as the lands formerly held by the Countess of Eu, William de Caieu, John de Stuteville and Robert de Wendeval <sup>1</sup>.

These lands did not remain static until 1254. Those which had belonged to Robert de Wendeval (the manors of Stivehay and Saxthorp in Norfolk), were restored to him in April 1245 <sup>2</sup>. Robert was again deprived of his lands in 1248, but they were then granted to William de Valence, the king's Poitevin half-brother <sup>3</sup>. The lands of John de Stuteville (Cambridge and Essex), reverted to the family in 1245 <sup>4</sup>. Of the lands ex William de Caieu, Coudray (Herts.) and Morden (Cambs.) were granted to William de Cheney in 1247 and only Wicton (Norfolk, worth £50 p.a.) remained to Edward <sup>5</sup>. The most valuable lands assigned to Edward in 1244 were those formerly held by the Countess of Eu, consisting of the Honour of Tickhill (Yorks. and Notts.), the Rape of Hastings and the manor of Burwash (Sussex) and the manor of Elham (Kent) <sup>6</sup>. Receipts for all these lands for Michaelmas 1252 to Easter 1254 were £941/10/8, with arrears for 3 previous years of about £2,000. Calculations from these figures would suggest that initially the grant was worth over £700 p.a. falling to about £650 p.a. after the losses of 1245 and 1247 <sup>7</sup>.

The administration of these estates, and the delivery of funds to Edward's personal guardians, was controlled by the Savoyard faction,

1) CPR 1232-47, pp.420,422: CR 1242-47, pp.173-4,215.

2) CR 1242-47, pp.215,301.

3) CChR 26-57, p.329.

4) CR 1242-47, p.325: CChR 1257-1300 p.78.

5) Liber Feodorum I, p.610: CR 1242-7, p.530,61-4, pp.414-5: CChR 1226-57, p.331.

6) Liber Feodorum II, pp.691-2,1148,1150,1153.

7) E372/98 m.6.

demonstrating the dominance of the queen and her kindred in all matters relating to the royal children. The first keeper was Bernard of Savoy, a illegitimate connection of the Count of Savoy and already associated with Edward in his capacity as constable of Windsor <sup>1</sup>. He was succeeded by another kinsman, Peter de Geneva, a great favourite of Henry III, who had married into the vast Lacy inheritance <sup>2</sup>. On his death Stephen de Feugeres, steward to the Queen's uncle, Peter of Savoy, took over the administration. His rôle as Peter's deputy raises the possibility that his two predecessors were also acting as Peter's agents <sup>3</sup>.

However, the revenues were not reserved for Edward's sole use. Stephen de Feugere's account shows that 45% of the revenues from 1252-4 were paid directly into the queen's wardrobe and 30% were spent on the building works at Windsor. Lesser sums were also paid into the royal wardrobe or spent on matters which in no way related to Edward's needs <sup>4</sup>. In these circumstances the separation of revenues for Edward seems rather pointless.

Similarly, certain facts point to a definite association of the individual estates with Edward. He received oaths of fealty from tenants, enjoyed rights of tallage and wardship, and obtained privileges such as fairs and markets for various manors, but his position was illusory <sup>5</sup>. His revenues were appropriated, his bailiffs acted on his father's orders, and his feudal dues were received or remitted by his

1) e.g. CR 1242-47, p.178; CLR 1245-51, p.113.

2) CLR 1240-45, pp.144, 145, 45-51, p.155; Paris, CMV, p.90.

3) CLR 1245-51, 51-60, CR 1251-3, passim; CPR 1247-58, pp.272, 364: Studd 17; C61/1 m.3: E372/98 m.6.

4) E372/98 m.6: E101/349/9: CLR 1251-60, passim.

5) CPR 1247-58, p.59, 75; ExeRF II, p.158: CR 1251-3, pp.82, 338, 351, 374: CIM 145: CChR 1226-57 p.347.

father <sup>1</sup>. His advowsons, similarly, were held to be in the king's gift, and the lands themselves could be and were given away to others <sup>2</sup>. The grant of the Norman lands carried with it concrete gains, unlike the purely nominal grant of Gascony to him in 1249, but it did not put him in actual control and it was liable to abuse and appropriation from the king. In this respect the endowment of 1254 regularised and strengthened Edward's position, but perhaps did not entirely eliminate the cavalier attitude shown by the crown.

1) CR 1251-3, pp.338,364.  
2) CPR 1247-58, pp.449,475,498.

ii) **The Settlement of February, 1254**

Edward's endowment of 1254 forms a great contrast to the haphazard arrangements for his maintenance which had hitherto prevailed. He was granted Gascony, the Channel Islands, Ireland (with certain reservations), Chester and the Four Cantreds, Montgomery, Builth, Cardigan and Carmarthen, the Three Castles, Bristol, the Peak, Stamford and Grantham, Freemantle, and the terra Normannorum which had previously been assigned to him. Even in the context of Henry III's gifts to his half-brothers and to other relations and favourites, this was lavish. The king was giving up his own revenues, rather than employing the customary expedient of a good marriage as a way of achieving an establishment (e.g. William de Valence's marriage to the Pembroke heiress). At barely 15, Edward achieved an establishment greater than that of any magnate, including his uncle, Richard of Cornwall. It was also more generous than the arrangements made by King Louis IX of France for his heir, Philip, who received a grant of Orleans, settled on his direct heirs with reversion to the crown <sup>1</sup>.

Edward's endowment may be compared with the treatment of the Young King by Henry II, the last occasion when the ruling monarch had made provision for an adult direct heir. Superficially, the young Henry was treated more generously than Edward, being made co-ruler of England, Normandy and Anjou. However, in spite of his coronation, he was only put into possession of a very small estate, and that only after a rebellion demanding his rights <sup>2</sup>. Henry III was doubtless aware of the precedent

1) Denholm-Young, Seignorial administration in England, p.22. Henry was also more generous in his life-time than Louis to his younger children, Layettes du trésor des chartes, IV, 5289,5497: Wood, The French apanages and the Capetian Monarchy, p.29n.

2) Warren, Henry II, pp.117,138.

of Henry II's scheme, and he pursued an opposite policy, reserving to himself all liege homage and fealty, and titles, but putting Edward in actual control of a wide territory. Matthew Paris complained that the grant amounted to half the kingdom and that Henry became a "regulus mutilatus" <sup>1</sup>.

The future establishment of his heir had been under consideration by Henry III for a number of years. As early as 1243 he had forced his brother, Richard of Cornwall, to renounce any claim to Ireland and Gascony <sup>2</sup>, although Gascony was not granted to Edward until 1249. In the decade following Edward's birth, the king steadily added to his possessions in England and Wales, by purchase (Chester), warfare (the Four Cantreds and Ceredigion), politics (the fall of de Burgh, and the break-up of the Marshal and Braose inheritances, and a growing elaboration and insistence on regalian rights. However, for some time he may have been undecided whether he was amassing these lands to enlarge the royal demesne, or to provide for Edward. From 1244 he also had to consider the interests of his second son, Edmund. His indecision can be seen in the repeated revision of his plans for Chester. In 1245 he drew up a grant of the county to Edmund, but this was not published or implemented <sup>3</sup>. In 1246, he promised the priory of St.Mary's, Chester that the grant he was making would be honoured by anyone to whom he granted the county, whether to one of his sons or another <sup>4</sup>. This implies that Edmund was still in the running for Chester, but no decision had been reached.

1) Paris, CM V, p.450.

2) Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall, pp.51,73: Foedera I i, p.253.

3) C47/9/1 m.5.

4) CPR 1232-47, p.491.

However, in 1247 Henry declared formally that Chester and the lands he had conquered from Gwynedd were to be permanently attached to the crown "ut semper spectantia ad coronam nostram" <sup>1</sup>. A similar promise was made in respect of Stamford and Grantham in 1253 <sup>2</sup>. These provisions, together with the revision in 1252 of the terms of the grant of Gascony to Edward, incorporating a non-separation clause, represent a further stage in the development of the king's plans for Edward. The decision should not be seen merely as an ad hoc response to the instability in Gascony, but as a culmination of a more far-reaching plan <sup>3</sup>. The king's willingness to reduce Edmund's prospects by the scope of the 1254 grants to Edward may be explained by the near-completion of negotiations with the Papacy to secure the kingdom of Sicily <sup>4</sup>.

The acquisitive land policy which the king had followed since his personal rule began, was coupled with an increasing awareness and elaboration of the concept of regalian rights. Royal policy from Henry II onwards had been to prevent and resume any alienations and encroachments on royal lands or rights. The king's obligations to maintain his lands and judicial rights were being expressed more specifically in the rites and oaths which accompanied the coronation <sup>5</sup>. The wish to make provision for the members of the royal family was now constrained by these perceived obligations to maintain the integrity of the crown's possessions. The grant to Edward settled the lands on him

1) C66/58 m.5; CPR 1232-47, p.501.

2) C47/9/1 m.7, "quod .. a predicta corona nostra nullo tempore separentur".

3) Le Patourel, History L (1965), p.299-301; Studd, BIHR L (1977) pp.5-6.

4) Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, p.120.

5) Hoyt, The royal demesne in English constitutional history, 1066-1272, pp.95-6, 146-155; Richardson, BIHR XV (1937), pp.94-9, Speculum XXIV (1949), pp.44-75, Traditio XVI (1960), pp.151-61; Kanterowicz, Speculum XXIX (1954), pp.488-502.

and the legitimate heirs of his body "so that the said lands and all the castles should never be separated from the crown, and that no-one by reason of any grant of the said Edward should have any right or claim at any time in the said lands, but that they should remain wholly to the kings of England in perpetuity" <sup>1</sup>. The king also reserved his ecclesiastical rights and revenues (over cross lands, ecclesiastical vacancies, and elections), except in Gascony.

This policy was not unique to England. A parallel can be drawn with the French custom of securing grants of appanages to the king's younger sons on their direct descendants, with reversion to the crown. This ensured that their lands were confined within the royal family and not subject to division or manipulation even within that group <sup>2</sup>. Similar stipulations were later included in the grants of land to Edmund of Lancaster, and by Edward II and Edward III to their younger brothers <sup>3</sup>. Richard of Cornwall's estates were the last endowment of a king's younger son not to include this provision, and when chance brought his lands back to the crown, they were incorporated in the lands reserved for the heir to the throne <sup>4</sup>. Dower settlements were also starting to include reversion clauses, e.g. for Eleanor of Castile in 1275 <sup>5</sup>, and for Constance of Béarn on her marriage to Henry of Almain <sup>6</sup>.

The conditions of the grant to Edward had the additional effect of preventing inheritance of his estates by any daughters. Partition among

1) CPR 1247-58, p.270; C66/65 m.8; Foedera I i, p.297.

2) Wood, op.cit. pp.11-14,21-2.

3) Report touching the Dignity of a Peer, Journal of the House of Lords 61 (1829), pp.735,737; CChR 1300-26, p.205, 1326-41, p.198

4) Report touching the Dignity of a Peer, pp.743-4; CChR 1326-41, pp.399-40; Wolffe, The royal demesne in English history, pp.53-4.

5) CChR 1257-1300, pp.192-3, her 1254 settlement was not restricted in this way.

6) Marca, Histoire de Béarn, p.616.

co-heiresses in the absence of male heirs was still the custom for the great fiefs downwards. The terms of Edward's settlement ensured that his estates could not be divided among heiresses while the crown passed in the male line. An examination of the restrictions on which Edward I and his successors placed on grants to their heirs shows the intention of protecting the lands against division, especially in the event of the heir predeceasing the king<sup>1</sup>. The settlement can be seen as one of the inspirations behind moves later in the century to combat the break-up of estates among heiresses by settling them in tail male.

The terms of the grant represent the incorporation of two parallel lines of thought. One was the recognition that the establishment of members of the royal family should respect the integrity of the crown lands. Many of the problems Edward later encountered were the result of Henry's achievement in endowing Edward with lands which had not been part of the traditional demesne. In addition, Edward fell victim to the changing attitude of the crown to the preservation of royal rights against the aspirations of tenants in chief. The principle had become established that the king could resume grants of lands or privileges made by his officials or predecessors. Such resumptions had been carried out by Henry II, John and Henry III's regents. In the oath taken by the royal councillors in 1257 was an acknowledgement of the king's right of resumption<sup>2</sup>. By the 1250's this view had been extended to alienations and subinfeudations carried out by the tenants in chief. A formal prohibition of subinfeudation without royal license was made by the king in 1256. The restrictions on land transactions by the Jews, imposed in

1) Report touching the Dignity of a Peer, op.cit. pp.232,737,743,747, 753: CChR 1300-26, p.202, 1326-41, pp.399-400, 1341-1417, pp.14,231: CPR 1301-7, p.424, 1324-27, pp.173-4. On the death of the Black Prince, his lands reverted to the crown rather than passing by the normal rules of inheritance to his son.

2) Hoyt, op.cit,p.162.

1269 and 1271, and on grants in mortmain in 1258, 1259 and perhaps 1267, may be seen as part of the same policy, to preserve the integrity of the lands from which the king drew his feudal dues. Resumptions made by Edward as king of lands which had been alienated without license, even by his brother, indicate the continuing development of this policy <sup>1</sup>. The Hundred Rolls inquests and the Quo Warranto proceedings represent its wider application. Thus, in 1254, restrictions placed on Edward were only slightly ahead of those imposed on his fellow-magnates <sup>2</sup>. The repercussions and practical implications of the non-alienation clause will be discussed below <sup>3</sup>.

The grant of February 1254 did not transfer any title to Edward, using the terminology "terra Vasconie" rather than "ducatus Aquitanie". Before his marriage Edward was known as "dominus Edwardus", and this (with its French and Gascon equivalents, "Sire Edward" and "senhor N'Adouart") continued to be the normal mode of reference. In his style, appearing on his seal and on documents emanating from his chancery, Edward employed the formula "regis Anglie primogenitus et haeres" <sup>4</sup>. The royal chancery also used this address. Henry III retained the style "dux Aquitanie, dominus Hibernie" <sup>5</sup>.

In some ways we need not be greatly concerned with the failure to accord Edward a conventional title. While "dominus" was a widely used honorific of varying status, it was also the title traditionally used by previous royal heirs and by English monarchs between accession and

1) e.g. AbbrRO, p.21: CChR 1257-1300, p.189.

2) Bean, The Decline of English feudalism, pp.51-79: M Prestwich, Edward I, p.13.

3) see Chapter 6.ii.

4) Studd, The Antiquaries Journal, 58 (1978), p.311.

5) although so too had Henry II after the grants to Richard and John.

coronation <sup>1</sup>. Other princes within the Angevin kinship network were similarly addressed (e.g. "Philippus regis Francorum primogenitus", "Theobaldus illustris regis Navarrie primogenitus et haeres" <sup>2</sup>. Edward's acknowledged position as heir gave him precedence over all other earls, and this was recognised on the comparatively-rare occasions when he witnessed his father's charters <sup>3</sup>. A comparison may be made with his brother, who habitually used the formula "Edmundus illustris regis Anglie filius" in preference to his comital title, presumably because it emphasised his superiority over other earls <sup>4</sup>.

The arrangement caused confusion to some contemporaries and later generations. While Edward's administration, except for the extravagant flourish of July 1254 (below), systematically referred to him as "dominus" (e.g. in his chancery, exchequer, plea rolls), others, especially among his subjects, were less accurate. The titles "Dominus Hibernie", "Dominus Vasconie" and "Dominus Insularum" were used occasionally, besides more extravagant honorifics <sup>5</sup>. In England, and particularly in Chester, Edward was sometimes thought to have acquired the title of Earl with the grant of the county. Dr. JR Studd has demonstrated that many of these references may be assigned to the period after 1272, when the earldom was again merged in the crown (e.g. in the

1) Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, p.239: the chronicle of the Abbey of St.Edmund's continued to use it for Edward between 1272 and 1274, C.Bury, p.74.

2) DD 425: RG I 2065: Lettres des rois, reines et autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre, I, p.150.

3) e.g. C53/48 m.5, 53 m.4, 57 m.7: CPR 1247-58, p.607. He was outranked as a witness only by his uncle, Richard of Cornwall, as King of Almain, CPR 1258-66, p.317: Flores II, p.493.

4) Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster I, pp.1-4,7-9: Just1/59 m.5: OChR 1257-1300, pp.58,67,78.

5) Cuttino GR A 284: Foedera I i, pp.330-1: Crede Mihi 25,27: El63/1/9 m.14: CJRI I, pp.306-7,313: Just1/1167 m.4.

chronicle of the abbey of St. Werburgh's Chester, based on a compilation made after 1265 and perhaps after 1272. He also establishes that the Dieulacres charter of Edward's creation as earl is spurious. However, the retrospective argument is not entirely convincing, especially since many of the references occurred before the award of Chester, with the title, to Edward's son. For example, the references in the Chester Plea Rolls in 1285 and 1287 to charters and episodes of 1260 and 1265 respectively, "dum fuit comes Cestrie vitae domini Henrici regis patris sui" <sup>1</sup>. We should not rule out the possibility that Edward was erroneously credited <sup>with</sup> the title during his father's lifetime <sup>2</sup>.

One reason for the confusion may have been the attitude of Edward's own wife. She is described as Countess of Chester ("domina comitissa Cestrie") in the chronicle of St. Benet of Hulme. This too was a late-thirteenth century compilation, though based on earlier material <sup>3</sup>. However, two contemporary sources, one official and one semi-official, and both emanating from outside Cheshire, also referred to Eleanor as "domina Comitissa" <sup>4</sup>. In both instances the source of the description may have been Eleanor's own officials, her attorneys in the exchequer of Jews and her bailiffs in the Peak. The policy may well reflect Eleanor's own reluctance, as daughter and sister of a king, to be content with an ambiguous title. Edward's own views are less accessible, although the scrupulosity of his own administration should be noted. That he granted his own son these, and more exalted titles, indicates that he did not

1) BL Harl. Ms. 2072 f. 9: Chester 29/2 m. 6d; Stewart-Brown, Plea Rolls, pp. 60, 215, 230; Studd, THSLC, 128 (1979), pp. 4-11.

2) other instances, AC, p. 90: CPR 1330-34, p. 191 (retrospective).

3) The account of the same episode in the earlier St. Albans chronicle did not use the title, C. John of Oxenedes, p. 203; Paris CM V, p. 513; Gransden, Historical writing in England, pp. 402-3.

4) CPEJ I, p. 170; CIM 645; C145/25/36.

consider it necessary to follow his father's expedient. Nevertheless, it becomes easy to understand that contemporaries may have been influenced towards usage of the comital title for both Eleanor and Edward.

If political and diplomatic considerations had not been compelling, it is unlikely that Edward would have been knighted and given his own establishment at such an early age. Two related constraints explain the king's action. The condition of Gascony had been causing concern for some time, and in the early 1250's Gascon dislike of the king's lieutenant, Simon de Montfort, had escalated to open revolt. The Gascons were promised that either Henry III or Edward would personally visit Gascony to investigate their grievances<sup>1</sup>. Professor le Patourel and Dr. JR Studd interpret the repetition and revision of the grant of Gascony to Edward as an attempt to reassure Gascons of their close relationship with the crown, by emphasising the non-separability of the duchy<sup>2</sup>. This interpretation does not take into account the wider policy of non-separability (above). However, the unrest in Gascony may well have encouraged the king to press ahead with the arrangement.

Gascon stability was further jeopardised by the new king of Castile, Alfonso X, who, in pursuit of his own claim to the duchy, took up the rebel cause. Henry's urgent summons to the English tenants-in-chief to defend the duchy from Alfonso's attack<sup>3</sup> was sent after the danger from Castile had been neutralised, but this should not detract from the fact that Gascony's safety was compromised by the existence of a hostile neighbour encouraging internal unrest. Gascon security was greatly enhanced by the reconciliation with Castile, achieved by

1) CPR 1247-58, p.141; Foedera I i, pp.282-3.

2) Le Patourel, *History L* (1965), pp.299-301; Studd, *BIHR L* (1977), pp.5-6.

3) February 1254, CR 1253-4, pp.114-5.

Edward's marriage to Alfonso's half-sister. In place of dowry, Eleanor brought with her a renunciation of all Castilian claims to Gascony and an order from Alfonso to his former allies to do homage to Henry and Edward<sup>1</sup>. That this was Henry's main objective in the marriage can be seen from his instructions to his proctors to obtain a full quittance of Castilian claims to Gascony "si meliores conditiones consequi non poteritis"<sup>2</sup>. Gascon unrest made it desirable to provide some focus for Gascon loyalty in the establishment of Edward in the duchy, and Gascon security made the Castilian marriage advisable. The marriage in its turn made a formal settlement on Edward unavoidable. The unrest in Gascony made it necessary for other lands to be linked with the grant in order to produce an income for Edward.

In spite of the long-standing development of the king's plans for Edward's establishment, the settlement of February 1254 was put together in a hurry, in response to the Gascon crisis. King Alfonso contributed to this, pressing that generous dower arrangements should be made for Eleanor<sup>3</sup>, and that Edward's own position should be secured. This is evident from his insistence that the grants made to Edward in Gascony under the small seal should be confirmed under the great seal on the king's return from Gascony<sup>4</sup>. The full allocation of lands to Edward was only worked out at the last minute. Builth had been transferred from John de Monmouth to William de Cantilupe in November 1253. While this was only a custody during pleasure, it seems improbable that the change-over would have been initiated if the castle was already destined for

1) Foedera I i, p.300; Paris, CM V, p.450.

2) Foedera I i, p.290; CPR 1247-58, p.230.

3) Foedera I i, p.306.

4) Foedera I i, p.306; E36/275 ff.214,246. It may also explain the repetition of the earliest grants of wardships, E36/275 ff.244v.-245.

Edward <sup>1</sup>. The grant of Ireland may also have been a last-minute decision. The reservation of Dublin, Limerick and Athlone would have made the administration of the country remarkably awkward, through the loss of the most lucrative region and the placing of the centre of government under a different authority. It is conceivable that the king had not initially intended to transfer the governance of Ireland, but only the revenues of particular estates, as in England. The earliest grants to Edward described his endowment as "terra Vasconia et aliae terrae ... in Hibernia et Anglia" <sup>2</sup>. The actual withdrawal of the royal seal and writ from Ireland did not occur until 1256.

Even before the formal grant to Edward, it had been discovered that the chosen lands would be insufficient to make up the yearly revenue considered appropriate <sup>3</sup>. This emphasis on an income of 15,000 marks p.a. confirms that many of the estates were included for fiscal requirements rather than geographical coherence. We must therefore be careful of drawing conclusions of political or strategic significance from the juxtaposition of a very heterogeneous collection of lands. The discovery of the shortfall also emphasises the lack of preparation before the grant.

The terms on which Edward was to hold his lands had also not been worked out fully. The reservation of ecclesiastical rights was intended to apply to all the lands granted to Edward <sup>4</sup>, but of the writs de intendendo issued in England by the regency, only the writ to Chester

1) CPR 1247-58, p.254,272,288,374; C66/65 m.14: CR 1253-4, p.195. Edward had some difficulty obtaining seisin.

2) C66/65 m.8.

3) C66/65 m.8, the first version of the promise to make up the deficit was enrolled above the 14 February settlement and dated two days earlier, although the sum required was not known until July 1254.

4) C66/65 m.8, "in omnibus terris superius memoratis"; CPR 1247-58, p.270, except Gascony and Oléron, covered by a separate grant.

mentioned the reservation <sup>1</sup>. More seriously, the original writs de intendendo sent out from Gascony in February had to be repeated in April, because the earlier instructions to swear homage and fealty to Edward had omitted the vital clause "salva nobis ligancia nostra" <sup>2</sup>.

The mechanism by which the deficit in income was to be made up to Edward was only elaborated over a series of months. After the initial discovery, a more detailed arrangement was worked out, promising to provide additional lands from those in royal custody (excluding demesne), or from wardships and escheats as these became available, until a permanent grant could be made <sup>3</sup>. This was developed in July, with new clauses to protect Edward's position when the wardships expired, giving Edward priority over other claimants and guaranteeing his possession against all comers. This grant was reinforced by an oath by the king, "et omnia predicta iurari fecimus in anima nostra fideliter servari" <sup>4</sup>. Another revision occurred in May 1255, when it was ruled that all grants of wardships to Edward would automatically include the marriages of the heirs and widows, and all advowsons, escheats and custodies falling in during his tenure <sup>5</sup>.

The separation of the king and his secretariat from the chancery and exchequer records and staff in England will have been an added complication. The delay in communications between England and Gascony also hampered the settlement. One of the earliest supplementary grants made to Edward, that of the Lorty wardship, fell through because an

1) C66/67 m.4; CPR 1247-58, p.365.

2) C66/65 mm.7,3; CPR 1247-58, pp.272,285.

3) 18 February, C66/65 m.8; CPR 1247-58, pp.269-70.

4) C66/66 m.11; CPR 1247-58, p.314, still dated 18 February, but enrolled on the patent roll for May-October 1254, among other letters dated July.

5) C66/69 m.9; CPR 1247-58, p.410.

alternative award had been made by the regency in England. The delay in calculating the sum still due to Edward was the result of the inability to consult valuations kept in the exchequer, and of the time-lag for letters ordering the valuation of the Ferrers custody to reach England, be implemented and the results sent back to Gascony.

One further point should be emphasised in connection with the communications difficulty. The person most interested in the settlement was in England, when his future life and resources were arranged in Gascony. Edward did not arrive in Gascony until early June, with his mother and uncles. Only then could the marriage agreement and dower settlement be promulgated<sup>1</sup>. The revisions to Edward's endowment which occurred in July may be seen as the result of criticisms made by Edward's advisers and representatives.

Before he left England, Edward had set up his own chancery and exchequer, and appointed officials to take possession and administer his new territories. In Gascony, the transfer of power to Edward and his carefully-chosen circle of advisers did not occur until his return from Spain in November, by which time the king was on his way back to England. In Ireland, the change-over was not implemented fully until 1256. Until Edward's return in November 1255, his English and Welsh estates seem to have been supervised by the queen and her estate steward. Even after Edward's return his mother's influence over the estate administration persisted as late as 1256 and 1257<sup>2</sup>, issuing orders for the management of the estates, and sending her steward to collect the issues.

In 1256 Edward travelled widely in England and Scotland, visiting

1) Studd 38-40; C61/1 m.3; Foedera I i, pp.304-5; Cuttino GR A 177.

2) Studd 501; C61/3 m.1: SC6/1094/11 mm.5d-7,17-18.

his new dominions, making his tournament debut and apparently enjoying his new position. The account of him by Matthew Paris is strongly hostile, depicting him as a wild, vicious youth, surrounded by a group of like-minded young men, and expressed deep concern for the kingdom's future <sup>1</sup>. It is impossible to draw any serious conclusion from this spiteful report, although later evidence confirms that Edward had inherited the Angevin temper and was subject to explosive outbursts of violence <sup>2</sup>. Edward's youth and his rapid elevation to wealth and power may explain both the extravagances of the late 1250's and early 1260's and the resentment these aroused.

1) Paris, CM V, pp.593,598.

2) M Prestwich, Edward I, pp.1,111.

It is appropriate to pass on to a closer examination of the resources placed in Edward's hands by the settlement of February 1254, and how these and Edward's position were altered by subsequent events. Edward's resources can be separated into several components:

- a) **The lands of the settlement of February 1254;** covered by the non-alienation clause. These lands did not remain static, in spite of the terms of the grant, but were reduced, added to and altered.
- b) **The supplementary estates;** wardships, leases and escheats intended to make Edward's lands up to the promised sum of £10,000 p.a.
- c) **Fiscal revenues;** non-territorial grants, which increased Edward's cash revenues and credit opportunities.
- d) **"Private enterprise";** Edward's resources were further supplemented by his own financial transactions, and by his gains after his victory over the Montfortian forces.
- e) **Grants of strategic significance;** over the later period of the reign, as Edward's political stature and influence developed, he also acquired a series of commissions of towns, castles and counties, culminating in the arrangements made when he left for the crusade in 1270. These grants, made during pleasure, were not intended to contribute to his financial resources, but were of strategic value.

The scope and history of these groups of territory are examined below, with an analysis of the assets available to Edward and the ways in which he was able to exploit them.

CHAPTER TWO: THE HISTORY OF THE SETTLED LANDS, 1254-72

i) Gascony

The dangerous situation of Gascony in 1254 should not blind one to its existing assets or to its potential. The old duchy of Aquitaine had been a princely inheritance, rendering Eleanor of Aquitaine the biggest matrimonial prize in Europe. The depredations of Philip Augustus and Louis VIII had considerably reduced the size and revenues of the duchy. However, the southern area which remained, now generally called Gascony, was still considerable. The duchy's economy centred on the wine trade, and this generated the principal revenues, the customs duties <sup>1</sup>.

In 1254 Gascony was at a low ebb, due to the exhausting and divisive effects of the revolt against Simon de Montfort. Henry III's campaign had drawn heavily on the existing and future revenues of the duchy. Prevoités and customs had been farmed out to repay debts or to raise money. The king was still committing future revenue as late as February 1254, and in September Edward took overresponsibility for additional debts <sup>2</sup>. The revenues from Ireland had for some time been largely swallowed up in Gascony <sup>3</sup>, an expedient which Edward was to continue <sup>4</sup>. However, if the internal unrest could be controlled and the external threats reduced, the duchy could be a valuable possession. These latter objectives were partially achieved by the Castilian alliance of 1254 and the treaty with France in 1259 which regularised Gascony's relationship with the French crown, although the

1) For a more detailed description of Gascony, see the introduction to J-P. Trabut-Cussac, L'Administration Anglaise en Gascogne, and M.W. Labarge, Gascony, Chapter 1.

2) RG I 2145, 2147-8, 2317, 2321, 2336, 2425: Studd 70; C61/1 m.1.

3) CPR 1247-58, p.55; R.G. I 3905.

4) Studd 43, 124; C61/1 m.3, 2 m.12: CDI, pp.61, 67.

acknowledgement of French suzerainty carried with it new difficulties, mainly connected with the restored right of appeal to the French courts<sup>1</sup>. Gascony remained a difficult country to control, with its warring, semi-independent lords and its turbulent, faction-ridden communes<sup>2</sup>, yet the compensations, even in crude financial terms, could be considerable.

Some idea of the profits which might be obtained from the territory can be derived from the fact that in 1267 the Great Custom of Bordeaux was farmed for one year to some merchants of Cahors for 15,000 livres bordelais (about £3,000)<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, in 1269 Louis IX lent Edward 70,000 livres tournois (c. £17,500) to finance his participation in the crusade: this sum was secured on the Great Custom and deemed capable of repayment at £10,000 Tours (£2,500) yearly. The duchy also served as a base for the assembly of troops and supplies for the crusade<sup>4</sup>.

Gascony's value to Edward as an independent base of operations can be dimly glimpsed in its contributions to Edward's activities in the Barons' Wars. The political disagreements in England affected his rule in Gascony, as in the baronially-instigated quashing of his attempted establishment of his Lusignan half-uncles in Gascony and Oléron in July 1258<sup>5</sup>. However, the resources of Gascony were also available to him to direct against his opponents in England.

In the most intense years of the struggle, 1264-5, Gascony and

1) e.g. the long-running Bergerac case took on a new lease of life in 1259, T-C admin, pp.267-286; CR 1259-61, pp.221-2,232; Gavrilovitch, Etudes sur le traité de Paris, pp.84-94. Cf. in 1268 Louis ordered the destruction of Edward's new castle at Sarlat, said to infringe the rights of the abbey, RHGF XX, p.117, XXIV, p.201.

2) Trabut-Cussac, RHB n.s.1 (1952), pp.185-199.

3) C47/25/1/2; CPR 1266-72, p.24; T-C, admin, p.315.

4) CLR 1267-72 1069; Studd 987; Foedera I i, p.481; Trabut-Cussac, Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes CXIX (1961), pp.114-24.

5) Studd 698,699,701; Foedera I i, pp.374,378; CPR 1247-58, pp.639-41

Oléron provided Edward with money, troops and shipping <sup>1</sup>. While Edward was imprisoned after Lewes, his interests were looked after and preparations made for his assistance by his mother, Eleanor of Provence, his Seneschal of Gascony, Henry de Cousances and other loyal lieutenants such as John de Grailly. The duchy was not exclusively cooperative at this time. Bayonne, which supplied Edward with troops which may have fought for him at Lewes, also possessed a Montfortian faction which prevented local galleys transporting the army assembled at Bruges by Eleanor of Provence <sup>2</sup>. Control of the duchy enabled Edward and his supporters to wage economic warfare against Montfortian towns which supported Earl Simon, seizing their shipping and goods and closing his own continental ports against them <sup>3</sup>. After Evesham, ships from Bayonne were involved in the naval reduction of the Cinque Ports <sup>4</sup>.

Viewed from other criteria, the grant of Gascony was of great importance to Edward. Seen purely in terms of prestige and status, its possession raised Edward from the level of a wealthy English baron to terms of near-equality with the holders of the great French fiefs. It gave him a continental standing which must have been of value to him during his frequent visits to France and the European tournament circuit. Potentially, Gascony promised Edward a sphere of independent development, at one step removed from his father's influence. This hope, whether or not it was fulfilled, is expressed in one of Edward's first acta, issued on his return from Spain in November 1254, where he uniquely describes himself as "Edwardus....iam regnans in Vasconia sicut

1) Cuttino, GR A 166,169; Foedera I i, p.450: E36/275 ff.228,230: E368/37 m.22d: T-C, admin, p.28: Livre des Etablissements de Bayonne, 15.

2) Correspondance d'Alfonse de Poitiers, II 2027.

3) CR 1268-72, pp.63-4.

4) CPR 1258-66, pp.655,659.

princeps et dominus" <sup>1</sup>. While he may not have achieved such total power, the experience of government which he acquired in Gascony must have been of value to him. His recognition of the duchy's importance can be seen in 1273-4 when the reorganisation of Gascon affairs took precedence even over his coronation.

The settlement also transferred to Edward the island of Oléron, off the coast of Saintonge, now of dwindling strategic and economic importance, but once the focus of the ambitions of the Lusignan counts of La Marche, as perhaps it was to be again <sup>2</sup>, and the Channel Islands. Another English outpost off the French coast, the islands were only of financial interest to Edward. Farmed for 400 marks, at one stage they were in the custody of a Bayonne merchant, perhaps as a way of discharging obligations to him. The inquiry into alienations initiated in 1268 may have been intended to increase their profitability, but it was only after another inquiry in 1274-5, that Edward was able to raise the farm to 500 marks, shortly before he transferred them to his knight, Otto de Grandson for life <sup>3</sup>. The island of Lundy in the Bristol Channel passed to Edward, not as a result of the grant of "islands of the sea". but as an appurtenance of Cardigan and Carmarthen <sup>4</sup>.

1) Studd 94; Foedera I i, p.310: E36/275 f.220.

2) Martène & Durand, Collectio 163,1184,1214-5: Coutumier d'Oléron, pp.27-38: below, Chapter 6.

3) E368/31 m.5: E159/29 m.8: E372/98m.1d: CFR 1272-1307, p.65: Le Patourel, Administration of the Channel Islands pp.74-88,124: SJ Extente, 1274.

4) E372/104 m.8d: CPR 1247-58, p.272.

## ii) Ireland

The Norman possessions in Ireland had been subject to the English crown since 1171, when Henry III decided he must take control of the territories acquired by Earl "Strongbow" and the other Anglo-Norman adventurers. English military penetration and colonisation into Leinster, Meath and Ulster continued fitfully under royal sponsorship, in parallel to the ecclesiastical reorganisation under papal supervision. By 1254 a wide area round Dublin was settled with English and Welsh colonists, and expansion into Meath and Ulster was well under way. Irish native dynasties such as the O'Connors of Connaught alternated between protestations of loyalty to the king and fierce raids on the settlers. Considerable areas of the West of Ireland, Munster, Thomond, parts of Connaught and Ulster remained independent and generally hostile to the "foreigners". But, in spite of the occasional reverses suffered by the colonists, Ireland was a valuable supplement to the king's income and sources of patronage <sup>1</sup>.

In February 1254 Henry III reserved some of the more profitable areas of Ireland, only transferring these to Edward in July (below). He retained control of the Irish church, and of the lucrative revenues from the crosslands and abbatial and episcopal vacancies <sup>2</sup>. The reservation of ecclesiastical appointments and fealty ensured the king's continuing influence, and left Edward in an anomalous position. Irish ecclesiastics frequently appealed to the king against any unfavourable action of Edward or his administration <sup>3</sup>. He also had no official involvement in

1) For more detailed information on the conquest and colonisation of Ireland see A.J. Otway-Ruthven, A History of Medieval Ireland, Chapters I-III, VI.

2) Disbursements ordered by Henry, 1254-1272, may have approached £3,000, CR, CDI, CPR 1266-72, p.288 and passim: C47/35/14/37.

3) Calendar of Archbishop Alen's register, pp.92,101-34: Documents relating to the medieval diocese of Armagh, p.12: CDI, p.95; KB26/158 m.12, Edward opposed the transfer to England of an ecclesiastical case.

the choice of Irish bishops <sup>1</sup>, and this is significant, in view of the number of Irish clerics prominent in the Irish administration.

Another consequence of Henry III's reservations was an overlap in the work of the Irish administration between their obligations to Edward as Lord of Ireland and their obligations to the king. For example, the escheator (William de Bagepuz, 1257-1271) administered both the ecclesiastical issues due to the king and the issues due to Edward from wards and escheats, and his accounts were audited by the Dublin administration <sup>2</sup>. Edward's administration continued to issue writs from Dublin in the name of Henry III <sup>3</sup>. Many royal writs to the justiciar or exchequer contained no references to Edward's position <sup>4</sup>. It is scarcely surprising that the transfer of lordship went virtually unnoticed in Irish chronicles <sup>5</sup>.

It is difficult to give precise figures for Edward's income from Ireland, which consisted of regular revenues from the demesne and borough farms (rents of assize), profits of justice, customs duties (from 1266), and the more irregular feudal revenues from escheats, wardships, and scutages. Gross receipts in 1251 (including ecclesiastical revenues) had been over £5,000, of which £3,500 was sent directly to the king or transferred to the new treasurer <sup>6</sup>. Calculations based on receipts by the treasurer and justiciar over 1270-72 indicate rather lower annual revenues, perhaps £3,800 <sup>7</sup>. Comparisons of items in a partial valuation of Irish revenues made in 1284, with the

1) but cf. O'Brien, *PRIA*, 73/C, pp.129-176: CPR 1247-58, p.577: SCl/7/184

2) CR 1259-61, p.87, 64-8, p.283; CPR 1258-66, pp.422-3; C47/35/14/32.

3) e.g. C47/35/14/10, Henry III to William de Bagepuz ....Teste R. de Rupella apud dublin.

4) e.g. CDI 391,481-2,649,652,718: CR 1261-4, p.11.

5) A notable exception is the *Chronicle of Henry of Marlborough*, f.87

6) Lydon, p.9.

7) a yearly average from the treasurer's account would be c.£2,400. The justiciar's account shows additional receipts, which, added together, give £7,736/3/4 for Michaelmas 54-56 Henry III, CDI 889-91; E101/230/2.

calendars and occasional transcripts of the (now destroyed) Irish Pipe Rolls, indicate that receipts for the period of Edward's lordship from the rents of assize were some 30% lower <sup>1</sup>. The lower figures for the period of Edward's lordship reflect not only the separation of the ecclesiastical revenues, but also the damage to the country's economy caused by the Gaelic revival.

Thus far, these calculations have focused on the gross income generated by Ireland, ignoring deductions for administrative and other local expenses. The net income, the actual cash available to Edward, will have been a lesser sum. Some conclusions can be drawn from known sums sent out of Ireland in the 1250's. Over 1250-51 2,700 marks were sent to Chester and 1,000 marks paid to Bordeaux merchants on the king's instructions <sup>2</sup>. In 1252 unknown sums were delivered to Chester in April and September, and £1,258/13/4 were ordered to Gascony <sup>3</sup>. In 1253 over £5,500 were paid into the royal wardrobe <sup>4</sup>. In 1254 555 marks was paid to Edward and £1,533/6/8 to the king (totalling c.£2,000), and in 1255 Edward received another 3,600 marks (£2,400) <sup>5</sup>. No figures are available for 1256, but in 1257 over £2,500 was sent to Chester for Edward's Welsh campaign <sup>6</sup>. These may not have been the only sums sent abroad, given the consignments of unknown size, or unreported. The significant point is that Ireland generated over £15,000 from 1250 to

1) £2,476 in 1284 and perhaps £1,800 earlier. The difference may in part have been the result of a campaign to improve the profitability of the demesne, 35,36 RepDKI, passim: BL Add.Ch.26515; Curtis, pp.2-4,10-11: CDI 1072,1177,2329.

2) over £2,500: Lydon, pp.19-20. This did not exhaust the treasury for a considerable sum was transferred to the next treasurer.

3) CDI 23,50,81,91-2,126.

4) CDI 259,285,304; cf. known consignments, 206,210,215, and orders, 147,149-50,247,293.

5) CPR 47-58, p.317: Studd 43,387; C61/1 m.3, 2 m.6; CDI, 382,455, giving the 1255 sum incorrectly as 600 m.

6) Studd 627,666; Lydon, pp.20.23.

1257, averaging over £1,875 p.a.<sup>1</sup>. Even if the treasury was drained on each occasion, it recovered with remarkable rapidity.

This type of calculation is not possible for the poorly-documented 1260's<sup>2</sup>, but the Irish Pipe Rolls indicate that there was then more drawing on the revenues at source for military purposes, which fits in with the increased hostility being shown to the settlers. This implies a corresponding reduction in the surplus available to Edward. No absolute confirmation is available until 1270, when the accounts of the treasurer and justiciar show a significant alteration to the 1250's pattern.

Ireland's profitability to England and to Edward was then drastically reduced. The justiciar had received a staggering 81% of the treasurer's receipts, besides almost £4,000 (over two years) from other sources. Audley's accounts show that this money was spent almost exclusively on Irish business, on household expenses, castle maintenance and garrison supply, and military expeditions. At his death his outgoings had considerably exceeded his receipts. The remaining 19% of revenue received by the treasurer was used in administrative expenses. No payments were made to Edward or to his receivers in England. A temporary recovery was staged in the later years of the century, Richardson and Sayles<sup>3</sup> estimate an average annual surplus for 1278-99 of £6,300, albeit with considerable fluctuations within the given dates. The time was foreshadowed when Ireland became England's pensioner.

Nevertheless, until the later 1260's Ireland represented a vital supplement to Edward's income. Irish revenues and material resources were used to maintain Edward's other territories, i.e. Gascony<sup>4</sup>. The

1) If 1256 is omitted entirely, an average of £2,142 p.a. is obtained.

2) i.e. Studd 839; C61/4 m.1: CDI, 681-2, cf.714: 35 RepDKI, p.45.

3) Richardson and Sayles, PRIA, 62/C (1962), pp.87-100.

4) e.g. for Gascony, Chancellor Gerrard's transcripts, p.255: Studd 347; CDI 446: Lydon, p.26.

contribution was most significant in Wales, in response to the native resurgence in 1256. The sea voyage from the Irish coast to Wales was comparatively short and the only way to evade the Welsh cordon round the castles of Dyserth and Deganwy. Several of Edward's administrative officers, such as William de Wilton and Thomas de Pivelesdon, were sent to Ireland to organise the supply chain and supervise the loading and payment of the fleet. Some idea of the scale of the enterprise can be derived from the size of the fleet. Payments were made to the masters of at least 34 ships carrying troops, horses and provisions <sup>1</sup>.

The ships sailing from Waterford in July 1257 carried over 500 horses, which Dr. Lydon suggests were accompanying a force of Irish "hobelars" or light cavalry-men <sup>2</sup>. Ireland supplied and maintained over 700 "satellites" or foot-soldiers <sup>3</sup>, besides contingents of crossbowmen and the hardly less valuable ditchdiggers, carpenters and smiths. Provisions and other supplies sent from Ireland were also on a large scale, several £100 worth of corn, fish, salt meat and wine were despatched at the Dublin exchequer's expense in 1257 and early 1258. There were also consignments of timber, brattices and boards, cloth for the troops and canvas for sacks <sup>4</sup>.

It is virtually certain that this was not the total of troops or supplies provided from Ireland, for in November 1257 Edward gave his commanders in West Wales carte blanche to draw on Dublin for whatever

1) At least 23 ships and their masters are listed in the payments made in July 1257, Harris Collectanea, pp.288-9. These are dated to July 1256, but a marginal note has the more probable date of 1257. Writs of August 1257 and January 1258 list another 10, Lydon, pp.22-26. The total number of ships must have been higher, for this count covers only those with an identifiable name and master. It included some from the Cinque Ports, East Anglia and Flanders: Lydon, Irish Sword, 2, pp.12-16.

2) Harris Collectanea, pp.288-9; Lydon, p.14.

3) 300 in July 1257, 400 in September, Lydon, pp.21,24. The 1,000 men at Cardigan, for whom cloth was sent from Drogheda need not all have been Irish.

4) Lydon, pp.21-6. The wine may have been imported prisage wine.

supplies and men at arms they should require <sup>1</sup>. In 1260, 1261-2, and 1266 consignments of wine and grain were sent to supply Chester and other castles <sup>2</sup>. Without Ireland it is difficult to see how Edward could have attempted any kind of resistance to Llewelyn. Ironically, the Irish situation had so far deteriorated by 1270 that the new justiciar, James de Audley, brought with him a force of Welsh mercenaries to campaign against the native Irish <sup>3</sup>.

Ireland was in some ways remote from the political debates and factional rivalries which dominated England over 1258-67 <sup>4</sup>. It was so far beyond baronial control that the Montfortians saw nothing to lose in exiling the intransigent Marchers there after Lewes. However, given the interlocking patterns of land tenure between Norman Ireland, England and the Welsh March, it was inevitable that the controversies would be exported across the Irish Sea. From Edward's point of view his Irish territories came into the political arena comparatively early with the government's (erroneous) fears that he would set up his dispossessed Lusignan uncles in Ireland. The appointment of Stephen Longespee was probably imposed on Edward by the dominant faction to guard against this contingency.

Edward himself soon attempted to free his Irish territories from the restrictions imposed in 1258. It is in this context that we should see Longespee's opposition to the grants Edward made in 1259 to the Geraldines, John FitzThomas and Maurice FitzMaurice <sup>5</sup>. In 1263 Edward's

1) Lydon, pp.26-7; Studd 635.

2) Studd 798,842,845,846: C61/4 mm.2,1: 35 Rep.DKI, pp.42,45-6: 2 RepRCI, p.52, no.1.

3) CDI 890: E101/230/2 m.1.

4) The following account owes much to the discussion by Dr. R.Frame, 'Ireland and the Barons' wars' in Thirteenth Century England ed. Coss and Lloyd, pp.158-167. see also, Chapter 6.ii.

5) Longespee refused to give FitzThomas seisin on the grounds that he had "deceived" Edward to obtain the grant, CDI 629,631,1474,1912: CIPM II 281,437: Studd 723-5; C61/4 m.5.

policy of buying supporters in England was also utilised in Ireland, most noticeably in the grant of Ulster to Walter de Burgh<sup>1</sup>. Edward was playing dangerously here, for the aggrandisement of de Burgh conflicted with the interests of the Geraldines whom he had previously favoured. Their rapidly-escalating feud may have been encouraged by Montfort, since the imprisonment of Edward's justiciar, de la Rochelle, and the resultant disruption of the administration, reduced the chances of serious assistance coming to the royalist cause from Ireland.

There is some evidence that Queen Eleanor, who had taken charge of Gascony during Edward's captivity and was coordinating the raising of forces on the continent, also attempted to mobilise royalist support in Ireland. The force being raised in Flanders under William de Valence, himself an Irish land-holder, and Warenne, at one time considered landing in Ireland<sup>2</sup>. Geoffrey de Geneville, lord of Meath in his wife's right, who had taken control of the country and succeeded in reconciling the warring factions<sup>3</sup>, may also have been involved in Edward's escape, since his castle of Ludlow afforded a refuge to Edward. The arrival in England of an Irish force including de Burgh and FitzGerald, perhaps present at Evesham, represented the triumph of the royalist faction in Ireland. Besides the unsuccessful expedition against Llewelyn, Irish barons were involved in the mopping-up campaigns in the Midlands and Kenilworth<sup>4</sup>.

The contribution of Ireland to Edward's crusade is unclear. Richardson and Sayles argue<sup>5</sup> that it seems unlikely that Edward did

1) Table 2.

2) Flores III p.264: Shirley II, pp.282-4: Correspondance d'Alfonse de Poitiers, II 2030.

3) SCL/18/7,8; Documents on the Affairs of Ireland before the King's Council, 9,10.

4) AM II, pp.365-6: Frame, op.cit. p.161.

5) Richardson and Sayles, Irish Parliament in the middle ages, pp. 54-5.

not at least seek an aid from the Irish. This may have been the reason for the visit in 1270 of the crusaders, John de Vescy, Otto de Grandson and Roger de Clifford<sup>1</sup>. Alternatively, they may have been raising troops or buying horses for the expedition. Several barons with Irish connections joined the crusade, such as Geneville and John de Verdon, but the deteriorating military situation in Ireland probably reduced the scale of enlistment.

As king, Edward continued to utilise Irish resources in his military activities, notably in his Welsh campaigns of the 1280's and 90's, and also in Scotland. Irish revenues staged a recovery from the low of the early 1270's and made possible many of Edward's more expensive projects. As before, Ireland's value to Edward was as the means of preserving and extending his other territories. Very few Anglo-Irish were recruited into his household or his inner counsels, although the long minorities of the Geraldine and Burgh heirs may explain this as lack of opportunity rather than deliberate exclusion. Edward encouraged his friends to make territorial gains there<sup>2</sup>, and this may reflect an awareness of the developing man-power shortage. Generally, Ireland, except as a source of funds, was not of great significance to him. His experience as Lord of Ireland did not increase his knowledge or understanding of the country. His accession to the throne only confirmed him in his previous attitudes and policies.

1) Kilkenny chronicle, B.L. Cotton Vesp. BI, p.332; For additional evidence of Clifford's visit to Ireland, Documents on the affairs of Ireland 13: CCR 1272-9, p.193.

2) Thomas de Clare, and Otto de Grandson, Frame, Colonial Ireland, pp.35-7.

### iii) Chester and the Welsh estates

Cheshire and the so-called "conquest of Wales", granted to Edward in 1254, were comparatively recent acquisitions by the Crown. The county of Chester had been secured for Henry III between 1237 and 1242 by purchase from the co-heirs of the last earl, John the Scot<sup>1</sup>. Even shorn of the accretions of the Blundeville inheritance, the county was still a territory of great potential, conferring independence and power upon its lord. It had its own exchequer and archive<sup>2</sup>, court and council<sup>3</sup>, and administration, controlled by the justiciar. Chester was of strategic importance as a port with close commercial links with Ireland, and also dominated the coast of North Wales and an area inland. The men of the county were less than enthusiastic about the changes which had followed the death of the last earl, principally because of increasing fiscal demands and administrative innovations. Such matters were still arousing antagonism in 1260 and even later<sup>4</sup>. However, in spite of this discontent, it is noticeable that many of Edward's household and other associates held land from him in Cheshire, and the county was a valuable base, especially during his Welsh campaigns.

The "conquest of Wales", effectively all of Gwynedd east of the River Conwy, had been seized from Gwynedd in the 1240's, the cantred of Tegeingl in 1241, and Rhos, Rhufoniog, and Dyffryn Clywd in 1247<sup>5</sup>. The attitude of Henry III to his gains was crystallised by May 1247 when he informed the men of Cheshire that the county and the castles of Dyserth and Deganwy (in the Four Cantreds) were to be permanently incorporated

1) Stewart-Brown, *EHR* XXXV 1920, pp.26-54.

2) Stewart-Brown, *EHR*, LVII, 1942, pp.289-297, XXXVII, 1922, pp.481-500.

3) Stewart-Brown, *Plea Rolls*.

4) CR 1247-51, pp.185,551, 51-3, pp.99,179, 54-6, p.372; Stewart-Brown, *Plea Rolls*, 5,52; Studd 1034: CPR 1272-81, p.6: C145/33/6: CIM 975.

5) AJ Roderick, *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 10, pp.246-8.

into the crown lands "ut semper spectantia ad coronam nostram"<sup>1</sup>. He may not have yet resolved to entrust these lands to his son, but he was creating a permanent bastion of royal power, dominating the north of Wales. Between 1241 and 1254 various steps were taken to control and consolidate the newly-acquired territories.

20 "keepers of the peace" were appointed for the Four Cantreds<sup>2</sup>, but the emphasis was on colonisation from England and castellation to protect the new settlements and the frontier<sup>3</sup>. A new castle was erected on the site of Deganwy, to guard the Conwy estuary. Work began on Dyserth in 1241, producing a strong stone castle of modern design, dominating the entrance to the vale of Clwyd. Rhuddlan, Chester and Beeston were also strengthened during this period<sup>4</sup>. Royal expenditure on Deganwy alone (including the cost of protecting the builders) between 1245 and 1254 was well over £10,000, an indication of the high value which Henry III set on his new lands, and of his determination to maintain his hold on the area. His concern can also be seen in his endeavours to restrain the harshness of the Justiciar of Chester in the area<sup>5</sup>, and to conciliate Welsh opinion by upholding Welsh law and custom where possible<sup>6</sup>. Clearly, the territories were seen as a valuable addition to the Crown lands, and Henry took such steps as were in his power to secure the stability of the region.

Edward's endowment also included the so-called "Three Castles" of Grosmont, Skenfrith and White Castle, the castles and honours of Montgomery, Carmarthen and Cardigan, and the castle of Builth. These

1) CPR 1232-47 p.501; C66/58 m.5

2) CPR 1247-58, p.45: E352/43 m.20; Stewart-Brown, *Pipe Rolls*, p.93.

3) RF Walker, *The Anglo-Welsh wars, 1217-67*, Oxford D.Phil. 1954, p.16: CR 1251-3, pp.149,459.

4) Brown et al. pp.625,645: Walker, *op.cit.* pp.19,604

5) e.g. CR 1247-51, pp.50,442,541, 51-3, pp.4,465,467.

6) e.g. CR 1251-3, pp.483,511.

territories gave Edward a chain of castles stretching from coast to coast, sufficient to justify Matthew Paris' assertion that Edward was known as "lord of Wales"<sup>1</sup>. The remaining independent Welsh princes may well have felt encircled by their new neighbour.

Of these territories, the honour of Montgomery was the closest to Chester and the Four Cantreds, although separated by the territories of the Welsh princes of Powys. The castle had originally been built by the great Roger de Montgomery to protect the crossing of the River Severn. Since then it had undergone many changes of master, and it was after a period spent in the hands of Gwynedd that Henry III resolved to retain the honour in his hands, and to erect a new castle on a different and more defensible site<sup>2</sup>. The rebuilding of the castle was accompanied by the foundation of a new town below the castle, and various attempts were made to encourage colonists, and sustain the settlement<sup>3</sup>.

South again, the Breos castle of Builth became a potential threat to the English, when a strategic marriage brought it under Gwynedd's control. Henry III took advantage of the weakness of Dafydd ap Llywelyn in 1241 to repossess the castle<sup>4</sup>. Builth was not the most modern or the strongest of the castles granted to Edward in 1254<sup>5</sup>, but it was an important link in Edward's chain of lordships, midway between Montgomery and the Three Castles, and in a part of the March which had frequently come under attack in the past. The Three Castles of Grosmont, Skenfrith and White Castle in Upper Gwent had been in the Crown's hands since the mid-12th. century. Like Montgomery, they owed their modernity and

1) "dominus Walliae dicebatur", Paris, CM V, p.597.

2) JE Lloyd, History of Wales, pp.389-90,662: C145/3/14; CIM 70: Brown et al. pp.739-41; Walker, op.cit. p.610.

3) CPR 1216-25, p.414; CR 1227-31, pp.121,139: C145/6/11, 5/12: CChR 1226-57 pp.10,100-1.

4) JE Lloyd, op.cit. pp.670,699,705n.

5) e.g. CR 1253-4, p.58.

strength to the empire-building proclivities of Hubert de Burgh <sup>1</sup>.

The Crown's properties in West Wales centred on the towns of Carmarthen and Cardigan, both 12th. century Norman settlements, which had come into the king's possession at the time of the break-up of the Marshal inheritance. For considerable periods in the 12th. and 13th. centuries they had been under native Welsh control. It was to prevent a repetition that both castles were remodelled and strengthened before their transfer to Edward <sup>2</sup>. The actual territory controlled by the constable of Carmarthen was confined to the commotes of Derllys ("comitatus Anglorum"), Widigada and Elfed ("comitatus Wallensium") <sup>3</sup>, although English influence reached further afield. Similarly, the grant of Cardigan carried with it the half commote of Iscoed is Hirwern which had come under the domination of the castle some time previously <sup>4</sup>. The Crown lands in West Wales also included the commotes of Perfedd, Anhuniog and Mefynydd in northern Ceredigion (Llanbadarn Fawr), which Henry III had seized from their Welsh lord in 1246 in retaliation for his support for Gwynedd <sup>5</sup>. Also attached to the lordship was the island of Lundy in the Bristol Channel, once of some strategic significance, but now perhaps most useful as a source of supply to the domestic household <sup>6</sup>.

Henry III had been asserting his claims to overlordship over the Welsh lords of Ceredigion since the 1240's <sup>7</sup>. Many Welsh lords had

1) Brown et al. pp.657,837,853: Paris, Historia Anglorum II, p.426.

2) Griffiths, Boroughs of Medieval Wales, pp.144-150: Walker, op.cit. p.611: E372/104 m.8d; JE Lloyd, Story of Ceredigion, pp.64-7,83-4,89,91-9: Cl45/33/31 m.2.

3) JB Smith, Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, 21, p.152: Cl45/33/31 m.2.

4) JE Lloyd, Story, pp.21,87.

5) JE Lloyd, Story, p.99: Walker, op.cit. pp.590-1: CIM 1164; Cl45/33/31 m.1d.

6) Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, pp.756-8: E372/104 m.8d: CPR 1247-58, p.272: CIM 979.

7) CPR 1232-47, p.242.

sworn fealty and recognised that their lands were held from the honour or "county" of Carmarthen <sup>1</sup>. These rights, transferred from Henry to Edward in 1254 <sup>2</sup>, were more than a formality, enforcing the authority and jurisdiction of the new county courts and obligations of military service. To reinforce this achievement, a large-scale enquiry was launched in 1242 into the Crown's feudal and judicial rights in the "counties", as they were now styled, of Cardigan and Carmarthen <sup>3</sup>. In the 1240's and 1250's the government was quite successful in achieving the recognition and observance of the courts. The profits of justice were not high, but the judicial rights enhanced the authority and prestige of the administration <sup>4</sup>.

Thus, in the years immediately before the grant to Edward, the crown territories had been both expanded and brought under more effective control. A side-effect was the increasing discontent among the Welsh at the disregard of local customs and the insensitivity of English officials. The inability of the local officials to observe the king's commitment to preserve Welsh law and customs strained the relationship between the English and Welsh to breaking point. For example, Rhys Fychan was promised in 1248 that he would be treated fairly under Welsh law, but he and his son later complained that this had repeatedly been denied them <sup>5</sup>. A valuable assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Marcher Wales makes the point that the policy of consolidation, through the erection of castles and the aggressive enforcement of judicial rights, was not unique to the crown, but followed by other Marcher

1) CLR 1226-40, p.477: CR 1237-42, p.198: CPR 1232-47, pp.474,479,485, 493: Griffiths, The Principality of Wales, p.2.

2) CPR 1247-58, p.369.

3) e.g. CPR 1232-47, pp.292-3.

4) e.g. CPR 1247-58, p.30: CR 1247-51, p.113: C145/33/31 m.2: Royal Charters and historic documents relating to Carmarthen, pp.18,47: Calendar of various Chancery Rolls, p.184.

5) CR 1247-51 pp.408,566: CPR 1232-47, p.430, 47-58, p.155.

lords, such as the Clares <sup>1</sup>.

It is difficult to assess with any certainty the income Edward received from his Welsh estates. The farm of Chester and the Four Cantreds continued at the existing rate, 1,000 m. p.a. This had been raised from 500 m. in 1250, an increase which was said to have caused much hardship. Evidence of receipts at other times tends to disprove these claims <sup>2</sup>. It was probably in recognition of the loss of the Four Cantreds that the farm was reduced to 800 marks. The first Justice known to pay at this rate was Reginald de Grey in 1270 <sup>3</sup>. There were additional revenues from the separately-administered forest, escheats and wardships <sup>4</sup>.

The figures for Edward's other Welsh lands are more tentative. Net receipts from Montgomery may have been about £60 p.a. <sup>5</sup>. Builth had been farmed for 40 marks yearly <sup>6</sup>. For the Three Castles, the estimate of 1250 may be compared with the sums actually received by Edward's bailiff and prevosts in 1256-7 <sup>7</sup>. The valuation is broadly equivalent to the figure reached by the subtraction of the expenses from the gross receipts, giving a net annual receipt of £100 for Grosmont and White Castle, rising to £150 in 1257, when Skenfrith reverted to Edward's custody. In West Wales the disparity between the farm paid by Robert Walerand and other evidence of revenue is so marked that one must conclude that the grant of the farm was intended to benefit him financially. A net receipt might have constituted two-thirds of the

1) RR Davies, Conquest, Co-existence and Change, pp.270-307.

2) E372/94 m.18, 97 m.8d, 119 m.20: Stewart-Brown, Pipe Rolls, pp.36, 58,66,71,76,87,93,97: Paris, CM, V, p.227.

3) E372/120 m.22; Stewart-Brown, Pipe Rolls, p.108.

4) E372/119 m.21d: E101/350/5 m.6d: C62/51 m.4.

5) £40 from the farm of the town and perhaps £40 gross from demesne and judicial rights, CChR 1227-57, pp.100-1: Brown et al. p.742.

6) CR 1253-4, p.195.

7) C145/4/10; CIM 89 : SC6/1094/11 mm.4,4d.

valuations, perhaps £100 p.a. <sup>1</sup>.

From these admittedly unsatisfactory figures, Edward's revenues could have been about £1,000 p.a., of which two-thirds derived from Chester, a substantial contribution to his exchequer. Using the same figures, we may assess his losses in the war at over £300 p.a. <sup>2</sup>, over a quarter of his revenues in all Wales. In real terms his losses were far greater, for the surviving revenues and more had to be devoted to the maintenance of remaining holdings and the financing of expeditions.

Edward's original endowment, supplemented by the Cantilupe and Lacy wardships, which included the castles of Abergavenny, Kilgarran and Ewyas, and by his acquisition of the lordship of Monmouth, made him a formidable power in Wales and the March. Even Hubert de Burgh at his zenith had not controlled as many lordships. The accumulation in the hands of the Crown, by conquest, diplomacy, purchase and escheat reflected not just the weakness of the Welsh princes and Lords Marcher, but deliberate policy, good management and also luck on the English side. It was a unique conglomeration, and we can only speculate as to the intentions behind its formation. At the time of the grant to Edward, English power in Wales can be said to have been at its height, with more territory under the direct or indirect control of the English Crown than at any previous time. The building programme of the 1240's and 1250's had emphasised and strengthened the English presence, while the judicial policy had extended control outside the castle demesne. New fiscal policies may have added to the profitability of the territories, but beneath the surface were profound dissatisfactions with the situation,

1) 40 m. farm and valuations of £155 p.a. E372/104 m.8d: C145/33/31: CIM 1000: Royal Charters ...Carmarthen, pp.45-50: Griffiths, op. cit. pp.149-50: CPR 1247-58, p.25.

2) 200 m. for the Four Cantreds, 40 m. for Builth, £60 for Montgomery and £80 for Llanbadarn Fawr.

only awaiting an opportunity for expression.

It was a time of rising nationalist feeling; for example, reactions to the death of Rhys ap Iairgwn in 1255 <sup>1</sup>. Already in 1251 the principal Welsh lords of Ceredigion and Ystrad Tywi had made an alliance with Llywelyn and Owain ap Gruffydd of Gwynedd against all comers <sup>2</sup>. It was this kind of link between hitherto divided North and South Wales which proved so disastrous in 1256-7. With hindsight, the causes of the coming catastrophe were visible in 1254.

However, the grant must be seen in positive terms, Henry was not intentionally handing over a time-bomb to his inexperienced son. Rather, he was transferring a dominion which had been assimilated and brought under English control. In 1254 the only opposition to English rule was fragmented and seemingly harmless. Not surprisingly, Edward saw no reason to hurry to inspect these apparently secure territories. Gascony had more urgent claims upon him. This was not an error of judgement, for the key date in the history of Edward's Welsh lands was not 1251, or February 1254 or summer 1256, when he first visited them, but summer 1255, and the victory of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd over his brothers Owain and Dafydd at the battle of Bryn Derwin. This victory left Llywelyn sole ruler of Gwynedd, at last in a position to claw back the territorial losses of 1241 and 1247, shake off English interference in Gwynedd's internal affairs, and assist others to do the same. To anyone dissatisfied with the territorial transfers of the 1240's or the nature of the English administration, he was a saviour, a focal-point for discontent and a rallying-point for revolt.

The Welsh war which began in 1256 can be divided into two phases, first, the rising in the Four Cantreds at the beginning of November

1) AC, p.89.

2) LW, pp.160-1.

which left the whole of Gwynedd is Conwy, with the exception of the beleaguered castles of Dyserth and Deganwy, in the hands of Llywelyn. The second phase was more prolonged, beginning with the expedition into South and West Wales in December followed by the move into Mid Wales and Powys in early 1257. These campaigns were not directed exclusively at Edward, but he was the principal victim. Llywelyn did not himself profit from these later conquests, but gained allies and goodwill by their distribution among various Welsh lords. In the first phase he had recovered lands and fealties formerly owed to Gwynedd, in the second he was operating outside the old boundaries of Gwynedd, in what has been claimed to be an unprecedented alliance between North and South <sup>1</sup>, leading to a redistribution of territory from the English to dispossessed Welsh lords and their descendants.

Contemporaries and historians have attributed the sudden eruption of the Welsh into open revolt to the misgovernment of Edward's officials. Varying criticisms were made by English chroniclers, generally on the theme that Edward "malo consilio" wanted to put the Welsh under a yoke of "servitus insueta" <sup>2</sup>, a recurring phrase. More specifically, the Dunstable annalist claimed that Geoffrey de Langley wanted to put the Welsh under English law and assign counties and hundreds to them <sup>3</sup>. Matthew Paris singled out Langley as the villain, but made no specific allegations <sup>4</sup>. The Tewkesbury annalist added to the more general criticisms the claim that Edward's seneschals, Geoffrey de Langley and William de Wytune, had wished to impose a poll tax of 15d. per person <sup>5</sup>. The Welsh chronicles spoke darkly of the need

1) Tout, Collected Papers II, p.53.

2) Flores II, p.416: A.Lond. p.49: AM I, p.158.

3) AM III, p.200.

4) Paris, CM V, p.292.

5) AM I, p.158.

to defend their laws and customs, but made no reference to any specific changes in administration.

Historians for the most part have adopted these views, and have developed from the account of the Dunstable annalist an elaborate scheme for the transformation of Edward's Welsh lands into English shires<sup>1</sup>. That Langley was seen as responsible for the debacle in certain circles, is suggested by the pardon granted to him "so that the king and his heirs will not be able to bring any charges against him on account of the Welsh war"<sup>2</sup>. Edward apparently did not blame him, for he was not immediately dismissed, and continued in favour until at least 1263. The pardon throws no additional light on the nature of his misjudgements or misdemeanours. The so-called shiring scheme cannot be accepted in the version suggested by Tout, since Cardigan and Carmarthen had already been shired during the 1240's (see above). Similarly, the Four Cantreds had been subordinated to the county and justiciar of Chester since 1247, arousing discontent well before the grant to Edward. The (probably genuine) grievances in North and West Wales had been building up since the 1240's<sup>3</sup>. Opposition was not confined to Edward's tenants; those of other Marcher lords went over to Llywelyn with similar alacrity<sup>4</sup>.

The question of the poll-tax requires closer examination. As with the shiring question, we may be dealing with opposition to the taxes levied by the English since their acquisition of the Four Cantreds. The king had the customary right to "cornagium" annually from the men of the lands ceded from Gwynedd, The English administration originally

1) e.g. Tout, op.cit. p.53: JE Lloyd, History of Wales, p.717. More recently, Professor Davies sees Edward as peripheral to the long-established royal policies, op.cit. pp.306-10.

2) CPR 1247-58, p.616.

3) e.g. CR 1247-51, pp.113,408,541,556.

4) Cal.AC Wales, pp.17-18; SCl/3 no154: Brut (Roll Series), p.349: AM IV, p.447.

considered this tax as equivalent to the tallage, arousing indignation and orders from the king to revert to cornage. The new boroughs and manors in North Wales did pay tallage, probably with some resentment, e.g. the complaints in 1251 that la Zuche distrained them to "novas inusitas et injustas consuetudines" <sup>1</sup>.

The naming by the Tewkesbury chronicle of two of Edward's officials as responsible for the tax is curious. Geoffrey de Langley was Edward's chief steward, but officially had no jurisdiction over Edward's North Welsh lands <sup>2</sup>. William de Wilton ("Wyttune" in Tewkesbury) was an important though shadowy figure in Edward's administration from 1254, again with no overt links with Edward's Welsh estates <sup>3</sup>. References in the bailiffs' accounts for 1256-7 prove that he was operating in Wales within the crucial period <sup>4</sup>. Tewkesbury's accuracy on this point must give greater credibility to the rest of the account.

Edward was entitled to claim tallage on his other lands in 1255, and may have levied either tallage or cornage in the Four Cantreds at that time <sup>5</sup>. Nothing in the records of Edward's administration show any receipts of this kind, so a firm conclusion cannot be hoped for. It would in any case be difficult to find a medieval community which did not consider itself to be overtaxed by lord or king. The complaints of the men of Gwynedd (c.1283) about excessive and uncustomary financial demands made on them by Llywelyn are a salutary reminder that "home rule" did not greatly improve the lot of the Welsh tenant <sup>6</sup>.

At this point it may be helpful to look at the Welsh accounts, to

1) E372/99 m.9d.; Stewart-Brown, Pipe Rolls, p.99; E368/31 m.8d: CPR 1247-58, p.171; CR 1247-51, p.541, 54-6, pp.301-2.

2) C61/1 m.4; Studd 11, a distinction unknown to Dunstable.

3) Studd 22; C61/1 m.4: SC6/1094/11 mm.10,11: CPR 1247-58, p.438: SC6/1094/11 m.16d: CR 1254-6, p.104.

4) SC6/1094/11 m.5.

5) CR 1254-6, pp.43,45,96.

6) LB Smith, Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, pp.158-176.

see whether they confirm the allegations of the English chroniclers. Accounts of oppression and spoliation were directed at English rule generally, rather than specifically against Edward or any of his officials<sup>1</sup>. The Annales Cambriae additionally stated, that in the first attack Llywelyn was accompanied by Maredudd ap Rhys Gryg (from South Wales), who had recently been dispossessed of his lands "per cavillationem Anglicorum et nepotis sui, scilicet Rhys Fychan"<sup>2</sup>. With them were "certain others their neighbours who had been ejected from their lands and inheritance". The English territorial gains of the 1240's had created many grievances, but the man singled out in the Annales, Maredudd ap Rhys, had suffered more recent losses. His grievance may hold the key to the timing and the scale of the rising, and especially to its extension into South Wales.

Maredudd ap Rhys Gryg was a descendant of the great Rhys ap Tewdr, but by 1256 he had lost much of his inheritance to the English and was unhappy about the subjection of the remainder to the county of Carmarthen<sup>3</sup>. The seizure of his remaining lands by his nephew Rhys Fychan drove him into alliance with Llywelyn. The Annales Cambriae are not the sole source for English involvement in this episode. In the account of John le Breton for Abergavenny is a claim for allowance of £31/15/10 paid in wages for an expedition of 35 knights and 700 footsoldiers going "ad partes de Llanandever per preceptum domini Willelmi de Wilton et commorantes per iiii dies" from 14th. September 1256<sup>4</sup>. Llanandever has been identified with Llandovery, at the head of the Tywi valley in Cantref Bychan. This was outside the limits of

1) e.g. AC, p.91: Brut, Rolls Series, p.341; Brut, (Peniarth MS, p.34.

2) AC, p.91.

3) JE Lloyd, History of Carmarthen I, pp.142-90, Story of Ceredigion, pp.59-78.

4) SC6/1094/11 m.5: Walker, op. cit. pp.630-2,640-1.

English rule in Carmarthen, but within Maredudd's territory. Edward's officials were thus implicated in the transfer of power from Maredudd to his nephew. Wilton's involvement is reminiscent of the Tewkesbury allegation. This interference in the balance of power in the area, only a few weeks after Edward's tour of his North Welsh lands will have aroused the worst suspicions as to Edward's plans, and may well have been the precipitating factor into war. Rhys Fychan was one of the first targets of Llywelyn when he came south in December <sup>1</sup>.

The rising of 1256 was thus caused by a combination of long-standing grievances over disinheritance and the disparagement of Welsh law, coupled perhaps with more immediate financial exactions and fears that a new phase of English expansion and dispossession was beginning. These grievances were largely the result of Henry III's policy of consolidation, intended to protect and strengthen the English position, but achieving the reverse. The underlying discontent would not have erupted in 1256 had it not been that the prince of Gwynedd was at last able to respond. Edward's visit of 1256 was certainly a catalyst, and the ambitious scheming of his officers also a factor. The very scale of his possessions in Wales, and their continued expansion, tended to focus hostility and discontent on him and his lands. He was paying the bill for the wider dissatisfaction felt with English expansion, English administration and English domination.

The outbreak of war took the English by surprise, although in June 1255 Henry III had warned of Llywelyn's improved position and increasing ambition <sup>2</sup>. Henry was deeply absorbed in the Sicilian negotiations, and saw the Welsh disturbances as a tiresome interruption, hoping for a

1) AC, p.91. Ironically, after leading Edward's forces to a crushing defeat in 1257, Rhys deserted to Llywelyn.

2) CR 1254-6, p.204.

negotiated settlement. Preparations for a royal campaign did not begin until June 1257, after the disaster at Cymerau<sup>1</sup>, by which time the situation was probably beyond retrieval.

Were Edward's officers were any better informed or prepared? Certainly, Wales must have been in their minds in the summer and autumn of 1256, with Edward's visit in August, the purchase of the Monmouth estate and leasing of Ellesmere (September and October respectively), and the expedition to Llandovery<sup>2</sup>. Measures to munition Montgomery in late October may suggest uneasiness<sup>3</sup>. However, during autumn 1256 Edward and his administration were much occupied with Gascon affairs<sup>4</sup>. No movements of troops occurred until the end of November, when 200 foot were sent to Shrewsbury<sup>5</sup>. By this date the Four Cantreds had fallen and Llywelyn had occupied Edward's lands in North Ceredigion<sup>6</sup>. Edward did react faster than his father: his bailiffs had also taken hostages by December, presumably to ensure the good behaviour of local Welsh lords<sup>7</sup>. By early 1257 a force led by John Lestrange, John FitzAlan and Gruffydd ap Gwenwynwyn was operating "under the Lord Edward's standard" from Montgomery, clashing unsuccessfully with Llywelyn. Stephen Bauzan, his constable of Carmarthen, was on the offensive in West Wales, backed by Nicholas FitzMartin and Patrick de Chaworth, until his defeat and death at Cymerau in June 1257<sup>8</sup>. In addition, 100 foot were sent at Edward's expense to Hay in March 1257, 250 foot to Radnor soon after, 700 foot to Cardiff and 700 foot to Newport in early July, (failing to

1) e.g. CR 1256-9, p.69: CLR 1251-60, p.381: AC, p.93.

2) The Irish evidence of the despatch of 600 horses to Milford Haven in July 1256 is almost certainly misdated from 1257, Lydon, pp.14-15: Harris Collectanea, pp.288-9.

3) CR 1254-6, p.370.

4) Cuttino, GR A 132,184,199,204: CPR 1247-58, p.500: Rec.Feod. 431-46.

5) SC6/1094/11 m.5; cf.CR 1256-9, p.12.

6) AC, p.91.

7) SC6/1094/11 m.5.

8) AC, pp.91,93-4.

prevent the capture of Newport) and 160 foot to Huntington and 400 to Brecon, on the orders of Humphrey de Bohun, Roger de Mortimer and Richard de Clare. Edward was waging war on a serious scale long before the royal expedition got under way.

This expedition, operating a two-pronged attack in North and South Wales, achieved very little at considerable cost. When it withdrew, all of Ceredigion (except the castles of Carmarthen and Cardigan), the cantred of Builth (except for the castle), the Four Cantreds (except for Dyserth and Deganwy), and lands of marcher lords such as Mortimer's Gwerthrynion and Gruffydd ap Gwenwynwyn's Powys, had been occupied by Llywelyn and his allies. Over the next few years truces punctuated by skirmishes, alternated with periods of further Welsh expansion. The loss of Edward's castle of Builth in 1260 led to a quarrel between Edward and his constable, Roger de Mortimer, whom Edward held responsible for the disaster <sup>1</sup>. In late 1262 the king summoned Edward back from France to relieve the besieged castles of Dyserth and Deganwy, but his expedition of spring 1263, unsupported by the Marcher lords, was another failure, and the castles fell soon after. Further south, Abergavenny escaped a similar fate by a very narrow margin <sup>2</sup>. Edward was unable to make any kind of reply to Llywelyn's successes, and the alliance between Gwynedd and Simon de Montfort seemed to spell disaster for his remaining Welsh territories <sup>3</sup>.

The collapse of the English position in Wales had serious financial consequences for Edward. Not only was his income from his Welsh lands reduced by more than 25%, but serious outlay was required to preserve

1) CPR 1258-66, p.85; Foedera I i, p.398, an exoneration of Mortimer dated 30 July 1260, later revoked "postea Edwardus filius regis coram magnatibus de consilio reclamavit contra remissionem".

2) Davies, op.cit. pp.310-12.

3) A.Ces, p.84.

his surviving estates and finance recovery. The cost of the 1257 campaign had been mainly borne by the royal exchequer <sup>1</sup>, but this was Henry III's main contribution, plans for subsequent campaigns being abandoned before he had incurred much expense. Edward was put to considerable and continuing expense to maintain his garrisons, strengthen his castles <sup>2</sup>, and finance expeditions. The evidence of troop movements suggests that he was also financing the defence of lands of other marcher lords. Patrick de Chaworth, while in Edward's service at Carmarthen, was killed in September 1258, leading an expedition to defend his own castle of Kidwelly <sup>3</sup>.

Edward did receive some assistance from his father to meet these commitments. Setting aside the 1257 campaign, Edward was advanced £1,233 in 1258, £1,333/6/8 in 1259 and £1,706/13/4 in 1263 from government funds, of which only £567 (for Cardigan and Carmarthen) was specifically to be repaid <sup>4</sup>. He was also assisted by gifts of weapons and supplies <sup>5</sup>. The king also made gifts to individual soldiers in Edward's service, which will have eased the claims on Edward's exchequer slightly <sup>6</sup>.

For his own part, Edward committed the majority of his Irish revenues. Ireland also supplied troops, horses, provisions and other necessaries (above). His towns of Bristol and Chester were used as the main supply bases for expeditions and garrisons. In the early stages of the war, the revenues of his remaining Welsh estates were devoted to the war-effort. From Abergavenny, forces of 1,000 infantry with supporting knights were simultaneously maintained. The bailiff of Monmouth financed

1) CLR 1251-60, passim: C47/2/1/5.

2) SC6/1094/11 m.5: Taylor, *Medieval Archaeology* V (1961), pp. 173-5.

3) further forces were sent to Brecon and Huntington in September 1257, SC6/1094/11 m.5: AC pp.96-7.

4) CLR 1251-60, pp.417,419,439, 60-67, p.132,67-72, pp.268,271,274: CPR 1258-66, pp.39, 253.

5) e.g. CR 1254-6, p.370, 56-9, pp.12,198: CPR 1257-58, p.617.

6) e.g. CLR 1251-60, pp.339,402,441,460,472,487,506.

several smaller expeditions<sup>1</sup>. His English estates sent supplies and some revenues passed directly from the bailiffs to the war-zone<sup>2</sup>. Edward borrowed sums totalling £4,333/6/8 from his father and uncles, Richard of Cornwall and Boniface of Savoy. To repay these loans Edward committed his customs revenue in Bordeaux and his Sussex lands. In summer 1257 he was also realising assets and anticipating revenue<sup>3</sup>.

In spite of his losses, Edward still maintained a power base in Wales, albeit a fragmented and stressed one. After Edward's surrender at Lewes, Montfort took steps to reduce his centres of power, singling out his Marcher strongholds. By December 1264 it was claimed that Edward had given up Bristol, although it was April before Edward's occupying knights could be dispossessed<sup>4</sup>. In the same month, William la Zuche's valiant attempts to defend Chester, with the county feudal levies, were terminated by his capture and imprisonment. Chester was not formally granted to Montfort until March, but his effective control probably dated from November/December 1264<sup>5</sup>. In March 1265 the negotiations for Edward's "release" ran parallel to the dismantling of his appanage. His constables of Cardigan, Carmarthen, Kilgaran, and Montgomery were instructed to deliver the castles to Montfortian nominees<sup>6</sup>. It was probably about this time that Monmouth, Abergavenny and the Three Castles were given up to Montfort, but Edward's other constables were more intransigent. The West Welsh castles had earlier sheltered Roger de Mortimer, and were still far enough outside Montfort's power to ignore his threats<sup>7</sup>. Montgomery's refusal to submit, in spite of the

1) SC6/1094/11 mm.5,6d.

2) SC6/1094/11 mm.2,3,5d,12d: CR 1256-9, p.69: CLR 1251-60, p.391.

3) Table 1. It is not known how Richard of Cornwall was to be paid.

4) CPR 1258-66, pp.395,425,431: CR 1264-8, p.106: C47/3/7/1.

5) A.Ces, pp.86-91: CPR 1258-66, p.416: CChR 1257-1300, p.54: KB26/198 m.17.

6) Studd 899-901: CPR 1258-66, pp.414,417: CR 1264-8, p.41.

7) dALL, pp.72-3: Battle Chronicle in Bémont, Simon de Montfort, p.378.

direct order which Edward was instructed to send, led to an invitation being issued to Llywelyn to take the castle. The treaty Montfort agreed with Llywelyn in June 1265 confirmed him in his existing conquests, and gave him the right to keep any royalist marcher territory he could capture, especially Montgomery <sup>1</sup>.

The alliance between Edward and the Earl of Gloucester transformed the situation. Even before Edward's escape, Clare had recovered Edward's castle of Monmouth, although it was recaptured by Montfort who used it and Abergavenny as a base during his final campaign <sup>2</sup>. Gloucester's galleys prevented Montfort retreating to Bristol, and his forces ensured victory for the royalists at Evesham. After Evesham, Edward's first thought was to recover control of Chester, before turning to the recovery of London and other strongholds.

Llywelyn was still a threat, forming an alliance with Simon de Montfort's son, and raiding into Cheshire. In September 1265 he defeated a combined force of Irish and Marcher troops led by Hamo Lestrangle and Maurice FitzGerald, whom Edward had sent into Wales. In May 1266 it was Mortimer's turn to suffer defeat <sup>3</sup>. By this point, the king, more concerned for the pacification of England was already negotiating for a truce. In February 1267 this became negotiations for a peace settlement, which was agreed at Montgomery in September. By this treaty Llywelyn was confirmed in his gains from Edward, and he was elevated to the rank of Prince of Wales. During two decades his achievements had effectively destroyed the plans of empire which Henry III and Edward may once have had in Wales <sup>4</sup>.

1) Foedera I i, p.457, "et maxime castrum Montisgomeri".

2) Flores III, p.3: AM III, p.161: Trivet, p.265: E101/349/30: CPR 1258-66, p.434. Repairs at Monmouth in December 1265 were probably necessitated by damage during these two attacks, CR 1264-8, p.95.

3) AM II, pp.366,370.

4) Tout, Collected Papers II, pp.84-6.

What were Edward's motives in agreeing to this settlement? His defeats may have disillusioned him with the prospects for English domination in Wales. Over the past two years he had reduced his surviving commitments in Wales, surrendering Cardigan and Carmarthen (by November 28 1265), the site of Builth (1266) and Monmouth and the Three Castles to his brother (June 1267) <sup>1</sup>. The struggle against Llywelyn was transferred to Edmund, perhaps to free Edward for other tasks. In 1266 Edmund was also promised that he could keep any lands he conquered from the Welsh. However, he too abandoned any plans for reconquest in 1267, being one of the negotiators of the treaty with Llywelyn <sup>2</sup>, and like Edward took up the idea of crusade instead. It has been suggested that the blocking of prospects in Wales encouraged Edward to turn his thoughts to the opportunities in Palestine. It is still as possible that it was the lure of the crusade (raised by Ottobuono at the Parliament of February 1267) which made Edward more amenable to the abandonment of his aspirations in Wales <sup>3</sup>. Professor Davies points out that Montgomery was only a temporary halting-point in Anglo-Welsh relations, leaving many disputed issues open to disagreement, and masking the uncertainties in Llywelyn's position. For Edward, the true sequel to the rising of 1256 was not 1267, but 1277 and the Treaty of Aberconwy <sup>4</sup>.

1) CPR 1258-66, p.513; C66/84 m.41: CChR 1257-1300, p.67: Studd 948,949; CCR 1279-88, p.59: 31st. Annual Report of the deputy keeper of the Public Records, pp.9-12: Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster I, p.8.

2) Foedera I i, p.472.

3) SD Lloyd, in 13th.Century England, edd. Coss and Lloyd, pp.120-124.

4) RR Davies, op.cit. pp.320-330.

iv) **The English Estates**

The English estates granted to Edward in 1254 were a random grouping of scattered territories, which had come into the crown's possession over the previous century. Edward retained the cluster of terrae Normannorum, which remained from those set aside for his maintenance <sup>1</sup>. Stamford and Grantham had also been resumed by the king as escheat of the Normans in 1204, but were almost immediately granted for life to Earl William de Warenne as compensation for his lost Norman estates. On his death in 1240, the lands were separated from the Warenne inheritance and kept in the crown's hands until the grant to Edward <sup>2</sup>. The Peak estate had escheated on William II Peveril's forfeiture, early in Henry II's reign. In 1199 the earl of Derby, William de Ferrers, was allowed to make a fine for some of the Peveril lands, in right of his wife, Margaret Peveril, but compelled to quitclaim most of her inheritance, including the Peak. Although he recovered custody of the Peak and Bolsover during the Minority, these were again surrendered to the crown in 1223 <sup>3</sup>.

Bristol came under Angevin control by the marriage of John to the Gloucester co-heiress, Isabel. When this alliance broke down and the earldom passed to Isabel's next husband, the town, castle and barton of Bristol were retained by King John. The earls of Gloucester were awarded a yearly sum in compensation for the barton, which remained the exchequer's responsibility after the grant to Edward. They were not compensated for the town or castle <sup>4</sup>. Edward was also given the royal manor and park of Freemantle, probably for recreational purposes, since

1) above, Chapter 1.i.

2) Just1/1187 m.23d: Peck, Academia Tertia Anglicana VII, pp.6-7: Rogers, The Making of Stamford, p.24.

3) GEC IV, pp.195,766.

4) CR 1261-4, p.284: CLR 1267-72, pp.22,215: E159/46 m.5.

it had no financial or strategic value. In spite of his enthusiasm for hunting, he showed little interest in the estate <sup>1</sup>.

Several of Edward's new possessions had thus been acquired by a degree of sharp practice on the part of the crown. While Stamford had only been granted to Warenne for life, its withdrawal (after over 30 years in his possession) left his heir without either the family Norman lands or any compensation for their loss. We may be sure that this rankled, for in 1263 Stamford and Grantham were John de Warenne's price for secession from the Montfortian camp. Significantly, the grant gave him the towns to hold "adeo libere et integre sicut pater predicti comitis unquam ipsas (villas) tenuit" <sup>2</sup>.

Robert de Ferrers' claim to the Peak was probably the cause of his animosity to Edward. In 1263 he seized three of Edward's castles, probably including Stamford and the Peak, and in early 1264 campaigned against Edward in the March. In retaliation, Edward, after the royalist victory at Northampton, raided the Ferrers estates in the Midlands and destroyed Tutbury castle <sup>3</sup>. Ferrers then took advantage of Edward's captivity to raid the Peak forest, and re-occupy the castle, disseising many of Edward's tenants, besides launching an attack on Edward's county of Chester <sup>4</sup>. The Peak, Stamford and Grantham, consequently, came into the custody of the Montfortian government, and Edward had to negotiate terms of recovery from the Montfortian keepers. In the aftermath of Evesham, Ferrers again raided Peak tenants <sup>5</sup>. It is hardly surprising that Ferrers was excluded from the the Dictum of

1) Brown et al. I, pp.97-9, II, pp.940-1: CPR 1247-58, p.270: CCR 1272-9, pp.263-4: E372/99 m.1.

2) PlacQW, p.429: RH I, p.354

3) AM III, pp.224,228,230: E372/116 m.2: Rishanger CDB, p.26.

4) VCH Derby I, p.405, from the Forest Eyre of 1285: AM III, p.235: A.Ces, pp.86-90.

5) CPR 1258-66, p.397: CR 1264-8, pp.27-8,54,233: CCR 1272-9, p.218: CIM 645,722,1018; C145/25/36: C47/2/1/8.

Kenilworth, and that Edward gave assistance to his brother's scheme to imprison Ferrers and defraud him of his estates <sup>1</sup>.

The loss of Bristol was a continuing grievance and inconvenience to the earls of Gloucester. Earl Richard was seriously incensed by the grant to Edward, which underlined the unlikelihood of the town's recovery. His dissatisfaction increased, probably causing the breakdown of the alliance he had made with Edward in March 1259 <sup>2</sup>. Gloucester's claims exacerbated the controversy between Edward and the government in 1259-60 over the choice of constable for Bristol. At this time Gloucester's men clashed with Edward's constable of Bristol, Roger de Leyburn. This affair may have arisen from a dispute over jurisdiction, rather than an armed assault on the town <sup>3</sup>. Leyburn's removal was evidently one of the conditions of Edward's reconciliation with his father and Gloucester in May 1260 <sup>4</sup>. Although their differences were again to go to arbitration, no change occurred in the castle's status.

Dissatisfaction about Bristol is unlikely to have caused Gilbert de Clare's alignment with the Montfortian camp. Ironically, the transfer of Bristol to Montfort himself during Edward's captivity probably hastened Clare's disenchantment with the rebel cause. There is no evidence that Bristol was mentioned in the negotiations between Edward and him at Ludlow, but he would have been extraordinarily selfless to confine his demands to the welfare of the realm. During his occupation of London in 1267, measures were taken to strengthen Bristol, perhaps through fears that he would move against the town. Soon after his reconciliation with the king and Edward, it was agreed that he should press his claim

1) Somerville, History of the Duchy of LancasterI, pp.3-8: T&S 44, cl.14,36.

2) AM I, p.155: HMC 69, p.67.

3) A.Lond, pp.54-5. The precise date is not given, and the venue said to be "in marchia Gallia".

4) CPR 1258-66, pp.59,79: Studd 742,790; C61/4 mm.4,3.14.

by law <sup>1</sup>. The existence of these claims and grievances was an added complication to Edward's affairs.

The estates were scattered, from Yorkshire and Derby (Tickhill, Laughton and the Peak), Lincoln (Stamford, Grantham, Paunton), East Anglia (Witton; some fees here were also held from the county of Chester), the West Country (Bristol), to the South East (Hastings, Burwash, Elham). In size, position and value, Bristol was pre-eminent, being in national terms second only to London. The town dominated the Severn valley and the Avon gorge, and as a port had close commercial links with Ireland, Gascony and South Wales. As a centre of communications it was unrivalled, which may explain its selection as the head-quarters of Edward's administration, housing his exchequer and co-ordinating his scattered dominions. It was of great value as an entrepôt: supplies for Gascony (by sea) and for Wales (by land and sea) were collected there, especially during 1254 and 1257 <sup>2</sup>.

Of the other lands, the Peak was principally an agricultural estate, with useful mineral resources <sup>3</sup>. Tickhill's interest to Edward largely consisted in the tournament site at nearby Blyth, which he visited in 1256 and perhaps 1259 and 1260 <sup>4</sup>. Stamford and Grantham drew their revenues mainly from agriculture and the wool/cloth industry. Stamford was a centre of the industry, trading with the cloth merchants of Flanders and Italy. Its annual fair produced 40% of the town's revenues <sup>5</sup>. Both Edward and the king made use of the fair to equip

1) CPR 1266-72, p.373: Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, p.6: AbbrPlac, p.191. His claim was rejected in 1275.

2) e.g. Studd 158,346; C61/3 m.3, 2 m.7: CR 1253-4, p.63, 54-6, pp.133,242, 56-9, pp.69,77,92, 139,141,401: CLR 1251-60, pp.385-6,413-4.

3) VCH Derby I, pp.316,377: CR 1254-6, p.91: CLR 1251-60, pp.320,391: E372/120 m.22.

4) Cartulary of Blyth Priory, p.cxi, no.298; BL Harl.Ms. 3759 f.96d: SC6/1094/11 m.2: Paris CM V, pp.557,609: CPR 1258-66, p.27.

5) SC6/1094/11 m.1: Rogers, op.cit. pp.37-45: EW Moore, Fairs of Medieval England, p.13, wrongly dating the town's return to Warenne .

their own households <sup>1</sup>. Paunton, Laughton and Witton were small manors, and Edward surrendered them to discharge his obligations to Geoffrey de Lusignan in 1256 <sup>2</sup>. Hastings, as one of the Cinque Ports, was the most significant of the lands in the South.

Some idea of the income Edward derived from these estates may be calculated from valuations and accounts. Bristol was habitually farmed for 400 marks p.a. <sup>3</sup>. The Peak was occasionally farmed, in the 1250's at £300 p.a. and by 1271 (probably from 1265) at 400 marks p.a. Accounts from the periods of direct exploitation suggest that the lower farm was a more realistic estimate of what the estate could bear <sup>4</sup>. Stamford and Grantham were later valued at £220 and £110 respectively. Comparisons with gross revenues from both towns in 1256-7 and from Stamford in 1261-3, indicate that the valuation represented a fairly accurate estimate of net revenue <sup>5</sup>. Witton, Paunton and Laughton were valued £160 p.a. net in 1256. For Tickhill, only the gross revenues for 1252-4 and 1256-7 are known (about £200 pa. for the honour and several dependent manors). Deductions for expenses are hampered by the other estates, which accounted through Tickhill, but a net figure of £180 p.a. seems a possibility <sup>6</sup>. From accounts for 1252-4 a gross annual revenue of £133 may be calculated for Hastings and Burwash, which roughly equates with the £200 net estimated for Hastings, Burwash and Elham, when they were demised to Boniface of Savoy in 1257 <sup>7</sup>. We may therefore estimate net

1) Studd 766; C61/4 m.4: RegTC, p.173: CR 1261-4, pp.33,44, 213.

2) Studd 620; CChR 1226-57, p.453.

3) E372/98 m.1d, 101 m.19d.

4) E372/95 m.6d, 98 m.6, 99 m.15, 120 m.22: C62/52 m.4: SC6/1094/11 mm.15,15d: Studd 783,809; C61/4 mm.3,2: CFR, p.183.

5) RH I, pp.351,396: SC6/1094/11 mm.1,1d: E372/105 m.21d, 116 m.2.

6) E372/98 m.6: SC6/1094/11 mm.1d-2d.

7) E372/98 m.6: Studd 23; C61/1 m.4: CPR 1247-58, p.572. These figures indicate that Peter of Savoy made a considerable profit when he farmed Hastings and Burwash for £80 p.a. in 1254.

receipts of about £1,400 for the English estates <sup>1</sup>.

These lands did not remain static between 1254 and 1272. Their history throws light on the pressures and constraints on Edward. The frequent swings between farming and direct exploitation may reflect attempts to utilise his financial resources to the maximum. For example, the Peak was farmed for 1256-7, directly exploited 1257-8, farmed 1260-62, and farmed (at a lower rate) 1265-72. The farm offered better opportunities for raising ready cash. This can be seen in 1257, when Edward farmed Bristol to the citizens for four years at the traditional rate, but receiving 75% of the sum at the outset. Similarly, in 1260 the Peak was farmed to a Nottingham merchant, Ralph Bugg, for two years at the conventional farm of £300 p.a. Ralph paid £350 in advance and £250 a month later <sup>2</sup>. On many other occasions Edward committed future revenues to raise cash or to repay loans. Table 1 lists these transactions chronologically, but the scope and the effect on Edward's annual income may be appreciated when the loans are organised geographically. Thus, the revenues were anticipated for:

Bristol for 1257-61

Elham for 1257-60 (granted away in 1260)

Grantham for 1257-8, 1261, 1262-3 (granted away in 1263)

Hastings and Burwash for 1254-9, 1261 (exchanged 1262)

Peak for 1260-62

Stamford for 1257-8, 1261-3 (granted away in 1263)

Tickhill for 1257-8, 1261, 1262-3 (granted away in 1263)

These arrangements reduced Edward's annual income, rendering further loans inevitable. It is significant that these expedients were

1) £233 for Bristol; £200 for Hastings, Burwash and Elham; £300 for the Peak, later falling to £233; £330 for Stamford and Grantham; £180 for Tickhill; £160 for Witton, Paunton and Laughton.

2) see Table 1.

apparently confined to 1257-63, when Edward's expenses were particularly heavy with the Welsh campaigns, his continental expeditions, and increasing military expenses in England. In 1264-5 his lands were in any case outside his control, while from 1266 on he had other sources of ready income, such as the customs grant, which were more suitable for raising loans.

It is also apparent that the grants Edward made represented a considerable sacrifice in income, and security for loans. In some instances these surrenders were partly forced on him. Laughton, Paunton and Witton were given up in 1256 to Geoffrey de Lusignan in part satisfaction of the king's promise of land in Ireland. In 1262, Hastings (probably including Burwash) were surrendered to Peter de Savoy, who had long seen the lands as complementary to his honour of Pevensey. Edward was partially compensated by a scattering of lands in East Anglia from the honour of Richmond, which later embroiled him in the claims of the Duke of Brittany for the restoration of Richmond. Other grants were made to provide for members of the household. Elham was granted to Roger de Leyburn in 1260, and smaller manors and rents were given to other knights e.g. Adam de Jesmond, Ebulo de Montibus, William Charles, Robert Tiptoft. In 1263 political imperatives caused Edward to give up Stamford and Grantham to Warenne, and Tickhill to Henry of Almain, besides other, lesser grants, to build up support against Simon de Montfort <sup>1</sup>.

Edward's resources enabled him to affect the course of the civil war, by using them to attach supporters. Politics had already impinged on his estates in other ways. By mid-1258 several of his estates were in the hands of his Lusignan uncles, Tickhill, for the repayment of a loan

1) see Table 2.

from Aymer de Valence, and Laughton, Paunton and Witton, by the grant to Geoffrey de Lusignan. Geoffrey also held Henham, a manor of Edward's FitzRobert wardship. On the expulsion of the Lusignans, these lands were taken into the hands of the government, who appointed keepers for them. Stamford, Grantham, Monmouth had been in the keeping of William de Valence, but may have already returned to Edward's control before the 1258 crisis. These arrangements took no account of the provenance of the estates and undoubtedly upset Edward <sup>1</sup>.

In mid-1259 Edward visited Tickhill and collected some of the honour's revenues and some from Laughton, which had both been deposited in the nearby priory of Blyth, issuing the prior a receipt in his own name <sup>2</sup>. In November 1259, he replaced the conciliar keeper of Tickhill with his own bailiff <sup>3</sup>. At the time of his partial reconciliation with Henry III, Edward's grievance with regard to these lands must have been recognised, for he was then restored control of Laughton, Witton and Paunton <sup>4</sup>. Tickhill never reverted to Aymer, who died in 1260, but on Geoffrey's return to England, Edward had to restore the manors to him <sup>5</sup>. Hastings also came into government custody with Peter of Savoy's lands in 1263, but Edward was not so deeply concerned, since he had quitclaimed these lands to Peter.

Edward's other estates were affected in other ways by the issues of the day. In addition to the Clare claim to Bristol, in 1263 Bristol was the target of an attack by Edward's estranged household knights under Roger de Leyburn, one of a series of raids directed against Edward and

1) Tables 1 & 2: CPR 1247-58, p.644.

2) Cartulary of Blyth Priory, 298; BL Harl.Ms. 3759, f.96d.

3) Studd 715; C61/4 m.5.

4) CR 1259-61, pp.81,86; Studd 823; C61/4 m.2.

5) CLR 1260-67, p.93; RH I, pp.113,391: Witton may have been seized again by the government in July 1261, CR 1261-4, pp.414-5.

his associates <sup>1</sup>. Before their seizure by Robert de Ferrers, the Peak and Stamford were halting-places for the royalist army making its way south after Northampton in 1264 <sup>2</sup>. During Edward's captivity, Simon de Montfort obtained control of virtually all of Edward's English estates. Control of Edward's strongholds was felt to be a pre-requisite for his release. He was compelled to cede Bristol in December 1264, although it was several months before Montfort gained access. The Peak and Chester were formally transferred in March 1265, although they had been in government custody earlier. Stamford and Grantham had come into government hands on their recovery from Robert de Ferrers. The surrender of Pevensey, in Edward's hands by commission of his uncle, Peter of Savoy, was probably accomplished in March <sup>3</sup>.

Contemporaries were confused as to the compensation given Edward for these losses. One chronicler believed that he had been granted Simon's earldom of Leicester <sup>4</sup>. In reality, he was granted the castle of Ludgershall in December 1264, and a small group of manors from Montfort's estates in May 1265, hardly adequate recompense <sup>5</sup>. His own town of Stamford was restored (briefly) in May <sup>6</sup>. He was also supposed to receive five castles, Scarborough, Bamborough, Nottingham, Corfe and Dover <sup>7</sup>. No attempt was made to transfer the two of greatest importance, Corfe and Dover, and Gilbert de Clare, as his own relations with Montfort deteriorated, refused to surrender Bamborough <sup>8</sup>. After Evesham, some of the Montfortian garrisons in Edward's own castles surrendered unprompted, but others held out until Edward invested them.

1) GC II, pp.221-4,226.

2) VCH Derby I, p.405: Whitlesey, pp.134-6: CLR 1260-67, pp.135-6: CR 1261-4, pp.342,383.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.414.

4) A.Lond. p.65.

5) CR 1264-8, pp.58-9: CPR 1258-66, pp.395,424.

6) CPR 1258-66, pp.416,424: CR 1264-8, pp.62-3.

7) CPR 1258-66, p.414.

8) e.g. CR 1264-8, pp.43-5.

There was a significant degree of pro-baronial feeling in his territories. In Hastings this can most easily be explained by dislike of Peter of Savoy, to whom the honour had been transferred, and solidarity with the other Cinque Ports, who had a long radical tradition<sup>1</sup>. In the Peak many of Edward's former bailiffs and tenants proved to be supporters either of Montfort or of the earl of Derby, who may have been able to draw on some residual loyalty to the Peverils<sup>2</sup>.

In Bristol, the support for Montfort is more surprising, for the town had a long history of loyalty to the Angevin cause, and had been especially helpful to King John in 1215-16 and to Henry III and his regents. John however had been careful to foster his relations with Bristol, confirming and extending their charter of liberties. Edward, by contrast, does not seem to have confirmed the Bristol charters, and viewed the citizens merely as a source of loans. In 1263 the pro-Montfortian feeling in the town is said to have been excited by hostility to the aliens in Edward's household. This suggests that the wider political issues of the time had spread from London to Bristol. The strong anti-semitic feeling in both towns supports this view<sup>3</sup>. Examination of the composition of Edward's household<sup>4</sup> confirms that at this time the alien element in his household was at its highest. In 1263 Edward required the assistance of the pro-baronial Bishop of Worcester to leave the town safely, but he succeeded in returning a few months later.

After Lewes his household knights were able to hold the castle for some time, although the measures taken to improve the fortifications of the castle and the mounting of catapults on the castle roof suggest that

1) Murray, The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports, p.28-40.

2) See Chapter 10.

3) Flores II, pp.482-3: CPR 1258-66, p.13.

4) See Chapter 8.v.

the pro-Montfortian faction had again won control in the town<sup>1</sup>. It was probably at this time that the ships and goods of Edward's Gascon merchants were seized in Bristol<sup>2</sup>. After the fall of the castle in April/May 1265, Montfort used the town as a back-up for his campaign in the marches<sup>3</sup>.

Not surprisingly, after Evesham the citizens of Bristol had to answer to Edward for its disloyalty, paying a heavy fine and perhaps losing the right to farm the town themselves. The lands of individual Montfortians were also transferred to royalists in the city<sup>4</sup>. From this time onwards, Bristol seems to have been consistently anti-royalist<sup>5</sup>. This change from their earlier pro-Angevin spirit seems to have been the most lasting legacy of Edward's lordship.

- 1) CPR 58-66, p.397: CR 64-8, pp.82-3,106: Flores II, p.503: R.Glos, p.751,754: Rishanger CDB, p.40: C47/3/7/1: C62/52 m.7.
- 2) CR 1264-8, pp.64-6, 68-72, p.579: CPR 1258-66, p.363.
- 3) CPR 1258-66, pp.425,429: Flores III, p.3: AM IV, p.167.
- 4) CCR 1272-9, p.392: CPR 1266-72, pp.3,16,88,439,451,688: CR 1268-72, p.579: CCR 1272-9, p.520: C47/35/18/9: E372/125 m.3.
- 5) Bristol Charters, 1378-1499, pp.77-80.

CHAPTER THREE: THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTATES

i) **Wardships and other Custodies**

In February 1254 the shortfall in value of the lands assigned to Edward was met by a promise to make up the deficit in wardships or escheats. As king, Henry was entitled to the custody and enjoyment of the revenues of all lands held directly from him, or held from lands otherwise under his control, during the minority of their heir. Low rates of life-expectancy meant that this was a dependable though irregular source of income. Escheats were less frequent, since the permanent return of an estate to its feudal lord only occurred on the total failure of heirs or its confiscation for some serious crime. In April the first wardships were given to Edward <sup>1</sup>. By 20 July, the deficit was estimated at 5,000 marks p.a., of which 2,000 would be supplied by the Ferrers estates <sup>2</sup>. On the same day Edward was granted the hitherto-reserved areas of Ireland, although it is not clear whether this additional revenue <sup>3</sup> was included in the calculations. The deficit may thus have been 2,000 marks p.a. rather than 3,000.

Nevertheless, one third or one quarter of Edward's income now became dependent on grants of an essentially temporary nature. Henry acknowledged this problem, engaging to make additional grants as the original custodies lapsed <sup>4</sup>. This requirement would interfere, not just once but repeatedly, with the king's obligation to provide for his household, relatives and other claimants on his generosity, or to use these feudal incidents to supplement his own finances. The maintenance of Edward's income would depend on the ability and good-will of the

1) the abortive Lorty grant and the Ferrers lands.

2) CPR 1247-58, p.314; C66/66 m.10. This calculation derived from the valuation ordered in April, CPR 1247-58, p.368; C66/67 m.3.

3) perhaps 1,000 marks, see 3.iii.

4) CPR 1247-58, p.310; C66/66 m.11.

king. Political circumstances, restrictions on the king's freedom of action, deterioration of his relationship with Edward, could put it into jeopardy. The shortfall in the original grant created an additional threat to Edward's independence.

However, there were several advantages to this type of revenue. The wardships were free from the restrictions placed on the original grant. Edward was free to give them away, or sell them. In May 1255 the retrospective assurance was made that all wardships included the marriages of the heirs and widows, advowsons, and escheats and custodies if any such fell in <sup>1</sup>. Any such livings would enable him to provide for his household clerks, and the marriages were similarly available for gift or profit <sup>2</sup>. The holder of a wardship was restricted from the sale of capital assets or disparagement of an heir by an unsuitable marriage, and he was obliged to provide for the maintenance of any children. One third of the estate was conventionally set aside for the support of a widow. Nevertheless, a wardship represented almost pure profit, for as a temporary possession, there was little likelihood of the revenue being spent on the future improvement of the estate. Almost as a consequence of the short-term nature of the property, these custodies were a valuable supplement to Edward's disposable income.

Was Henry III serious in his promise to maintain Edward's income? In seven of the grants, the majority between October 1254 and January 1255 and the last in April 1258, that promise was specifically mentioned. Additionally, the lands were valued to establish the sum still outstanding <sup>3</sup>. Royal promises of wardships were sometimes qualified by the proviso that his obligations to his son must first be

1) CPR 1247-58, p.410; C66/69 m.9.

2) See Tables 2 and 3 for grants made by Edward from his custodies.

3) CR 1253-4, pp.218,278-80,319, 54-6, p.22; CPR 1247-58, pp.394,501,622.

discharged, or that Edward must give his consent to the delay <sup>1</sup>. This suggests that the king continued in awareness of his promise, and intended to fulfil it, but was he able to do so? A brief chronological survey of all wardships granted to Edward between 1254 and 1272 should make it possible to assess Henry's intentions and achievement.

### 1) Lands of Sabina de Lorty

Granted to Edward 12 April 1254 in Gascony. An administrative confusion led the regents in England to grant the lands to Henry de la Mare and Ebulo de Montibus. Edward's bailiffs may have been in possession in early 1255, but in 1256 Edward waived his claim and the custody passed to de la Mare. It would have paid £100 p.a. for almost twenty years <sup>2</sup>.

### 2) Lands of William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby

Granted to Edward 15/21 April 1254, and valued at 2,000 marks p.a. <sup>3</sup>. The estates centred on Tutbury castle in Derbyshire, extending into Lancashire and the Midlands. The heir, Robert, would come of age in 1260 <sup>4</sup>. Edward's estate accounts show receipts were well above the valuation figure <sup>5</sup>. Edward presented to 2 livings <sup>6</sup>. In May 1257 he sold the remainder of the custody to the queen and Peter of Savoy for 6,000 m. <sup>7</sup>.

### 3) Temporalities of the See of Carlisle

Only briefly in Edward's possession, from July 1254 until December. It fell vacant again in 1255, but was not returned to Edward <sup>8</sup>.

1) e.g. CPR 1247-58, pp.394,473,474,488,501: CChR 1226-57, pp.467: CR 1253-4, p.214, where the claims of William de Valence and Richard of Cornwall were also said to have priority.

2) CPR 1247-58, p.287,463,478: CR 1253-4, pp.67,90, 54-6, p.46: E36/275 ff.244v,247: E159/31 m.16: CIPM I 315,785.

3) CPR 1247-58, pp.314,367; C66/67 m.3sc: E36/275 f.245.

4) AM I, p.491.

5) SC6/1094/11 mm.9-14d. over £900 in six months: Kniveton Leiger 32.

6) Table 3.

7) C47/9/1 m.4: CPR 1247-58, p.554.

8) CR 1253-4, p.83: CPR 1247-58, p.392: AM III, p.193.

#### 4) Lands of Gilbert de Segrave

Granted October 1254. The estates were located in the Midlands <sup>1</sup>. Incomplete accounts of estate bailiffs suggest revenues were above £400 p.a. <sup>2</sup>. In April 1258 the heir made a fine for seisin with Edward of 300 marks <sup>3</sup>. Edward had granted two manors from the estate to the commanders of his Welsh forces for which loss he had to compensate Nicholas de Segrave. He also presented to 2 or perhaps 3 livings <sup>4</sup>.

#### 5) Lands of William de Cantilupe

Granted October 1254, and supplemented in 1255 by the lands of William's widow, Eva and two smaller tenants <sup>5</sup>. William's estates were principally in the Midlands, Somerset and Wiltshire. He also held the castle of Totnes for the king, and this too came under Edward's control. His widow's holdings complemented Edward's other lands, giving him control of the castles of Abergavenny in Gwent and Kilgaran in West Wales, as well as lands in Ireland <sup>6</sup>.

This was one of the most lucrative and long-term of the wardships granted to Edward, worth almost £800 p.a. with nearly 20 years to run <sup>7</sup>. Edward utilised the wardship in varying ways, exploiting most of the estates directly and farming some (e.g. Abergavenny). Some manors may have been sold, e.g. Brickmarston and Rokeby (Wilts.) which came into the keeping of the merchant, Richard de Bedford <sup>8</sup>. Others were used to make provision for members of the household and their dependants <sup>9</sup>.

1) CR 1253-4, p.278, 54-6, pp.6,22: CIPM I 334.

2) SC6/1094/11 mm.7-8d,19-21.

3) CR 1256-9, p.211, probably within a year of his majority.

4) Tables 2 & 3.

5) CR 1253-4, p.319, 54-6 pp.42,118,121, 56-9, p.100: CPR 1247-58, pp.420-1: AM III, p.196.

6) CIPM I 318,340,886, II 17: CCR 1272-9, pp.114-7.

7) SC6/1094/11 mm.2-7d,17-18: Studd 818; C61/4 m.2: CIPM II 17: CCR 1272-9, pp.114-7.

8) CCR 1272-9, p.88.

9) Table 2; E368/36 m.6d: CPR 1258-66, p.177. Paris' account of a sale was probably a confusion with that of the Ferrers lands, CM V, p.621.

From 1262-5 the issues of the remaining Cantilupe estates were among those exchanged with the king for the revenues of the Jewry<sup>1</sup>. This arrangement did not affect Edward's right to the advowsons<sup>2</sup>. The heir paid Edward 800 marks before April 1270 to have seisin of Abergavenny in advance of his majority<sup>3</sup>.

#### 6) Lands of Michael de Mannoers

Granted by 16 October 1254, located in Yorkshire and the Midlands<sup>4</sup>. Edward granted the widow's marriage to Walter de Vernon, and transferred the wardship to his butler, Walter de Capeles in 1265<sup>5</sup>.

#### 7) Lands of William de Beauchamp

Seisin was ordered in January 1255, but the failure to identify the lands or previous holder, suggests this may represent only a scribal error for Cantilupe<sup>6</sup>.

#### 8) Lands of William, son of Walter de Merk

A writ of seisin was issued in January 1255, and custody transferred from Henry de la Mare, who had been keeper of the lands while William was himself a minor<sup>7</sup>. It was not a large estate, but Edward held it until the early 1270's<sup>8</sup>.

#### 9) Lands of Robert Fillol

A writ of seisin to the sheriff of Wiltshire was issued in June 1255<sup>9</sup>. No other references have been traced.

1) CPR 1258-66, p.233: C66/77 m.11d. described as "Bergeveny, Calliston, Caune, Eyton, Houton, Harmesworth, et Bolewyk".

2) Table 3.

3) CR 1268-72, p.255.

4) CR 1253-4, p.280.

5) Studd 501; C61/3 m.4: CPR 1258-66, p.466: SC6/1094/11 m.1d: CIPM I 598.

6) CR 1254-6, p.23.

7) CPR 1247-58, p.394: ExeRF II, pp.45,198.

8) CChR 1257-1300, p.165.

9) CR 1254-6, p.101.

#### 10) Lands John de Longvilers, junior

Extended in February 1255 before delivery to Edward's bailiffs <sup>1</sup>. John de Longvilers, senior, had died in October 1254, and his adult son, John, died soon after, leaving as heiress his daughter, Margaret <sup>2</sup>. Edward broke the lands up to provide for various members of his household, Adam de Montalt, Robert de Stuteville, and Wynemer de Gymery. Gymery was also granted the marriage of the heiress, which he transferred to Geoffrey de Neville <sup>3</sup>. The remaining Lincolnshire manors were included in the lands exchanged for the Jewry in 1262 <sup>4</sup>. Margaret had come of age by 1268 <sup>5</sup>.

#### 11) Lands of Hugh Thalemach

Granted 28 August 1255 <sup>6</sup>. The lands in Suffolk were still in Edward's custody in 1257, and perhaps 1259, but had been surrendered by 1270 <sup>7</sup>.

#### 12) Lands of John de Kinnersley

Seisin was ordered in September 1255, but on the same day the lands were given to Juliana d'Aubigny. An inquest in 1257 found custody belonged of right to Roger de Clifford <sup>8</sup>.

#### 13) Lands of Nicholas de Meriet

Granted to Edward 20 September 1256, but did not include marriage of the widow <sup>9</sup>. Edward seems to have split the custody between William de Cheney, a household knight and steward to Eleanor of Castile, and

1) CR 1254-6, p.41.

2) CIPM I 296: E368/36 m.6d..

3) Table 2; CPR 1258-66, p.154: C66/76 m.12; Studd 797,864,1036.

4) below, Chapter 3.iv.

5) R.Giffard, pp.24-6.

6) CPR 1247-58, p.423.

7) Liber Feodorum pp.134,283,391,916-7: SC6/1094/11 mm.7,8d: CR 1259-61, p.138, 68-72, p.248.

8) CR 1254-6, pp.136,138, 56-9, p.33.

9) CPR 1266-72, p.163: E36/275 f.246.

Agnes Bauzan, widow of Edward's knight, Stephen, and her second husband, Anketin de Martival. In November 1263 the Martivals were instructed to surrender the lands to the heir John, who was then of age <sup>1</sup>. Court proceedings show that John had not waited for formal transfer of Meriet from Cheny, but had occupied it by force <sup>2</sup>.

#### 14) Lands of Ralph de Levinton

The Levinton custody is perplexing. Ralph's lands were mainly in Cumberland, consisting of the manors of Skelton and Levinton and Gamelsby and Glassanby <sup>3</sup>. The wardship was granted to Sanchia of Cornwall, saving the marriages of Ralph's daughter and widow, which were granted to Eustace de Balliol <sup>4</sup>. However, Edward's accounts show that in 1256-7 the manors of Skelton and Levinton were in the hands of his bailiffs and the issues were being paid to his Bristol exchequer or elsewhere on his orders <sup>5</sup>. Edward later appointed Eustace de Balliol as keeper <sup>6</sup>.

In 1258 an inquiry was ordered into the complaint by Thomas and Christiana de Lascelles that they had been seised of a moiety of the manors of Glassanby and Gamelesby, when Edward's bailiffs disseised them of this land by reason of his custody of the daughter and heir of Ralph de Levinton <sup>7</sup>. The case then went to the Curia Regis, where Thomas and Christiana were accused of lying to the inquest, causing the court to believe that Christiana was the sole heiress to these manors, whereas her younger sister Eva, whose heir was under age and in Edward's

1) CPR 1258-66, p.187: ExeRF II, p.406: CIPM II 539.

2) KB26/174 m.7, 175 m.4. Cheny had already been sued by the widow for commission of waste on the manor, KB26/160 mm.44,60d.

3) CIPM I 199,871.

4) CPR 1247-58, pp.207,271,395: CR 1253-4, pp.35-6.

5) £66/9/4 ob. for Skelton and £26/2/3 ob. for Levinton, SC6/1094/11 mm.12d.,13.

6) E368/36 m.6d: E159/36 m.4d.

7) CPR 1247-58, p.627.

custody, had been entitled to half the manors <sup>1</sup>. By 1260 the court had decided in Edward's favour, and the manors were restored to Eustace de Balliol as keeper <sup>2</sup>. By 1270, Eustace had married Helewise, for he was allowed to pledge the manors to raise money for the crusade. At Helewise's death the estates were divided among her own relations <sup>3</sup>.

Given the doubts over the circumstances of Edward's acquisition of the custody, it cannot be included in calculations of the income given by his father.

#### 15) Lands of Margaret de Lacy

Granted 10 March 1257, with no details about the lands or their former holder <sup>4</sup>. A later summons to the keeper to appear before Edward's auditors described the lands thus:

"quas contingebatur filio et herede Johannis de Verdon et Margarete uxoris sue in honoris de Ewyas Lacy" <sup>5</sup>.

From this, Margaret can be identified as Margaret de Lacy, granddaughter and co-heiress of Walter de Lacy, lord of Meath and Ewyas Lacy, who had married John de Verdon in 1244 <sup>6</sup>. These 1257 and 1262 references are the first notices of Margaret de Verdon's death, which was otherwise only known to have occurred before 1267 when her husband remarried. Her husband, John de Verdon, was living in 1257, and by the "custom of England" would have expected to retain a life-interest in his wife's lands. He certainly continued in possession of her Irish estates, so perhaps the arrangement made for her Welsh estates was the result of differing customs of inheritance and wardship on the March. Ewyas Lacy,

1) KB 26/161 m.7d,162 mm.3d,36d Eva's heir must have been Helewise

2) CR 1259-61, pp.202-3.

3) CPR 1266-72, p.441; CCR 1272-9, pp.132-5.

4) CPR 1247-58, p.545; C66/71 m.12: E36/275 f.245v.

5) E368/36 m.14d.

6) Other women of this name were Margaret de Quency, widow of John de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, still alive in 1257, or Walter de Lacy's widow, Margaret de Braose, who died after 1255, but whose heirs were adult.

held from the king, was taken into custody, and granted to Edward, during the minority of John and Margaret's eldest son, Nicholas, who would have been aged between 11 and 13 at this time <sup>1</sup>. Edward will therefore have held this custody until 1265 or 1267. Nicholas was in seisin of his mother's lands at his death in 1271, which serves as further corroboration that his father had not kept control during his life-time.

As keeper, Edward appointed John FitzJohn, who, as Margaret's half-brother (he was the son of Isabel, Gilbert de Lacy's widow, by her second marriage to John FitzGeoffrey), will have seemed an appropriate guardian for his nephew's lands <sup>2</sup>. The acquisition of Ewyas further strengthened Edward's position on the March.

#### 16) Lands of Walter FitzRobert

Granted 10 April 1258, and located in Essex <sup>3</sup>. The heir was still a minor in 1268 <sup>4</sup>. Almost immediately, Edward granted the manor of Henham (worth £40 p.a.) to his uncle, Geoffrey de Lusignan. It was seized with Geoffrey's other lands in August 1258. Unlike the other lands Edward had given Geoffrey, this was not returned to Edward, but farmed to Walter's widow Ida until Geoffrey recovered it in September 1261 <sup>5</sup>. Between Lewes and Evesham, it was occupied by John de Arderne <sup>6</sup>. The remainder of the wardship was sold by Edward to Stephen Longespee, for 3,000 marks, of which 2,000 had already been paid <sup>7</sup>. The date of the transaction (23 June 1258) may correlate with the uncertain

1) His date of birth is not known, but can be estimated by his parents' marriage in 1244 and the birth of his younger brother, Theobald in 1248.

2) Watson, Genealogist, NS XXI, pp.1-5; CIPM I 767; GEC XII, pp.246-9.

3) e.g. CChR 1226-57, p.474; E36/275 ff.246-7; SC6/1094/11 m.20d.

4) e.g. CR 1264-8, p.486.

5) CR 1259-61, p.445; ExeRF II, p.359; E159/32 m.7d.

6) Just1/237 m.6; Hunter RS, p.127.

7) CPR 58-66, p.13; C66/73 m.13.

political situation. At least some of the remaining 1,000 marks was still outstanding after Stephen's death in 1260, when the custody passed to his heirs <sup>1</sup>. Calculations from the sale price indicate the custody was worth perhaps £240 p.a.

#### 17) Lands of William de Fors, Earl of Aumale

Granted to Edward 18 October 1260 (4 months after William's death), "by counsel of the magnates of the council" <sup>2</sup>. The heir, Thomas, would not have come of age until 1274, but he and two siblings died in the 1260's leaving the inheritance to pass to their sister Avelina. She married in 1269, came of age in 1273, and died in 1274, when the lands were claimed by her collateral relations and mostly acquired by the king <sup>3</sup>. It was an enormous estate, comprising the lordship of Holderness in the East Riding, the honour of Skipton in the West Riding, and other lands in Yorkshire, Lincolnshire and the South <sup>4</sup>. Figures cited during the law-suit between Isabel de Fors and her mother, the Countess of Devon, in 1270 valued the Fors estate at 1,500 m. p.a., of which Edward received 1,000 m. p.a. (net, with £500 of this coming from Holderness alone) <sup>5</sup>. This estimate fits in very well with known receipts for Holderness and Skipton <sup>6</sup>.

Edward used some of the smaller properties to provide for members of his household <sup>7</sup>. Before March 1262, and probably before June 1261, he sold Skipton to Alexander Steward of Scotland for £1,500. Over £1,000

1) E368/42 m.12.

2) ExeRF II, p.327: CPR 1258-66, p.97; C66/74 m.2: E372/104 m.1, 105 m.20d.

3) GEC I, p.356, quoting Inquests PM/24/6: CIPM I 471: McFarlane, History L (1965), pp.151-2.

4) CIPM I 471: E372/104 m.1, 105 m.20d, 111 m.27, 125 m.3. One third of Holderness, and Cockermouth in Cumberland, were assigned to the widow.

5) E13/1e m.7.

6) SC6/1078/7, 1087/6 mm.1,2,3a,5d; English, The Lordship of Holderness, pp.227-231: Denholm-Young, YAJ XXXI (1934), p.393.

7). Table 2

was still outstanding in July 1262, when Edward enlisted his father's help to recover the debt. In November it was decided that Steward had defaulted on the agreement and the sheriff of York was instructed to recover Skipton, by force if necessary. Steward's failure to complete his side of the bargain may have been due to financial difficulties. He was contracting large loans from the Jews in September 1261<sup>1</sup>.

Edward then sold Skipton to Isabel de Fors, perhaps in 1263, certainly by 1266<sup>2</sup>. By 28 June 1261 Edward sold Holderness, and the marriages of the heirs, jointly to Isabel de Fors and her mother, Amice de Redvers for 3,000 marks<sup>3</sup>. This sum was paid in instalments over 1261-4 from the revenues of Holderness<sup>4</sup>. The sale of Holderness and Skipton to Isabel placed these areas in the control of a baronial sympathiser. Isabel made great efforts after Evesham to convince the government of her loyalties, but her sympathies were too strong to be concealed<sup>5</sup>. In 1263 Holderness was put on alert "pro dubitatione guerre" and about this time the royalist John de Balliol besieged Skipton. In 1266-67 Skipton was munitioned by Montfortian sympathisers against Edward, when he marched north against John de Vescy, and frequent messages were sent to the "barons" at Peterborough<sup>6</sup>.

1) CR 1261-4, pp.170,185-6; CDS I 2311,2318, V ii 21. Denholm-Young, op.cit.p.396, and Sanders, English Baronies, p.142, incorrectly identify him as Alexander Comyn, Scotland's Justiciar and hereditary constable.

2) SC6/1078/6: Abbr.Plac, p.159; Denholm-Young, op.cit. pp.390,395-6, unconvincingly argues that Isabel recovered the honour by force.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.161; C66/76 m.9.

4) Table 1: SC6/1078/7; English, op.cit. pp.72,228-232.

5) The removal of Wight from her keeping in 1267 shows that the government was not deceived, Jacob, Studies in the period of baronial reform and rebellion, p.210n: CPR 1258-66, p.545, 66-72, pp.67,156: CR 1264-8, p.374; Denholm-Young, op.cit. p.391 from SC6/1078/11.

6) English, op.cit. pp.75,234; Denholm-Young, op.cit. p.396,410, from Justl/1051 m.1: SC6/1078/7, 1087/6 mm.2,1, "in archeriis et minoribus conductis et in castro commorantibus dum dominus Edwardus fuit versus partes Aquilon. 47s.2d."

There was considerable hostility to Edward and his officials in Holderness in 1266-7<sup>1</sup>. The garbled account of the "Holderness rebellion" in the Meaux chronicle probably relates to opposition to Edward's northern campaign against John de Vescy<sup>2</sup>. The consequences of Edward's need for cash in 1261-2 were therefore far reaching, although it is hardly surprising that he did not anticipate the future problems. That this type of difficulty did not occur more frequently may be explained by the fact that Edward's land transactions were generally made with members of his family, household or affinity.

#### 18) Lands of Robert de Stafford/Strafford

His barony of Stafford was granted to Edward in June 1261<sup>3</sup>. In June 1262 Robert's (?illegitimate) son brought a claim for unlawful disseisin against Edward and his clerk, Master Thomas de Pivelesden. The case was defended unsuccessfully for Edward by Geoffrey de Langley, his former chief steward to whom he had given the custody, worth £100 p.a. and the marriage of the heir. £20 p.a. in the issues had earlier been granted as a fee to Ralph Basset. By 1272 Nicholas de Stafford had married Langley's daughter<sup>4</sup>.

#### 19) Lands of Peter of Savoy

All Peter's lands, the honours of Richmond, Pevensey and Hastings (previously exchanged with Edward), were given to Edward to hold during pleasure after Peter's death in June 1268, answering for the issues at the Exchequer. Pevensey was soon delivered to Queen Eleanor, as part of a wider agreement between Edward and his mother<sup>5</sup>. In July Edward was

1) e.g. CPR 1266-72, p.1: Denholm-Young, op.cit. pp.410-11.

2) Chronica Monasterium de Melsa II, pp.xx-xxi,106,132: Denholm-Young, op.cit. pp.401-2, takes a different view.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.156.

4) Just1/954 mm.11d.13d: Plea Rolls t.Henry III ... affecting Staffordshire tenants pp.151,212: CPR 1258-66, p.265; C66/79 m.8.

5) ExeRF II, p.472: below, Chapter 3.iii.

instructed to surrender Richmond to John of Brittany, whose long-standing claim could be met now that Peter's obstruction had ceased. Writs of seisin show that Edward had not yet obtained seisin of the castle of Richmond from Peter's steward <sup>1</sup>. Edward kept control of the Richmond fees in East Anglia throughout the reign <sup>2</sup>, in addition to the lands he had previously exchanged with Peter in East Anglia. In late 1268 he was instructed to deliver Hastings to John <sup>3</sup>. He succeeded in retaining the castle and advowson. While Edward was away on crusade Henry agreed to pay Peter's nephews in Savoy, to whom he had bequeathed Hastings and Pevensey, compensation of £100 p.a. until Edward's return, since he was not prepared to dispossess Edward from Hastings without his consent <sup>4</sup>.

#### 20) Lands of Giles de Erdinton

Granted in January 1269 and located in Shropshire and Cheshire <sup>5</sup>.

#### 21) Lands of Ralph FitzRanulph

The custody of Anastasia, third daughter and co-heiress of Ralph, and one third of his lands was granted in June 1270, specifically to repay Edward for money he had paid to the Count of Bigorre on the king's behalf. By August Edward sold the custody and marriage to Gilbert Hansard for 400 marks. Gilbert made a very poor bargain, since Anastasia died childless in early 1272 <sup>6</sup>.

#### 22) Lands of Nicholas de Crioll

Before February 1272 Nicholas de Crioll married his heir to Margery, daughter of Gilbert Pecche, and settled his manor of Benhale on

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.246-7,362.

2) e.g. E372/125 m.3: E101/350/6: CPEJ I, pp.305-6: E371/37 m.7.

3) CPR 1266-72, p.304.

4) E159/45 m.10.

5) CPR 1266-72, p.314: CChR 1226-57, pp.277,409.

6) CPR 1266-72, pp.436,484: E372/115 m.11d, 125 m.3: CLR 1267-72, p.233: ExeRF II, p.563: E371/36 m.8.

them. It was agreed that if Nicholas died before his son reached his majority, Edward would have the custody of the manor. This arrangement came into operation in February 1272, when Edward was granted all the Crioll lands (Kent, Leicester and Huntingdon, as well as Suffolk) during the younger Nicholas' minority<sup>1</sup>. Pecche then paid Edward's lieutenants 250 marks for the custody of Benhale and Warin de Chaucombe was deputed by Burnell to keep the other lands<sup>2</sup>.

### 23) Lands of Roger Bertram

The account of the escheator beyond the Trent for September 1270-January 1274 stated that he had received no issues from these lands because they had been granted to Edward with the marriage of the heir<sup>3</sup>. No formal grant survives, but the escheator's statement surely implies a grant to Edward before his father's death. However, the lands and previous holder have not been identified.

It has been suggested that the baronial council prevented the king from fulfilling his commitment by continuing grants of custodies to Edward<sup>4</sup>. While it is true that, from at least May 1258, the council scrutinised all grants or sales of wardships in an attempt to improve the royal finances<sup>5</sup>, this probably did not affect Edward greatly. The majority of the grants to Edward were made in 1254 and 1255. From September 1255-May 1258 only two further grants were made<sup>6</sup>. Thus, the near-cessation of grants does not correlate directly with the collapse of the royal finances and the reforms forced on the king at Oxford, but occurred two years earlier.

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.623-4,635.

2) E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 mm.4,6,6d: E101/350/6: RH I, p.219.

3) E372/117 m.7.

4) Studd: Acts, Chapter Two.

5) CPR 1247-58, p.628: Treharne, Baronial plan of reform, p.93.

6) The Lacy and FitzRobert wardships, September 1257 and April 1258.

It may still be possible to relate the reduction in the king's generosity to his financial difficulties and the Sicilian affair, but other grants made between 1255 and 1258 establish that, in spite of his debts, he still had lands to bestow<sup>1</sup>. When the loan made to the king by Florentine merchants in June 1257 required him to cease grants of wardships until their claims were satisfied, the king, and Edward, insisted on certain exceptions to fulfil earlier promises. Edward's claims were not mentioned here, which must surely indicate that they were deemed to have been met<sup>2</sup>. Estimates of revenue from the custodies can only be very tentative, but the three large wardships granted to Edward by October 1254 may have brought in 4,000 marks p.a.<sup>3</sup>. By the end of 1255 the additional grants should easily have made up the required figure. Henry had no need to make further grants to his son, until the expiry of his existing custodies.

Later evidence indicates that Henry III did manage to replace outgoing wardships. The surrender of the Segrave wardship in April 1258 virtually coincided with the assignment to Edward of the lands of Walter FitzRobert. This was the last instance where the grant was specifically said to have been in fulfilment of the king's promise to Edward. Similarly, in 1260 the coming of age of Robert de Ferrers was followed by the grant of the Fors wardship, worth perhaps 1,000 marks p.a. This was a lesser sum than the Ferrers lands, but certainly the most valuable grant in the king's gift at that time. This grant was made with the consent of the baronial council, and is easier to interpret if considered to be in fulfilment of the earlier commitment to Edward<sup>4</sup>.

1) e.g. grants to the queen, CPR 1247-58, pp.503,536,539,540,614.

2) CPR 1247-58, pp.562-3.

3) 2,000:Ferrers lands; 500-600:Segrave lands;1,500:Cantilupe lands.

4) The conversion of the Ferrers and FitzRobert lands did not oblige the king to replace them before the date when custody would have lapsed.

From October 1260 Edward held two very valuable wardships, the Cantilupe and Fors lands, whose issues he could expect to enjoy until the early 1270's. The Merk, FitzRobert, Stafford, and Lacy custodies would also run until the late 1260's, making Edward's position secure for the next decade. It is not surprising that Edward did not figure largely in the grants of custodies for the rest of the reign; his father had other more pressing claims on his purse.

In the exploitation of the wardships assigned to him, Edward had three choices, to exploit directly, to farm or to sell. Surviving accounts tend to suggest that the first method was the most profitable, but it was subject to fluctuation. It put an additional burden on his administration, especially when the lands were located away from the main concentrations of his possessions. Of the wardships whose history can be traced, the Segrave wardship was exploited directly, until its (premature) surrender to Nicholas de Segrave. The Ferrers lands were administered in a similar way for two years and then sold. Most of the Cantilupe lands were exploited directly for the longest period, 1255-62, and 1265-70/72, but they were included in the issues exchanged for the Jewry between 1262-5. Abergavenny was farmed at least from 1259-62. The lands of Walter FitzRobert, William de Fors and Ralph FitzRanulf were sold, shortly after they came into Edward's possession. The smaller wardships, and outlying estates of the larger custodies, mostly passed to members of Edward's household, as gifts or instead of fees.

Initially, there was a greater tendency towards direct exploitation, although this impression may be a distortion caused by the survival of the bailiffs' accounts for 1256-8. Large-scale sales began in 1257 and gathered pace in the 1260's. The timing of some of these sales, e.g. June 1257 and June 1258 may have political significance. Ultimately, Edward preferred the profits to be made from the

exploitation of the Jewry or the convenience of ready money to the steady revenues which might have accrued from his custodial lands. However, he possessed a steady income from his permanent endowment, and it is not surprising that his more negotiable property was disposed of in this manner. Nevertheless, Edward's attitude to the lands he held in ward concurs with his growing tendency to prefer cash or income from fiscal sources to more conventional revenues.

#### **Additional Note**

Wardships falling in as the result of other custodies have been excluded from this analysis, as have custodies which came to Edward from his own vassals, and the lands received by Edward's lieutenants during his absence on crusade, such as the Aubigny, FitzAlan, FitzEustace, and Harcourt custodies, all of which may have come to him as king (E372/125 m.3). The equally tendentious custody of the lands of John de Eyncourt has been omitted (CCR 1272-9, p.377; CIPM I 734; CR 1256-9, p.100; CPR 1247-58, p.581, 66-72, p.309), as has the temporary grant of the lands of William de Horsendon (CR 1264-8, p.184; E368/41 m.15d). Also excluded are the lands of John de Monmouth, which Edward purchased, sometimes described as a wardship (below, 4.ii), and the lands of William Pipard, which came to Edward as keeper of the royal castle of Totnes for the king (CPR 1258-66, pp.390,595; CIPM I 650). These transactions were not connected with the king's obligations to Edward.

ii) **Leases**

a) **New Forest**

In August 1254 Edward was granted a ten-year lease of the New Forest, extended in August 1265 for another five years <sup>1</sup>. As with a wardship he was barred from sale of capital assets, and he was also instructed to respect the rights of the forester in fee, Robert Walerand. The records of the forest eyres show that Walerand's administration continued virtually unchanged after the grant to Edward <sup>2</sup>. The only difference was that Walerand, and farmers of individual manors accounted to Edward's Bristol exchequer and auditors <sup>3</sup>. The forest was a very insignificant addition to Edward's estates, worth perhaps £30-£50 p.a, although the venison supplied Edward's own household and his wife's less peripatetic establishment at Windsor <sup>4</sup>. In 1266 Henry approved Edward's transfer of the forest to his wife.

b) **Ellesmere**

Another of Henry III's gains from Gwynedd, this Shropshire manor was granted to Edward for a ten-year period from Michaelmas 1256 at a farm of £30 p.a. <sup>5</sup>. Once this was paid, his profits from the manor were unlikely to have exceeded £10 p.a. <sup>6</sup>. The exchequer regularly noted his obligation and his indebtedness mounted until 1269 when he was charged with £330 arrears, representing 11 years farm <sup>7</sup>. No attempt was made to distrain him for the debt, and he never settled it. Until 1258 the keeper was Edward's knight, Warin de Bassingbourn <sup>8</sup>. In May 1258 a royal grant assigned the manor to Peter de Montfort for 18 years in lieu of

1) CPR 1247-58, pp.322,454, 58-66, p.504: E368/30 m.11.

2) Calendar of New Forest Documents, passim.

3) E368/36 m.11: C62/52 m.5.

4) E372/105 m.21: C62/52 mm.5,7: CPR 1266-72, p.367: E159/46 mm.4,4d, 48 m.2.

5) CPR 1247-58, p.504.

6) E372/119 m.20, 125 m.3: CCR 1272-9, p.279.

7) E372/104 m.5, 113 m.9.

8) E368/36 m.4d.

his fee of 50 marks <sup>1</sup>. In December 1263 it was transferred to Hamo Lestrange for 17 years in lieu of his 30 marks fee, converted in 1267 to a regular grant to Hamo and his heirs <sup>2</sup>.

Dr Walker believed that the manor passed out of Edward's possession entirely in 1258, in a process of rationalisation and reduction of Edward's Marcher commitments <sup>3</sup>. This explanation does not allow for the exchequer evidence, and attaches undue significance to the change at other castles from direct exploitation to farm. If we accept that the exchequer staff calculated correctly, Edward's farm was considered to have run for 11 years until 1267, i.e. terminating on the grant to Lestrange. Thus, from 1256-1267 the exchequer had held Edward responsible for the farm, although he did not receive the issues. It is surely plausible that this arrangement was reached with Edward's consent, or at his instigation.

The identity of the recipients supports this view. Montfort was a frequent witness to Edward's charters in the late 1250's, and Edward's principal captain on the March from 1258-63, when politics divided them. The transfer to Lestrange may be seen as his price for returning to Edward's support with the Leyburn affinity. The conversion to a permanent grant in 1267 may have been a further reward for his loyalty. The earlier commission to Bassingbourn may also have provided his fee.

The objection may be made that the grants were made in the king's name with no reference to Edward. It will be demonstrated that, on other occasions, appointments and grants, made by Edward out of lands which the king had given him, were described by the chancery as grants by the king <sup>4</sup>. This may have been an earlier instance.

1) CPR 1247-58, p.628.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.302, 66-72, p.39.

3) Walker, *op.cit.* p.678.

4) as in the grants of the assets of rebel Londoners, and the commissions of castles and counties in 1270, Chapters 4.i.c, 5.iii.

iii) Escheats and permanent additions to the endowment

In July 1254 the king awarded to Edward those parts of Ireland he had withheld from his grant of February, i.e. the towns and counties of Dublin and Limerick and the town of Athlone <sup>1</sup>. His motive was undoubtedly to assist in bringing Edward's income up to the desired level. In financial terms the grant may have amounted to over 1,000 marks p.a. <sup>2</sup>. The inclusion of these territories was of incalculable value in terms of administrative convenience and enhanced prestige. The king took care to make clear that the conditions and restrictions of the original grant were now extended to these areas.

Only three further grants were made containing the non-alienation clause, St.Briavels in 1266, Pevensey in 1268 and Overstone in 1272. This last instance is particularly curious since it was made in September 1272, when the king was virtually incapacitated and the government was being carried on by Edward's remaining lieutenants and the council. Henry's rapidly-approaching death rendered this addition to Edward's lands insignificant, in comparison to the kingdom he was soon to inherit. Yet it was thought desirable, by men used to considering Edward's own interests as paramount, that the manor should be added to his estates and protected by the restrictive clause. The explanation lies not in Edward's relations with his father, but in his long-term attitudes to his estates <sup>3</sup>.

Overstone had been an escheat as terra Normannorum and granted to the king's clerk, Master Gilbert de Millers, before October 1255, and most probably before 1254 <sup>4</sup>. It returned to royal control on Gilbert's

1) CPR 1247-58, pp.270,314; C66/65 m.10.

2) calculated from farms and known receipts, 35 RepDKI, pp.33,35, 37,39,45: Chancellor Gerrard's transcripts, pp.254-5; CDI 2329: JR Studd, BIHR L (1977), p.14 from transcript of Irish Pipe Roll.

3) CPR 1266-72, p.674; C66/90 m.6.

4) CR 1254-6, p.146.

death. Edward's "appanage" had been founded on escheats of the Normans and it seems that his administration took the opportunity to return this isolated manor to its logical place. The appanage was of little relevance to Edward any longer, except as the future provision for his heir. Subsequent events show Edward's concern to keep his former estates intact as an endowment for the heir to the throne. In 1272 his ministers were adhering to this policy, as in their purchase of several manors and rents which Edward had previously separated from his estates <sup>1</sup>.

The grant of St.Briavels and the Forest of Dean in February 1266 is less easy to explain. The castle had been a royal possession for many years, administered by a succession of keepers, and there is no obvious reason why it was given to Edward at this time, or at all. Worth slightly over £100 p.a.; it may have been intended to compensate for the surrender of Carmarthen and Cardigan to Edmund in late 1265. However, it is curious that Edward was granted another Marcher castle at a time when his interests in West and South Wales were being transferred to his brother. When Edward's Welsh ambitions revived in the 1270's the castle was remodelled, but this will not have been envisaged in 1266 <sup>2</sup>.

The exchange of Hastings with Peter of Savoy in 1262 resulted in a modification of the 1254 grant, with the release of Hastings and the imposition of the same terms on Edward's new manors in East Anglia, ceded to him from the honour of Richmond <sup>3</sup>. When the return of Richmond to the Dukes of Brittany was raised again, it was eventually decided to satisfy John with Richmond and Hastings, fortunately back in the crown's hands after Peter of Savoy's death <sup>4</sup>. He probably felt aggrieved at the

1) Chapter 6.ii.

2) Brown et al. II, pp.821-2: Bazeley, Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society 33 (1910), pp.20,168,178-9,227-242: E101/350/6: E372/125 m.3: C47/35/10/48: C62/51 m.8: E368/44 m.5d.

3) CChR 1257-1300, pp.42,44-5: CPR 1266-72, p.733.

4) CPR 1266-72, p.304. Edward retained the castle of Hastings then.

transfer of the honour and rape to Brittany, and the grant of Pevensey may have been the crown's attempt at compensation.

Richmond had been left by Peter to his niece the queen, and protracted negotiations followed before agreement was reached between the king, Edward and the queen. Pevensey was to be part of Edward's endowment, but Queen Eleanor was to hold it for her life, bound also by a non-alienation clause<sup>1</sup>. Accordingly, the honour did not revert to Edward until her death. Pevensey was one of the few sections of the "appanage" which was not similarly conferred on Edward's heirs. Instead, it was designated as dower land for successive queens.

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.312,330: Abstract of feet of fines for Sussex 743. This arrangement took no account of the claims of Peter's Savoyard nephews, E159/45 m.10.

#### iv) Fiscal Revenues

##### a) The Jewry

Towards the end of the twelfth Century the English Jewry, previously a provider of loans to the king, became a source of revenue by a systematic policy of taxation and exploitation. The mythological figures of 60,000 marks recorded for the Guildford tallage and the Saladin tithe were succeeded by lesser, regular demands <sup>1</sup>. In 1194 the position of the Jew in England was formalised and regulated by the establishment of the Exchequer of the Jews. He was restricted to residence in approved towns, and all financial transactions in which he was involved were under the supervision and control of the Crown. According to the "Laws of King Edward", the Jew was the property of the crown <sup>2</sup>. By the mid-thirteenth Century the convention was that the Jew could be taxed by the king at will, while alive, and, after his death, one third of his chattels, including money owed him, came to the king. This was the "assize" or "custom of Jewry" <sup>3</sup>.

At Trinity 1262 (4 June) the Jewry came under Edward's control for three years <sup>4</sup>. In return, the revenues of certain of Edward's lands were to be paid to the king <sup>5</sup>. If revenues exceeded 3,000 marks p.a., the surplus was to be delivered to Edward. Edward was to enjoy "omnibus exitibus et provenientibus debitis et consuetis que ipsi accedere possent". The king reserved the right to levy a tallage if he went on

1) GC I, p.422; AM II, p.264.

2) "judaei et omnia sua regis sunt", Chronica Rogeri de Hovedene II, p.231.

3) Select Pleas, Starrs and other records of the Jewish Exchequer, p.73: Richardson, The Jewry under the Angevin kings, chapters 3,7-9: Roth, A history of the Jews in England, chapters 1-3.

4) i.e. until 31 May 1265 (Trinity Sunday) or 4 June 1265.

5) the Channel Islands; the New Forest; the lands once held by John de Monmouth; the Three Castles; the lands in East Anglia obtained by exchange with Peter of Savoy; Grantham; Tickhill; parts of the Cantilupe wardship, i.e. Abergavenny, Calston, Calne, Eyton, Houghton, Harmsworth and Bolwick; the Longvilers wardship.

crusade during the term of the lease. Edward was to have the use of the machinery of the Exchequer of Jews, including the seal and the prison in which were held Jews and their debtors who had been distrained for non-payment. The Justices of the Jews and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were to assist him in collecting his dues <sup>1</sup>. Edward appointed at least one of the two or three justices of the Jews, and the keeper of the rolls <sup>2</sup>. After the Jewry reverted to the king, many arrears were still due to Edward, and from 1265-72 he maintained a clerk in the Exchequer of Jews for their receipt <sup>3</sup>.

No reason was given for this exchange. It was not the first time that the king had given up the Jewry, although on previous occasions he had surrendered it to settle his debts <sup>4</sup>. We must ask what was worth the surrender of 3,000 marks p.a.? Almost immediately, Edward traded the revenues to some Florentine merchants as repayment for a loan of 1,110 marks. This arrangement is worth examining in detail because it establishes that Edward anticipated a fixed revenue from the Jewry. The loan was to be repaid:

"de M et CC marcis quas idem filius noster recepturus est de iudaismo nostro de termino sancti Michaelis predicto secundum formam conventionis initam inter nos et ipsum" <sup>5</sup>.

From this arrangement we may calculate an expected yearly income of 2,400 marks, less than the sum for which Edward was liable to his father. The explanation lies in an order to the royal treasurer in August, to pay Edward 4,000 marks out of the 7,000 marks remaining from the fine for which the Jews had compounded their arrears of debts owed

1) CPR 1258-66, pp.233,511,554; C66/77 m.11d: E368/36 mm.17,17d: CR 1261-4, pp.170-1.

2) CLR 1267-72, p.190: CR 1264-8, pp.52,62.

3) E368/42 m.15d.: CR 1268-72, p.368: CPR 1272-81, p.87.

4) Paris, *Historia Anglorum* III, pp.334,343: CLR 1251-60, pp.500-1: Jenkinson, *TJHSE* VIII (1918), pp.19-54.

5) C66/77 m.8: CPR 1258-66, p.219. Note the incorporation of an interest charge of 90 marks.

to the king<sup>1</sup>. Thus, in return for 9,000 marks (3,000 m. p.a. over 3 years), Edward would receive 4,000 marks cash and revenues of 7,200 marks (2,400 marks p.a. over 3 years), a total of 11,200 marks. This arrangement can be shown to have been even more desirable for Edward when we consider that 5,110 marks were received within two months of the agreement. Moreover, in June 1263 he leased the Jewry to the Cahorsin merchants, Peter and William Beraud, for two years in return for a sum of money which he had already received<sup>2</sup>. If we assume that this loan was calculated on a similar scale and interest rate to the one from the Florentines, Edward will have been paid in the region of 4,400 marks. Thus, in barely a year from the original arrangement with the king, Edward had anticipated all future revenues from the Jewry, and his cash gains should have totalled 10,700 marks<sup>3</sup>. In view of the lease to the Beraudi brothers, it is curious to find references in early 1265 to a tallage being collected on Edward's behalf<sup>4</sup>.

The whole arrangement can be seen to have been very definitely to Edward's advantage. The king's generosity may have been in recognition that Edward's interests and political alignments were now in harmony with his own<sup>5</sup>. Additionally, it compensated Edward for the less advantageous exchange he had carried out the previous day, with Peter of Savoy, giving up the honour of Hastings, which Peter had long coveted, for less important lands in East Anglia<sup>6</sup>. The acquisition of this sum in June and August 1262, can be related to the financing of Edward's

1) CR 1261-4, p.84.

2) C66/79 mm.8,1; CPR 1258-66, pp.263,283.

3) 4,000 cash, +1,100 loan in lieu revenues September 1262-March 1263, +1,200 revenues June-August 1262, March-June 1263 +4,4000 loan in lieu revenues July 1263-65.

4) CR 1264-8, p.62.

5) cf. Ridgeway, D.Phil, pp.385-7, although his account of Edward's problems and restrictions placed on him distorts the position.

6) CChR 1257-1300, pp.42-5.

continental visit of 1262-1263. The Cahorsin loan "pro negociis ipsius Edwardi et regni nostri gravibus et arduis", which Edward received in London, either in March before he left for Wales, or in May/June on his return <sup>1</sup>, may have supplied his spring campaign against the Welsh or his summer campaign against the Montfortian adherents on the march. It could have paid for the mercenaries he brought with him from the continent, whom he deployed on the March and later in Windsor. Even with this advance, Edward's need of money was still so acute in June 1263 to occasion his raid on the New Temple <sup>2</sup>.

The arrangements for the payment of the 3,000 marks p.a. to Henry III deserve comment. The lands remained under Edward's control; Gilbert Talbot and Thomas Bolton, his chief stewards, were appointed jointly by the king and Edward to administer the lands <sup>3</sup>. Existing arrangements, such as farms and castellans, were not disturbed, and revenues continued to be paid into Edward's Bristol exchequer <sup>4</sup>. Talbot and Bolton were merely required to deliver the issues twice-yearly to the king. Only one reference can be found to actual payment. In October 1262 the king ordered the treasurer to deposit the Michaelmas receipts with the king's treasure in the Tower. Ironically, it was from this source that the cash advanced to Edward for the Welsh campaign derived <sup>5</sup>. The arrangement did not prevent Edward from granting Grantham and Tickhill to John de Warenne and Henry of Almain in 1263 to detach them from Montfort.

After Lewes most of Edward's estates were transferred to Montfortian custody, inevitably disrupting the arrangement. The Jewry was one of the few properties left nominally in Edward's possession.

1). Edward's presence in London in March is confirmed by the fragmentary wardrobe roll, C47/3/43/7.

2) GC II, p.222.

3) e.g. CR 1261-4, pp.185-6.

4) e.g. C62/52 m.5.

5) CR 1261-4, p.155.

After his escape from Hereford, Montfort ordered that the Exchequer of Jews be purged of Edward's officials and any money being levied for him was to be collected and kept from him<sup>1</sup>. From 1263, the general disruption of the times and the singling out of the Jews, their property and records for attack will have greatly reduced their profitability<sup>2</sup>. The operations of the exchequer may have been suspended for some time. This will have affected Edward less than the merchants to whom he had farmed the Jewry<sup>3</sup>. Edward's rôle in the enactments of the Provisions of Jewry of 1269 indicates that he and the council accepted that the profitability of the Jews should not be promoted at the expense of the baronage<sup>4</sup>.

Henry III resumed control of the Jewry after Evesham<sup>5</sup>. Edward was still entitled to debts outstanding from the period of his custody, and in February 1266 the exchequer was instructed to levy these on Edward's behalf<sup>6</sup>. Receipts were still coming in as late as 1272. Edward's clerk at the Exchequer of Jews, William de Middleton, received at least £311 in payments from indebted Christians, and orders were issued to levy a further £133/8/4<sup>7</sup>. Middleton's account, rendered for December 1265-May 1274 shows that the majority of these debts were recovered<sup>8</sup>. During his custody of the Jewry, Edward also made occasional gifts from his profits and acquisitions and once remitted a debt<sup>9</sup>. Thus, his

1) CR 1264-8, p.62.

2) Roth, op.cit. pp.60-63.

3) Select Pleas ...Exchequer of Jews, pp.41,49,51: CPEJ I, pp.133,139, 142,146: CR 1264-8, pp.32,44,52,83: CPR 1258-66, pp.322,577, 66-72, pp.13,51.

4) Select Pleas ...Exchequer Jews, pp.xxxvii-li: Roth, op.cit. pp.65-6.

5) E372/116 mm.1,ld: CPR 1258-66, pp.470,505-7, 66-72, p.191,196,317: Roth, op.cit. p.63, is in error here.

6) CPR 1258-66, p.554.

7) E159/43 m.2ld: Select Pleas ...Exchequer Jews, p.39: CPEJ I, pp.132,144,158,174,176-7,179,18, 194,198,203,256-7,260-5,309.

8) His receipts from the Jewry were £422/15/4, CPR 1272-81, p.87.

9) Table Two: CPR 1266-72, p.109: CR 1264-8, p.205: Richardson, op.cit. p.105, traces the history of a piece of land pledged to a Jew, which subsequently came into Edward's possession.

total receipts from the three-year custody may be calculated to have exceeded 11,333 marks.

In 1270 the king granted to Edward a tallage on the Jewry towards the financing of his crusade. This was assessed at 6,000 marks, of which 4,000 marks had been allocated and partially collected before Edward's departure for Palestine in August 1270. In his absence his agents carried on the collection of the sums outstanding, bringing in over £850<sup>1</sup>. While Edward was in the Holy Land his wealthy uncle, Richard of Cornwall, was persuaded to advance the 2,000 marks still outstanding from this tallage. He was given a grant of the Jewry (excluding tallages), with reversion to his heirs, for the repayment of this sum. Richard died before this money had been recovered from the issues of the Jewry, which therefore passed into the keeping of his younger son and heir, Edmund. Before repayment was completed the king's own financial exigencies caused him to resume the grant, and levy a new tallage, to the Jewry's great distress. Repayments to Edmund did not resume until February 1273<sup>2</sup>.

From this new tallage of 5,000 marks Edward was granted £1,000 in July 1272, made up from contributions assessed on a number of individual Jews of London, Stamford, Winchester and Doncaster<sup>3</sup>. By August 1272 the first payment of this tallage had been made to Edward's attornies<sup>4</sup>. Thus, the Jewry made a total contribution of 7,500 marks to Edward's crusade<sup>5</sup>.

1) E101/350/5 m.6d: E372/125 m.3. We may infer that between 2-3,000 marks had been paid before Edward sailed from Portsmouth.

2) CPR 1266-72, pp.545-6,671: CPEJ II, p.24.

3) Their contributions totalled £1,002/8/1 ob. and the king insisted that the extra 48s.1 ob. be paid to the exchequer, CR 1268-72, pp.498-9.

4) CR 1268-72, pp.518-9.

5) Richardson's discussion of the tallages of the 1270's omits the 1270 tallage, confusing some of the evidence for it with that of 1272. He gives the best account of the extortionate 1273-4 tallage, Richardson, op.cit. pp.214-6.

With the lease of 1262-1265, and the ensuing arrears, and his share of the tallages of 1270 and 1272, Edward obtained a considerable supplement to his cash revenues, totalling perhaps 19,000 marks. When he became king, he was already well-acquainted with the fund-raising potential of the Jewry. He was to exploit this beyond all limits before bringing his Jewish subjects to destruction <sup>1</sup>.

**b) The "New Aid"**

On 12 February 1266 it was decreed that all stranger and overseas merchants might only enter England and trade by license of Edward. Two days later the king ratified the "conditiones autem et pacta" that Edward had reached with the merchants <sup>2</sup>. In April, the grant was repeated with the stipulation that Edward was only to take a reasonable levy on imports and exports, so that the merchants did not suffer <sup>3</sup>. In all these grants the application was to foreign and overseas merchants "extranei et transmarini mercatores". However, the order of November 1266, to give assistance to Edward's bailiffs in their collection of the aid, specifically stated "tam alienigenis quam indigenis" <sup>4</sup>. There can be no doubt that the aid was levied on native merchants, hence the exemptions sought from it by native institutions. Henry III later declared that the aid was being levied generally on all merchants for merchandise sold or bought in his land <sup>5</sup>. Had native merchants been exempted, the collection of the levy would have been greatly impeded, as many overseas merchants would have claimed native status to avoid the payment. The aid may originally have been intended for non-native

1) Richardson, op.cit. pp.213-233.

2) C66/84 m.28; CPR 1258-66, pp.551,553-4.

3) C66/84 m.22; CPR 1258-66, pp.575-6; Foedera I i, p.468.

4) C66/85 m.37; CPR 1266-72, p.1.

5) CPR 1266-72, p.141: cf. the description by FitzThedmar, dALL, p.109.

merchants only, and the realisation of difficulties in collection caused its expansion to cover all merchandise regardless of provenance.

Gras has suggested that the new system was partly initiated to protect the merchants <sup>1</sup>. Certainly, in a separate writ of 8 April, it was stated that the merchants had been placed under Edward's protection:

"ad meliorationem status regni nostri et mercatorum cum rebus et mercandisiis suis in regnum nostrum venientium volumus quod omnes mercatores tam indigene quam alienigene pacem et tranquillitatem habeant" <sup>2</sup>.

The king was concerned lest foreign merchants be deterred from coming to England because of the unsettled conditions arising from the civil war <sup>3</sup>. It was later claimed that the aid had been granted to Edward "by the counsel of the merchants" <sup>4</sup>. If the merchants really did advise the measure (rather than simply being involved in discussions about scope and scale), their motivation is likely to have been a hope that, as a source of revenue, they would be better protected in the prosecution of their business.

The aid was something of an innovation in fiscal policy. It fell in a different category to the local tolls and exactions which were commonplace through the towns of England and Europe. The only English precedent was the tax of a fifteenth briefly imposed by King John on imports and exports, which raised almost £5,000 <sup>5</sup>. The level at which Edward's aid was to be paid is not stated, beyond the recommendation that it should not be too heavy. The novelty of the aid is apparent in the earliest references to it on the patent rolls. The first two entries concerning the aid are marked out on the roll by a drawing of a

1) Gras, Early English Customs System, p.53.

2) C66/84 m.20; CPR 1258-66, p.580.

3) cf. his letter to the men of Poole, urging them to welcome such merchants, but prevent them from venturing inland until it was safe for them to do so, Shirley, II, 650.

4) CPR 1266-72, p.141.

5) Gras, *op.cit.* pp.48-53, 217-222.

pointing hand in the margin. The description of the concession shows an uncertainty of nomenclature. It was first described as "pro Edwardo filio R. de consuetudinibus sibi concessis", and secondly as "de nova concessione facta domino Edwardo"<sup>1</sup>. In November it was described as "certum auxilium"<sup>2</sup>. It is some time before the regular term "novum auxilium" comes into use. The repetition of "new" shows that to the civil service, and probably to all, the grant was a new departure.

Both as an innovation and a financial exaction, the aid was not popular. In October 1266 the king issued general instructions to his ministers to give assistance to the collectors, and in November he instructed his officials in Yorkshire and Northumbria to act against the bailiffs of the bishop of Durham and Isabella de Fors<sup>3</sup>. Their opposition may have represented a belief that the intrusion of the collectors infringed their judicial liberties. Alternatively, as exporters in the wool trade, the tax affected them personally<sup>4</sup>. The merchants who took over collection of the aid also met with some resistance, and faced the additional problem of dishonesty among the local collectors<sup>5</sup>. King Louis of France was extremely indignant about the tax, which he considered especially directed against French merchants. Henry III's reply pointed out that the tax applied to all merchants, but offered to suspend it temporarily, so that French merchants might come to England and discuss the aid's application. He may have anticipated agreeing a fine for exemption, but this was not achieved<sup>6</sup>.

1) 12 and 14 February; the latter term was also used on 2 April, C66/84 mm.29,28,22.

2) C66/85 m.37.

3) CPR 1266-72, pp.1-2; C66/85 m.36.

4) English, *The Lordship of Holderness*, pp.199-200.

5) *Abbr.Plac.*p.184; CPR 1272-81, p.286.

6) CPR 1266-72, p.141: cf. CCR 1272-9, p.33; Gras, *op.cit.* p.55.

Initially, Edward kept control of the aid in his own hands and collectors were appointed for the various ports <sup>1</sup>. Some of them were prominent merchants, for example, Gregory de Rokesle, at one time the collector for London <sup>2</sup>. Officers of Edward's household were employed to audit and supervise the collectors, and levy any arrears or forfeitures to Edward's use <sup>3</sup>.

By May 1270 the system of direct collection had been replaced, and the custom was farmed to the Florentine merchants, Deutatus Gwillelmi, Hugo Pape and company, with whom Edward had long had dealings. An official record of the sum agreed for the farm is not known, although the Liber de Antiquis Legibus gave it as 6,000 marks p.a. <sup>4</sup>. Later, probably after July 1270 when the king confirmed the original agreement, the lease was extended until the end of August 1271 for an additional 2,000 marks. However, in August 1270 Edward revoked this extension on the grounds that he had been cheated:

"quia nos deceptos in prorogatione ipsa ultra dimidiam justi precii fore conprobavimus manifeste".

He assigned the collection of the aid, allegedly for this same period, to the Beraud brothers of Cahors, for 4,000 marks <sup>5</sup>. After Edward's departure for the Holy Land the quarrel with the Florentines was evidently resolved, for, in December 1271, Edward's lieutenants leased the aid to Gwillelmi and his associates until Christmas 1272 <sup>6</sup>. In the case of the Beraud lease it was agreed that the farm should be set against the money already owed to them by Edward, and any residue

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.1-2, 1272-81, pp.4,239-40.

2) CPR 1272-81, p.239-40.

3) CPR 1266-72, p.129,717, 72-81, p.4.

4) dALL, p.110.

5) C66/88 mm.3,10; CPR 1266-72, pp.442,463, giving the new farm incorrectly as 40,000 marks.

6) CPR 1266-72, p.617. They may have taken over directly from the Berauds, promising to repay the 600 marks the Cahorsins had paid for the last term, CPR 1272-81, pp.286-7.

would be paid into Edward's exchequer. The money Burnell did receive from them may relate to the second lease. The Florentine merchants also paid money to Burnell, and it is not possible to distinguish between the receipts <sup>1</sup>. In Ireland the aid was administered separately, and the escheator, John de Sandford, received £100 from the sale of the aid for one year, and £100 in receipts from the aid before the sale <sup>2</sup>.

Frequent petitions were made for exemption from the aid, not all of which were granted <sup>3</sup>. At the instance of Walter Giffard, then bishop of Bath and Wells, he exempted the abbey of Glastonbury and the cathedral chapter of Wells <sup>4</sup>. The burgesses of Corby were exempted at the instance of Robert d'Aubigny <sup>5</sup>. The city of London, whose merchants had most to lose from the tax, made a fine of 200 marks with Edward for exemption <sup>6</sup>. Such exemptions, especially of large merchant communities such as London and Rouen, were bound to reduce the revenues from the aid. The embargo on trade with Flanders from 1270 onwards, cutting wool and cloth exports back very considerably, will also have had a detrimental effect on receipts <sup>7</sup>. In 1275 the aid, then being administered by the Ricardi of Lucca, was superseded by a levy on exports of wool, wool-fells and hides, known as the "new custom". This custom was also entrusted to the merchants of Lucca to collect <sup>8</sup>.

1) In the account for receipts from Edward's estates from July 1270, Burnell was paid £592 in two instalments "from the collectors of the new aid", and a further £888/13/4 from the collectors "tam de tempore Petri Berardi quam de tempore Deutati Guillelmi, Hugone del Pape etc", E372/125 m.3: E101/350/6.

2) 36th.Rep.DKI, p.23.

3) e.g. CPR 1266-72, p.42.

4) Studd 959; HMC 12, 1885, p.154, 1907, p.309

5) Studd 990,1005; SCL/12/4,11.

6) dALL, p.110.

7) Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, pp.621-2: TH Lloyd, The English Wool Trade in the Middle Ages, op.cit. p.515.

8) CPR 1272-81, p.84: Gras, op.cit. pp.59,64,223-4: AbbrRO, p.23.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

i) **War Acquisitions**

a) Seizures of rebel lands

After the royalist victory at Evesham the king announced that the lands of all rebels were forfeit, and he sparked off an orgy of violence and dispossession causing great hardship and contributing to the difficulties of restoring peace. It is fair to point out that victorious Montfortians had acted very similarly after Lewes<sup>1</sup>. It would have been very difficult for Henry III to control his supporters, seeking reward and revenge alike, especially when his main preoccupation was to regain control of the kingdom. By mid-September 1265 an attempt was being made to bring order to the situation; commissions were appointed for each county to inquire into rebels, and the lands they had held, and take these into the king's hands. Grants were then made of the confiscated lands in a more organised manner, although errors of duplication or mistaken seizure still occurred. The Dictum of Kenilworth replaced outright disinheritance by a sliding scale of fines, and formalised the process of redemption. The earl of Gloucester's intervention in 1267 ensured that the Disinherited were returned to at least partial possession to facilitate payment of the redemption money. However, the legal records of the next decade are ample testimony to the confusion which had reigned, and to the difficulties which ensued in the attempt to reward the king's supporters, penalise his enemies, and punish criminal acts which had occurred during the period of disturbance<sup>2</sup>.

In the initial seizures of land, the king's half-brothers were

1) e.g. seizures in Kent, Sussex and London, Just 1/1207 passim.

2) A detailed analysis of the events of 1265-7, focusing on the Disinherited, may be found in CH Knowles, University of Wales, Ph.D. thesis, 1959: cf. Jacob, op.cit. pp. 167-274.

prominent. So too was the earl of Gloucester, in contrast to his later concern for the plight of the Disinherited. Prominent royalists such as Roger de Mortimer, John de Warenne, Roger de Clifford were also swift to profit from the change in their fortunes. Many had old scores to pay off, and campaign expenses to recover. Many quarrels occurred in rivalry over these acquisitions, e.g. between Mortimer and Gloucester, Warenne and Gloucester, La Zuche and Warenne, Leyburn and Gloucester, and perhaps between Edward and Gloucester <sup>1</sup>.

In Edward's case, it is almost impossible to distinguish between his rôle in the process of pacification and his participation in the uncontrolled disseisins which followed Evesham. As his father's representative, he was empowered to come to terms and pardon rebels. Even before Evesham he had authorised his agents to receive repentant Montfortians into the king's peace <sup>2</sup>, and he continued this policy after the victory <sup>3</sup>. He was responsible for negotiating the surrenders of the castles of Gloucester <sup>4</sup>, Wallingford and Berkhamstead <sup>5</sup>, his own properties of the Peak and Chester <sup>6</sup>, Dover and the Cinque Ports <sup>7</sup>, and of the Disinherited in Axholm and Ely <sup>8</sup>. During his Alnwick campaign of March-April 1267, he had similar powers.

The reverse side of this power was the right to seize and distribute the lands held by unrepentant rebels. The inquiries held from October 1265 into the rebel property and land seizures give some idea of

1) CPR 1258-66, p.655.

2) CR 1264-8, pp.131-2,226-7: CPR 1258-66, p.632, 66-72, pp.15,632; C66/85 m.33.

3) e.g. CPR 1266-72, pp.225,248,258.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.627; C66/84 m.8: Just1/59 mm.5,8,19d, 83 mm.9d,16d: E368/45 m.6.

5) Studd 905; SCL/8/19; Shirley II 291: C66/84 m.36; CPR 1258-66, p.528: CR 1264-8, pp.228,257.

6) CR 1264-8, p.23: C47/2/1/8: CIM 645: A.Ces, pp.94-5.

7) Studd 915,917; SCL/8/23,24: CR 1264-8, p.217,306: CPR 1266-72, p.56.

8) CPR 1258-66, pp.536,538, 66-72, p.26,152-3,235,248,279: CR 1264-8, p.379: AM III, pp.246-7: Hunter RS, p.235: Just1/83 mm.3d,6.

the scope of this process <sup>1</sup>, and the confusion which ensued. Some problems arose from the gradual elaboration of policy over confiscations. For example, before the king ordered that all occupied rebel land and any rents received from it be surrendered to him, Edward had granted to Thomas de Clare the soke of Oswaldebeck in Le Clay (Notts). This had been part of the estate of Henry de Hastings, one of Edward's prisoners from Evesham. In recognition of Edward's grant, the king made an exception to the September ruling and instructed the tenants of the soke to pay the rent for the previous term to Thomas <sup>2</sup>. Other difficulties arose from cases of individual malice. During the siege of Alnwick, one of the royalists there took advantage of the confused conditions to dispossess one of his tenants, by persuading Edward that the man was a rebel <sup>3</sup>.

Perhaps surprisingly, Edward did not single out the lands of his personal enemies such as Robert de Ferrers for widespread seizures. He occupied lands of some tenants of Ferrers in Northamptonshire, but those men were well-known rebels anyway <sup>4</sup>. Some lands of Simon de Montfort and his son Henry in Leicestershire, Shropshire, Bedfordshire and Hampshire <sup>5</sup>, besides the castle of Odiham, held from the king as a life-grant by Simon <sup>6</sup>, were also seized by Edward or in his name. Evidence of a vendetta may be seen in the attacks on the lands of the abbey of Peterborough, which had supported the rebel garrison of Northampton, by several of Edward's men <sup>7</sup>, but Edward's general conduct was restrained, especially in contrast with other prominent royalists.

1) CIM 609-940.

2) A.Ces, pp.94-5: CPR 1258-66, pp.421,512: C66/84 m.41.

3) Abbr.Plac. p.166; CDS I 2452,2538.

4) John FitzJohn and Michael Tovy, CIM 834.

5) CIM 616,692,722: RH I, p.185: CPR 1258-66, p.501.

6) CPR 1247-58, p.250: CR 1264-8, pp.68-9,149.

7) below, Chapter 4.i.d.

For the most part the lands seized by or for Edward were not those of prominent or wealthy Montfortians. He never singled out the entire estates of any one rebel. In some cases the rationale behind the seizures is easy to identify. Where Edward's own tenants had supported Montfort, he was particularly quick to take action against them, hence the systematic seizures in the Peak by Edward's Poitevin knight, Imbert Guy <sup>1</sup>. In Somerset Edward recovered two manors of his own Cantilupe wardship, which had earlier been granted to Peter de Montfort, Edward's former constable, who was killed at Evesham. A third Somerset manor of the wardship, also held by Peter, was recovered by the bailiffs of Eleanor of Castile <sup>2</sup>. The Somerset manor of another rebel, Ralph Bluet, was also seized for Edward <sup>3</sup>. It is probable that Edward's bailiff for the Cantilupe honour of Bridgewater was systematically organising the occupation of rebel lands in the district.

In other cases the seizures undoubtedly relate to the location of Edward's own lands. In the Corby area of Northamptonshire, Edward's bailiffs occupied lands adjoining Edward's custody of Haringworth, which had been raided earlier in the disturbances <sup>4</sup>. In Bedfordshire, the proximity of the occupied territories to his manors of Eaton and Houghton was not accidental <sup>5</sup>. Edward's Bedfordshire bailiff, Thomas Inge, had been attacked and robbed by alleged rebels, and this could explain his diligence in land seizures. Another bailiff, John de Hadenham, who was responsible for Edward's various East Anglian lands, had been victimised by rebels, and he too took every opportunity to retaliate, even arresting two merchants trading in Ipswich on the

1) CIM 645; C145/25/26.

2) CIM 860,875: CPR 1258-66, p.453: Shirley II, pp.298-9.

3) CIM 866.

4) Hunter RS, pp.203-4: CIM 835,841, cf. seizures in Cleyley, 834.

5) CIM 614.

grounds that they were Londoners <sup>1</sup>.

Edward sent members of his household and other royalists on specific missions of occupation in various regions. In many cases, the objective was not the punishment of rebels, but the facilitation of the process of pacification, as also in their employment to receive surrenders of rebel-held strongholds. A typical example here is the commission to John de Musgrove to occupy the manor of Kingston in Berkshire, said to be held by Gerard de Lisle, one of the Disinherited in Ely. John later cleared himself of a charge of robbery, by producing Edward's writ instructing him to take possession of the manor and its contents, to prevent supplies being sent to assist the Disinherited in Ely, and to supply Edward's own forces <sup>2</sup>.

Similarly, in the course of the pacification, Edward sent Matthew Bezill and John de Rokele to occupy certain lands held by rebels in Kent, causing a later complaint by the Archbishop of Canterbury that his liberty and rights over his tenants had been infringed. John Reynger also occupied lands in Kent "by writ of the king and the Lord Edward", perhaps including the lands of Luke de Hegham and Henry de Dunley <sup>3</sup>. A group of seizures in Nottingham were carried out by Robert Tiptoft and Ralph de Woodburgh on Edward's behalf <sup>4</sup>. Henry Husse's seizures in Hampshire suggest a similar commission, as do other operations in Buckingham, Hertford, and Yorkshire <sup>5</sup>. Edward's knight, John de Verdon, who took custody of Windsor from the Montfortian constable, John FitzJohn, in company with several members of Edward's household, including his physician, William de Farnham, plundered FitzJohn's

1) Just1/59 m.3: CIM 640: CR 1264-8, pp.145-6.

2) Just1/42 mm.13d,18.

3) CPR 1266-72, p.124: CIM 726,745,753.

4) CIM 848,849,850,851. Not all the manors were specifically stated to have been taken for Edward, but the scope suggests a general commission.

5) CIM 635,692,692,709,939.

chattels and live-stock at the castle <sup>1</sup>.

At the battle of Northampton Edward had taken charge of some of the more important prisoners and distributed them among his strongholds <sup>2</sup>. After Evesham, the most prominent prisoners, Humphrey de Bohun junior, Henry de Hastings and Guy de Montfort, were initially imprisoned in Edward's Cheshire castle of Beeston. The only grant known to have been made by Edward from their lands was the small grant to Thomas de Clare from the Hastings estates. Some other Montfortian prisoners came into Edward's possession. He organised their pardons and designated the recipients of the ransom or fine for redemption <sup>3</sup>.

Given the overall proportion of royalist lands seized at this time, it is not surprising that some of the lands which came into Edward's possession were taken in error. Admittedly, the jurors of the 1265 inquests were very prone to disclaim knowledge of rebels, or exonerate those accused of complicity, so the number of errors is probably lower than the Inquests would suggest <sup>4</sup>. Among those whose lands were seized for Edward, Robert Pecche was said by the Hundred of Corby not to have been against the king, but other evidence shows him to have been a committed Montfortian, and a leader in the resistance in the Isle of Ely in 1267 <sup>5</sup>. Where a mistake had occurred, Edward was prompt to restore seisin <sup>6</sup>. James le Sauvage also claimed to be innocent of the charges laid against him, but arrangements for his redemption fine, suggest he

1). KB26/174 m.10d, 175 m.23d: CLR 1260-67, p.226.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.318.

3) Ralph Basset of Sapcote, whose lands were awarded to John de Verdon, probably at Edward's instance, Studd 914; SC1/8/22: CPR 1258-66, pp.534,559,670: CR 1264-8, p.387: SCR 388: William Foliot, whose fine was allocated to Fulk de Rycote on Edward's orders, Studd 913; SC1/8/21.

4) e.g. Luton's disclaimer on Henry de Montfort, CIM 616.

5) AM III, p.246-7: CIPM I 916: CIM 814,835: CR 1264-8, p.348.

6) e.g. Henry de Engayn, Gerard de Rodes, Henry de Dunley, CIM 753,835,850. cf. Luke de Hegham, CIM 726, and Lucy de Grey, Studd 909; SC1/8/18.

failed to prove his case <sup>1</sup>.

Out of 25 cases where land was seized by or for Edward, 3 were certainly royalists, Henry de Dunley, Henry de Engayn, Gerard de Rodes, and perhaps also Luke de Hegham. 17 were certainly Montfortians, Ralph Bluet <sup>2</sup>, John le Breton <sup>3</sup>, Walter de Burgh <sup>4</sup>, Robert de Coleville <sup>5</sup>, Robert Corbet <sup>6</sup>, Fulk de Dene <sup>7</sup>, John de Dive <sup>8</sup>, John le Frere, junior <sup>9</sup>, John de Holewell, with his brother, Master Stephen de Holewell <sup>10</sup>, Gerard de Lisle <sup>11</sup>, John FitzJohn <sup>12</sup>, Henry de Montfort, Peter de Montfort <sup>13</sup>, Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, Robert Pecche <sup>14</sup>, Michael Tovy <sup>15</sup>, Robert de Vere, Earl of Oxford <sup>16</sup>. A further 2 were probably Montfortians, William Quarel <sup>17</sup>, James le Sauvage. Too little is known about Roger de Blunt and Simon le Rutor to reach any conclusion <sup>18</sup>.

Thus out of the 23 cases where there is a reasonable amount of evidence, 17 definite and 2 probable seizures of rebel lands were made,

1) SCR 463,481,491: Hunter RS, p.247: CPR 1258-66, p.537: but cf. Jacob, op.cit. pp.154n,179n.

2) guilt admitted by jurors, CIM 866.

3) Kenilworth garrison, CIM 835: Justl/237 m.8; Hunter RS, p.141.

4) bailiff to Montfort, CIM 841.

5) with John D'Eyville at Canterbury, CIM 939, raided royalist lands in Bucks. Justl/59 mm.1,2, pardoned, on terms Dictum, CPR 1266-72, p.150.

6) in Dover garrison, SCl/8/23, raided royalist lands in Kent before Evesham, Justl/1207 mm.2d,3,5d,11.

7) at Evesham, CIM 835.

8) at Evesham, CIM 853, lands granted to Laurence de St.Maur, SCR 449.

9) in garrison Launceston with Montfort, CIM 834, had to stand to Dictum, CPR 1266-72, p.63.

10) supporter of Montfort, CIM 614, cf. CPR 1258-66, pp.402,479,545 on Stephen's guilt.

11) in Ely, Justl/42 mm.13d.18: CPR 1266-72, p.356.

12) notorious Montfortian, at Lewes, Evesham, one of the occupiers of London in 1267, CPR 1258-66, p.614; CPR 1266-72, p.146: ExeRF II, pp.472-3.

13) killed at Evesham.

14) in Ely 1267, AM III, pp.246-7.

15) fought at Lewes, Londoner, CIM 834, below.

16) captured at Kenilworth with Simon the younger, CIM 635.

17) said to be bailiff of William Marescal, CIM 841.

18) CIM 709.

against 3 definite and 1 possible seizures of royalist lands, which were all rapidly restored. No cases have been found where an alleged royalist experienced difficulty recovering his lands from Edward. Only in one instance, at Chawton, were the royal commissioners resisted by Edward's men in their attempts to extend and take possession of occupied lands. Of the lands seized for Edward, besides the Cantilupe manors he recovered, only Henry de Montfort's Luton, Odiham and Michael Tovy's land in East Pirie remained in his possession <sup>1</sup>. The other seizures were surrendered to the king and granted to other loyalists <sup>2</sup>. Edward's conduct, in the number of seizures, their provenance and their surrender to the king, was more moderate than that of many other royalists. This is perhaps surprising, given Edward's general reputation, and therefore worthy of note.

b) Formal grants of rebel lands, and redemption fines according to the Dictum of Kenilworth

The lands formally granted to Edward were comparatively few. Before the battle of Lewes he was awarded the Kent lands of William de Say and John de Cobham. The subsequent reverse in royalist fortunes meant that the grants were not implemented. After Evesham both escaped further confiscation and returned to royal favour, perhaps as a result of an association with the earl of Gloucester <sup>3</sup>. After Evesham, in October 1265 the grant to Edward of the lands of William Paynel was enrolled on the Charter Roll <sup>4</sup>. All the lands of Richard de Amundeville, Nicholas de

1) E372/125 m.3: C62/51 m.7. The Montfort heirs and Tovy were excluded from the Dictum, T&S 44, cl.11,34. Tovy's manor was soon granted by Edward to one of his household, William de Gunneville, Table 2.

2) e.g. the Dene lands to Matthew Bezill, although he lost these on a technicality, Just1/618 m.20; Leicester's lands passed to Edmund; FitzJohn's to Gloucester; Peter de Montfort's to Leyburn and Thomas de Clare.

3) CPR 1258-66, pp.316-7,575,591: CIM 658,744,806,925.

4) CChR 1257-1300, p.58.

Cantilupe, Robert le Constable, John de la Haye, Thomas de Multon and the Murers family, and the lands in Buggethorp (Yorks) of Thomas de Chauncy and Walter de Grey were listed as granted to Edward in the Supplementary Close Roll, believed to have been drawn up in late October or early November <sup>1</sup>. No grants to Edward appear on the Exchequer Roll of grants, which Dr. Knowles dates in its final form to summer 1266 <sup>2</sup>. Later legal proceedings and subsequent transactions show that Edward was also granted some of the lands of John de Beauchamp, Richard le Breton, John FitzPhilip, and Gerard de Lisle <sup>3</sup>. His claim to the lands of John de Berners was upheld by the king, but in terms which imply royal confusion about Edward's acquisition of the lands <sup>4</sup>.

Geographically, there was little system to the grants. A number of the lands were located in Lincolnshire (e.g. some of those of John de la Haye, Thomas de Multon, Nicholas de Cantilupe, Richard de Murers, Thomas de Chauncey), and another cluster in Yorkshire (lands of Robert le Constable, Walter de Grey, Thomas de Chauncy, the Murers brothers). John de la Haye also held lands in Sussex, Kent and Northampton <sup>5</sup>, and Nicholas de Cantilupe in Nottingham and Derbyshire <sup>6</sup>. Richard de Amundeville's lands were principally in Warwickshire <sup>7</sup>, and John de Beauchamp's in Bedford, Buckingham and Worcestershire <sup>8</sup>. Gerard de Lisle held land in Berkshire and Norfolk <sup>9</sup>. FitzPhilip's lands were probably in Staffordshire <sup>10</sup>, and William Paynel's estates have not been

1) SCR 379,382: CH Knowles, op.cit. chapter 2.

2) Hunter RS, pp.247-257.

3) CR 1264-8, pp.281,366-7: Justl/83 mm.14d,16: CPR 1266-72, p.5; C66/85 m.36: Hunter RS, p.216.

4) CPR 1266-72, p.410.

5) CIPM II 59, III 101: CIM 297,720,796

6) CIPM I 874.

7) CIPM I 10,360: CIM 268,930.

8) CIM 612-3,629,936.

9) CIPM IV 434.

10) CChR 1226-57, pp.364,474.

traced. The reason for the cluster of lands in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire is unknown, and the other lands granted Edward were scattered.

Few of the rebels had any significant connection with Edward which might explain the grants. John de la Haye had been a member of the Dover garrison which had surrendered to Edward <sup>1</sup>. John FitzPhilip, who was pardoned and reinstated in his lands at the queen's instance, had been connected with Edward's childhood household <sup>2</sup>. William Paynel had served in Edward's Welsh expedition of spring 1263, but by 1266 his connections were rather with Edward's brother <sup>3</sup>. Richard de Amundeville <sup>4</sup> and Nicholas de Cantilupe <sup>5</sup> had also served with Edward in Wales, and John de Berners had been a member of Edward's first continental tournament expedition <sup>6</sup>. This may be no more than coincidence.

No pattern can be discerned in the history or affinities of the other rebels whose lands were awarded to Edward. Beauchamp was one of the casualties at Evesham <sup>7</sup>, and Robert le Constable was a follower of John d'Eyville <sup>8</sup>. Edward had been interested in the estates of Gerard de Lisle in the course of the Ely campaign, but it is not clear whether the grant of his manors was the result or the cause here. Only Grey and Chauncy were linked in any way, by Grey's tenancy of Chauncy's lands in Buggethorpe <sup>9</sup>. Evidence from the pattern of occupations after Evesham does not suggest that any of these lands had been singled out by Edward. They were then occupied by a variety of royalists, e.g. the earl of

1) CPR 1266-72, p.152: CR 1264-8, pp.217-8,369: Studd 915,917: SCL/8/23,24: CIM 720-1,725,796,925,1024: KB26/175 m.15.

2) CR 1253-4, p.23: CPR 1266-72, pp.5,52; C66/85 m.36: Just1/237 m.7.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.256,590, 595, 66-72, p.265.

4) garrison of Kenilworth, AM IV, p.195: CIM 930: CPR 1266-72, pp.17,26.

5) surrendered to Edward and the king at Nottingham, January 1266, CPR 1272-81, p.230: CIM 644,796,849.

6) killed at Chesterfield, Just1/237 m.7; Hunter RS, p.132.

7) AM IV, p.174.

8) CPR 1258-66, p.390.

9) CIPM II 427: CChR 1226-57, p.471.

Gloucester, Philip Basset, Roger de Clifford, Robert de Brus. Only in two instances, the transfer for safe-keeping of Haye's Borewell to Stephen de Penchester <sup>1</sup>, and the seizure of Cantilupe's Nottingham and Derbyshire manors by William de Mortain, do the identity of the temporary holders suggest a connection with Edward.

Edward, and those to whom he granted the lands, had difficulty retaining some of these estates, or exacting the redemption fine. Edward gave up John FitzPhilip's lands voluntarily, but Richard le Breton reoccupied his lands forcibly. In 1269 the king ordered the special eyre to investigate the incident <sup>2</sup>. Nicholas de Cantilupe also reoccupied his manor of Muscamp which had been granted to John de Vaux. In January 1266 the King's Bench was considering what steps to take to return seisin to Vaux <sup>3</sup>. Gerard de Lisle had to be distrained in 1270 to settle his debt to John de Musgrove for redemption of the manor of Mundeford which Edward had granted John <sup>4</sup>. John de Berner's manor of Streathall in Essex, which Edward granted to Tiptoft, after it had been recovered by process of law from Albreda de la Haye, was threatened by a plea for dower by John's widow <sup>5</sup>. Thomas de Chauncy and Walter de Grey both asserted their innocence, but eventually were brought to agree redemption fines <sup>6</sup>. Although the grant on the Supplementary Close Roll awarded Edward all the lands of John de la Haye, his Sussex manor of Middleton was first occupied and then granted to William de Rosham <sup>7</sup>. The manor of Lidenham in Shropshire, which Edward gave to Adam de

1) CPR 1258-66, p.451.

2) Just1/83 mm.14d,16. No record of the result of the case has been found.

3) KB26/175 m.11d.

4) Hunter RS, p.216.

5) CPR 1266-72, p.410; CR 1268-72, p.251; Just1/237 m.7; Hunter RS, p.132.

6) SCR 436,476; CR 1264-8, p.551, 68-72, p.147.

7) CIM 925; CR 1268-72, p.90.

Montgomery as forfeit by Richard de Amundeville, proved to have been leased from a royalist, William de Hastentot. According to the Dictum, William was entitled to receive the agreed rent from Adam and recover the land at the expiry of the original term. Initially, the king favoured Hastentot's claim for restoration, but in 1267 he bought him off with a fee <sup>1</sup>.

Most of the rebel lands granted to Edward were used to reward members of his household for their war-service. Adam de Montgomery, granted Lidenham, was probably Adam FitzPhilip, who had refused to surrender Edward's castle of Montgomery during his captivity <sup>2</sup>. John de Musgrove, one of the garrison of Bristol who had attempted to rescue Edward from Wallingford, was granted Gerard de Lisle's manor, although not the one he had seized on Edward's orders during the Ely campaign <sup>3</sup>. Robert Tiptoft, another of the Bristol garrison, and a long-standing member of Edward's household, was granted John de Berner's Streathall. In several instances, lands previously granted to Edward were then awarded by the king to others, without apparent reference to Edward. However, as the recipients were members of Edward's household, or close associates, it seems probable that these grants were the result of decisions by Edward. For example, the grant of Muscamp to John de Vaux; the marriage of Nicholas de Cantilupe's widow to Alan Plogonet, at Edward's instance, and the wardship of his heir to William the cook <sup>4</sup>; and the grant of Thomas de Multon's Cumberland lands to Roger de Leyburn, significantly soon after a reference to Edward's obligation to endow Leyburn with lands <sup>5</sup>.

1) T&S 44 cl.24: CR 1264-8, p.207: CPR 1266-72, pp.55,711: E368/42 m.1: CChR 1257-1300, p.147.

2) CPR 1258-66, pp.411,417.

3) CPR 1258-66, pp.350,396: C62/49 m.1: E371/29 m.9: Appendix 2, n.11.

4) SCR 379: CPR 1258-66, p.640: CR 1268-72, pp.134-5: KB26/175 m.11d: CIM 955: CIPM II 504.

5) CChR 1257-1300, p.56: CPR 1258-66, p.471: SCR 430

In some cases Edward collected the actual redemption fines, although giving the money away in one instance to William Charles, his wife's knight and steward<sup>1</sup>. Robert le Constable promised to pay Edward £60 to recover his lands<sup>2</sup>. The most lucrative arrangement was for the lands of John de Beauchamp. In 1267 the king, with Edward's consent, allowed John's heirs to buy back his lands. Matilda de Beauchamp agreed to pay Edward 500 marks in instalments for her share. Thomas FitzOtto, husband of Matilda's sister, Ela, apparently made a similar arrangement. The remaining third of the estates was assigned to the young daughters of Baldwin Wake, and he bought the wardship from Edward for 600 marks<sup>3</sup>. Grants of rebel land to Edward were on a comparatively-modest scale, and in most cases soon transferred to members of his affinity.

c) Edward's London prisoners

After Evesham it took an army and the threat of a siege to restore his capital city to Henry III. The support the citizens had shown to Montfort, who had used London as his base for several years, aroused Henry III's deepest resentment. In September 1265 the party of Londoners who came to Windsor to surrender the city were arrested and imprisoned in breach of their safe-conduct, and the privileges of the city were suspended. In October the persons and possessions of five of the most prominent offenders were granted to Edward<sup>4</sup>. London was excluded from the Dictum<sup>5</sup> and only obtained peace with the king for the high price of 20,000 marks. According to Thomas Wykes, this was intended to pay the

1) CR 1264-8, p.551.

2) CR 1264-8, p.550.

3) CR 1264-8, pp.281,366-7,372,491-2: E368/42 m.1.

4) AM IV, pp.177-8: dALL, p.79: CPR 1258-66, p.462, lists only Thomas FitzThomas, Michael Tovy and Thomas de Pivelesdon, but clearly, by January 1266, Edward had also been given Stephen Bukerel and John le Chapeler, CPR 1258-66, p.532.

5) although commended to the king's consideration, T&S 44, cl.11.

king's debts overseas <sup>1</sup>. Edward's prisoners were excluded from this pardon, so these unfortunate men could only negotiate their freedom from Edward on his terms.

Of the five, Bukerel, Tovy and FitzThomas came from the inner circle of the London mercantile patriciate, families with long traditions of involvement in trade and government in the city of London, and linked to the radical tradition of the previous decades. Le Chapeler, by contrast, was a new man in London, who had made his fortune in the hat trade and imports from Spain. Pivelesden was something of an outsider, a clerk from a Shropshire family, linked to the radical movement in London by his marriage to Tovy's niece. They had taken control of the popular movement in London, which had risen against the patrician oligarchy, and allied with Simon de Montfort. FitzThomas had been mayor of London during the Montfortian ascendancy. They had orchestrated the attacks on the property of royalists in and near London. Tovy had commanded the force of Londoners which fought at the battle of Lewes <sup>2</sup>.

Edward's prisoners were clearly not considered equally guilty. Bukerel and John le Chapeler were released on terms in April 1266. Tovy was released in June 1268, and FitzThomas in March 1269, perhaps as a concession to popular unrest in the city <sup>3</sup>. Thomas de Pivelesden, while no more heavily implicated than Tovy or FitzThomas, was treated with greater severity. His support for the Montfortian cause, after his years of service in Edward's household, was seen as a personal betrayal by Edward. He was not released until 1275, on the personal intercession of

1) AM IV, p.184.

2) Just1/59 mm.2-3d,19d, 1207 mm.4,5: London Eyre of 1276, 52,146,296: CIM 745: KB26/182 m.21d.: CR 1264-8, p.181: CPR 1266-72, pp.237-8: Williams, Medieval London, Chapters 3,8.

3) Williams, op.cit. p.241 sees his release as a mistake, in view of the discontent at the collection of the corporate fine.

the new Archbishop of Canterbury.

These men paid heavily for their radical politics. Even the royalist Wykes disapproved of their treatment, stating that Bukerel and Chapeler were "*intolerabili summa pecuniae pro liberatione sua mulctati*"<sup>1</sup>. Le Chapeler was fined 500 marks<sup>2</sup>. The sum paid by Bukerel is not known, but it is unlikely to have been smaller, and an instalment was out-standing at his death<sup>3</sup>. Michael Tovy was fined only £200, but barred from entering London, without the licence of the citizens or the king<sup>4</sup>. FitzThomas agreed to pay £500 over three years, but his moveable property was restored in return<sup>5</sup>. There is no record of a fine paid by Pivelesden. His long imprisonment may have been held to have purged his offence, but in any case, linked to the merchant class only by his marriage, he will have been less wealthy than his fellow-prisoners<sup>6</sup>. In addition, Edward did not return the property and valuables of his prisoners. As they had mostly followed the patrician custom of investing in country estates<sup>7</sup>, Edward acquired estates in the Home Counties and as far away as Northampton, as well as property in the city.

Some of their houses and manors were apparently distributed by the king, after the grant to Edward. The recipients were all members of Edward's household or affinity, and it is very probable that these awards were allocated by Edward. John le Chapeler's Fleet property was granted to John de Verdon<sup>8</sup>. Bukerel's house in Aldermanbury went to

1) AM IV, p.178.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.579; C66/84 m.21.

3) KB26/182 m.21d, "*pro certa pecunie quantitate*": E368/45 m.8d: E13/1f m.12d.

4) CR 1264-8, p.453: CPR 1266-72, pp.237-8.

5) Studd 972: CPR 1266-72, p.328.

6) CPR 1272-81, pp.92,94.

7) Williams, *op.cit.* p.56.

8) CPR 1258-66, p.466.

Roger Mortimer, who sold them to a royalist Londoner, Walter Hervy<sup>1</sup>. Pivelesden's London houses were given to Henry of Almain, from whom they passed to Edmund of Lancaster, Thomas de Clare and ultimately to another royalist Londoner, Stephen de Cornhill. Pivelesden's land in "Michia" was given to Edward's knight/household steward, Hugh FitzOtto, who passed it on to Edward's buyer, Master Humphrey<sup>2</sup>. FitzThomas' houses were distributed between John de Musgrove, Warin de Bassingbourn, Itier Bouchard and an abbey<sup>3</sup>. Tovy's London property passed to Walter de Merton, and Edward gave his manor in Northamptonshire, which Robert de Ferrers had given to Tovy, to his knight, William de Gunneville<sup>4</sup>.

Bukerel, le Chapeler, FitzThomas, and Tovy were given pardons, which indemnified them from any claims for injuries done by them during the civil war, a very useful concession in the vindictive conditions of the late 1260's and 1270's<sup>5</sup>. Edward issued another pardon to Bukerel in February 1268, directed to the justices of the special eyre who were hearing the case brought against Bukerel by John Reynger, one of the victims of the raids of 1263-5. Reynger was deeply indignant that, unlike the rebels who stood to the terms of the Dictum, the pardoned Londoners appeared to be exempted from any obligation to answer for their crimes. He argued that it could not have been the intention of the king or Edward that he should be deprived of his goods. Bukerel's death soon after appears to have brought the case to an inconclusive end.

1) CPR 1258-66, p.493: CR 1268-72, p.102.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.460: SCL/2/32: Just1/1207 m.3d: Letter-book C, f.22v; Calendar of Letter-book C, p.25.

3) CPR 1258-66, pp.464,466,468: CChR 1257-1300, p.177: Williams, p.236.

4) Beauchamp Cartulary Charters 352,354: BL Add.Ms. 28024 f.40.

5) Bukerel, 5 April 1266, KB26/182 m.21d: le Chapeler, 8 April 1266, royal confirmation only, C66/84 m.21; CPR 1258-66, p.579: FitzThomas, 9 March 1269, C66/87 m.20; CPR 1266-72, p.328. In this instance Edward stated that he had received FitzThomas "ad hominem suum" and taken him under his protection: Tovy, 15 July 1268, BL Add.Ms. 28024 f.43, with a similar clause "tanquam nostrum hominem proprium".

Bukerel's mother, Isabel, was less successful when she attempted to recover the Aldermanbury house, which had passed to Walter Hery. As mayor of London, Hery was able to prevent the case coming before the Court of Hustings and blocked the legal process until 1276 <sup>1</sup>.

Michael Tovy was even more optimistic about the opportunities offered by the legal system. With supreme impudence, he tried to use the machinery of the special eyre against royalists such as John FitzAlan, against whom he brought a case for occupying his manor during the disturbances. Tovy appeared several times before the special eyre of Nicholas de Yatingden in Buckinghamshire, claiming his right to redeem his manor from William de Gunneville, according to the Dictum. Gunneville, one of Edward's household knights, first argued that he did not have to answer the plea, since he held the land by a grant from Edward. When this was rejected, he pointed out that, as a Londoner, Tovy was excluded from the terms of the Dictum. In response to this, Tovy put forward the argument that he was not a Londoner, for he had not been born in London. Elaborating this position, he alleged that he had not been imprisoned as a Londoner but because at Lewes he had been to Leicester "*capitalis eiusdem familiaris*", and had led a wing of the army. He had surrendered to Edward only "*salvis sibi terris et tenementis*", a highly improbable claim. The startled justices sent this claim to be heard by the king, but it is highly unlikely that it received serious consideration at court <sup>2</sup>. Gunneville did later quitclaim the manor to Tovy, but the timing suggests that he was realising his assets to raise money for the crusade <sup>3</sup>.

1) KB26/182 m.21d. Bukerel evidently believed in using all possible means of protection. At the hearing he also produced letters of pardon he had recently obtained from the earl of Gloucester: Williams, p.236.

2) Just1/59 mm.2,2d.,3d.,19d.

3) July 1270; BL Add.Ms. 28024 ff.40,43.

The subsequent fortunes of these men were rather different. Stephen Bukerel died while the Reynger law-suit was still in progress, although the will of his brother, proved in 1278, showed that the family wealth had survived Stephen's misfortunes <sup>1</sup>. Le Chapeler avoided legal proceedings and resumed his mercantile career. In 1276 he was trading in wool, and he left substantial assets when his will was proved in 1280 <sup>2</sup>. FitzThomas died before the London eyre of 1276, but his family were profoundly impoverished <sup>3</sup>. Pivelesden, after his long imprisonment in Dover castle, recovered to some extent, finding refuge and a new career in the household of the earl of Gloucester <sup>4</sup>.

Although Tovy's finances recovered to some extent, ultimately he more unfortunate than any of his fellow prisoners. Ironically, it was the law, which he had previously attempted to manipulate, which destroyed him. In the London eyre of 1276 he was prosecuted for the killing of one John of Brittany in 1263, and for the theft of horses from the king and John de Grey, for thefts from William de Axemue and certain Jews, and others. Although all the crimes were connected with the attacks on royalists and royalist property during the disturbances, they were held to have been committed in time of peace. They came therefore under the more rigorous terms of the general eyre <sup>5</sup>. Tovy was exonerated of the attack on the Jews, but found guilty of the other crimes and hanged. He was unlucky (to say the least) not to have been dealt with under the more lenient conditions of the special eyre. The

1) Williams, p.248: Calendar of Wills of the Court of Hustings I, p.36.

2) Calendar of Letter-book A, p.10: C.Wills...Hustings I, p.45.

3) London Eyre of 1276, 521: Williams, p.248.

4) R.Peckam I, p.2: CPR 1292-1301, pp.13,22,27. Williams is incorrect to argue from the bequest to Pivelesden's wife in 1278 that her husband was dead, C.Wills...Hustings I, p.32: Williams, p.248.

5) see Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, II, p.507 on the definitions of the times of war and peace.

legalistic interpretation also rendered the pardon granted to him by Edward ineffectual <sup>1</sup>.

d) Corporate fines and other cash gains

As early as 26 October 1265 the king also granted to Edward the merchandise of citizens of London and the Cinque Ports which had been impounded in Flanders during the civil war. It was intended that these goods should be used to repay to Roger de Mortain 1,700/3/8 livres paris which Edward had earlier borrowed <sup>2</sup>. Edward accordingly wrote to the Countess of Flanders asking her to deliver 1,703/6/8 livres paris to Mortain <sup>3</sup>. By January 1266, the king's reconciliation with the Londoners had included a promise that they should recover these goods <sup>4</sup>. In mid-May Edward and the king agreed that the promise to the Londoners should stand <sup>5</sup>. However, Mortain did obtain £532/15/8 sterling in their goods and chattels in Flanders, and it was not until 1301 that the citizens succeeded in having this sum allowed against the 20,000 marks fine offered for the king's pardon in 1266 <sup>6</sup>.

Henry III also awarded to Edward the goods of the Londoners which had been impounded (perhaps by John de Warenne) at the town of Lynn <sup>7</sup>. It is unlikely that Edward derived much profit from this, although his clerk, John de Hadenham, was said to have received sums of money at Lynn on Edward's behalf. It was later stated that the merchandise had

1) London Eyre of 1276 146: Chroniques de London, p.14.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.472.

3) undated, probably pre 10 January 1266, Studd 930; SC1/12/6; DD 405.

4) CPR 1258-66, pp.530-1, repeated in May, p.589.

5) CPR 1258-66, p.590.

6) The exchequer officials were reluctant to make this allowance, on the grounds that the paperwork was not in order, but Edward overruled them. He stated that he knew Roger had been paid, because it was only then that he had returned the jewels which Edward had pledged to him as security for the original debt. Letter-book C, ff.143,143v; Calendar of Letter-book C, pp.231,233.

7) CPR 1258-66, p.491.

illicitly disappeared from the town. In February 1273 Elias de Hertford and William de Middleton were sent to investigate its loss, after an earlier inquiry ordered by Henry III had achieved nothing <sup>1</sup>.

The decision to return the Flemish seizures to the Londoners, thus depriving Edward of money promised him and greatly needed, probably decided the king to assign to him a share in the collective fine offered by the Londoners. Originally, Henry had set aside £7,500 to redeem from King Louis of France the Three Dioceses of Cahors, Limoges and Perigoux, which Queen Eleanor and Edmund had sold for 20,000 livres tournois (with a buy-back option at 30,000 livres), to raise money for the campaign against Montfort. Louis chose to accept only the 20,000 livres (£5,000) and waived the penalty. The surplus 10,000 livres tournois (£2,500) were then assigned to Edward. Although the money had been borrowed to pay Louis (in anticipation of the collection of the fine), Edward was not delivered the same money, as originally planned, but was paid in instalments over the next two years. The evidence of the city's account for the fine shows that very little of the money was paid in cash to Edward, but was laid out on his instructions to repay various debts <sup>2</sup>.

According to the Londoners' account, which was finally accepted in 1301 after years of controversy and only on the payment to Edward of an additional £1,000 fine to be quit of the account, £2,129/2/10 was paid out <sup>3</sup>. The citizens paid £456/13/4 into Edward's wardrobe (in instalments of 400 marks, 135 marks and £100). A total of £1,273/9/4 was

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.513-4; CPR 1272-81, p.5.

2) Letter-book C, ff.4,142,142v,143,143v,145,145v,146; C.Letter-book C, pp.228-237; CPR 1258-66, pp.548,650,658-9,662,667-8; CLR 1260-67, p.245, 67-72, p.34; Gavrilovitch, Etudes sur le traité de Paris, pp.121-4; Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, p.280.

3) The £532/6/8 received by Roger de Mortain has not been included in these calculations, since the account does not specify whether the money was considered to be part of the £2,500 diverted to Edward's use from Louis, or an additional gift. The inclusion of this sum brings Edward's gains from the fine to £2,661/8/6.

paid to various creditors of Edward, the most significant sums being £700 to the Parisians, Ralph Pacy and Ivo le Breton, and £442 to a merchant of Douai, Nicholas de Lyuns. Household expenses, in wine and fodder, accounted for £71/14/0. Gifts, £2 to Walter de Watford, citizen of London "pro laudabili servicio" and £28/19/6 in cash and goods to the Counts of St.Pol and Boulogne, totalled £30/19/6. These payments represented their expenses, when they joined the royalist army during the occupation of London by the Earl of Gloucester. Arrears of fees paid to Hugh de Creky and William de Lyanne (two Low Country household knights) cost another £99. A payment of £84 to Eustace de "Britann" was not explained, it may have been for a fee or a debt. The delivery of 170 marks (£113/6/8) to Thomas de Ipegrave was probably in his fee, either as Edward's constable of the Tower or as seneschal of Gascony. Calculations from the identified payments show that roughly 60% of Edward's share of the fine was assigned to the discharge of his debts.

This assignment of £2,500 (10,000 livres tournois) was not Edward's only gain from the Londoners' fine. He was separately assigned 800 marks from the first instalment of the fine<sup>1</sup>. A debt of 400 marks to William de Valence was also discharged for him. This sum was outstanding from a loan of 1,000 marks, which William had made him "ad urgencia negocia sua expedienda" and which Edward could not otherwise afford to repay<sup>2</sup>. A further payment of £383/8/5 for the expenses of the Counts of Boulogne and St.Pol was also said to have been ordered by Edward<sup>3</sup>. Out of 1,030 marks which the king borrowed from some Ghent merchants in anticipation of the London fine, Edward was given a further £100. Altogether,

1) in that an earlier loan of 800 marks from the citizens was allowed them in the fine, so that Edward was not required to repay it, C66/84 m.30; CPR 1258-66, p.548, incorrectly printed as £800.

2) "pro aliis negotiis sibi incumbentibus ei commode satisfacere non possit", C66/84 m.24; CPR 1258-66, p.568.

3) Letter-book C, f.4. not included in Edward's share of the fine.

Edward's receipts from the Londoners' fine totalled £3,412/11/3.

To put this figure into perspective, it should be noted that disbursements from the fine to other members of the royal family amounted to £1,637/6/11 (besides the £5,000 repaid to the French king). Payments into the royal wardrobe totalled £1,617/6/8, and a further £1,096/7/6 was spent on a variety of military and household expenses and small gifts<sup>1</sup>. Edward's share of the fine was the largest after that received by Louis, probably in recognition that his military expenses were incurred as much for his father's benefit as his own. The breakdown of payments shows that Edward's cash gains were less than £500.

The method by which the fine was raised, a tallage assessed on the citizens of London, royalist as well as Montfortian, rich and poor, was the subject of much criticism during the late 1260's and 1270's, and the cause of certain discontent and possible hardship<sup>2</sup>. The reluctance of the exchequer to allow payments made for the king or for Edward against the fine will also have produced resentment and served as a continuing irritation.

His allocation from the London fine was not the only gain of this kind made by Edward. His own town of Bristol made a fine of unknown size with him for the recovery of his favour, which was still being collected in 1270<sup>3</sup>. It was not just his own tenants, who felt the need to propitiate Edward for their past activities. Many other pro-Montfortian communities and individuals paid to recover his goodwill. The burgesses of Oxford offered 500 marks, which was later reduced to 200 marks for cash<sup>4</sup>. Pardons such as the one Edward granted to the abbey of Waverley

1) Letter-book C, loc.cit: CPR 1258-66, pp.567,594,613: CPR 1266-72, pp.10,35,467.

2) Williams, pp.240-241.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.439: 1266-72, p.451: CCR 1272-9, p.392.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.576; C66/84 m.22.

for its part in the disturbances, issued at Winchester in late September 1265, and to the town of Hereford in October 1267, are unlikely to have come free of charge <sup>1</sup>.

The Peterborough chronicle of Walter de Whitlesey, although written in the 14th. Century, gives a detailed account of the payments the abbey made (so detailed that they would appear to have been taken from a contemporary financial account), illustrating what was probably a widespread practice. Peterborough had made the mistake of sending a force to assist the barons in Northampton, or so it was claimed. After the fall of the town, the abbot came to Nottingham (c.18-20 April 1264) and paid 300 marks to the king and £60 to Edward. At Stamford (20-27 April), he made further gifts of money and horses, paying £114/5/9 to the king, Edward, Richard of Cornwall and others. After Evesham, the abbot attended the Winchester parliament and there paid £333/6/8 to the king, £133/6/8 to the earl of Gloucester, £200 to Edward, and lesser sums to Robert Tiptoft, Warin de Bassingbourn, Geoffrey de Fanecourt, Thomas de Bolton and William Picot, who had occupied manors held from the abbey. The king then marched north for the siege of Kenilworth, and at Northampton the abbot "spontanea voluntate" paid £53/6/8 to the king and £26/13/4 to Edward. Shortly after, at Kenilworth, he made what he hoped was his last payment of £33/6/8 to the king "pro eius amore perfecto recuperando" <sup>2</sup>.

Peterborough's case was not unique. The chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds recounts that at Winchester:

"magnam pecuniam fere ab omnibus prelatiſ Angliæ tam pater quam filius ceterique curiales extorserunt".

The abbey of St. Edmunds itself paid a total of 800 marks to the

1) CPR 1266-72, p.347; C66/87 m.13: Studd 956.

2) Whitlesey, pp.136,138-9: cf. CR 1264-8, p.160, 500 marks promised at Winchester, of which 400 were paid into the wardrobe in December.

king, Edward and others <sup>1</sup>. Other abbeys, priories and prelates also made individual fines with the king <sup>2</sup>. The town of Lincoln is known to have bought the royal pardon for £1,000 <sup>3</sup>. Given the example of Peterborough and Bury, it is very probable that these and other payments to the king were accompanied by payments to Edward, which left no trace on the chancery rolls. Reading abbey, for example, may have found the abbot's role in foiling the attempt to rescue Edward from Wallingford, particularly costly <sup>4</sup>. The last payment of this kind to come to Edward was the 400 marks paid into his wardrobe by the Montfortian bishop of Chichester, on his return from the papal judgement, soon after Edward's accession. The bishop had more than his Montfortian past to expiate. He had also exasperated Edward by giving shelter to Amaury de Montfort, youngest son of the earl of Leicester whose brothers had recently earned Edward's unrelenting hatred for their murder of his cousin, Henry of Almain in 1272. The size of the bishop's fine no doubt related to this error of judgement <sup>5</sup>.

These were fines for goodwill. While hostilities were still raging, there had been opportunities to levy what can only be described as protection money. Peterborough Abbey in 1264-5 additionally paid Edward £240 "ut in tempore hostili ... contra violatores et malefactores tueretur" <sup>6</sup>. More blatantly still, Edward is said to have exacted from the Hundred of Wirksworth, tenants of his enemy Robert de Ferrers, £200 to refrain from burning the district <sup>7</sup>. References to this type of

1) C.Bury, p.30.

2) 500 m. from Winchester priory, E372/112 m.24: 500 m. from Ramsey, CR 1264-8, p.195: 1,000 m. from the bishop of Winchester, and 500 m. from the bishop of Lincoln, CR 1264-8, p.176,178,186.

3) CPR 1266-72, p.34.

4) Just1/42 m.10.

5) E372/121 m.22: dALL pp.158-9.

6) Their chronicler's comments suggest that they were not very impressed with the results of this payment, Whitlesey, p.140.

7) AM III, p.235.

payment are scattered, but are circumstantial and consistent enough to be believed, and to suggest that the known cases are only a fraction of the sums exacted by the victors.

There must have been innumerable other gains available to the winning side after Evesham. An example of a fringe gain was the £80 which Edward was given by his father in October 1265. This sum had been deposited in the abbey of Thame by Simon de Montfort and the king wrote to the abbey instructing them to deliver it to Edward <sup>1</sup>. The only surprising point is that there were not more seizures, more extortions, more acts of revenge. Edward appears to have been moderate in his acquisitions, even though his campaigning expenses were heavy. In February 1266 the king gave him the fines made by the ecclesiastical tenants-in-chief for service due for the expedition to Northampton in December 1265/January 1266. These were assessed at 1,000 marks, and intended to repay Edward for his expenses in his campaign against the Disinherited on the Isle of Axholm the previous December <sup>2</sup>. However, this will only have represented a fraction of Edward's costs over 1264-7. Unlike Edmund, he made virtually no long-term gains of land from the royalist victory. His acquisitions, in land or cash, were used to settle his debts or to reward his followers.

1) CPR 1258-66, p.467; C66/83 m.4.

2) CR 1264-8, pp.171-2,289-90,441: E368/40 m.7d.

## ii) Private Leases and Purchases of Land

Edward's attitude to his financial position may be suspected from his reluctance to enter the land market on his own behalf. While he was obliged to capitalise on his own assets, by sale or farm, he was not generally interested in speculation or more commercial transactions. Unlike his wife, he did not specialise in the buying-up of Jewish debts or the acquisition of the estates of impoverished members of the knightly class <sup>1</sup>. Only two instances can be traced of this type of transaction by Edward.

Edward's purchase of the lands of John de Monmouth, including the castle and honour of Monmouth, occurred before 13 September 1256. All John's lands were quitclaimed to Edward in perpetuity, but in return John only obtained a life-grant of certain (unidentified) of Edward's lands <sup>2</sup>. John's death in March 1257 made the arrangement remarkably profitable for Edward, even with the concessions he was later obliged to make to John's widow and collateral heirs <sup>3</sup>. We can only speculate as to the motives for the exchange. John had no direct heirs, and may have felt no compunction about disinheriting his distant kin. He was heavily in debt to Jewish money-lenders and to the exchequer <sup>4</sup>. The arrangement apparently freed him from pursuit for these debts, and perhaps provided him with ready cash, and this may have been his incentive <sup>5</sup>.

On Edward's side, Monmouth complemented his lands and castles in

1) e.g. CR 1264-8, p.449: CPR 1266-72, p.402: CCR 1279-88, pp.80-81: Knowles, op.cit. part III, chapter 5: Prestwich, Edward I, pp.124-5.

2) CPR 1247-58, pp.500,545; C66/70 m.3, 71 m.12.

3) CIPM I371: CR 1256-9, pp.58,63,424: CCR 1272-9, p.338: CPR 1272-81, pp.139,354: E159/48 m.10d: Just1/1187 m.2: KB26/168 m.4.

4) £1,777/14/5 at his death: E352/46 m.15: ExERF II, p.264. Edward, like his brother later, was probably exempted from liability for these debts, CPR 1266-72, p.418, 72-81, pp.202-3: CCR 1272-9, p.486

5) Ignorance as to the lands transferred to Monmouth makes further speculation about his motives fruitless

Gwent, and the arrangement took place at a time when his ministers were pursuing an aggressively expansionist policy in Wales. Henry III was in favour of the exchange, which he confirmed and facilitated by the transfer to Edward of any royal claims to the lands after John's death. Although the arrangement was profitable to Edward, his interest was in the honour's strategic rather than financial value. The transaction, involving the disherison of collateral heirs, may be compared to the recovery negotiated by Edward's lieutenants of terra Normannorum from John de Burgh in exchange for a life-grant and pension, and with the tactics employed by Edward as king to secure the reversion of certain earldoms to the crown <sup>1</sup>.

Edward's other acquisition was on a much smaller scale. The manor of Winterbourne Gunnor (Wilts) had been transferred by John Mansel to Henry de la Mare, son of the justice, on his marriage to a relation of Mansel <sup>2</sup>. On 28 October 1265 de la Mare leased it to Edward for 18 years. In return for a down payment of 70 marks, Edward was to pay nothing further for 8 years, and was then to pay 10 marks p.a. until the expiry of the term. This rent was to be reduced if the value of the manor was reduced by dower assignments, tallages or:

"hostilitatis manifeste infortunia per oppressiones regum ac magnatum terre qui pro tempore fuerint futuris temporibus currant in regno Anglie" <sup>3</sup>.

De la Mare was probably actuated by financial embarrassment into agreeing to the lease. He later turned to robbery, was captured, and killed while trying to escape. As a felon, his lands escheated to the crown and it was some time before Edward could establish his right to

1) McFarlane, History L (1965), pp.145-159; Studd, PhD. Introduction.

2) Cartulary of St.Mark's Hospital, Bristol, 21, 1959, 256; Bodleian MS Top.Glouc. c.9 f.159

3) C.St.Mark 257,258; Bod.Ms. loc.cit. ff. 159-160v; CPR 1258-66, p.165.

the manor <sup>1</sup>. Edward's attention must have been drawn to the manor through his chaplain, Gilbert de Waltham, who had been rector of the parish since at least 1263. Indeed, the appointment of Gilbert to administer Winterbourne may imply that Edward had taken on the lease to provide for his chaplain <sup>2</sup>. In October 1268 Edward granted the manor to the hospital of St.Mark's, Bristol. The grant may correlate with Waltham's appointment as master of the hospital the following February, indicating a policy of continuing provision for him <sup>3</sup>.

Thus, Edward carried out one transaction of probable strategic value, and one intended to provide for a member of his household. A comparison may be made with his policy of expansion in Gascony, where, with the king's assistance, he purchased a series of castles, and obtained grants of land on which he founded bastides (below). Again, his intentions were to enhance his control over the country and improve its security. In no instance can he be shown to have used his money or position to build up additional assets of financial value.

1) C.St.Mark 263,266; ff.161-2: CPR 1258-66, pp.39,46,57, 66-72, p.82

2) C.St.Mark 259-261, ff.160v-161: CR 1261-4, p.328. See Chapter 8.i for Gilbert de Waltham.

3) C.St.Mark 264-5,270-1; ff.161-163v. Edward also induced Thomas de Clare, also granted the manor in 1267, to quit-claim his rights. C62/50 m.8, another instance of Edward's provision for Gilbert.

## CHAPTER FIVE: COMMISSIONS DURING PLEASURE

The permanent grants made to Edward, settled on his heirs and protected by a non-alienation clause, and the additional and mainly temporary grants intended to supplement his income, were not the only awards made to Edward. He was also given a number of castles and counties to hold for the king "during pleasure". In the majority of these cases he was expected to pay the usual farm, or to account to the exchequer for the issues. Such grants were not intended to augment his revenues, but had military and strategic significance. Control of key royal castles and of the local administration of the country had long been a factor in the power struggle between the king and the Montfortians. Commissions to Edward reflected a development in his position and in the degree of responsibility with which the king was prepared to entrust him. Obviously, he did not attend to these charges in person, but appointed deputies to discharge his obligations. However, his own position was enhanced by his control over personnel and places, and the grants were an acknowledgement of his reversionary interest and of his father's increasing trust and dependance on him.

### **i) Commissions of Castles before May 1270**

The first grant of this kind to Edward was that of the castle of Orford in Suffolk, which was committed to him in June 1262. At this time Edward's relations with his father had improved considerably, as exemplified by the measures Henry took to improve Edward's finances. That the king also transferred to Edward the strategically-significant castle of Orford, supports the view that the arrangements of summer 1262 represented a genuine rapprochement between Edward and his father, rather than a reduction in Edward's freedom of action and political significance. The king reserved the revenues of the town. Further corroboration of the military rather than financial significance of the

grant, is provided by the measures taken to repair and restock the castle, while it was in Edward's care <sup>1</sup>. After Lewes, Orford was one of the first of Edward's castles to be taken from him, and it was entrusted to a leading Montfortian, Hugh le Despenser, who was responsible for the defence of the East Coast against royalist attack <sup>2</sup>.

Edward may have forcibly recovered the castle after Evesham. In November 1265 the king ordered the release of a ship Edward had arrested at Orford, which implies he had been campaigning in the area <sup>3</sup>. The regrant of the castle and town to him in 1272, on different terms to those of 1262, indicates that he did not resume custody in 1265 <sup>4</sup>. The tenants and burgesses were to answer for the issues either to the exchequer or to Edward's attornies, which may indicate a blurring of distinction between Edward's revenues and those of the crown <sup>5</sup>.

By contrast, the castle of Ludgershall was granted to Edward while he was a captive of the Montfortian regime <sup>6</sup>. The commission may have been a conciliatory gesture, in view of his territorial losses to Montfort. Alternatively, it may have been intended to give the barons extra leverage in expelling the royalist constable and the members of Edward's household, who had been occupying the castle <sup>7</sup>. Immediately after Evesham, Edward's knight, John de Musgrove, was appointed castellan of Ludgershall and Marlborough <sup>8</sup>. He may have been deputising for Edward, since improvements ordered in the park in October indicate that the king had left the castle in Edward's custody <sup>9</sup>. The account of the keeper, John de Bikenor, for 1270-73 confirms that Edward retained

1) "hiis que sunt extra clausum castris", CPR 1258-66, p.216; C66/77 m.9: E371/26 m.11: CLR 1260-67, p.158: Brown et al. pp.769-771.

2) CR 1261-4, p.349: CPR 1258-66, pp.332,337.

3) CR 1264-8, p.153.

4) CPR 1266-72, p.651: E371/36 m.18: E372/177 m.7d.

5) E372/125 m.3, Hugh de Dyninton paid the farm to Burnell as Edward's receiver.

6) CPR 1258-66, p.395; C66/83 m.26.

7) CPR 1258-66, p.350: CLR 1260-67, p.242.

8) E371/29 m.9.

9) CR 1264-8, p.77.

control of Ludgershall throughout the remainder of the reign <sup>1</sup>. The original Montfortian grant had obliged Edward to answer for the issues "ad mandatum nostrum". The later arrangements are not clear, but John de Bikenor paid the £30 p.a. farm to Edward's receivers, or elsewhere on Edward's direction, and a small sum was paid directly into the exchequer, perhaps after Henry III's death <sup>2</sup>.

The castle of Odiham came into Edward's possession in the aftermath of Evesham, presumably on its surrender by the castellan, Richard de Havering, who had been holding it for Simon de Montfort <sup>3</sup>. Edward retained possession through the reign, although no formal grant has been found. Since he received the issues, and was able to assign rents in the manor, we may infer that the castle was considered as a war gain rather than a commission <sup>4</sup>.

His victory at Evesham enhanced Edward's political stature and reputation immeasurably. The effect can be seen almost immediately in his new freedom to organise the pacification campaign. Dover and the Cinque Ports were recognised as one of the most significant objectives <sup>5</sup>. Control of Dover and the Ports was necessary for the maintenance of overseas communications. The Portsmen could muster the largest number of ships in the country and were able thus to intercept and attack shipping, dislocating trade and preventing the landing of reinforcements from overseas <sup>6</sup>. They had been allied to Montfort for much of the civil war, perhaps because he encouraged their piracy as a means of blocking royalist reinforcement from the continent <sup>7</sup>.

Edward's personal intervention was necessary to secure the

1) E372/120 m.22.

2) El01/350/6: E372/120 m.22, 125 m.3.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.431: Just1/42 m.3. Soon after Evesham, the constable was John de Verdon, perhaps deputed by Edward, CR 1264-8, pp.68-9,149.

4) CCR 1272-9, p.453: CPR 1266-72, p.265: C62/51 m.6, 52 m.3, 53 m.4, 59 m.3: El01/350/6: E372/125 m.3.

5) Studd 930; SCL/12/12; Shirley II 289.

6) e.g. the fears of Richard of Cornwall in 1262, Shirley, II, p.193.

7) Murray, Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports, pp.35-40.

surrender of Dover, where he installed his household knight, Geoffrey de Neville, as constable <sup>1</sup>. The other Ports proved more intransigent. Contemporaries believed that the harsh treatment of London and reprisals against individual Portsmen, had strengthened the Ports' resistance <sup>2</sup>. It took Roger Leyburn, with sporadic assistance from Edward and an East Coast/Gascon fleet, until March 1266 to subdue them. It is a measure of their strength, and of the need of the royalist party to control the South Coast and make the Channel safe for shipping, that the men of the Ports were treated with a leniency which neither the rebel barons nor the citizens of London had enjoyed <sup>3</sup>.

When the Ports surrendered, their custody had already been committed to Edward by the king <sup>4</sup>. Dover and Sandwich had been promised to him still earlier <sup>5</sup>. In 1268 Edward was also appointed Chamberlain of Sandwich, completing his monopoly of offices in the Ports <sup>6</sup>. During the process of the reduction of the Ports, Edward made various appointments of keepers for Dover, Sandwich and the other Ports. He replaced Neville with a former royalist constable, Matthew Bezill, and divided the responsibility for the Cinque Ports between Roger de Leyburn, Stephen de Penchester, and deputies Simon de Creye and Thomas de Sandwich <sup>7</sup>. The overlapping nature and seeming contradictions of these appointments may be explained by the confused times and the many demands made for the services of loyal and capable officers. For example, Leyburn was simultaneously sheriff of Kent and Cumberland, and steward of the royal household, besides his appointment as Edward's deputy in the Ports and his campaigning responsibilities in Kent and the

1) Studd 915,917; SCl/8/23-4: GC II, p,243: AM IV, p.178.

2) AM II, p.367,369, IV, pp.455-6.

3) CPR 1258-66, pp.574-5,588: dALL, p.83: GC II, pp.244-5. This lenient treatment continued, cf. Shirley II, pp.315-6: Murray, op.cit. p.40.

4) 20 November 1265, CPR 1258-66, p.507.

5) "sine litteris", E371/30 m.10.

6) CPR 1266-72, p.200.

7) CPR 1258-66, pp.507,512,578; C66/84 m.44: Studd 918, mistranslated; SCl/12/16: E371/30 m.10.

Weald<sup>1</sup>.

In August 1266 Edward was assigned the issues of the county of Kent, the manor and hundred of Middleton and the seven hundreds of the Weald, for the maintenance and munition of Dover<sup>2</sup>. This arrangement continued through the period<sup>3</sup>, except for the withdrawal of the Weald issues, granted for life to Leyburn<sup>4</sup>. Dover, the "key to England", was both vital and expensive<sup>5</sup>. In spite of the assigned revenues<sup>6</sup>, Edward's constable, Stephen de Penchester, still found his expenses greatly exceeded his receipts<sup>7</sup>.

Dover remained in Edward's control throughout the remainder of the reign, from late 1267 in the keeping of Stephen de Penchester, together with the Cinque Ports. From Henry's viewpoint, it was desirable to have a strong castellan of Dover, and one whom he could trust absolutely. His age and dependence on his son was now such that it could be assumed that their interests would coincide, especially where the security of the kingdom, so soon to be Edward's, was concerned. Custody of the Ports must also have facilitated enforcement of Edward's grant of the customs. When Edward left for the Holy Land, Dover, together with the other royal castles granted to him more recently, was under the control of his lieutenants, ensuring that no undesirables could enter his future kingdom by that route.

Edward was also awarded custody of the castle of Nottingham in September 1268 during pleasure<sup>8</sup>. He received several sums from the farm of the town and the issues of the county for the munition of the

1) Lewis EHR 54 (1939), pp.198-202.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.626: SCl/8/25. This arrangement was not without precedent, e.g. in 1263 the sheriff, Nicholas de Crioll, was regularly required to deliver the issues for the munition of Dover, E371/27 m.13.

3) e.g. CPR 1266-72, p.171: E372/112 m.23, 115 m.7d.

4) C60/69 m.20.

5) Paris, CM III, p.28.

6) worth at least 500 marks p.a. CPR 1258-66, p.547.

7) £1,866/6/9 for the period of the account, E372/116 m.2d, 118 m.20.

8) CPR 1266-72, p.259: E371/32 m.11.

castle <sup>1</sup>. More significant strategically, was the grant to him in February 1269 of the Tower of London, including the custody of the city, until this was restored to the citizens in 1270. The chronicle of FitzTheodmar recorded the commission, adding that Edward appointed Hugh FitzOtto as his deputy. This account receives confirmation from the Originalia Roll for 53 H.III, which noted under 17 February 1269 the king's commission to Edward of the Tower, during pleasure and answering to the exchequer for the issues. The next entry recorded the appointment of FitzOtto as keeper of the city, although with no reference to Edward <sup>2</sup>. This type of entry confirms the contention stated elsewhere, that grants and appointments recorded as made by the king frequently concealed decisions made by Edward. Later evidence confirms Hugh's position as Edward's deputy <sup>3</sup>. Edward accounted for the issues to the exchequer, although he and his deputy were allowed £200 p.a. for their expenses. On restoration of the citizens' farm, the constable's fee was halved <sup>4</sup>. The custodies of Nottingham, Dover and the Tower were amended to five-year grants on the occasion of the mass transfer of castles and counties to Edward in May 1270.

1 CLR 1267-72, p.75: E372/113 m.18d.

2) dALL, p.108: E371/33 m.2.

3) CLR 1267-72, pp.78-9.

4) CLR 1267-72, p.179: C62/49 m.4: E371/34 m.2.

ii) **Commissions of Counties before May 1270**

In October 1266 Edward was formally appointed sheriff of the counties of Buckingham and Bedford. The original grant committed the counties to him at the accustomed farm:

"reddendo inde per annum nobis ad scaccarium nostrum antiquam et debitam firmam"<sup>1</sup>.

However, in Michaelmas 1267 the king instructed the exchequer to inform Edward, or his attorney, Bartholomew le Jovene, of the figure set for the "antiqua firma" and the outstanding debts of the county, without delay, so that Edward could answer to the exchequer for the counties<sup>2</sup>. The Pipe Rolls for 51,53,54, and 56 H.III noted the farm due for the counties as £369/19/11 and £108, and added:

"idem vicecomes non respondit de aliqua proficua comitatuum quia R. commisit ei dictos comitatus respondere inde p.a. tantum de antiqua firma".

This implies that Edward's appointment was unprecedented, and it had been decided that he need not pay the "profits of the county" normally taken from a sheriff, but only the "antiqua firma" and the old increment, a saving of 180 marks p.a. for these counties. Other than this, the Pipe entries for Buckingham and Bedford appear normal; Edward was described as sheriff and Bartholomew le Jovene, and later Thomas de Bray, accounted for him as under-sheriffs<sup>3</sup>. Orders went out to Edward or to his deputy to pay royal debts out of the issues, and writs of allocate were issued for them in consequence<sup>4</sup>. The sheriff continued to execute writs from the king, and to levy debts owed to the king in fines from the eyre<sup>5</sup>.

In August 1266 Edward had been assigned the issues of the county of Kent, although he was not yet acting as sheriff. By December 1269, he

1) CPR 1258-66, p.645; C66/84 m.2.

2) E368/42 m.4d..

3) E372/111 m.22, 113 m.16d, 114 m.1, 116 m.10d.: Morris, The Medieval English Sheriff, p.243-4.

4) e.g. CPR 1266-72, p.91: CLR 1267-72, pp.3,19.

5) CPR 1266-72, p.378: CLR 1267-72, p.172.

had been awarded custody of the counties of Shropshire, Stafford and Hereford, although in only one instance, Hereford, was his position noted on the Pipe Roll. Here, for Michaelmas 1269, after the name of the sheriff, Richard de Hok or Oke<sup>1</sup>, was inserted above the line and in a paler ink, "pro Edwardo filio R", which suggests that the exchequer clerks were not completely clear about the arrangement<sup>2</sup>. It is not entirely clear whether Edward was entitled to any part of the issues for these counties. The king's acceptance of Edward's suggestion that some of the money owed to Roger de Leyburn for his campaigning expenses should be paid out of these issues could imply that Edward did have some claim to them<sup>3</sup>. Surviving accounts for Hereford do not show the payment to Leyburn or any money passing to Edward. After deductions for alms, castle maintenance etc. any remaining sums were paid to the royal wardrobe<sup>4</sup>. The accounts for Shropshire and Stafford at this time are incomplete, but neither writs of liberate nor the Pipe Roll for 1 EI, with details going back to 54 H.III, noted payments to Edward<sup>5</sup>.

1) Holz in PRO, Lists and Indexes IX, p.59.

2) E372/114 m.3d. The roll for Buckingham and Bedford was always fully entitled as "Edwardus filius R primogenitus, Bartholomeus le Jovene (or Thomas de Bray) subvicecomes pro eo", E372/111 m.22, 116 m.10d.

3) £400 of the £3,000 plus owed him, CR 1268-72, pp.162-3; CPR 1266-72, p.397; CLR 1267-72, p.128.

4) E372/114 m.3d, 116 m.25d.

5) E372/117 mm.16d,17d: E372/116 m.1; CLR 1267-72, p.126.

iii) **The Award of May 1270**

According to the Winchester chronicler, the king, in the parliament held at Winchester, on 16 October 1268 appointed Edward seneschal of England, and soon after made a very extensive grant to him.

"xviii kal. Novembris tenuit dominus rex parlamentum suum apud Wyntoniam in quo fecit Edwardum filium suum senescallum Angliae; et ibidem tenuit rex suum Natale ubi constituit dictum Edwardum custodem Londoniae et omnium castellorum suorum in Anglia"<sup>1</sup>.

Denholm-Young, discussing this grant, stated that it "conceals the virtual abdication of Henry III". He commented further, that the grant, evidently including counties as well as castles over a term of five years, "made Edward almost a viceroy ... with authority in that very sphere most jealously preserved, the appointment of castellans"<sup>2</sup>. Before considering whether this was the effect of the grant, it may be helpful to examine the account in more detail, and see whether it can be confirmed from any other source.

An immediate difficulty is the date, impossible as it stands in the printed version. Neither xvii kal. Novembris, or Denholm-Young's suggested amendment to xviii kal. Decembris, or even xviii kal. Januar. fit the royal itinerary in any case<sup>3</sup>. The statement that the grant of the seneschalcy was made in parliament at Winchester compounds the difficulty. There was a full-scale parliament held in October 1268, but at Westminster not Winchester. The only parliaments held at Winchester during this period were the September 1265 post-Evesham parliament, and one in July 1270<sup>4</sup>. The possibility of a scribal or transcriptal error in the chronicle, confusing Westminster with Winchester, can be ruled out, because the account then states that Christmas was spent "ibidem", meaning Winchester. Other sources confirm that Christmas 1268 was passed

1) AM II, p.107.

2) Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall, pp.145-6.

3) the court was based at Westminster during October, and did not reach Winchester until mid-December.

4) Powicke and Fryde, Handbook of Chronology, p.506.

at Winchester <sup>1</sup>. Given the fluidity which the term "parliamentum" still retained, it is possible that the chronicler meant no more than a grant approved by the king's council, but this does not solve the dating problem.

The alleged grant of the Stewardship of England to Edward is puzzling. This office had been granted to Edward's brother, Edmund, and his heirs, with the other possessions of the former earl of Leicester shortly after Evesham. This grant is believed to have not been fully implemented, and a life-grant was substituted in 1269 <sup>2</sup>. Denholm-Young argued that the lapse of the original grant, the alleged grant to Edward and the subsequent life-grant to Edmund, represented a strategy by Edward to establish his future rights of disposal of the office. However, this flawed account in the Winchester chronicle is a slender base on which to rest the hypothesis. Edward did later emphasise that even Edmund's life-grant was a special concession <sup>3</sup>. Representations from Edward could have caused Henry III to modify his original decision into the limited grant of May 1269, said to be "de gratia nostra speciali" <sup>4</sup>. However, this suggestion does not require Edward to hold the office himself in the interim. If, as suggested, he was able to quash Edmund's original grant and keep the stewardship in abeyance for a further three years, his own appointment was superfluous. It is possible that the chronicler had been confused between the brothers, and that the story arose from discussion at Winchester of the life-grant soon to be made to Edmund <sup>5</sup>.

1) A.Lond p.79.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.470, 66-72, p.339; Vernon-Harcourt, His Grace the Steward, pp.138-139,154-163, Denholm-Young, *op.cit.* pp.145-6.

3) e.g. the letters patent which Edmund issued soon after Edward's coronation, presumably at the new king's instance, Vernon-Harcourt, *op.cit.* pp.162-3 from E36/274 f.197v; CPR 1272-81, p.81.

4) C66/87 m.17; Vernon-Harcourt, *op.cit.* pp.161-2.

5) There is no possibility of scribal error, confusing Edward with Edmund, since the reference to the commissions of castles began "dictum Edwardum", referring back to the previous phrase.

In any case, no mass transfers of castles can be traced for December 1268/January 1269. The most likely explanation is that the story grew out of the grant of the Tower, initially including custody of the city, to Edward in February 1269. This intended grant could have been discussed at Winchester the previous Christmas. However, while the Winchester account may contain a kernel of truth, it does not sustain the claim that a sweeping transfer of castles to Edward took place at this time. Nor can it bear out the interpretation which Denholm-Young attached to it. The evidence he cited, of the commission of castles and counties to Edward, is valid, but it all dates from 1270 and later. It is not impossible that Winchester, writing retrospectively, transferred to 1268 an episode of mid-1270. But if this is so, the chronicle version is so confused that it is more satisfactory to discard it totally and trust to official sources for a reconstruction.

The solution to the puzzle lies on the Originalia Roll for 54 H.III, evidently unknown to Denholm-Young<sup>1</sup>. Under the date 28 May 1270 is enrolled a note of the transfer to Edward of the county and castle of York and of his appointment of Roger Lestrangle to keep these under him. The current sheriff, John de Hauton, was instructed to deliver his charges to Roger as York had been granted to Edward for five years from June 24 "in forma de consilio prelatorum et magnatorum qui sunt de consilio nostro provisa". This entry is followed by a long list, over two membranes, of other counties and castles transferred to Edward by the agreement. The motive was given in the preamble to the order as:

"cum propter salvacionem et securitatem nostram et Edwardi primogeniti nostri et pro conservatione pacis et tranquillitatis regni nostri, concesserimus eidem Edwardo castrum nostrum et comitatus Ebor..."<sup>2</sup>.

That it was Edward's impending absence abroad which was at issue

1) It has also been missed by Professor Prestwich, who discusses the Winchester account briefly, Edward I, pp.61-2, but attributes financial significance to the arrangement.

2) E371/34 mm.1,2.

here, is confirmed by the terms on which Edward's deputies were appointed, with the reversion of custody to Edward, should he return to England within the stated term. Later references on the patent roll, concerned with new appointments of keepers used a formula to describe the agreement, that it was made between the king and Edward "ad nostram et suam securitatem" <sup>1</sup>. The timing and the phraseology establish that the arrangement was a response to Edward's imminent departure for crusade, and that its significance was strategic and political rather than financial.

The great majority of the castles and counties awarded to Edward by this agreement are listed on this Originalia Roll. An account of the transfers also appears, with some variations, on the Fine Roll for 54 H.III <sup>2</sup>. A few castles and counties not mentioned in either roll can be shown by later references to have been awarded to Edward at this time also <sup>3</sup>. Later references <sup>4</sup> stated that the original agreement was made under the king's letters patent, but it escaped enrollment on the Patent Roll.

However, a draft survives, in the compilation of documents in the Cottonian manuscript, Nero C III. The erasures and alterations identify

1) e.g. C66/88 mm.1,2, 89 mm.15,23. This phrase was evidently culled from the original letters patent.

2) The York entry, reciting the terms of the agreement between Edward and his father, is virtually identical to that on the Originalia Roll, except that the arrangement was said to be for three years "per triennium", rather than for five. Later in the roll "per quinquennium" was used, suggesting a scribal error in the earlier usage. Edward was described as "karissimi filii", (as in the draft, below) rather than "filii" (as in the Originalia Roll). The list of castles and counties involved is less complete, omitting Bucks and Beds, Cambs and Hunts, Cumberland, Northants, Lincoln and the Tower. It mentions Shropshire and Stafford, omitted from the Originalia Roll, C60/67 mm.4,5,9.

3) eg. Wiltshire and Salisbury castle, E371/36 m.8; C60/69 m.6.

4) E371/36 mm.8,18.

it as a rough copy <sup>1</sup>. It begins:

"sciatis 'quod cum Edwardus primogenitus noster profectus fuerit ad partes ...' (this phrase is an insertion, with the last word illegible) ad tuicionem et securitatem nostram et karissimum filium Edwardum nostrum concesserimus et comiserimus eidem Edwardo castra nostra 'de Corff.' (deleted), Dovorr. cum comitatu Kanc. (and list of castles as below) custodiendum a festo Sancti Johannis Bapt. proximo futuri per 'triennium' (deleted and 'quinquennium' inserted) sequens 'in forma inter nos et ipsum provisiva' (deleted) ita quod idem filius noster ea committat prelatibus et magnatibus ac fidelibus regni nostri custodienda sub ipso per terminum predictum ad opus nostrum et suum et heredum suorum magis viderit expedire".

Towards the bottom of the piece appears the note:

"scribatur regi Scocie pro R de Leyburn de denariis crucesignatis in Scocie etc." <sup>2</sup>.

This is followed by a reworking of a clause relating to the surrender of the castles and counties to Edward by the castellans and sheriffs, if he returned from the East before the expiry of the agreed term. Clearly, this is a sheet of rough jottings, perhaps emanating from the chancery. The erasures are significant: the transfer was initially "per triennium", deleted and replaced by "per quinquennium". This may be tied in with the one use of "triennium" on the Fine Roll. It is not surprising that the length of Edward's absence was uncertain, and the final decision was to err on the side of caution. The rewritten clause on restoration will have been intended to protect Edward's position, as the probability of his return before the expiry of the agreement was increased by the adoption of the longer term.

The draft list of castles and counties to be transferred differs slightly from those on the Fine and Originalia Rolls. Several places were omitted, but the (otherwise omitted) county and castle of Gloucester, the castle of Winchester and the county of Southampton were included <sup>3</sup>. Evidently, further alterations took place between the

1) BL Cotton Nero C III f.198.

2) Sadly, this entry has not proved of assistance in dating the draft.

3) The full draft list comprised Gloucester with the castle; Hereford with the castle; Kent with Dover castle and Sandwich; Nottingham & Derby with Nottingham castle; Shropshire & Stafford, with Shrewsbury and Bridgnorth; Somerset & Dorset, with Corfe and Sherbourne; Southampton, with Winchester and Devizes; York with Bamborough, Scarborough and York.

drawing up of this document, and the implementation of the scheme.

The full complement of counties known to have been transferred to Edward, with castles where specifically mentioned, comprised Bamborough, Buckingham and Bedford, Cambridge and Huntingdon, Colchester, Cumberland, with the castle of Carlisle, Devizes, Devon, with Exeter castle, Essex and Hertford, Hadley, Hereford, with the castle of Hereford, Kent, with Dover castle and the Cinque Ports, Lincoln, Tower of London, Norfolk and Suffolk, with the castle of Norwich, Northampton, with the castle, Nottingham, with the castle, Oxford and Berkshire, with Oxford castle, Porchester, Rochester, Scarborough, Shropshire and Stafford, with the castle of Shrewsbury, Somerset and Dorset, with Sherbourne and Corfe castles, Warwick and Leicester, Wiltshire, with Salisbury, and Yorkshire, with the castle of York. In most cases the customary arrangement was followed, committing certain castles to the appropriate sheriff <sup>1</sup>. However, Bamborough, Colchester (from June 1270-January 1271 and from April 1272 onwards), Corfe, Devizes, Dover (from January 1271), Hadley, Porchester, Rochester, the Tower and Scarborough were administered separately. The castle of Bridgnorth was certainly administered by the successive sheriffs of Shropshire, Hugh and Ralph de Mortimer, although it was not listed in the orders for transfer <sup>2</sup>.

The counties for which no evidence survives of a grant to Edward are Cornwall, Lancashire, Rutland, Worcester and Westmorland, all of which were privately held, rarely accounting on the Pipe Roll <sup>3</sup>. Richard de Crepping, Edward's sheriff of Cumberland, was later described as sheriff of Cumberland and Westmorland for Henry III and Edward, so it is not impossible that Edward's authority extended into Westmorland at this time <sup>4</sup>. Gloucester, Hampshire, Surrey and Sussex, Northumberland

1) Willard et al. The English Government at Work, II, p.44.

2) CFR 1272-1307, p.2: CLR 1267-72, p.187.

3) Morris, op.cit. pp.179-182.

4) CCR 1272-9, pp.544-5.

were also omitted from the lists of transferred counties on the Fine and Originalia rolls, although it is not inconceivable that at least some of these were under Edward's control. Gloucester, Surrey and Sussex all had a change of sheriff at about the time of the transfers to Edward, and Gloucester and Hampshire featured on the draft agreement<sup>1</sup>. Even if these counties were not transferred, Edward's control of the country was still very comprehensive.

In almost all cases the grant to Edward resulted in a change of sheriff or castellan. Only in Kent was Stephen de Penchester, in any case Edward's nominee, left in possession. Even in the other castles and counties which had been in Edward's custody prior to this grant, i.e. Nottingham, the Tower, Buckingham and Bedford, Hereford, Shropshire and Stafford, the keepers were changed at this time.

In two cases (Cumberland and Porchester) the existing keeper was reluctant to surrender the charge, and the king's intervention was required to achieve the transfer<sup>2</sup>. In Essex and Hertford the transfer also ran into difficulties. Originally, Edward appointed William Charles to keep the counties and the castle of Colchester. In early August the king ordered the previous castellan, Thomas de Clare, and the sheriff, William de Boyville, to surrender their charges. However, by the end of August, Edward had evidently decided to separate the custody of the castle from the counties, and he appointed Walter de Essex as sheriff. For some reason the king then insisted that the outgoing sheriff should remain in office until St. Edward's day, and ordered that Essex should not act in the counties until then. Possibly this was due to some technical point raised by the exchequer, or perhaps the king considered that the alteration represented a slight to Charles, then his household

1) PRO, Lists IX, pp.49,135.

2) E371/34 m.2; C60/68 m.15: CPR 1266-72, p.470,496,498,626. Ironically, the new incumbent for Cumberland, Robert de Chaury, was himself reluctant to surrender his office when Edward's attorneys later wished to replace him, CPR 1266-72, pp.649, 670-1.

steward <sup>1</sup>.

During the period of Edward's absence only in 2 castles and 6 counties were the nominees of May 1270 left in possession throughout this period <sup>2</sup>. At Hadley a change was intended, but not implemented. In 7 cases a change was caused by the death in office of the original nominee <sup>3</sup>. Other changes were necessitated by the transfer of the original nominee to another office, as when James de Audley was appointed to Ireland. Hamo Lestrangle surrendered Shropshire and Stafford when he followed Edward to Palestine in February 1271 <sup>4</sup>.

No particular pattern emerges from the other changes of office. These did not occur at yearly intervals, or even at the same time. New appointments were made in October 1270 (Corfe), January 1271 (Colchester and Kent), May 1271 (Somerset and Dorset), October 1271 (Oxon and Berks), January 1272 (Scarborough), April 1272 (Colchester, Corfe, Devizes), May 1272 (Wilts and Sarum). Occasional changes also occurred between Henry III's death and Edward's return to England in late August 1274. After his return all his sheriffs (except for Warks and Leics) were replaced. Several of the individual castellans remained in office undisturbed <sup>5</sup>.

In some instances appointments were later made which contained no reference to Edward. This need not be taken to signify that the arrangement had already lapsed. The Originalia Roll for 56 H.III recorded the commission of Carlisle and Cumberland to Richard de Crepping to hold at the king's pleasure. By the terms of the 1270 committals and judging from other appointments, this commission should

1) C60/67 mm.4,5: PRO, Lists IX, p.43.

2) Bamborough and Dover, Buckingham and Bedford, Cambridge and Huntingdon, Hereford, Norfolk and Suffolk, Nottingham, York.

3) Devon, Richard of Cornwall; Devizes and London, Philip Basset; Lincoln, Thomas de Bolton; Rochester, Nicholas de Crioll; Shropshire and Stafford, Hugh and Ralph de Mortimer.

4) E372/117 m.6d.

5) e.g. John de Havering, Robert de Neville, Stephen de Penchester, Elias de Rabayn.

have been described as made by Edward's attornies. However, the entry was annotated:

"postea venit idem Ricardus et protulit litteras regis Edwardi antequam esset rex in quibus continetur quod idem Ricardus respondeat sicut R. Karleolensis episcopus respondere consuevit".

This makes it clear that Edward's attornies had authorised the appointment and decided its terms, although the clerk noting the transfer of custody omitted these details <sup>1</sup>. In another instance, the Originalia Roll recorded the commission of Warwick and Leicester to William Bagot in July 1271 with no reference to Edward. The Fine Roll, under the same date, noted the king's acceptance of the commission by Edward's lieutenants of these counties to Bagot <sup>2</sup>. Thus, other examples, where the record showed a change of keeper made without reference to Edward or his lieutenants, can be seen either as clerical shorthand, or as a recognition that there was now little difference between the authority of Edward's lieutenants and the authority of the crown. The fact that none of the accounts for these counties and castles on the Pipe Rolls contain any reference to Edward can also be disregarded for these reasons.

An examination of the sheriffs and castellans serving under Edward from June 1270 shows a mixture of typical shrieval figures and some more important men closely connected with Edward. In the analysis of these persons which follows, deputies are included only when their appointment was specially approved <sup>3</sup>. All sheriffs had deputies and clerks to assist them in their duties and an examination of the Memoranda Rolls shows that during this period the great majority sent a subordinate to render account at the exchequer <sup>4</sup>. These subordinates had to meet certain conditions of status, but they were chosen by the individual

1) E371/36 m.18.

2) E371/35 m.11: C60/68 m.6.

3) i.e. Hugh de Babinton, Gilbert de Kirkby, Roger de Pridias, C60/68 m.7: CPR 1266-72, pp.515,685.

4) e.g. E159/45 mm.15,22,22d.

sheriff, who was ultimately responsible for their actions and accounts. Such minor figures can shed no light on the selection process and choices made by Edward and his attorneys. October 1274, the date of the mass replacement of sheriffs, has been chosen for an end date here rather than November 1272, the date of Henry III's death. Between that November and Edward's return, his lieutenants continued to govern in his name, as did the sheriffs and other officers previously appointed by him or them.

Several of the castles and counties awarded to Edward in May 1270 were entrusted to the men who were also made guardians of his children and lands in August 1270<sup>1</sup>. To Edward's uncle, Richard of Cornwall, was entrusted Devon and the castle of Exeter, to Philip Basset, Devizes and the Tower, to Giffard, initially Hadley castle and the counties of Nottingham and Derby, with the addition of the Tower on Basset's death. Mortimer and Walerand were not appointed to any offices in May, although Corfe was transferred to Mortimer in October. Linked with this group were the appointments of Mortimer's brother Hugh (succeeded by his son, Ralph) to Shropshire and Stafford, of Giffard's brother William to Norfolk and Suffolk, and of Walerand's nephew and heir, Alan Plogonet to Somerset, Dorset, Corfe (until October) and Sherbourne<sup>2</sup>.

Other appointments were made to persons whose links with Edward were equally clear. James de Audley had previously been Edward's justice of Chester, and was soon to be promoted to serve Edward in Ireland<sup>3</sup>. Thomas de Bolton had been bailiff, auditor, supreme steward and justice

1) Richard of Cornwall, Walter Giffard, the Archbishop of York, Philip Basset, Roger Mortimer and Robert Walerand. Edward's clerk, Robert Burnell, was added to this group by March 1271 before the deaths of Basset or Walerand. Walerand was probably incapacitated by illness for some time before his death. Studd 1008; Foedera I i, p.484: CCR 1272-9, p.48: C47/35/14/41.

2) E371/34 mm.1,2: CPR 1266-72, p.468: E372/117 m.16d: PRO, Lists IX, passim.

3) A.Ces, pp.94-5,98-9: Studd 1014,1015.

of Chester for Edward before his appointment to Lincoln<sup>1</sup>. Walter de Shelfhanger had previously served Edward in Chester and as a bailiff, before acting as deputy to the royalist sheriff of Norfolk during the civil war<sup>2</sup>. William de Boyvill may well have been Edward's constable of Orford in early 1264<sup>3</sup>. Geoffrey de Neville of Raby may have been Edward's household knight and castellan of Dover<sup>4</sup>. Thomas de Clare, described by one chronicler as "tanquam familiaris et cubicularius" to Edward, had been responsible for his escape from Hereford in 1265, and subsequently remained closely associated with him<sup>5</sup>. William Charles was a household knight of Eleanor of Castile, married to one of her attendants<sup>6</sup>. Roger Lestrangle was a younger brother to Hamo, Edward's long-serving household knight and constable, himself appointed to a custody at this time. Roger had been keeper of the Peak for Edward since late 1265, and was now to combine this position with the shrievalty of York<sup>7</sup>. William de Mortayn was one of Edward's tenants in the Peak, with him on the Axholme campaign, after carrying out a series of seizures for Edward<sup>8</sup>. Stephen de Penchester had been serving Edward in Kent and Dover since 1265.

Others of the new sheriffs and castellans had close connections with the royal household, and had proved their loyalty and ability in other offices. William Belet, appointed to Porchester in November 1270, had been a vallettus to Henry III by 40 H.III and for some time had received a fee from the king<sup>9</sup>. Robert de Chaury, now bishop of

1) e.g. CPR 1258-66, p.233, 1266-72, pp.90,129,470-1: SC6/1094/11 m.1: RegTC, p.174: A.Ces, pp.98,100.

2) C61/4 m.3: Reg.TC, p.174: SC6/1094/11 m.12.

3) CLR 1267-72, p.15.

4) Appendix II, n.12

5) AM IV, pp.163-4.

6) CPR 1258-66, pp.212,376,325.

7) C62/52 m.4: E372/120 m.22: CIM 966.

8) E159/34 m.15d: CIM 645. He also possessed local administrative experience, CPR 1266-72, p.134: CR 1264-8, p.300.

9) E372/100 m.4, 111 m.27, 113 m.12.

Carlisle, had been controller of the queen's wardrobe in the 1250's<sup>1</sup>. Stephen de Edworth had been marshal of the household, and was in 1271 promoted to steward, in succession to William Charles<sup>2</sup>. Prior to his appointment to Cambridge and Huntingdon, Robert del Estre had been the buyer of the king's wines<sup>3</sup>. The Giffard brothers were sons to Edward's childhood mentor, Hugh Giffard, and Walter was a former chancellor. Philip Basset had also been justiciar<sup>4</sup>. Thomas de Bray was constable of Monmouth for Edward's younger brother<sup>5</sup>.

These men could bring authority, loyalty and administrative experience to their new duties. Besides their links with Edward, many of them had held other castles and shrievalties for the king. Philip Basset had been sheriff of Oxon. and Berks. and of Somerset and Dorset, and castellan of Devizes and Oxford<sup>6</sup>. Edworth had been keeper of the city of London<sup>7</sup> and Walter Giffard, the Archbishop of York, was a former castellan of Oxford<sup>8</sup>, and Mortimer, a former sheriff of Hereford<sup>9</sup>. Alan Plogonet had been castellan of Corfe<sup>10</sup> and Nicholas de Crioll had been castellan of Dover and sheriff of Kent<sup>11</sup>. Robert de Neville, lord of Raby and elder brother of Geoffrey, was widely experienced, having held Bamborough, York and Northumberland for the king during the civil war<sup>12</sup>. Elias de Rabayn was also a long-serving royal officer, a former sheriff of Somerset and Dorset, and constable of Corfe<sup>13</sup>. John de

1) Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, V, p.235: Powicke and Fryde, Handbook of Chronology, p.213.

2) E372/111 m.27: CPR 1266-72, p.570: Tout, VI, p.41.

3) CLR 1267-72, p.124: CPR 1266-72, pp.297,422.

4) Powicke and Fryde, op.cit. pp.71,83.

5) CChR 1257-1300, p.155.

6) PRO, Lists IX, pp.107,122: E371/25 m.3, 26 m.4, 27 m.10, 28 m.3: CLR 1260-67, pp.125,133,201-2.

7) CPR 1266-72, p.249.

8) E159/45 m.7: CR 1264-8, p.268.

9) E372/112 m.11d: PRO, Lists IX, p.59.

10) CPR 1258-66, pp.348,401,414: CLR 1267-72, p.121.

11) E371/27 m.13: CLR 1260-67, p.5: PRO Lists IX, p.67.

12) E371/28 m.3: CLR 1267-72, p.13: CPR 1258-66, p.19: PRO, Lists IX, p.97.

13) CLR 1251-60, pp.244,284,360: PRO, Lists IX, pp.120,122.

St.Valery had previously served as sheriff, as had Hamo Lestrangle <sup>1</sup>.

The other appointments were of men slightly lower on the social scale, but virtually all with administrative experience at a local and judicial level. William Bagod had previously been sheriff of Warwick and of Shropshire <sup>2</sup>, and Walter de Essex of Essex and Hertford. He may also have been keeper of the Clare estates after the death of Richard, earl of Gloucester <sup>3</sup>. William de Lisle was a former sheriff of Northampton <sup>4</sup>. Hugh de Stapelford had been a deputy-sheriff in Nottingham and Derby, and keeper of the honour of Peverel <sup>5</sup>. Robert de Trillek had been under-sheriff for Ralph de Mortimer in Shropshire and Stafford, before succeeding him as sheriff. He had previously served Roger de Mortimer in this capacity in Hereford <sup>6</sup>. Osbert de Bereford, sheriff of Warwick in 1273, was closely connected with the earl of Warwick and his deputy in the Forest of Dean <sup>7</sup>. Robert del Estre had been bailiff of the West Riding <sup>8</sup>. Henry de Malemayns had been deputy to Leyburn as keeper of the peace for Kent <sup>9</sup>. Generally the activities and service of these men did not extend outside their own county. Some had also served the king in a variety of judicial capacities <sup>10</sup>. The experience such men could offer was eminently suited to their positions.

Edward's selection of sheriffs, with the exception of the group of his own officers and associates, was fairly typical, probably no different to those the king would have appointed. This may reflect the influence which the exchequer was beginning to exert on such

1) PRO, Lists IX, p.107: E371/27 m.11.

2) E371/34 m.2: PRO, Lists IX, pp.117,144.

3) E371/34 m.3: PRO, Lists IX, p.43: CLR 1267-72, pp.37,88.

4) PRO, Lists IX, p.92.

5) PRO, Lists IX, p.102: CPR 1266-72, p.29.

6) E372/112 m.11d; PRO, Lists IX, p.59.

7) Bazeley, *op.cit.* p.178: E159/45 m.20d..

8) CPR 1266-72, p.205.

9) CPR 1266-72, p.265.

10) e.g. William Bagod, John de Cokefeud, Robert de Neville, Master Roger de Seyton, CPR 1258-66, pp.159,205, 1266-72, pp.160,287,292,585: CR 1256-9, p.134, 1268-72, pp.20,21,23,145: CLR 1267-72, p.108.

appointments <sup>1</sup>. There were perhaps a greater number of curial appointments than in other years. Another point to note is the presence of at least two Montfortian adherents in the group. John de Havering and his father Richard had been able to escape the consequences of their political alignments by the way in which Edward had been treated while in their custody at Wallingford, and by their prompt surrender of Wallingford and Berkhamstead after Evesham <sup>2</sup>. This appointment would seem to show that he had been completely restored to favour and trust. John de St.Valery had served as a Montfortian sheriff but he too had evidently regained the king's favour by 1267 when he was constable of Corfe <sup>3</sup>. Hugh de Stapleford served as deputy-sheriff in Nottingham and Derby from 1264-6, which implies his acceptability to the Montfortian regime <sup>4</sup>.

It is interesting to see that appointments to these offices did not entail a full-time commitment. Charles and Edworth both combined their duties with their work as stewards of the royal household. Walter Giffard, Roger Longespee and Robert de Chaury had ecclesiastical responsibilities, Longespee was also briefly keeper of Wallingford and Berkhamstead after Richard of Cornwall's death <sup>5</sup>. Roger Lestrangle was throughout Edward's keeper of the Peak and keeper of Chartley castle <sup>6</sup>. Geoffrey de Neville was simultaneously keeper of the royal forests beyond the Trent <sup>7</sup>. John de Havering also acted as constable of Marlborough <sup>8</sup>. Cokefeud, Seyton and Robert de Neville continued to

1) Morris, pp.176-7: Madox, History and Antiquities of the Exchequer II, pp.67-8.

2) CR 1264-8, pp.131,257: CPR 1258-66, p.528: SC1/8/19.

3) PRO, Lists IX, p.107: CR 1264-8, p.345.

4) PRO, Lists IX, p.102.

5) E371/36 mm.7,18.

6) CCR 1272-9, pp.17-18.

7) E371/34 m.2: CLR 1267-72, pp.176,179,183,212.

8) CPR 1266-72, p.646, a common administrative coupling, increasing the possibility that Marlborough too had been delivered to Edward in 1270. It was also held by Mortimer jointly with Edward's Corfe, C60/68 m.14.

serve as justices <sup>1</sup>. Giffard, Basset and Mortimer also had far more engrossing duties as Edward's lieutenants. Thomas de Clare, even after he had returned from the Holy Land, first acted for Edward in Gascony and then organised the Irish campaign of 1274. Such men can have been little more than nominal supervisors.

Although most of these sheriffs were replaced in the sweeping changes of October/November 1274, most of them continued in service to the new king. Havering, Hever, Kirkby, Shelfhanger, and Stirchesly were immediately transferred to serve as sheriffs in other localities <sup>2</sup>. Boyvill and Bereford also served as sheriffs and held other offices at a later date <sup>3</sup>. Walter de Essex was keeper of the vacant bishopric of London in 1280 <sup>4</sup>. John de Havering was still at the beginning of a long career in royal service, which would make him justiciar of North Wales in 1296 and constable of Beaumaris in 1300 <sup>5</sup>. Roger Lestrangle became justice of the forests south of the Trent, serving in this capacity for many years <sup>6</sup>. John de St.Valery became a baron of the Exchequer <sup>7</sup>. Elias de Berkwey was sent to Ireland to receive oaths of fealty on Edward's behalf and he then became chancellor, escheator and treasurer of Ulster <sup>8</sup>. Robert de Neville was later constable of Scarborough <sup>9</sup>. Alan Plogonet was later a royal castellan in Wales <sup>10</sup>. Bagod, Bray, Crepping, Estre, Hever, Geoffrey and Robert de Neville, Stirchesley, Sully and Seyton all served as justices or on judicial commissions <sup>11</sup>.

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.523,642,666,695,700: CR 1268-72, pp.404,420,564.

2) PRO, Lists IX, pp. 54,135,92,12,102.

3) PRO, Lists IX, p.144: CFR, p.126: CCR 1272-9, pp.81,91,138.

4) CPR 1272-81, pp.363,370.

5) CFR, pp.380,427.

6) C62/60 m.4: CFR pp.193,376,382.

7) C62/52 m.11.

8) E101/350/5 mm.5,6: 35th.RepDKI, pp.32,33,63: CDI II, 1219,1383: C62/52 m.8.

9) CFR pp.70,76.

10) CFR p.242.

11) CPR 1272-81, pp.118,342,346-7,349-50,405,411,465-6,469: CFR pp.67, 205,219,312,433: CCR 1272-9, pp.522,529-30.

Bartholomew de Sully was a member of the king's council by 1276<sup>1</sup>.

The agreement under which these castles and counties were committed intended that Edward and his subordinates should answer to the exchequer for the issues, including the profits of the counties, unlike in the earlier grant of Buckingham and Bedford. Many of the commissions on the Originalia Roll recorded the sums set for these<sup>2</sup>. The profits of the counties were by far the most valuable part of the shire revenues, since allowances for grants of lands, alms and administrative expenses now swallowed up most of the ancient farms and often the increment as well. The earlier arrangement still applied to Buckingham and Bedford, as the Pipe Roll noted, and Edward's lieutenants received sums from this source, and from the farm of the town<sup>3</sup>.

In almost all the other counties, the accounts on the Pipe Rolls suggest that the issues, including the profits, were due to the exchequer in the normal way. For example, the sheriff of Lincoln, Thomas de Bolton, can be found to have paid the 300 marks p.a. due for the profits into the royal wardrobe and the exchequer, and to have received allowance for administrative expenses and for sums he expended locally in discharge of the king's debts<sup>4</sup>. However in Kent, where a farm of 500 marks should have been paid to the constable of Dover, and an new increment of 100 marks p.a. to the exchequer, money was again being paid to Edward's receivers. The sheriff for January 1271-March 1273, Henry Malemayns, paid £83/0/8 to Burnell "de prestito Com. Kancie" and £50 to John de London, described as "de prestito eundem Comitatum preter antiquam firmam". This formula echoes that used in Buckingham and Bedford, seeming to imply that the 100 mark new increment was considered

1) CCR 1272-9, p.360.

2) E371/34 mm.1,2.

3) E372/116 m.10d, "idem vicecomes non respondit de aliqua proficua com." E372/125 m.3: E101/350/6: CCR 1279-88, pp.223-4.

4) E372/115 m.10d,116 mm.1,12d: E401/64 m.4: CLR 1267-72, pp.165,172.

to be due to Edward <sup>1</sup>. The farm for the town of Rochester was also due to Edward, by a grant of the king in April 1272, but no evidence for its payment to Edward has been found <sup>2</sup>. The sheriff of Northamptonshire also paid some of his issues for 55 H.III to John de London (£5/9/9), but no reason for this payment was noted, and it has not been traced on the Northamptonshire account on the Pipe Roll <sup>3</sup>.

In Nottingham and Derby some information about the arrangement can be derived from the reminder sent by Edward's lieutenants to the exchequer in Michaelmas 1271. This stated that Edward's intention had been that Archbishop Giffard should hold the counties "pro certa firma" of £100, and the exchequer was not to vex him with any additional demands. £100 was in fact the sum paid by previous sheriffs as the profits of the county. The intention appears to have been to remind the barons that Giffard held the counties at farm rather than in custody, thus removing his obligation to account for every small receipt. It is unlikely that he was being dispensed from the obligation to pay the "firma antiqua", although allowances against this made it little more than a formality. Accounts rendered for Giffard for 54 H.III-1 EI show that he did account for the "firma antiqua" and the "firma numerata" as well as for the profits of the county <sup>4</sup>.

In other counties also small sums were noted as delivered to Edward's officials, generally for their expenses <sup>5</sup>, but these need not have the same significance as the payments to Edward's official receivers. The conflicting evidence makes it difficult to reach a firm conclusion, other than that the situation was clearly novel, causing confusion then, both at the exchequer and in the counties. Edward's accession meant that the exchequer had no need to disentangle which sums

1) E372/115 m.7d, 116 m.2d, 117 m.8, 125 m.3: E101/350/6.

2) E371/36 m.18.

3) E372/117 m.1, 125 m.3: E101/350/6.

4) E159/46 m.2d: E372/115 m.19, 117 m.9: E371/32 m.1.

5) E372/118 m.11d: CR 1268-72, p.498: CLR 1267-72, p.203.

had been owed by him to the exchequer, or received by him before his father's death, or due to him as king.

As a result of the 1270 grant Edward had a power base in virtually every corner of the kingdom, not for financial gain but for government. Denholm-Young was correct to see the transfer as putting Edward in a controlling position in the country, but this was not to enable him to exercise this power for the remainder of the reign. Far from being a viceroy, Edward was going to be an absentee landlord. This was not so much an enhancement of his position as a means of ensuring that his rights as heir should not be threatened while he was away on crusade. Nevertheless, the decision indicates the dominant influence which Edward had achieved in government since 1265. The arrangement was almost without precedent, but a comparison may be made with the agreement reached between King Stephen and Henry FitzEmpress, whereby the major strongholds of the kingdom were transferred to new constables who gave hostages and swore loyalty to Henry. This arrangement was intended to safeguard his position in the event of Stephen's death<sup>1</sup>.

The 1270 arrangement ensured that, while Edward was away, his attorneys would control the principal strongholds of the realm and dominate local government. It would not be possible for the king, weakened by age and illness, to fall under an unsuitable influence and make appointments of which neither the country nor Edward could approve. If the problems of 1263-7 recurred and the peace were again disturbed, Edward's men were placed at key-points throughout the kingdom to enable them to control and contain any trouble. If the king died, they could ensure a smooth transfer of power, and keep the country safe until Edward's return. The success of the arrangement can be seen from the length of Edward's absence, even enabling him to sort out his affairs in Gascony before returning to England for his coronation.

1) Regesta Anglo-Normannorum III, p.272.

CHAPTER SIX: THE EXPLOITATION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF EDWARD'S RESOURCES

Edward's estates have now been examined in some detail and it should be possible to reach some definite conclusions about his situation and resources. It was a very complicated group of territories, geographically scattered with their separate local administrations, customs and law codes to be considered. From 1259 there was a further complication in that Gascony had reverted to the feudal jurisdiction of the French king. There were additional difficulties in that the legal and feudal implications of the transfer of territories, with the reservation of ecclesiastical and feudal rights, had not been fully worked out when the lands were delivered to Edward.

At a time when Edward was still groping his way to maturity, great advances were being made in political theory, especially in the obligations and rights of subject to king, vassal to lord etc. This ideological interest was coupled with the rampant factionalism and self-interest of the English court and baronage. The relationship between Edward and his father, and between Edward and his father's subjects, was a delicate one, exacerbated by the fact that it was over seventy years since the country had last experienced the situation of a monarch with an adult son and heir. The example of the last occasion, the turbulent dealings of Henry II with his successive heirs, was not one to inspire confidence. In spite of Henry III's considerable affection for his son, his fear of the dangers of a reversionary interest and the counter-measures he employed, rendered their relationship an uneasy one.

Edward's resources underwent a considerable transformation over 1254-72. Various aspects have been described in the previous chapters. It must now be considered whether this endowment, awarded for his independent maintenance, served its purpose. Factors such as the nature

of the endowment, his attitude to it, his relationship with his father, and the political and ideological ferment of the late 1250's and 1260's must be examined for the constraints they imposed, before we consider its contribution to his activities and his contribution to the period.

Three key questions must be addressed:

- i) What were Edward's resources, and what funds did they generate?
- ii) What constraints operated on their exploitation?
- iii) In what ways were those resources, land, influence and money, utilised?

#### i) Finance and Estate Management

Edward's three principal territories, Gascony, Ireland, and Chester, all possessed their separate local administrations and exchequers, and were virtually autonomous under Edward and his council<sup>1</sup>. The other estates in England, Wales and the March, and the central administration at Bristol, were under the authority of the "senescallus terrarum" or "supremus senescallus", the office to which Langley was appointed<sup>2</sup>. Under the steward were a series of constables and bailiffs of varying importance. Several officers were in authority over a group of other estates, e.g. the constable of Abergavenny over the Three Castles, and the constable of Tickhill over Stamford, Grantham and the Cantilupe wardship. The bailiffs' responsibilities were generally assigned on a geographical basis, regardless of provenance, hence Henry de Lee had custody of the Levinton wardship and the Ferrers lands in

1) below, 8.v. Orders sent to Chester by the estate steward represent the transmission of decisions made by Edward and his advisers.

2) C61/1 m.4. This term does not appear to have gone into regular use. The most frequently used term was simply "senescallus", although the audit of 1262 summoned Leyburn to account under the title "senescallus" with "terrarum" interlined, E159/36 m.4d. cf. C47/11/2,4, a retrospective reference to Leyburn's acknowledgement of the rights of the Priory of Lenton in the Peak forest "tunc senescalli domini".

Lancashire <sup>1</sup>.

These bailiffs had to be coordinated with the new administrative centre and exchequer which was established at Bristol, and with Edward's own itinerant establishment. This situation was complicated further, when Edward came to control fiscal resources such as the Jewry and the new customs levy, for which a whole administrative network of collectors had to be set up. Further stress was placed on his administration by the growing number of castles and counties committed to his keeping in the last years of the reign. It says much for the adaptability and calibre of his administrative staff that they were able to meet these new challenges, and eventually to operate in Edward's four-year absence. To a large extent, Edward's administration was patterned on the royal departments such as the exchequer, chancery, and wardrobe, but the way in which his officers welded together the scattered territories is still a remarkable achievement.

There was a considerable degree of interaction between the outlying territories, including Ireland, Chester and Gascony, and the professional administrators and clerks, who operated out of Bristol, or itinerated with Edward. In the 1257 Welsh campaign, clerks and English estate officers such as William de Wilton and Thomas de Pivelesden, were sent to Ireland to organise the supply chain. The Bristol exchequer itself moved to Monmouth for the duration of the campaign. On other occasions, agents, such as Burnell and Thomas de Ipegrave, were despatched to Ireland to act in association with the local officers. Such activity was not confined to emergencies. In 1261, Edward's serjeant, Thomas de Bolton, was sent to Chester to fix the assize of weights and measures for the county with the Chamberlain of Chester <sup>2</sup>.

1) SC6/1094/11.

2) BL Add.Ms. 35179 f.89.

The flexibility and versatility of the administration is demonstrated by the varying composition of those appointed to assess tallages or audit estate accounts. In 1260 the assessors of the tallage included the estate steward, Roger de Leyburn, the constable of Tickhill, Roger de Stoke, his otherwise unknown kinsman, Nicholas de Stoke, the Nottingham merchant who was then farmer of the Peak, Ralph Bugg, and the keeper of the wardrobe, John le Breton <sup>1</sup>. Analysis of auditors reveals an equally-varied composition, with the inclusion of a number of financial experts from outside the administration, generally with geographical links with Edward's territories. Thus, in 1257 two receivers of the Bristol exchequer, Caux, and Cumb, and another member of the estate administration, Bolton, were supported by the abbot of Kingswood <sup>2</sup>. In 1261 the steward (le Breton), the ex-steward (Langley), a senior constable (Talbot), a clerk of the Bristol exchequer (Winchester), and Bolton were assisted by the abbot of Tintern and a baron of the exchequer, Arnold de Berkeley <sup>3</sup>. The audit of 1262 was not typical, with the royal treasurer, John of Caux, presiding over a group of (unnamed) auditors said to have been appointed by Edward.

Later in the reign audits became more internal affairs, being the responsibility of John de London and Adam de Winchester from the mid-1260's <sup>4</sup>. They continued to audit Edward's former bailiffs even after his accession to the throne, occasionally assisted by local figures <sup>5</sup>. The great officers, such as the treasurer and justiciar of Ireland, were

1) Studd 821-3; C61/4 m.2.

2) SC6/1094/11.

3) RegTC, p.174, f.48.

4) e.g. for the constables of Peak, Dover, Bristol, the bailiff of the New Forest and the Channel Islands, and the Chester administration, E372/116 m.2d, 118 m.20, 120 m.22, 125 m.3: C62/50 m.6, 51 m.11, 52 m.4,5, 56 m.9.

5) Ralph of Sandwich, the Montfortian keeper of the wardrobe, rehabilitated and soon to be appointed steward of the demesne, assisted in the 1272 audit of the Constable of Dover, E372/116 m.2d..

audited by more prominent figures. Hugh of Taghmon's account as Irish treasurer was to be audited annually by the justiciar, chancellor, chancellor of the exchequer, Master of the Temple and Prior of the Hospital in Ireland, during Edward's absence on crusade <sup>1</sup>.

Edward's administration carried out a general audit regularly, perhaps annually at Michaelmas, besides auditing individual officers at other times <sup>2</sup>. The arrangements for the general audit varied; in 1257 the auditors travelled as far afield as Tutbury to hear accounts, as Adam de Winchester and John de Bradene did in 1272, paying a six-week visit to Chester and the Peak <sup>3</sup>. Other bailiffs came to the auditors, to Bristol in 1257, and perhaps 1258 <sup>4</sup>, to Westminster in 1261, 1262 and 1272 <sup>5</sup>. Revelations in the extraordinary audit of 1262 suggest however, that earlier bailiffs had managed to avoid rendering account or settling arrears for some time after they surrendered their offices <sup>6</sup>.

Some alterations in the administrative structure occurred during the period, besides the adaptations occasioned by the grants of the Jewry, customs and counties. The most drastic change took place in 1262, when two stewards replaced the outgoing John le Breton, perhaps made the scapegoat for the accounting failures revealed in the 1262 audit. The appointment of Bolton and Talbot to succeed him may have been a recognition that the work load was beyond the capacity of one person, or intended as a check against fraud <sup>7</sup>. There was a clear demarcation of duties between Talbot and Bolton, with Talbot taking responsibility for

1) CDI 881.

2) e.g. in 1259 Henry de Burn, the incoming escheator of Hastings, was instructed to audit his predecessor's account, Studd 738-9; C61/4 m.5.

3) SC6/1094/11 m.10d: E372/125 m.3: C62/52 m.4.

4) SC6/1094/11: C62/52 m.5.

5) RegTC, p.174, f.48; E372/120 m.22, 125 m.3: Appendix 1.

6) Appendix 1.

7) CPR 1258-66, p.233. Their bailiwick clearly extended beyond custody of the estates whose revenues had been assigned to the king, e.g. CR 1262-4, pp.185-6: CPR 1258-66, p.234.

the Marcher estates, where he took up residence. Bolton probably took charge of the English estates, and overall financial authority.

After Henry III's death the estates were administered separately until Edward's return to England in 1274. In the general administrative shake-up that followed, the lands in England and Wales were mostly incorporated in the demesne administration or assigned in dower to the queen. Their separate nature persisted: Burnell's account for revenues and expenses was not closed until 1281, and few of the bailiffs were replaced and audits were still carried out by officers of the old regime. The organisation, which had been developed and altered as a matter of expediency, had acquired a separate identity which took some years to dismantle, even after its original purpose had long been superseded. It is curious that, in spite of intentions to preserve the integrity of the estates for future heirs, even this degree of break-up occurred.

Edward's estates and administration were in a rather different position to that of all other landholders in the country, as his father frequently reminded him<sup>1</sup>. This special relationship led to additional privileges and assistance being made available to him. The machinery of the eyre was used to compel his bailiffs to render account and discharge their arrears<sup>2</sup>. The exchequer acted for him in the recovery and receipt of debts, not merely from Jewish debtors, as had been agreed by the terms of the lease, but in other transactions<sup>3</sup>. Like the king,

1) e.g. CR 1254-6, pp.38-9, 59-61, p.493.

2) Just1/1187 m.3: KB26/158 m.18d, 162 m.10d. These occasions predated the 1262 crisis.

3) E368/35 m.10d, David de Jarpenville for the chattels of Walter de Scoteny: E159/36 m.5, the debts of Roger Lovesey and William of Tewkesbury: E368/41 m.15, John Mauduit; m.15d. executors William de Horsendon: E368/42 m.12, executors of Stephen Longespee; m.6, various debtors; m.1, Matilda de Mowbray and Thomas FitzOtto. Debts from the audit of 1262 are excluded from consideration here.

Edward was given priority in the repayment of debts out of the chattels of deceased debtors <sup>1</sup>. The exchequer also levied the scutages from the Axholme campaign which the king had granted him <sup>2</sup>.

When Edward himself infringed exchequer regulations, or was amerced for legal offences, he was pardoned any fine <sup>3</sup>. Where particular administrative problems were concerned, such as his attempt to recover Skipton, the king instructed his treasurer and chancellor to give Edward advice and assistance as necessary <sup>4</sup>. In the early years the queen's household staff, especially her steward, William of Tarrant, also assisted in estate matters <sup>5</sup>. Such assistance will have reduced the administrative burden on his own staff.

As discussed above <sup>6</sup>, Edward was initially promised an income of £10,000 for his maintenance, of which £6,666/13/4 was expected from the settled lands. The study of these lands <sup>7</sup> suggests that in peacetime Gascony could produce £2,500-£3,000 in surplus revenues. The Irish revenues are to some extent guesswork, but sums taken out of the country in the 1250's and other evidence indicate a surplus of £2,000 p.a. The Welsh estates in 1254 were producing perhaps £1,000 net revenue and the English estates at other times in the region of £1,400. These figures produce a total revenue approaching £7,000 p.a. The analysis of the additional grants made to Edward <sup>8</sup> suggests that by mid-1255 he had been awarded lands adequate to supply the promised £3,333/6/4.

1) E368/36 m.17d, George de Lydeard.

2) E368/40 m.7d, 41 m.5d.

3) e.g. Just1/1187 m.3, Edward was in mercy for his failure to prove his case against the bishop of Lincoln, and the roll is annotated "et remittitur": cf. the failure by the exchequer to pursue the arrears of his farm for Ellesmere.

4) CR 1261-4, pp.170-1.

5) SC6/1094/11.

6) Chapter 1.ii.

7) Chapter 2.

8) Chapter 3.

Replacement wardships assigned to him were not quite of comparable value to those which expired during this period, but they were close enough to indicate that the king had made a serious and sustained effort to meet his commitment to Edward.

This should not imply that Edward's revenue at any time reached the promised level. The estimates above, although intended as net rather than gross figures, derive from peace-time calculations, and represent the ideal net income. Circumstances, however, were very rarely ideal throughout Edward's dominions. Initially, Gascony was recovering from the disruption of civil war, and dependent on subsidies from Ireland. As the Gascon situation eased, the loss of many of Edward's Welsh estates and the threat to those remaining diminished his revenues and in turn absorbed the Irish surplus. When the situation stabilised, at least in so far that Wales ceased to be a drain on Edward's exchequer, Irish revenues had already fallen off considerably in face of the Gaelic revival. By 1270-72, local expenses there were swallowing up all available funds. The English civil war, with its additional repercussions on trade in Gascony and peace in Ireland, also reduced revenues, even setting aside the confiscation of many of Edward's estates. Thus, throughout the period circumstances largely beyond Edward's control reduced his disposable income to considerably below the level promised him, perhaps by 20% or more.

There were other losses besides those caused by war and civil unrest. Surrenders of land at the king's behest <sup>1</sup>, and by his own choice <sup>2</sup>, reduced his annual income still further. The necessity, forced on him by his financial embarrassments, of selling off assets or

1) Cardigan and Carmarthen; the Three Castles; Hastings and Burwash, for inadequate compensation; and his private acquisition of Monmouth.

2) Tickhill; Stamford and Grantham; Elham; and lesser grants, Table 1.

giving leases in return for immediate relief, compounded his problems.

The process was not entirely one of loss. The king helped him out with cash awards <sup>1</sup> and the opportunity to convert his landed assets into more negotiable property. Grants of land were rare after 1265, when the main supplement to Edward's income was the new customs levy <sup>2</sup>. There were other irregular acquisitions, such as rebel properties and fines <sup>3</sup>, Edward's share of the fine paid by Llewelyn for the Treaty of Montgomery and the transfer of homage of Welsh lords <sup>4</sup>, besides the Jewish tallage, the ecclesiastical Twentieth, and other grants assigned for the crusade <sup>5</sup>. The customs levy was the only permanent acquisition of any size from 1265-72. Perhaps by personal choice, the balance of Edward's income and resources from 1262 onwards shifted away from land to sources of ready money.

One may see signs that Edward was adopting the techniques used by his uncle, Richard of Cornwall. Perhaps this explains his initial interest in the Jewry. Richard was popularly reputed to have laid the foundations of a vast fortune by such policies as his lease of the Jewry from Henry III and his organisation (on a profit-sharing basis) of the recoinage. It is tempting to speculate that Edward's venture in this direction, a recoinage in Gascony in 1261 for which an initial aid was levied, and which was certainly expected to raise much needed funds, was

1) see Table 1 for debts settled by Henry and probably not repaid. Also Chapter 2.iii for assistance during the Welsh war. E101/325/3 notes £400 advanced to Edward, October 1258-9, without stating its purpose.

2) Chapter 3.iv.

3) But see Chapter 4.i. The London fine was swallowed up in repayment of debts incurred during the civil war.

4) CPR 1266-72, pp.175,302,457,573: LW 249,252,255,257,259: E372/125 m.3.

5) Chapter 3.iv: CR 1268-72, p.529: CPR 1266-72, p.452,640: Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers, pp.23,25: E372/117 mm.6,6d, 118 m.20, 125 m.3: C47/35/1/9,131,185,193-4: CLR 1267-72, p.123.

prompted by Richard's example <sup>1</sup>. More characteristic of Edward's later policy was his leasing of the Gascon mint to the merchants of Lucca in 1274 <sup>2</sup>. The levying of scutages in Ireland and the 1254 aid demanded in Ulster were swallowed up by local needs, although Edward may have obtained an aid for the crusade <sup>3</sup>. In Gascony he did obtain an aid, the fouage of 1255 <sup>4</sup>. His cost-effective purchase of Monmouth and lease of Winterbourne Gunnor are the only signs of the acquisitive land-dealings carried on by his wife, or of the manipulative inheritance policies he pursued as king <sup>5</sup>.

An examination of the loans, sales and leases negotiated by Edward reveals interesting patterns in his sources of ready money, and a series of peaks in his needs <sup>6</sup>. Edward was initially in great need of money to finance his new establishment and administration, and complete the pacification of Gascony. His father had effectively mortgaged the Gascon revenues, and it was not until mid-1255 that he received any sizeable sums from Ireland <sup>7</sup>. Edward's agents in England borrowed against the future revenues of the English estates, principally from Edward's uncle, Richard of Cornwall, who paid out 9,000 marks in three loans. In Gascony, besides a loan from his future mother-in-law in Ponthieu, Edward raised sums from Gascon merchants, mostly to be repaid from the customs revenues, and from the Florentine merchant, Deutatus Guillelmi, secured on the English revenues and initiating a long financial relationship <sup>8</sup>.

1) Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall, pp.58-71; T-C admin, pp.24-5.

2) Gascon Calendar of 1322, 189.

3) Richardson and Sayles, The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages, pp.54-6: Chapter 2.iii

4) T-C admin, p.12; Studd 271-84; C61/2 m.8d, 3 m.2.

5) McFarlane, History L (1965), pp.145-159.

6) Table 1.

7) Henry took the lion's share of surplus revenues in 1254.

8) Guillelmi was granted protection as Edward's merchant, C61/1 m.2, not in Studd's Catalogue.

A steady flow of loans were obtained through 1255 <sup>1</sup>, still maintaining a tripartite system of loans from the family, and from Gascons and Florentine merchants. The next peak occurred in 1257, as a result of the Welsh crisis. Richard of Cornwall disappeared as a source of finance, now that his resources were reserved for his German adventure. His place as Edward's principal source of funds was taken by Edward's kinsmen of Savoy and Poitou, not for any political reason, but because Edward's need caused him to explore every possible source of funds to finance his forces in Wales.

Loans peaked again in 1260, but this may relate as much to the better records as to the expansion of Edward's household and political aspirations over late 1259-1260. Another change had occurred in the identity of the lenders. The majority of loans were derived from the wealthier towns in Edward's endowment, Bristol and Chester, and from English merchants. One very large sum came from Edward's justiciar of Ireland, William de Dene <sup>2</sup>.

Over 1261-3 there is evidence of continuing financial difficulties, which may also have led to the searching audit carried out in 1262 on Edward's present and past bailiffs. The account of Edward's keeper of the wardrobe for December 1259 until July 1261 shows that only a maximum of 17% of his receipts could have come from the estate revenues, and the remainder of his receipts were obtained on credit. His expenditure still exceeded those receipts by some £300 <sup>3</sup>. Further evidence that the financial administration was in considerable disarray is provided in the discovery in October 1261 that the revenues of Grantham, which Edward had transferred to the king to repay the money he had laid out to

1) This impression is partly due to the excellent records for 1254-55.

2) No satisfactory explanation for his possession of such a large sum and willingness to lend it to Edward has been found.

3) Chapter 8.iii.

discharge Edward's continental debts, had been assigned perhaps even a year earlier to clear Edward's debt to the abbot of Peterborough <sup>1</sup>.

Edward's expenses were certainly heavy, with his military household expanded for the continental tourneys, even before his expenses campaigning in Wales and the March in spring and summer 1263. His sales of assets increased, and Henry III largely bought Edward out of trouble, discharging his debt to King Louis and assisting him further with the grant of the Jewry, which Edward gave up in 1263 to settle other loans. The seizure of the treasure in the New Temple in 1263 is ample testimony to Edward's continuing shortage of funds <sup>2</sup>. Edward had taken out loans or incurred debts with a series of Italian and Cahorsin merchants. Most of them already had branches in London, e.g. Luke de Lucca, whose London house, where papers connected with Edward and Henry of Almain were kept, was raided by the Montfortians in 1263 <sup>3</sup>. The proceeds of the Holderness sale over 1262-4 were largely devoted to repayments.

In 1264 large sums were obtained from the French king and the Paris Temple, obviously to help the royalist campaign, at the cost of a settlement in the long-running Bergerac dispute, with Edward giving up the lands <sup>4</sup>. After Evesham, Edward initiated a series of loans from Flemish merchants, as did his cousin Henry of Almain. In spite of the London fine, 1267-8 saw another increase in borrowing, principally advances on the new aid or the Bordeaux custom by continental merchants. Several firms were particularly frequent suppliers, such as the Florentine firm of Pape and Guillemi, and the Cahorsin Beraud brothers. Luke de Lucca of the Riccardi came into increasing prominence, although

1) CR 1259-61, p.448. Table 1.

2) AM III, p.222: GC II, p.222.

3) London Eyre of 1276, 521: cf. Guillelmi's losses in the civil war, E372/119 m.21d.

4) This agreement was not ratified by Henry for some time and seisin was not transferred until 1267, T-C, admin, p.32n.

his association with Edward dated back to 1261. Over 1270-72 he became still more important in the transfer of funds to Acre and Paris to settle loans Edward had incurred from Venetian and Siennese merchants and from the military orders in Palestine.

There are obviously gaps in our knowledge of Edward's loans. For example, we have no record of the Great Custom of Bordeaux between 1260 and 1267, yet it is highly probable that Edward continued to use it as security for loans. Edward's borrowings from Gascon merchants were so steady in 1254-5 that we may expect these to have resumed in his subsequent visits of 1260 and 1261, but very little evidence has survived. The shift towards commercial loans rather than family loans was the result of the death or departure from England of many of Edward's wealthier kinsmen rather than a deliberate policy<sup>1</sup>. On many occasions the terms of the loans are not clear. The appointment of sureties was common through the period. It is rare that interest payments can be identified, as in the 1262 loan from Maynettus Spine of Florence, repaid on the Jewry. More typical of the later period were the loans with penalty clauses for default, although it was common to promise to pay any recovery expenses.

Edward's record on repayment is difficult to assess. On several occasions loans can be traced which were outstanding many years later. For example, a Bayonne loan of 1254 was still undischarged in 1259, and Aymer Crozat's loan was owing in 1268 and still unpaid in 1285. Other loans were reassigned when the payment date drew near<sup>2</sup>. A common expedient was to contract another loan to repay a creditor, as at the Boston fair of 1260, and the 1270 use of Florentine money to repay the

1) which does not imply that Edward's relations were not thoroughly professional in their attitude to money-lending, e.g. the safeguards Boniface of Savoy and Richard of Cornwall wrote into their agreements.

2) e.g. the 1260 loan from Philip le Taylor and Reginald of Suffolk.

Fleming, Bartholomew Verdiere. Edward certainly understood the realities of the credit system, as his urgent letters from Acre to his lieutenants show, warning that credit would be cut off and his reputation suffer, if he were not seen to repay his debts <sup>1</sup>. Many loans were repaid by the expedient of transferring an asset, such as the Bordeaux custom, the Jewry or the New Aid. This was usually agreeable to the moneylenders since it enhanced their chances of recovering the debt.

Over 1254-9 Edward's borrowings were less sophisticated than in later life. In 1255 he sent John le Tailor to Paris with letters of credit to buy cloth, whereas by 1266 he seems to have maintained a permanent agent in Paris <sup>2</sup>. In the interim the Hospital at Clerkenwell, rather than the Temple which his father preferred, may have provided the financial organisation to supplement his own arrangements. The order continued to assist him, especially during the crusade, besides supplying personnel for his exchequers in Ireland and England <sup>3</sup>. However, in the 1260's and 1270's, Edward can be seen to have mastered the techniques of credit and farm, of surrendering a source of revenue in return for funds as required, the technique on which much of his financial well-being as king was to depend. His relationship with the Riccardi was already well-established <sup>4</sup>. The financial expedients to which Edward resorted so frequently as king were already an established pattern before his accession.

1) Studd 1026-7; BL Harl.Ch. 43 C 48: Cartulaire Générale de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers III 3445: SCl/8/28; Shirley II 347.

2) Studd 927; E36/274 f.225, an order to pay the Poitevin, Emeric Becket, sent to Grailly or "cuicunque pagam suam faciendum apud Paris."

3) Table 1; cf. Edward's frequent residences at Clerkenwell, receipt of loans, and the rôle of the Temple and Hospital in the collection of the Twentieth in 1270, CCR 1272-9, p.34: E372/117 m.6..

4) cf. Kaeuper, Bankers to the Crown, pp.75-104, 135-151.

## ii) Alienation and Attitudes to the Endowment

Edward's settled estates were considerably reduced and altered over this period, with the biggest alterations initiated by the king. It is curious that while Henry III created the precedent of the appanage, it was the three Edwards who succeeded him who developed the principle further, and added to the land by escheat and conquest, to build up an endowment which exceeded the one Henry had given to his son<sup>1</sup>. At his coronation Edward is said to have declared his intention of recovering all the lands his father had granted away<sup>2</sup>.

Even before his coronation, Edward and his ministers were already building up the appanage for the next generation, with the addition of Overstone in 1272, and the recovery by Edward's lieutenants of Wheatley and other manors alienated by the Countess of Eu to Hubert de Burgh and his heirs<sup>3</sup>. During the early 1270's a policy of systematic repurchase of the grants Edward had made from his estates was adopted, redeeming land in the Peak from the heirs of Adam de Jesmond, the fee in Bristol from Robert Tiptoft, and (a few years later) the lands ceded to Edmund of Lancaster in the 1260's<sup>4</sup>.

Legal machinery was also put into operation to recover grants which Edward, from his new perspective as king, regretted having made. In the Quo Warranto hearings<sup>5</sup>, it was alleged with regard to Stamford and

1) e.g. the addition of the principality of Wales and the Duchy of Cornwall, to which all Richard of Cornwall's other honours had been attached, Report touching the Dignity of a Peer, pp.743-7.

2) M. Prestwich, Edward I, p.91, from the Hagnaby chronicle.

3) CPR 1272-81, pp.41,145: KB26/194 mm.37,37d.

4) E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.5: CPR 1266-72, p.407; C66/88 m.22, Tiptoft was compensated by the king: CChR 1257-1300, pp.215,218; LW 248.

5) PlacQW, pp.429-30. This argument failed to consider that Edward had granted the manors to Warenne to hold as freely as his father (William de Warenne) had held them, or that Edward on other occasions had granted this franchise, e.g. C.Ormond Deeds I 123: Chartularies of St.Mary's Abbey, Dublin II, p.254: cf. CR 1254-6, pp.38-9, which implied that while the king did not want Edward to use additional liberties in one particular instance, he was able to do so on other occasions.

Grantham that Edward had no right to appropriate the liberty of return of writ, much less grant it to John de Warenne. Still later, the royal pleader in Ireland attempted to recover the advowsons earlier granted to the Bishops of Cork, claiming that Edward had not been entitled to surrender them <sup>1</sup>. The long-running legal campaign against the heirs of John FitzThomas used a variety of arguments, including that the lands had been granted while Edward was a minor (in 1259!) and that the justiciar had not (in fact in defiance of Edward's mandate at the time) given seisin of the lands <sup>2</sup>.

While the grant to Edward of Caernarvon of Wales and Chester did not include the key phrase that the lands were not to be separated from the crown, the strict reversion clause, and conventional checks on unlicensed subinfeudation would have had the same effect. Edward's awareness of the continuity from his own grant is made clear by a subsequent clause, that the lands were to held as freely and for the same service as when he had held them from Henry III <sup>3</sup>. The grant of Aquitaine carried the additional clause:

"ita tamen quod prefatus filius noster ducatum antedictum alienare non possit nec quicquam de eodem aut pertinenciis eiusdem detrahare vel diminuere quoquo modo" <sup>4</sup>.

As king, Edward was fully committed to the concept of a separate and protected endowment for his heir. Had his attitude been different before the imminence of his father's death altered his viewpoint?

First, the point must be made that before his accession to the throne Edward never tolerated encroachments on his rights and

1) CJRI I, p.142, the legal claims omitted to mention that Edward had only surrendered the advowsons after a law-suit brought by the Bishop, *Chartae, Privilegia et Immunitates*, p.33. Edward had made numerous grants of advowsons in Ireland on other occasions, e.g. to Rochelle.

2) CJRI I, p.153; CDI, pp.102,278-80,424-9; CChR 1257-1300, pp.416-7.

3) *Report touching the Dignity of a Peer*, p.232; CChR 1300-1326, p.6.

4) CPR 1301-7, p.424; *Foedera I ii*, p.983.

possessions. He was just as ready as his father to repulse such attempts and to resume property and privileges which he felt had been unlawfully alienated e.g. the operations of Geoffrey de Langley in Stamford on Edward's behalf, which led to the resumption of several pieces of land<sup>1</sup>. An inquiry was held by the seneschal of Gascony in 1259 into all liberties, rights and dues pertaining to Edward in the duchy<sup>2</sup>. The enquiries which the king sponsored into alienations in Edward's territories were not directed against his son, but were to his son's benefit and probably at his instigation. Edward's approval may be inferred from the use of his officials to carry out the surveys<sup>3</sup>. These inquiries can be seen as fore-runners of the sweeping inquisitions of the Hundred Rolls and Quo Warranto and their counterparts in Gascony, initiated by Edward after his accession.

Secondly, while after 1272 Edward used specious legal claims in certain cases to disclaim grants he had earlier made, he did not do so in all cases. The majority of the recovered lands were redeemed by purchase or exchange, in the same way that his former grants of life-fees were compounded. It is difficult to believe that Edward would have paid out money to retrieve these properties if he could have done merely by invoking the non-alienation clause. The conclusion seems clear that after 1272 it was not considered that grants made by Edward from his appanage had been de facto in breach of the non-alienation clause. This may not even have been the case prior to 1272.

1) Just1/1187 m.23d.

2) Studd 729; C61/4 m.5; RG I ii p.lxxxviii. 4. A similar inquiry began in the Channel Islands in 1268, SJ Extente. 1274, pp.3-4.

3) e.g. for Tickhill, Stamford and Grantham in 1260; for Tickhill, Chester and Monmouth in 1262; and for Chester and all the English lands in 1272, CPR 1258-66, pp.103,234, 66-72, p.705; CIM 517; cf. Farrer, Honours and Knights Fees II, pp.1-5, on the difficulties in establishing the fees pertaining to Chester. Studd, THSLC 128 (1978), p.13, takes a different view here.

The restrictions imposed on Edward by the non-alienation clause have been considered by successive historians to have dominated his life and his relations with his father in the years from 1254-72. For example, Dr. Studd states:

"it was the question of alienation contrary to the conditions of his endowment that generated the most heat between the king and the Lord Edward".

To support this view, Studd cites the annulment of the Oleron grant, the Gravamina of 1261, the arrangements made when Monmouth was transferred to Edmund, the disagreement over Belin, inquiries into alienations on Edward's lands, and the revocation of the Elham grant, although he accepts that in this last instance the king "acted in concert" with Edward<sup>1</sup>. Subsequent work has largely adopted these views<sup>2</sup>. To test the validity of this hypothesis, it is proposed to examine the grants made by Edward, and the occasions on which the clause may have been invoked.

The grants of land and privileges made by Edward are listed chronologically in Table 2. Over 35 were made from the lands of the permanent endowment, and an additional 9 in fulfilment of promises by the king, or in extension of earlier royal grants<sup>3</sup>. There were also 10 grants of franchises or privileges. These figures may be compared with perhaps 10 grants made from Edward's acquisitions<sup>4</sup>, roughly 10 from escheats within the settled lands, 6 life-grants, c.25 from custodies

1) JR Studd, BIHR 50 (1977), pp.10-12. He also argues that the terms of the grant prevented consolidation or dispersal of the lands, leading to "a static view of the appanage".

2) e.g. M Prestwich, Edward I, with some reservations, pp.12-3,36-7,62-3; Ridgeway, D.Phil, p.400, who sees the events of 1263 as releasing Edward from the restrictions.

3) Grants made in exchange for other lands, and the 10 or so made from escheats in lands of the "appanage" have been excluded here. 6 life-grants were also made.

4) Monmouth, Winterbourne Gunnor, Jewry.

and 20 from rebel estates <sup>1</sup>.

It may be argued that many of these grants received royal confirmation, thus waiving the restriction. However, with the exception of the confirmation given to Warenne in 1266, and the confirmation to William de Turberville in 1257 on the grounds of Edward's minority <sup>2</sup>, the confirmations were certainly no different to those obtained by other tenants-in-chief, ecclesiastical bodies and lesser men, indicating only a desire to protect the grants (often retrospectively) by every means possible. The number of grants which received confirmation is misleading, since the irregular survival of Edward's acta has caused the survival, in disproportionate number, of grants confirmed by the king and enrolled. Even so, over 20 grants "imperpetuum" can be traced, with recipients of varying status from Henry of Almain down, which were not confirmed by Henry III. The number of grants, both confirmed and unconfirmed, does not imply that Edward had regular difficulty in making and maintaining the awards.

The chronology of the grants requires further comment. As the record stands, over 1254-6, Edward made very few grants (excluding wardships), other than in fulfilment of his father's promises or connected with the Gascon pacification. Over 1257-8 the numbers increase slightly, but the lands were generally escheats <sup>3</sup>. Provision for those of Edward's household serving in Wales (or their dependants) was made by grants of custodies or fees. Only from late 1259 did Edward draw to any serious extent on the settled lands, with grants reaching a maximum from 1262-3. From 1265-72 very few grants of this kind were made.

These figures must be treated with caution. An inevitable

1) including grants made in the king's name from lands given to Edward.

2) CChR 1257-1300, p.2; C53/48 m.5.

3) e.g. the grants in Stamford to ecclesiastical houses and to Ebulo de Montibus, or the grants from seceding Welsh tenants.

distortion has been produced by the survival of Edward's patent roll for 1259-60. We cannot tell whether this sudden increase in grants was the result of Edward's alliance with Montfort, increasing his freedom of action, or whether, had the previous patent roll survived, he would be found to have been continuing a policy developed earlier. However, since the number of grants for 1263-3, surviving only through enrollment on the royal records, or other chance, still exceeds the 1259-60 group, we may be confident that Edward did make many more grants during the latter period. Equally, the comparison of the 1254-5 rolls with that of 1259-60 confirms the change of policy, which had occurred between those dates.

External circumstances must be considered also. Over 1254-6 Edward's entourage was mainly composed of older more established figures, already in receipt of royal fees. Only from 1257 when Edward began to recruit among a younger, less well-endowed class of knight, did pressure on his resources become more acute. From 1265 onwards two factors may explain the fall in grants of this kind. First, these resources were finite. The loss of territories to the Welsh, the surrender of various estates to his brother and brother-in-law, the distribution of Tickhill, Stamford and Grantham and other lands among his 1263 allies, reduced the opportunities available. The deteriorating military situation in Ireland rendered grants there less welcome, and Gascony was rarely used to endow non-continental members of the household. The shift in Edward's revenues from estate-based to fiscal-based sources will also have resulted in a tailing-off of land grants.

Secondly, the bonanza of confiscated lands in 1265 reduced the pressure on Edward's other lands as a source of patronage. Edward distributed virtually all his acquisitions among his household, and many of his affinity also received grants directly from the king. Expansion of the household for the crusade was achieved by financial contracts,

again obviating the need for further reduction of Edward's land base. Thus, while an examination of the chronology indicates that Henry III might in 1261 have had some justification for complaint about Edward's increasing use of his endowment as a source of grants, the alterations in the pattern of Edward's patronage do not correlate with the fluctuations in his relationship with his father, but with entirely separate factors.

An examination of the occasions on which the terms of Edward's settlement were invoked, shows plainly that the factional and political upheavals of the late 1250's and early 1260's had caused its exploitation in ways not envisaged by donor or recipient in 1254. A brief summary of each episode may facilitate development of this view.

**1) Appointment of Geoffrey de Lusignan as Seneschal of Gascony, June-July 1258**

This occurred before 28 June 1258. A series of letters to Ireland (28 June), the Channel Islands (5 July), and Gascony (28 June) at the height of the Poitevin crisis at the Parliament of Oxford warned Edward's subjects that he intended to make appointments of chief officers and castellans in these territories:

"Edwardus ... cui commisimus terram nostram Vasconie (or variants), salva fide nostra ad se sustinendum, intendit ... facere senescallum in Vasconie, nobis inconsultis, per quod dubitamus quod nobis et ipsi graviter dampnum et exheredationis periculum possit imminere"<sup>1</sup>.

On 12 July at Winchester, two days after he had agreed to swear to the Provisions, Edward issued a revocation of one appointment, that of his Lusignan uncle to Gascony, on the grounds that he had made it without asking consent of king and council. The revocation was

1) C66/72 m.5: Foedera I i, p.373; CPR 1247-58, pp.639-40.

specifically on their orders "de speciali mandato dicto domini regis et consilio comitum baronum et aliorum magnatum Anglie". He promised that another seneschal would be appointed on their advice <sup>1</sup>. There may have been some doubt that Geoffrey would accept this, since on 22 July another order was issued to Geoffrey (by now overseas) annulling the grant to him of "terram Vasconie una cum senescalcia eiusdem terre" and ordering him to surrender any documents from Edward relating to the appointment <sup>2</sup>.

Clearly Edward had not made appointments in all the territories to which letters were sent. These, and the confusion between a grant of Gascony and appointment of a seneschal, indicate the alarm felt by the anti-Poitevin faction, and the doubt as to Edward's intentions.

#### 2) Life-grant of Oleron to Guy de Lusignan, June-July 1258

This was very closely related to the above appointment and crisis. Again, the initial letters of revocation (11 July 1258) did not identify the recipient, or clearly describe Edward's action:

"cum commisimus Edwardo filio nostro insulam nostram Oleron. ad sustentacionem suam salva fidem nostram ita tamen quod non separetur a corona Anglie, et idem Edwardus insulam illam alteri dare vel committere proponat, nobis inconsultis .. de quo nobis et ipsi grave posset dampnum seu exheredacionis predictae insule" <sup>3</sup>.

A specific order was sent to Guy on 22 July, probably despatched with the one to Geoffrey, and in very similar terms <sup>4</sup>. Another went to Oleron on 26 October 1258, with more detail. It stated that, although Oleron had been committed to Edward for his maintenance:

1) C66/72 m.6d; CPR 1247-58, p.664; Foedera I i, p.374.

2) CR 1256-9, p.319.

3) C66/72 m.5; Foedera I i, p.374; CPR 1247-58, p.641; E36/275 f.230. The echoes of the orders in 1) are very clear.

4) CR 1256-9, p.319.

"ita quod eam (insulam) alicui dare, dimittere vel alienare non possit sine consilio nostro, et Guido de Lesingnan frater nostro alio modo quam bono procuraverit a prefato filio nostro dictam insulam sibi dare ad vitam ... sine assensu nostro"<sup>1</sup>.

Edward's revocation, not issued until 4 November 1258, admitted that he had made Guy a life-grant, forgetting ("non bene reducentes") the terms of his endowment, and without consulting his father<sup>2</sup>. Additional letters were sent to Oleron on 3 September 1259 and 17/18 February 1261. The former stated that Oleron was to remain attached to the crown and the king had no intention of alienating or giving it elsewhere<sup>3</sup>. The latter again promised the islanders "nolumus vos a corona Anglie ullatenus segregare", and warned them to be intendant only to the king or to Edward<sup>4</sup>.

In both 1) and 2) we see the triumph of the anti-Poitevin and reformist factions, which succeeded in imposing their views on various matters, including the expulsion of the Poitevins, on the king at the Parliament of Oxford. Edward's decision to make his stand with the Lusignans, expressed in these grants, was in part a recognition that the other measures proposed by the reformers would interfere with his independence as well as with his father's.

The hostile reaction to the grant was less concern with the terms of Edward's endowment than with the fact that, having succeeded in removing all castles of strategic significance from alien control, the dominant group did not want the Poitevins in a position of power just across the Channel. The inclusion of Oleron gave an added dimension to the arrangement, for there was a long-standing Lusignan claim to the

1) Cuttino GR A 170: E36/275 f.231v; CPR 1258-66, p.1; C66/73 m.15, dated only to 43 H.III, promising to send a seneschal to Gascony.

2) Cuttino GR A 168: E36/275 f.228v; Foedera I i, p.378.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.41; C66/73 m.3: E36/275 f.228; Foedera I i, p.388; Cuttino GR A 171.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.141; C66/76 m.17; Foedera I i, p.404.

island <sup>1</sup>. For a detailed analysis of the events of 1258 see Dr. Carpenter <sup>2</sup> and Dr. Ridgeway <sup>3</sup>. It will be perceived that the terms of Edward's endowment had successfully been argued to include restrictions on his freedom to make appointments within his lands, on the grounds that the lands were intended to maintain him.

### 3) Complaints about Edward in the Gravamina, March 1261

These occurred in the Latin version of 9 March 1261, and the revised version analysed by Dr. Ridgeway, and dated to 9-15 March 1261, from which the revised Anglo-French version was later compiled. In view of Dr. Ridgeway's comprehensive analysis <sup>4</sup>, we need only note here that the first version complained that the barons:

"permittunt Edwardum filium regis distrahere que dominus rex ei dedit in augmentum corone Anglie, et que ei tradita fuerunt ut non separentur a corona Anglie",

and that Edward had been seduced from his loyalty to his father by a certain man <sup>5</sup>. The revised version added to the first accusation the sentence:

"Et ponit senescallum in Wascon. et justiciarios (or justiciarium) et alios ballivos contra voluntatem domini regis".

The second accusation was expanded into an attack on the council, as instigators of Edward's disloyalty <sup>6</sup>. The Anglo-French version dropped both these accusations.

This episode is further proof of the king's abilities to turn his adversaries' expedients against themselves. Whether the accusations about appointments referred to current fears about Edward's activities,

1) The revival of Lusignan interest in 1252 is noted by Ridgeway, who interpreted opposition to it as deriving from Savoy.

2) DA Carpenter, War and Government in the Middle Ages, ed. Gillingham and Holt, pp.106-119.

3) HW Ridgeway, in Thirteenth century England, ed. Coss and Lloyd, pp.89-99.

4) HW Ridgeway, BIHR 61 (1988), pp.227-242.

5) T&S 30 cl.20,21.

6) Ridgeway, op.cit. cl.20,21.

or were retrospective complaints about Edward's activities in 1259-60<sup>1</sup>, they represent an exploitation of the reformist action described in 1) and 2). The complaint about the dissipation of Edward's endowment may have referred to a current or past grievance, whether mismanagement of resources<sup>2</sup> or grants of land<sup>3</sup> or, more plausibly, his general activities, as in the royal accusation (c.1260-August 1261), that the abbot of Peterborough, had lent Edward money secured on his estates, enabling him to wage war against the king<sup>4</sup>.

#### 4) The general audit of Edward's estates, January-April 1262

This was initiated in late 1261, while Edward was overseas. The first exchequer summons stated as a reason for the audit:

"Cum Edwardus filius R. nichil habeat in terris aut redditibus nisi ex commissione R. et ipse ad presens agat in partibus transmarinis, propter quod oportebat regem utilitati sue quam propriam reputantes diligentius prospicere, ac multi ballivi sibi teneantur in ratiociniis in compotis reddendis"<sup>5</sup>.

The audit took place over January-April 1262, resulting in the discovery of alleged deficits in the accounts of several of Edward's bailiffs. The largest of these was that of Edward's former estate steward, Roger de Leyburn. The king followed proceedings closely visiting the exchequer himself. His declaration on that occasion developed the theoretical argument further:

"Dominus rex protestatus fuit quod non feofavit eundem Edwardum filium suum de terris aut tenementis predictis nisi cum ad sustentacionem suam, ita quod non separentur a corona sua. Et quia reputavit predictam pecuniam de predictis arreragiis tanquam suam precepit quod per vicecomitem Kancie levarentur predicti denarii"<sup>6</sup>

1) Dr. Ridgeway argues that the complaints were topical, e.g. the presence of Guy de Lusignan in Gascony, which may relate to the letter to Oleron in Feb. 1261, see 1).

2) cf. 4), below.

3) cf. 5), below.

4) Flores II, p.448: Table 1.

5) E159/36 m.4d. For a full discussion of the 1262 audit and its implications, see Appendix 1.

6) E368/36 m.10.

The intention of the settlement, for Edward's sustenance, is here used to give the king responsibility for the good management of the estates and revenues, a development from the claim in 1) and 2).

5) **Revocation of the grant of Elham to Roger de Leyburn, April 1262**

In the attempts to recover this deficit from Leyburn, he was ordered, 6 April 1262, to surrender the manor of Elham, which Edward had granted him in November 1260. However, this was not described as a means of recovering the debt, but was represented as a separate infringement of the terms of Edward's grant:

"in quo non habet ingressum nisi per Edwardum primogenitum nostrum, cui illud dimisimus ea condicione quod a corona nostra Anglie non separetur, et qui illud eidem Rogero dimisit sine assepsu et voluntate nostra contra formam condicionis predicte ut dicitur" <sup>1</sup>.

It was also claimed that the resumption was in reprisal for Roger's commission of waste on the manor, which was also represented as being in disinheritance of the king and Edward <sup>2</sup>. This confiscation was later represented to have been part of a judicial process, "nos ipsum Rogerum inplacitavimus in curia nostra de manerio predicto". In the brief period of reconciliation between the king and the Montfortians in late summer 1263, after Edward had been induced to pardon Roger and his associates (18 August), but before he had won them back to the royalist camp and retained them in his household (24 October 1263), the king agreed to the restoration of the manor to Roger:

"intuitu diutini obsequiis tam in partibus transmarinis quam cismarinis laudabiliter impensi, remisimus eidem Rogero placitum predictum et donacionem et concessionem quas dictus Edwardus fecit dicto Rogero ... ratas habemus et gratas" <sup>3</sup>.

Leyburn retained the manor through subsequent changes of fortune, apparently without requiring any additional confirmation. During the

1) CR 1261-4, p.117.

2) CR 1261-4, p.171.

3) E368/94 m.47: Larking, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, V (1862-3), pp.167-79. The witness list to the charter was strongly Montfortian.

Hundred Rolls and Quo Warranto enquiries, his heirs had to defend the grant, but did not encounter the difficulties faced by Warenne <sup>1</sup>.

In spite of the claims made at the time of the confiscation, this seizure obviously represents a further stage in the dispute over Leyburn's account. We may question, if this grant was a genuine grievance, why was the issue raised in 1262 and not in 1261, at the time of the Gravamina <sup>2</sup>. The local chronicles saw both the audit and the seizure as instigated by Edward himself, spurred on by his mother <sup>3</sup>. Leyburn's subsequent actions indicate hostility to Edward, the Savoyards and members of Edward's household, such as Robert Walerand. This therefore may have been the first occasion when the non-alienation clause was of some use to Edward himself. It is less clear whether Edward's hostility to Leyburn derived from the discoveries of the earlier audit or from political differences of mid 1261. The whole process against Leyburn, and the invocation of the non-alienation clause, may well have been stage-managed by Edward and his father.

#### 6) Prohibition on alienation of continental rights, November 1264

In November 1264 the Montfortian government attempted to prevent the royalists on the continent raising money for the war-effort. This move was probably directed specifically against the transfer of the Three Dioceses to King Louis in return for cash, but the prohibition of "quidam venditionem seu alienationem jurium et feodalia nostrorum et predicti filii nostri" could have been applied against other measures taken by Edward's supporters in Gascony. The transfer went ahead regardless, and although Henry III later reversed the agreement, he

1) RH I, p.203: PlacQW, pp.324,329-30,366. In 1324 Juliana de Leyburn had to produce the charters in another plea, and their enrollment on the Memoranda Roll led to their survival.

2) above, 3).

3) GC II pp.222-4, Chronicle of Dover, quoted by Larking, p.163. The king represented the audit as initiated by Edward, CR 1261-4, pp.170-1.

never questioned its validity <sup>1</sup>.

**7) Confirmation of the grant of Stamford and Grantham to John de Warenne, February 1266**

The grant was made in August 1263, as the price of his secession from the Montfortian camp. It was not attacked, but on 14 February 1266 the king issued a confirmation of the grant, because of John's good service, although it was "contra formam donacionis nostrae" to Edward. The terms of this confirmation were virtually identical to that issued to Leyburn in 1263, including the clause on service in England and overseas. It may well be that the overturning of the Elham grant in 1262 determined Warenne to have his own position protected by a confirmation similar to that obtained by Leyburn <sup>2</sup>.

**8) Inquiry into alienations in Ireland, July 1268**

In July 1268 the king announced that he had discovered Edward had made grants in Ireland which infringed the terms of his settlement:

"totam terram Hibernie .. ita quod non separetur a corona nostra Anglie, ac idem Edwardus sine licencia nostra alienaciones quorundam terrarum et tenementorum spectancium ad terram predictam .. contra tenorem feoffamenti nostri"

This, stated the king, was unacceptable, and he was sending Henry of Almain to revoke all such grants:

"revocandi omnia maneria et terras et tenementa quae idem filius noster post feoffamentum predictum terre predictae alienavit, et ea in manum nostram capiendi"

Henry was empowered to encourage colonisation along the borders with Gaelic Ireland and hear judicial pleas <sup>3</sup>. Other grants made to Edward and his family and household at this time, and evidence of his rôle as an adviser of the king, seem to rule out the possibility that he had quarrelled with his father. The choice of Henry of Almain, Edward's

1) CPR 1258-66, p.474; C66/83 m.28d; Foedera I i, p.448: see 4.i.

2) PlacQW, pp.429-30.

3) C66/86 m.10sc; CPR 1266-72, p.246.

cousin and close associate, for whom he was negotiating a lucrative marriage, for this mission, also does not equate with the view that this commission was hostile to Edward. The protection issued to Henry, stated that his journey was "pro negociis Edwardi filii R et suis de licencia R", which puts a slightly different emphasis on the mission<sup>1</sup>. It is possible that, as in the Elham episode, the king's action concealed an agreement with his son.

Edward had made a number of grants in Ireland. If the inquiry had seriously intended to attack one or all of these, with or without Edward's consent, the most likely target would have been Walter de Burgh, to whom Edward had granted Ulster in 1263<sup>2</sup>. At this time Burgh had revived his differences with the Geraldine family, and was carrying on another feud with the church. The following year this provoked another threat from the king, relating to his usurpation of ecclesiastical rights, which the king stated could not have been included in the grant from Edward. Henry warned that, if de Burgh continued to claim jurisdiction over the Archbishop of Armagh, the king would intervene "in a different way". This I take to be a threat to revoke the grant of Ulster<sup>3</sup>. The 1268 episode may have been an earlier stage in this dispute.

One other possibility could have been the projected restoration to Maurice FitzMaurice of the castle of Athlone, which had originally been granted to him in 1259 as part of Edward's bid for emancipation from

1) C66/86 m.9; CPR 1266-72, p.248. In spite of the protection, there is no evidence that Henry travelled to Ireland.

2) Table 2. The Ulster grant was the largest made by Edward. The only other grant of serious size was that to John FitzThomas in 1261. Given that these lands were now in Edward's custody for a protracted minority, it seems unlikely that that grant could have caused a problem in 1268.

3) Shirley II, 673: CDI 860,2551: Prynne, p.113, from SCl/2/36, 4/8: cf. Annals of Ulster, pp.344-5.

conciliar control, and resumed in 1261 by Rochelle<sup>1</sup>. Alternatively, this grant may have been another measure intended to contain de Burgh.

A simpler explanation, again linked with de Burgh, would be that the deteriorating military situation in Ireland was causing alarm in England. A force of colonists was defeated in 1268<sup>2</sup> by the O'Connors, and it may have been felt the local magnates were insufficiently zealous in defence of the country. De Burgh and FitzGerald were still preoccupied by their feud<sup>3</sup>. Almain's other instructions confirm the king's concern about the Gaelic revival, that he should make enfiefments as a barrier against further advances<sup>4</sup>. There is no evidence that Almain did go to Ireland, but instead, Robert de Ufford, one of Edward's most trusted household knights, was appointed Justiciar in September 1268<sup>5</sup>. He arrived in November 1268, with instructions to "order and settle the country"<sup>6</sup>, and immediately took counter-measures against the Irish<sup>7</sup>. It may be no coincidence that the Geraldine/ Burgh feud was said by one of the more reliable Irish chroniclers, Henry of Marlborough, to have been resolved in 1269<sup>8</sup>. It is very probable that the appointment of Ufford superseded the Almain commission, and the episode only demonstrates Henry III working with his son for the defence and good government of Ireland.

1) 35 RepDKI, pp.48-9, 36 RepDKI, p.24. The 1268 transfer, effected in August on Edward's orders, and therefore initiated earlier, was said to have been to Maurice FitzGerald. This must mean FitzMaurice FitzGerald, because his nephew had died in July 1268.

2) exact date unknown, New History of Ireland 8, p.108: Annals of Connacht, p.151.

3) Chronicle of Henry of Marlborough, f.88.

4) "de terris nostris inter hibernicos vel prope hibernicos aut in marchie hibernicorum".

5) CPR 1266-72, p.255.

6) Annals of Connacht, p.153.

7) e.g the building of the castle of Roscommon, CJRI II pp.133-5: SCL/20/45: Otway-Ruthven, A History of Medieval Ireland, p.199.

8) Chronicle of Henry of Marlborough, f.88.

9) Revocation of the return of Belin to Gaillard de Soler, November 1269

The king's objection, expressed in the assertion that the grant of Gascony had been made to Edward on the condition that it should not be dismembered, was that Edward had restored the castle of Belin and its appurtenances, to its former holder, Gaillard de Soler, without receiving an oath of fealty. Edward was ordered to resume the castle and keep it until proper title was established <sup>1</sup>.

All the Soler lands had been confiscated in the civil war of 1253-4, and when he was pardoned Belin had been retained on the grounds that he had not established his right to it. Nevertheless Edward in 1259, with the king's approval, had agreed to compensate Soler for its continued detention. The failure to consult his father, as instructed in 1261, about an alteration in the agreement may explain the king's opposition in 1269. The dispute was about suzerainty of the castle, its tenants and judicial rights, rather than actual possession <sup>2</sup>. Edward's motive in restoration was probably to obtain the cooperation of the powerful Solers in keeping the peace in Bordeaux and Gascony while Edward was away in the East. Henry and Edward had long disagreed on policy towards the feuding mercantile dynasties of Bordeaux, with Edward favouring the Solers. Henry may have been concerned that the concession to the Solers would upset the precarious balance with the Colombs. Regalian right and the terms of Edward's settlement may not have been the principal preoccupation here <sup>3</sup>.

It does not appear that Henry prevented the transfer, perhaps Edward convinced him of the need for it. In the 1270's Edward set up an enquiry into royal rights in Belin, and he was later forced to purchase

1) "nullatenus dismembrandi", CPR 1266-72, p.396: C66/88 m.26.

2) CPR 1247-58, pp.350-2: RG I 3695-8: CR 1259-61, pp.485-6.

3) Trabut-Cussac, RHB, 1 (1952), pp.185-199.

rights from tenants there. By 1310 the Solers were held to owe service, so Edward had establish some nominal rights over the castle, although at what cost is not known. If in 1269 expediency had prevailed over royal claims, at a later date Edward was eager to amend the situation <sup>1</sup>.

Two other instances, where the principle of non-alienation has been said to be in operation, may be disregarded. The compensation offered to Edmund for grants made out of the lordship of Monmouth, before its cession to Edmund, must represent part of an agreement to transfer lands to a certain value to Edmund. Monmouth was entirely separate from the terms of the 1254 settlement, and the clause of the dictum of Kenilworth on the recovery of royal rights cannot be used to explain the stipulation <sup>2</sup>. The episode described by Lydon, of a royal annulment of the appointment of a justiciar in Ireland in October 1272, is referenced to the letter of June 1258, and is entirely spurious <sup>3</sup>.

Over 1258-62 there occurred a development in the understanding of the terms of Edward's settlement. Besides the formal restriction on alienation, the concept was formulated that the purpose of the endowment, to maintain Edward, justified interference from the king, if he considered that Edward's actions were in any way detrimental to this original intention. Thus the terms of the settlement became a catch-all principle, available to restrict grants of land or rights, remedy alleged mismanagement, collect debts, oversee expenditure, and interfere with the running of the administration and the choice of personnel. The question of appointments is distorted by the developments resulting from the Provisions of Oxford, and these will be considered separately. For

1) RG II 71: Livre des Hommages 527: Cuttino GR A 13/18, 52/60.

2) Chapter 4.ii, but cf. Studd, BIHR 50 (1977), p.11: Hoyt, The Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History, pp.164-5: T&S 44 cl.6.

3) see 1), above: New History of Ireland, II, p.180.

the rest, it is a confirmation of Edward's generally good relations with his father that the occasions of interference were comparatively infrequent.

The occasions when the settlement was invoked were very limited. In 1258 the king was constrained to use it, and in 1261 he took revenge for this, turning the tables on the barons, with whom his son had been, and perhaps was thought still to be, entangled. In the Leyburn affair, there is good reason to detect a similar stratagem, with the difference that now Edward was co-operating with his father, and separated from Leyburn by political differences as well as financial grievances. The baronial expedient of 1264 may be dismissed as just that, and the confirmation to Warenne in 1266 demonstrates that the restriction existed only to be put aside. In the Irish affair, it appears that the objection was not carried through, and the king and Edward were in agreement about the measures taken. With Belin, we see the king's perpetual concern about regalian right, and perhaps a policy dispute about balance between rival factions. However, the significant point is that, as in Ireland the previous year, as far as the evidence goes, the grant was not reversed.

The terms of the settlement must not be used as the justification for every instance of interference by the king in Edward's administration. As suzerain, Henry's feudal rights and judicial obligations compelled him to take an interest in Edward's administration, as in that of every other tenant-in-chief in the country. A comparison may be made with the interest also shown by King Louis in Gascon affairs from 1259, which obviously had nothing to do with the terms of Edward's endowment. Thus Henry was capable, indeed obliged to take action against activities in any of Edward's estates (not just the two-thirds of the original settlement), which contravened his rights.

This type of interference could extend into administration, especially on questions of national security, and may explain certain appointments made by Henry (below). As the king's son, Edward may have experienced more of this interest than many of his fellow landholders, since Henry clearly felt that Edward had no excuse for practices which infringed the crown's rights. For example, he objected to the conduct of Edward's bailiffs on one of his custodies, in usurping the right of return of writ on the grounds that:

"omnes qui in servicio sunt filii nostri predicti vel sustentantur per ipsum, jura nostra et corone nostra conservare teneantur"<sup>1</sup>.

It is quite possible that other of the king's disputes with Edward (particularly Belin) arose from transgression of this principle than from the suspicion that he had infringed the terms of the 1254 settlement.

The question of interference in appointments within Edward's territories deserves further consideration. The terms of his settlement were exploited as a further justification for the extension to Edward's dominions of the controls introduced by the Provisions of Oxford over royal appointments. The Provisions reformed the system of appointment and custody of royal castles, introducing limited terms of office, an oath of loyalty for all castellans<sup>2</sup>, and the replacement of politically-unsound officers with those of reformist sympathies<sup>3</sup>. It was not laid down that these restrictions were to apply to Edward's castles also, unless it was included in the intention to reform Edward's household. Perhaps it was only as a result of the Lusignan appointment that it was considered necessary. Here too, as with the grants, the king

1) CR 1259-62, p.493.

2) T&S 5 cl.8; also enrolled on the Memoranda Roll for Michaelmas 1258, E159/32 m.11.

3) T&S 5: AM I, pp.448,453.

was able to benefit from a policy introduced as part of the reform package forced on him in 1258.

The revocation of the appointment of Geoffrey de Lusignan to Gascony was succeeded by a series of measures against Edward's officers. New castellans were appointed on conciliar advice, given an oath to swear, and required to surrender their responsibilities either at a specific date, or when so ordered by the council. Undertakings survive for Nicholas FitzMartin, William ap Gurwaret, Guy de Brion, constables of Cardigan, Carmarthen and Kilgaran for 1258-9<sup>1</sup>. The appointments at Bristol in December 1258 (occasioned by FitzGeoffrey's death) were also limited term, and approved by the council<sup>2</sup>. Some of Edward's officers retained their posts, perhaps because their politics were acceptable<sup>3</sup>. Alternatively, the restrictions may have applied only to the high offices and the key Marcher castles.

The promise to make a new appointment in Gascony was clearly part of this policy, as was the replacement of Alan la Zuche in Ireland by Stephen Longespee, now firmly aligned with the reformist party. Dr. Studd is mistaken to view these appointments as the result of the king's interference. His contention that the delay between Longespee's appointment and his arrival in Ireland<sup>4</sup> represented Edward's resistance to the plan cannot be sustained<sup>5</sup>. This kind of delay was common<sup>6</sup>, and in this instance, it is hardly surprising that Longespee, maintaining his interest in politics, delayed his crossing

1) CR 1256-9, p.330; CPR 1247-58, p.654; C66/72 m.2. Robert Walerand also swore an oath on his appointment to Bristol in 1259, below.

2) CR 1256-9, p.350. This was probably only a confirmation of the status quo, formally granting custody to FitzGeoffrey's son and steward.

3) e.g. Roger de Montalt.

4) Longespee was appointed by October 1258 and did not leave for Ireland before June 1259.

5) JR Studd, *BIHR* 50 (1977), p.9.

6) cf. Audley in 1270, R&S admin, p.79; CDI 889-90: E101/230/2.

until after the parliaments of October 1258 and February 1259, at which the details of reform were hammered out. While Longespee was in England, his steward, Geoffrey de Forestel, acted in Dublin, so there was no delay in the transfer of power <sup>1</sup>.

We should not assume too readily that the conciliar nominees were inevitably unacceptable to Edward. As with the appointments of "councillors", care was taken to select men who were presumably considered politically sound, but who, from their previous employment in Edward's service, might have been thought acceptable to him <sup>2</sup>. For example, the vexed question of a Gascon seneschal was solved by the appointment of Edward's existing bailiff of the Channel Isles, Drew de Barentin, to combine the two offices. His background, an Anglo-Norman knight of the royal household, and a close friend of the alien earl of Warwick, does not mark him out as an obvious baronial sympathiser <sup>3</sup>. This may have been a temporary expedient, but as a former seneschal he was well qualified for the position. His promotion may have been a diplomatic solution to the difficulty caused by the Lusignan affair. He was probably appointed in November 1258, on a fixed term, as with the other appointments. This would explain his need for a new contract in November 1259 <sup>4</sup>. Rochelle and FitzMartin had previously been employed in Edward's administration, and were well qualified for their posts.

From Edward's viewpoint, the problem was not the experience,

1) Berry, PRIA 24/C p.39: C47/35/14/13.

2) Of the councillors, Montalt was already justice of Chester, Longespee had served in Gascony, Grey's service predated the transfer to Edward, although his brother and nephew had served Edward. These three were of course all qualified by their knowledge of Edward's estates to exercise a supervisory rôle. Balliol was an unknown quantity.

3) His retention in Edward's household and subsequent career in the service of Edward and the royalist cause confirms this view.

4) Barentin was already in the Channel Islands at the beginning of the 1258 crisis, CPR 1247-58, p.640, and Table 5. No conclusion on Edward's attitude to him can safely be drawn from his reappointment by Edward for a year from Nov. 1259, Studd, BIHR 50, p.8, and T-C, admin, p.145.

previous service or even politics of the new appointees, but the restriction on his independence which they represented. His successive alliances with Gloucester and Leicester were intended to free him of this constraint, and (probably as important) to recover the lands he had entrusted to his Lusignan uncles, which had been seized and not returned to his possession <sup>1</sup>. His agreement with Gloucester included the condition that Edward "eit hastifment ses chasteus et ses terres en sa main et en sun poer" <sup>2</sup>. This agreement foundered before Edward was able to take any steps to recovery. Indeed its only consequence seems to have been another conciliar-instigated appointment at Bristol, this time of a castellan more sympathetic to the king and to Gloucester, who may have backed the appointment as part of the arbitration process which might have returned Bristol to him <sup>3</sup>.

The alliance with Leicester was more successful<sup>4</sup>. Very soon Edward recovered Tickhill, replacing the conciliar-appointed custodian, and he terminated his great-uncle's lease of Hastings <sup>5</sup>. At Bristol, he replaced Walerand with his own knight and estate steward, Roger de Leyburn <sup>6</sup>. In Chester he probably replaced the justice, Montalt <sup>7</sup>. In Ireland Edward pursued a plan of attrition. Unable to dismiss Longespee, he transferred custody of the counties of Limerick, Waterford, Cork, Connaught and the castle of Athlone to the powerful Geraldine clan <sup>8</sup>. When this move is seen as a counter to the justiciar, his refusal to

1) i.e. Tickhill, Laughton, Paunton, Henham.

2) HMC 69, Middleton Mss, p.67.

3) CPR 1258-66, pp.29,32,63-4; C66/73 m.6, 74 m.13. This was represented as an appointment by Edward, but later reference is made to the oath taken by Walerand when appointed "iuraveritis quod castrum illud nemini liberaretis sive nobis et consilio nostro".

4) on the pact with Leicester, see Dr. DA Carpenter, BIHR 78 (1985) pp.226-237.

5) Studd 715,732,734; C61/4 m.5.

6) Studd 742; C61/4 m.4.

7) between August and November, Studd 711-2; C61/4 m.5: A.Ces,p.76.

8) Studd 722-5; C61/4 m.5.

give seisin to FitzThomas takes on a greater significance.

The series of tournaments Edward attended in mid-1259 and early 1260 were probably intended to build up support among the younger knights, besides providing a plausible excuse to increase the size of his entourage. There are many parallels for the use of tournaments as rallying-grounds for political dissent<sup>1</sup>. Edward's visit to Blyth in June 1259 (the occasion on which he helped himself to the Tickhill and Laughton issues deposited in the Priory), coincides so closely with the date of the projected tournament, that it seems highly probable that this went ahead in spite of the royal prohibition. Similarly, his visit to Warwick in August must have been occasioned by the Round Table held there<sup>2</sup>. We may also speculate that Edward attended a subsequent tournament at Blyth in 1260. Activity of this kind, coupled with increasing alignment with the radical elements forming round Montfort, could explain his involvement in the protest of the "bachelors"<sup>3</sup>.

The failure of Edward's attempt to assert his independence was due to the weapon which the reformers of 1258 had made available to the king. The Provisions and subsequent events had established the principle that king and council should oversee Edward's appointments. When Henry managed to establish a majority of support on the council, he could use this concept against Edward and his new allies. Hence, the changes forced on Edward at Bristol, Montgomery and the Three Castles, all said to be appointed "per regem et E filium R et consilium R" and in

1) Denholm-Young, in Studies in Medieval History presented to F.M. Powicke, ed. RW Hunt, WA Pantin, RW Southern, pp.240-268.

2) Cartulary of Blyth Priory, p.191; BL Harleian Ms. 3759 f.96v: CPR 1258-66, p.27: AM IV, p.445: Studd 709: BL Add.Ms. 35179 f.89v. The act which establishes Edward's presence in Warwick contains the declaration of Edward's obligations of good lordship, indicating that his attitudes had already undergone a radical shift, Carpenter, BIHR 78 pp.235-7.

3) AM I, p.471: Tout, Collected Papers II, pp.277-83: but cf. M Prestwich, Edward I, pp.30-1.

fulfilment of Edward's oath to the Provisions <sup>1</sup>.

We cannot be sure that all subsequent appointments made by the king were the result of friction between father and son, provoking measures to contain Edward. The appointments made by the king in late 1261 to Chester and Ireland were in response to the deaths of the office-holders, and an urgent appeal from the Irish administration <sup>2</sup>. Edward's absence overseas was said by the king to be his reason for making a temporary appointment to Chester <sup>3</sup>. A similar motive lay behind his appointments in Cheshire in December 1262, when Edward was again abroad and the border was in turmoil <sup>4</sup>. The choice in 1261 of Thomas de Orreby, one of Edward's 1259 appointments, to succeed his kinsman at Chester, was surely not one the king would have made had his intentions to Edward been hostile. Rochelle too was a plausible choice for Ireland, in spite of his pro-baronial past, and he was probably already in Ireland <sup>5</sup>. He too continued in office after Edward had the opportunity to replace him. Dr. Studd's suggestion, made for the Chester appointment of 1261, and the changes at Chester of 1262, that the king was exercising his rights of suzerainty, may explain these appointments. It was certainly contemporary convention that a suzerain could interfere in the interest of national defence, as witness Edward's request to his father to compel the bishop of Hereford and William de Evereus to garrison their castles against the Welsh advance in 1263 <sup>6</sup>. The security motive is corroborated by the king's orders to Edward's

1) "secundum formam iuramenti nostri quam dudum fecimus", Studd 790-6; C61/4 m.3: CR 1259-61, p.42. Dr. Studd's discussion of the Bristol appointment does not place it in a political context, BIHR 50, p.8-9.

2) Sayles, Documents on the Affairs of Ireland ... King's council, 5.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.174; C66/76 m.4.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.238,240; C66/79 mm.19,18.

5) e.g. KB26/169 m.1.

6) Studd 886: SCL1/3/78; Foedera I i, p.425: Studd, BIHR 50, p.17.

steward, Gilbert Talbot to munition Edward's Gwent castles<sup>1</sup>. Edward may even have agreed that his father should supervise his estates while he was abroad. The king's action at Totnes in appointing a new castellan, stated that Edward had demised the castle to him, while he was overseas<sup>2</sup>.

Against this, it must be pointed out that one of Rochelle's first actions as justiciar was to recover the castle of Athlone from Maurice FitzMaurice, to whom Edward had awarded it in 1259, and retain it in his own custody. The timing of these appointments in late 1261 was only shortly before the problems in Edward's financial administration led to royal intervention. In mid-1262 when the subsequent crisis had come to a head, the castellans of Carmarthen and Cardigan again received fixed term appointments, and took the oath to king and council<sup>3</sup>. It is possible that the king was still exploiting baronial tactics to maintain a degree of supervision over Edward.

After 1262 the instances of royal interference in Edward's appointments cease. The despatch of Hugh de Turberville to Carmarthen and Cardigan in August 1263, appointed "de voluntate nostra et procerum nostrorum", was the result of the short-lived peace between the king and Montfort, causing a return to the principles of the Provisions<sup>4</sup>. The appointment of Hamo Lestrangle, then Edward's sworn supporter, to Montgomery in December, recorded as made by the king and council, may be explained by his appointment jointly to the royal castles of Shrewsbury and Bridgnorth. Also, the royal order may have been intended to assist in getting custody from the previous castellan, Lestrangle's Montfortian

1) CR 1261-4, p.191.

2) CPR 1258-66, pp.192,215.

3) LW 39.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.240-; C66/79 m.18.

brother, John, bypassing any possible stand on the Provisions<sup>1</sup>. During Edward's captivity, Montfort attempted to obtain control of Edward's castles by conciliar orders, but several of Edward's castellans disregarded these entirely.

The artificiality of the 1258-65 interference is demonstrated by the total cessation from 1265 of appointments made by the king, or giving his formal consent. Over the entire period, 1254-72, the evidence for interference in Edward's appointments is less strong than has been suggested. In Gascony, Dr. Studd considered that only Grailly and Ippgrave were freely appointed by Edward, and that Barentin, Turberville and Tany were "nominated by the king or at least approved by him"<sup>2</sup>. Between nomination and approval there is a considerable difference. Even so, these three appointments do not make his case. Barentin's appointment is discussed above. Those of Turberville and Tany can be easily eliminated, since they were appointed during Edward's absence on crusade, after the deterioration of the king's health (from February 1271) had left government in the hands of Edward's lieutenants, Richard of Cornwall (d. April 1272) and the council. References to the king and council in the appointments represent only an underlining of the new seneschals' appointments, or chancery convention<sup>3</sup>. Of all appointments in Gascony (14 seneschals and 3 lieutenants), only Longespee, appointed on the king's recommendation, and Barentin represent anything but the choice of Edward or his administration<sup>4</sup>.

A similar analysis of appointments in Ireland indicates that of 9 instances of appointment over 1254-72, 3 were made locally and later

1) CPR 1258-66, p.300; C66/81 m.20: E371/28 mm.1,3. Studd, BIHR 50, p.10, sees this as another example of the king's "meddling".

2) Studd, BIHR 50, pp.8-9: cf. T-C admin, p.145.

3) cf. the practice of representing other appointments made by Edward's lieutenants as emanating from the king, Chapter 5.iii.

4) see Table 5.

confirmed<sup>1</sup>. Of the other appointments, Longespee was almost certainly a baronial nominee, and Rochelle's reappointment is discussed above. No other appointments in Ireland suggest anything other than free nomination by Edward. Elsewhere, other than the instances noted above, no interference in personnel or appointments made by Edward is known. The connection between the terms of Edward's settlement and the interference in Edward's appointments was spurious, an aberration thrown up by the Provisions, and the abnormal conditions of the conflict which ensued.

1) e.g. Maurice FitzMaurice, after Audley's death and until the receipt of his formal commission, only attested as acting justiciar, e.g. C47/10/13/4. Dene and Barry were local appointments, their continuation in office implies confirmation by Edward. The analysis of Richardson and Sayles, Administration of Ireland, pp.9-10, using chronicle variants to define appointments as local or external, cannot be sustained, though shortage of space precludes further discussion.

### iii) Policy and Politics

The king's reluctance to grant long-established royal demesne lands to Edward resulted in the transfer to him of a number of grievances, previously directed against the king. An extraordinary number of Edward's estates had been acquired by a combination of purchase, sharp practice and disregard of the normal conventions of inheritance. The new aggressive policy of the defence of royal rights against encroachment had led also to the resumption or denial of the inheritance of judicial privileges. In other cases long-standing custody had created a false sense of ownership, and consequent resentment on resumption.

In Ireland, John FitzThomas had been denied the lands of his father-in-law, Thomas FitzAnthony. John de Verdon, unlike his brother-in-law, Geoffrey de Geneville, was not allowed to exercise the judicial rights previously enjoyed by his wife's family in Meath. Walter de Burgh, a great Connaught landholder, also had a claim to the lands his family had carved out from the Irish in Ulster. Along the Welsh March, Edward's castles had been acquired at the expense of the Marshal, Breos and Burgh families. Even the terra Normannorum forfeited as much as fifty years previously, were still vulnerable to overseas claimants. Peace proposals with France, gathering momentum from 1256, threatened Edward's title to these lands, as Henry was aware <sup>1</sup>. The treaty of 1259 did indeed recognise the claims of the Dukes of Brittany to Richmond, with implications for Edward after his exchange of Hastings for some of the Richmond estates in 1262. Chester, Bristol, the Peak, Stamford and Grantham, even Oleron and Gascony <sup>2</sup>, and the conquests in Wales, all presented grievances and potential difficulties from those who considered themselves dispossessed.

1) e.g. CR 1254-6, pp.38-9; T-C admin, pp.19-20.

2) once coveted by Richard of Cornwall, Denholm-Young, Richard of Cornwall, pp.51,73; Foedera I i, p.253.

Apart from these hereditary and familial claims, Edward's establishment in a position of power could not but interfere with the ambitions of local magnates. In Gascony and Ireland he was merely taking over his father's position <sup>1</sup>, although it could have been feared that he would take a more personal interest in these territories. More dangerously though, in Wales Edward's combination of the gains of Henry III and his own custodies and purchases made him a threat of the first magnitude to Llywelyn ap Gruffydd's plans for the restoration of Gwynedd. Llywelyn was probably not the only person to find the situation disturbing. The unprecedented support he received from the native lords of South Wales, and the ambivalent attitudes of the Marcher lords to Edward's problems, may have been caused by the suspicion occasioned by Edward's new position and activities. Henry III's generous settlement, by accident or design, placed Edward in a position where he could scarcely avoid posing a threat to the aspirations of the magnates.

It must be emphasised that not all those who might have considered themselves aggrieved by Edward's acquisitions allowed this to affect their behaviour to him. The earls of Lincoln, Edmund (d.1256) and Henry (active from 1270 though not officially of age) did not press any claim to Chester, and their relations with Edward were warm. Others, while clearly unhappy with the situation did not allow it to compromise their loyalty. John de Verdon continually pressed his claims to judicial rights in Ireland, achieving an Inquest ad Quod Dampnum in 1267, but, perhaps because of the potential financial loss, never achieved success. However, he was prominent in the campaigns of the pacification, and accompanied Edward on the crusade <sup>2</sup>. He and his brother-in-law, Geoffrey

1) remembering Henry's reservation of rights.

2) Studd 940: C145/14/17: C47/10/14/1: CDI, p.130: Otway-Ruthven, PRIA 66/C (1967), p.417, but cf. Otway-Ruthven, IHS V (1946-7), p.4.

de Geneville were among the sufferers from Edward's transaction with John de Monmouth, but again do not appear to have been resentful. Verdon, curiously, also lost by the decision to assign his son's inheritance in wardship to Edward <sup>1</sup>.

In some cases, political difficulties led Edward to reverse his father's policy and surrender lands and rights in return for support. Hence, his grant of Desmond to John FitzThomas in 1259, and a whole series of grants in 1263, including Ulster, Tickhill, and Stamford and Grantham. We cannot know whether the life-grant of Oleron to Guy de Lusignan was more than a gesture of defiance, or whether Edward hoped for some concrete advantage from it. Roger de Mortimer's custody of Builth, until its conquest by Llywelyn, cannot have been coincidental to his Braose wife's interest in the castle, but it is not known whether Mortimer succeeded in forcing the appointment on Edward in May 1260 (above), or whether Edward himself transferred the castle earlier in the hope of gaining his support. Edward's particular bitterness at the castle's fall to the Welsh, and Mortimer's rôle in this disaster, suggest the former.

In other cases resentment at the losses which Edward's endowment had endorsed, was a principal factor not just in dealings with Edward, but in alignments during the civil war. The issue of Bristol embittered Edward's relations with Earls Richard and Gilbert of Gloucester over a decade. It was not the only reason for their disagreements, but the grievance surfaced in times of stress <sup>2</sup>, and rendered accommodation more difficult. In the case of the earl of Derby, the loss of the Peveril inheritance appears to have been the mainspring to his activities over 1263-6. That it was not merely Edward's possession of the Peak that

1) See Chapters 3.i, 4.ii.

2) e.g. 1259-60, 1263-5, 1267-8, Chapter 2.iv.

incensed him, may be seen from his 1264 campaign, which also singled out the castle of Bolsover, formerly part of the Honour of Peveril and retained in royal custody <sup>1</sup>. It is ironic that Ferrer's attempt to recover family lands led to the loss of the major part of his remaining estates, setting up a grievance which endured for the next generation.

In considering how Edward managed his great appanage, it is not always possible to distinguish between policies initiated by Edward personally, or by his advisers and administration. Admittedly, the same can be said of the great legal reforms which characterised his reign. Nor can it always be seen when policies merely followed those of Henry III and his administrators. Thus, in Wales a policy of expansion, consolidation, and fortification had been initiated before the lands were transferred to Edward. It is not entirely clear whether the immediate grievances which provoked the Welsh rising were a continuation of royal policy or a new departure. Perhaps one should look at Edward's Welsh policy rather as an abrupt acceleration, but along a path which had already been laid down.

In Gascony it is clear that Edward and his advisers were pursuing a policy which was not only original, but opposed to that of his father. Edward's relations with the city of Bordeaux early diverged from Henry III's attempts to promote reconciliation and a balance of power between the families of Soler and Colomb. Instead, Edward's policy was to exalt one party over the other, with the intention that this should lead to an expansion of his own personal power over the city. This plan was fulfilled in 1261 when the Solers delivered to him control over the appointment of the mayor. This policy, putting the coveted office outside the control or abuse by the two factions, may even have improved

1) A.Ces. pp.88-9.

the stability of the community. It is significant that as early as 1256, Edward could pursue an independent policy in Gascony, especially one diametrically opposed to his father's views<sup>1</sup>. It is therefore not inconceivable that his policies in Wales, undertaken the same year, may also represent an independent initiative.

Edward's other Gascon policies were those of consolidation, an expansion of his personal possessions, and extension of his feudal control of other landholders. He founded a number of bastides, although not quite on the scale of his neighbour, Alphonse of Poitiers, Count of Toulouse<sup>2</sup>. These included Montségur<sup>3</sup>, Pembo<sup>4</sup>, Puyguillem<sup>5</sup>, Beaumont du Périgord<sup>6</sup>. Libourne and La Linde were founded by the seneschals of those names, and Edward gave privileges to these and other new towns. The fact that some of the land for these bastides was given rather than purchased suggests a degree of popular support for the policy. Where possible, Edward bought or offered exchanges for individual castles, especially those of strategic significance<sup>7</sup>, such as Castle Sarrasin<sup>8</sup>, Sault des Navailles<sup>9</sup>, Mauléon<sup>10</sup>, Meilhan<sup>11</sup>, Roquépine<sup>12</sup>, half of Blanquefort<sup>13</sup>, rights over Pellegrue<sup>14</sup>. Henry III's approval for this policy can be seen in the fact that he supplied

1) Trabut-Cussac, RHB (1952), pp.185-199.

2) Higounet, Paysages et Villages Neufs du Moyen Age, pp.388-9.

3) founded c.1261-3.

4) built on land given for the purpose by the abbey of Pembo in 1268.

5) Edward was given the castle and enough land to found a bastide.

6) 1272, RecFeod, 397,472: Catalogue des Chartes de Franchises de la France II, 1425-7; AHG V pp.8-44.

7) T-C admin, pp.xx-xxi.

8) 1255.

9) 1261, this was sold back to the previous owner to hold from Edward in 1262, Livre des Hommages, 1,504.

10) 1261, compulsory exchange, T-C admin, p.24: RecFeod. 394.

11) 1261, Cuttino GR A 95,113, part of Estissac (c.1268, RG II 1750).

12) 1270, Livre des Hommages 509.

13) 1270, Cuttino GR A 67: CChR 1257-1300, p.79: RecFeod. 365. Edward had already seized the other half, RecFeod. 265.

14) 1270, Livre des Hommages, 510-512.

the money for the purchase of Sault des Navailles. Other castles were occupied in Edward's name, much as Henry III had done in 1253-4, for example, Lourdes, Gensac, Fronsac, Miramont, Pellegrue<sup>1</sup>. In many cases this was intended to ensure rights of suzerainty over allodially-claimed castles, hence the willingness to return them to the original holder, once Edward's rights were acknowledged<sup>2</sup>.

The Gascon administration experienced a certain amount of reform and reorganisation during this period. There were alterations in the exchequer structure, and a recoinage was carried out in 1261<sup>3</sup>. Various towns also received new or amended charters of liberties<sup>4</sup>. In at least two of these cases (Bergerac and Bordeaux), the rights of the commune to elect a mayor, or mayoral powers, were seriously curtailed in Edward's favour. Considered with the acknowledgements of fealty and the various enquiries into usurpations of rights, it is clear that Edward was consolidating his feudal powers over his vassals, and his physical control over the duchy.

In Ireland the continuing and increasing resistance of the native Irish to the colonists put significant pressures and constraints on the development of any structured policy in Ireland. Edward's response to the military problem was one which accepted his absentee status. Although he could and did send loyal and competent men over to Ireland to administer the territory, he recognised that the size and nature of the country made delegation very necessary, and that he could only

1) 1260: until 1262: until 1277: T-C admin, p.212: 1272.

2) This was the policy which Edward apparently disregarded at Belin.

3) T-C admin, pp.14,24-5,287.

4) e.g. Issigeac, RG I ii 4447, April 1258: RecFeod.481: La Réole, AHG II 251; Catalogue des Chartes de Franchises, 1634-5: Bordeaux, Livre des Coutumes 496; RecFeod 449: Blaye, Catalogue... de Franchises, 451: AHG XII pp.1-3: Bémont, Revue Historique, CXXII (1916), p.12: Bergerac, CChR 1226-57, p.447; C61/2 m.11; Studd 148: Bourg, T-C admin, p.24; Catalogue des Franchises 604.

maintain his hold on Ireland with the active co-operation of the local magnates, an asset which he had not enjoyed in Wales. Seen in this light, the generous grants to John FitzThomas in Munster and the return of Ulster to the Burgh family were highly practical, although it may have been the immediate political advantages which actuated Edward.

The chance that brought these grants back into Edward's hands for long minorities, by the deaths of the holders and cadets of both lines, in battle or as a result of the rigours of campaign, rendered this policy void <sup>1</sup>. Several other Anglo-Irish nobles fell in the Irish wars, making the task of governing Ireland still more difficult <sup>2</sup>. Like the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem, the Anglo-Irish lordship began to suffer from a shortage of knights and leaders during this period. Edward's response can be seen in the encouragement he gave men like Thomas de Clare and Otto de Grandson to seek their fortunes in Ireland, and strengthen the resources of the lordship to resist the Gaelic revival.

In England Edward's domains were scattered and subordinated to the royal administration. The same theme of jealousy over rights and encroachment may be detected, but little underlying principle of government. These estates were principally treated as financial resources, for leasing, farming or security for loans. However, it was on his English estates that Edward felt most closely the implications and consequences of the reformist policies. These were the lands with whose loss he was faced in 1264-5, and there and on the Welsh March his campaigns were fought. There too he had most opportunity to learn the details of governing his future realm. Many of his policies, as well as the men to implement them, were acquired in the years of apprenticeship.

1) Annals of Inisfallen, pp.362-3: Annals of the Four Masters, pp.405-415: Annals of Connacht, pp.135-7,154-9.

2) e.g. Nicholas and John junior de Verdon in 1271.

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE HOUSEHOLD, 1239-54, A PRELIMINARY STUDY

During the years in which Edward lived principally at Windsor, he formed part of the household maintained for the royal children and their companions. This household can be seen as an extension of the queen's, since finance and personnel were largely provided by or channelled through her. Besides its function as the royal nursery, Windsor was also a frequent residence for the court and a state prison (holding Gruffydd ap Llywelyn at this time). As the king's family grew, the nursery establishment was enlarged, including various young nobles, either wards of the crown, or sons of ambitious parents hoping for future advancement from childhood associations with the heir to the throne. Young relations of the royal family were also accommodated there on a permanent or temporary basis.

At Windsor, each of the royal children had separate, but overlapping establishments. Thus, each was in the charge of an individual guardian (initially, Hugh Giffard and Master Walter de Dya for Edward), but other attendants were shared, or at least freely-transferred between the children, or elsewhere, according to need. For example, Edward's nurse, Alice de Luton, also acted as midwife for the queen, and other members of the family, such as the Countess of Leicester, when required. His physician, Master Thomas, attended the other children at Windsor<sup>1</sup>, and his chaplain, Simon de Burnham, transferred to his sister Margaret's service. Bartholomew Pech was moved from Margaret's household to care for Edward on the death of his former tutor, Hugh Giffard. This flexibility of employment was ideally suited to an establishment made up of a varying number of inmates of different ages and needs, but handicaps identification of servants specially

1) E101/349/10.

assigned to Edward. In spite of this community of service, scattered references during the 1240's suggest that Edward's individual household was quite elaborate, including a chaplain (Simon de Burnham), doctor (Master Thomas), groom of the chamber (Walter de Kanun), a serjeant of the pantry/buttery (Robert de Aubervill).

Over 1249-53 a larger nucleus of identifiable knights, yeomen, clerks and other servants, specifically attached to Edward, may be observed<sup>1</sup>. In addition, other categories of household officer appear for the first time, perhaps newly-recruited, such as two falconers (Walter, and Henry de Moles), a keeper of hounds (Ralph), a marshal (Giles de Wodeham), several yeomen (Nicholas de Yatingden, Alexander Reyner, John Russell), a tailor ("R"), and laundress (Allole). He also shared the king's falconer, Ralph de Erlham and the royal mews at Geytinton. These introductions reflect the more active and public nature of Edward's life, and the sporting interests in which he was able to indulge, e.g. hunting at Windsor, Woodstock and Havering<sup>2</sup>. Previously, he had been principally resident at Windsor, with occasional visits to Westminster for the celebrations on the feast of St. Edward, and special expeditions, such as in 1246 to the South coast, and to the new abbey of Beaulieu<sup>3</sup>. The building of a chamber for him at Guildford in 1246 and at other royal residences over 1250-52, indicates that a wider range of travel was envisaged<sup>4</sup>. The number and range of his attendants widened in consequence of his more active life-style.

In late 1251 the arrangements made for the marriage of the king's daughter, Margaret, to the young king, Alexander of Scotland, at York

1) e.g. his cook, William; sauser, Ralph; almoner; buyer, Colin; clerk, John de London.

2) CLR 45-51, pp.168,219: CR 51-3, p.416.

3) Paris, CM IV, p.553: AM II, p.337: CLR 45-51, p.65,?84.

4) CLR 45-51, pp.17,245,251,321,363,372, 51-60, pp.3,23,61,83,92-3,95,119: CR 47-51, pp.435,476,482.

exemplify Edward's partial emancipation. Separate arrangements were made by his servants for his rooms and provisions in York. His lodgings were to be as close to his father as possible. Extra hangings for his chapel were sent to York, and the king carefully planned his son's clothes for this lavish and ceremonial occasion. Edward was to be issued with 5 robes, and his two knights with two robes. Four tabards of cloth of gold with the royal arms on the front were ordered for Edward, his guardian, Bartholomew Pech, and for Nicholas de Molis and Ebulo de Montibus, the knights equipped above. These men formed Edward's official suite for the occasion <sup>1</sup>. On Molis' despatch to Gascony, his place in the household was probably taken by his connection, Stephen Bauzan, in 1252.

The backgrounds of the members of Edward's early household were diverse. Edward's tutor, Hugh Giffard, was cousin to the Giffard barons of Brimpsfield, and had previously served the royal administration as constable of the Tower. His successor, Bartholomew Pech, had been employed on diplomatic missions and was a former sheriff of Somerset and Dorset. Of the clerical co-guardians, Dya was a Savoyard, le Brun perhaps Poitevin, trained under Peter des Rivaux, and Wakering an English clerk from the royal administration. Of the knights, Molis and Stephen Bauzan were Anglo-Norman, with distinguished records of service in Wales and Gascony. Ebulo de Montibus, in contrast, was part of the Savoyard group. He had arrived in England in the 1240's and rapidly gained royal favour <sup>2</sup>.

Space precludes detailed analysis of the lesser members of the household, but of the valletti, Reyner was approaching the end of his career, and may have been introduced into the household by Giffard <sup>3</sup>.

1) CR 51-3, pp.12,14,18,181.

2) CPR 47-58, pp.43,63: E101/308/1.

3) CLR 1240-45, p.191: CR 1253-4, p.312.

Yatingden and Russell were younger, belonging to the landed gentry, and in training for knighthood. Yatingden's brother had entered the queen's household by 1254, so the family may have been favoured by her. Gilbert de Erlham was a member of a family long-established in royal service as falconers. Others were probably of English origin, such as Alice de Luton, John de London, and Giles de Wodeham. Alice de Luton, Bauzan and Pech had held other positions in the royal children's households, while Giffard, Molis, Brun had been seconded from the royal administration. Apart from the officers of the estate administration, only Dya and Montibus represented the Savoyard faction. The household composition was fairly diverse, with a bias towards curialists and administrators, rather than to those of higher rank.

Control and disposal of the lands and revenues assigned to Edward was in the hands of the queen and her Savoyard kin. A succession of Savoyards, Bernard de Savoy, Peter de Geneva, Stephen de Feugeres administered them under the supervision of the queen's uncle, Peter of Savoy<sup>1</sup>. Although over 1252-4 other royal administrators such as William Aguillon, Henry de Bath, and to a lesser extent, Pech and Montibus, were involved in the running of the estates, overall Edward's household were not required to act in the estate administration. By the end of 1253, only Pech, Bauzan, and Montibus to a lesser degree, possessed any such experience. The alterations in Edward's circumstances in 1254 thus required a radical change and expansion of his household to cater for his new responsibilities and opportunities.

Before Edward's departure for Gascony, his own chancery had been set up and was issuing and enrolling his letters<sup>2</sup>. His exchequer and administrative headquarters had been based at Bristol, and a chief

1) Chapter 1.i.

2) beginning at Mortlake, May 10 1254, C61/1.

steward and various constables and bailiffs appointed to administer his new lands and castles. The beginnings of this expansion can be seen in the process of the transfer of Edward's new territories in March 1254. In Ireland this was very much a transaction on paper only. In England and Wales the actions of Pech and Bauzan, were supplemented by two new recruits to his staff from the service of the king's other children, Ralph de Dongon and Geoffrey de Langley, and by William de St.Omer, then sheriff of Hereford and conveniently placed to receive seisin of Edward's Gwent properties. Langley, a former justice of the forests, recently returned from the service of the king's daughter in Scotland, was appointed chief steward over all the English and Welsh lands (excluding Chester and the Perfeddwlad) in May. As his work in March indicates, he had already entered Edward's household and was probably responsible for the creation of the new administrative organisation <sup>1</sup>. Similarly, Dongon probably set up Edward's wardrobe, and perhaps also the chancery <sup>2</sup>. By May the initial arrangements were complete, and appointments made then reveal the extent and trends of recruitment.

In Ireland, North Wales and Chester, the existing officers were left in position, answering now to Edward rather than to his father. Gascony and the Channel Islands remained under his father's control until after Edward's own arrival. Elsewhere, new appointments were made. Of the new officers, Gilbert Talbot (Montgomery and the Three Castles) was a local landowner, experienced in local administrative and judicial duties. He may have been related to Simon Talbot, one of the receivers at the new Bristol exchequer. William de Wilton (Ferrers wardship) was a man of considerable administrative experience. At the time of his

1) Paris' account of Langley telescopes events to imply incorrectly that he entered Edward's service in 1252, CM V, p.340.

2) below, 8.iii.

recruitment into Edward's service, he was a royal justice and keeper of the vacant see of Lincoln. He was a connection of the royal family through his wife Roesia, the widow of Henry's illegitimate half-brother, Richard. He may have been involved in the administration of the Eu estates prior to their formal transfer to Edward.

Ivo de Elinton was certainly recruited from the Eu administration, although transferred from Tickhill to the Peak. Given the Savoyard control of those lands in the early 1250's, he had evident Savoyard connections, although his origins are obscure. Imbert de Montferrand (Montgomery) was a Savoyard, but particularly well-qualified for service on the March by his previous position as steward to the Savoyard Bishop of Hereford, Peter de Aigueblanches. Nicholas de Marnham (Tickhill, Stamford and Grantham) has so far defied identification, that it is not clear how he entered Edward's service, although he may have had local connections in Lincolnshire.

This reconstruction of appointments is of necessity very sketchy, covering only the appointments recorded by Edward's chancery in May 1254. Appointments to several castles are not known<sup>1</sup>. At a lower level it seems probable that many less-important bailiffs were undisturbed, especially in the Norman escheats, and this may give a misleading impression that Edward promoted Savoyard employment on his estates.

In fact, the appointments were much more balanced. Local knowledge and administrative background were the criteria used for selection. Savoyard participation occurred by the transfer or continuation in office of existing officers or as a result of special qualifications, as in Montferrand's case. Langley was a favourite with the queen, but he

1) e.g. to Cardigan and Carmarthen, unless Bauzan retained custody and installed a deputy until his return from Gascony.

had trained under Peter des Rivaux and was an experienced administrator. Significantly, while the existing household staff were used to take initial possession, when it came to the permanent appointments they made almost no appearance. This may have been in recognition of their lack of experience or local knowledge, or because they were already preparing to accompany Edward to Gascony. The new administration, which Edward left largely established in England and Wales, was staffed by the existing officers or by recruits from the royal administration. This trend was to persist for some years.

Edward sailed for Gascony in June 1254, with his mother and Savoyard great-uncles <sup>1</sup>. An examination of the protections then issued shows that a majority of the previously identified members of his household accompanied them e.g. Stephen Bauzan and Ebulo de Montibus (knights), John de London (clerk), Alice de Luton (nurse), Bartholomew Pech (tutor), John FitzPhilip, Ralph (sauser), William (cook), Giles de Wodeham (marshal), Nicholas de Yatingden (vallettus) <sup>2</sup>.

Also travelling with Edward was Richard de Kilkenny, probably a kinsman of the chancellor, William de Kilkenny, soon to be Bishop of Ely. Richard was one of those selected to be knighted with Edward in Spain. At least six of those who were to be knighted at Burgos crossed to Gascony with Edward. Nicholas de Yatingden was already in Edward's service, and the brothers, Amaury and Herbert Pech, were the sons of his tutor. Of the other candidates, John FitzBernard was a vallettus of the royal household and marshal of goshawks. Matthew Bezill, of Burgundian origin but now an established land-holder in England, was a senior member of the queen's household, promoted to be her steward c.1254.

1)AM III, p.106: GC II, p.204

2) CPR 47-58, pp.374-6.

William de Frethorn was in the queen's household in 1252, and presumably crossed from England, although no protection was issued for him. Amaury de St.Peter was probably a connection of the Cheshire knight, Urian de St.Peter, who also travelled to Gascony with Edward. William de Alneto later served Edward in Ireland but little is known of his background. Peter de Cisteus and Robert de Munbrus, granted a fee from the king in 1254, were probably Gascons<sup>1</sup>. Of these, only 4 remained in Edward's service after they were knighted<sup>2</sup>.

The list of protections was evidently not exhaustive. Other members of the original household continued in Edward's service in Gascony, such as Ralph de Dongon. Edward's sporting establishment remained in England, and other servants left his service at this time<sup>3</sup>. Perhaps 12 of Edward's former household crossed to Gascony with him. Others on the expedition had probably already been recruited into Edward's expanding household<sup>4</sup>.

A further 11 of the passengers on the queen's ships are known to have been in association with Edward at a later date but this is scarcely surprising. When the much longer list of protections for those who had crossed to Gascony in 1253 with the king is examined, over 50 of the men listed there later entered Edward's service<sup>5</sup>. More significantly, a certain 9 and possibly 3 more of those who had come to Gascony with the king then entered Edward's service<sup>6</sup>.

Recruits were also made into Edward's household from natives of

1) CR 53-4, pp.269,271-3,275,277: CPR 47-58, p.352.

2) John FitzBernard, William de Frethorn, Herbert Pech, Nicholas de Yatingden.

3) e.g. Alexander Reyner, John Russell.

4) e.g. Walter de Langley, Geoffrey's son, and William de la Launde, both in Edward's pay in Gascony in 1255. John Hardel, later clerk of Edward's marshalsea, is another possible entrant at this time.

5) CPR 47-58, pp.231-2,235.

6) Richard Bauzan, Richard de la Bere, John de Beseville, Peter Branche, William de Cheny, John de Courtenay, Ebulo de Geneva, Stephen de Salines: Geoffrey de Childwick, Geoffrey de Gacelin, Geoffrey de Geneville.

Gascony. One who formed a lasting connection with Edward was William de Montrevel junior, who accompanied Edward to Spain<sup>1</sup>. Trabut-Cussac believed that Edward took a largely Gascon suite with him to Spain, but, apart from Montrevel, little corroborative evidence has been found. Others who accompanied Edward, besides the candidates for knighthood, were his Lusignan uncles, the earls of Gloucester and Warenne, the Scots noble, Alan le Usser, John de Burgh, Richard de la Bere, Fulk de Mastac and the Poitevin, Maurice de Rocheford<sup>2</sup>.

Edward brought with him to Gascony most of his existing household, and his enhanced position and new military and administrative responsibilities led to a great expansion, drawn principally from those who had crossed to Gascony with the king and queen. The expedition to Gascony naturally called on the men who by birth and estate were qualified to associate with Edward. Those who chose to serve in person may reasonably be described as loyal, adventurous and ambitious, and perhaps younger than average. It is not surprising that in the future these qualities would recommend many of them to the service of the heir to the throne.

Over 1254-5 Edward's household continued to expand, with recruits deriving from his new administrative officers and tenants and their connections<sup>3</sup>, or from those of curialist background, such as Drew de Barentin and William de Cheny. Cheny may have introduced one of his tenants into Edward's service, who became one of his most favoured knights, Warin de Bassingbourn. Richard Bauzan was brother to Edward's knight, Stephen. The expansion of Edward's household was an opportunity

1) CR 53-4, p.277.

2) CR 53-4, pp.268,276-7: T-C admin, p.7: Blaauw, Sussex Archaeological Collections II (1849), p.26 (Chronicle of Lewes priory).

3) e.g. Geoffrey de Geneville, an Irish baron by marriage, Walter de Vernon, a Cheshire tenant: La Zuche, and the Beaumes brothers: Grey and Adam de Jesmond.

for many others to further the careers of their connections and proteges. The chancellor of the exchequer, Roger de la Leye, evidently introduced his kinsman, Nicholas, into Edward's chancery. Geoffrey de Childwick was a connection of the curialist, John Mansel. Henry of Knaresborough was perhaps sponsored by Richard of Cornwall, lord of Knaresborough. Several Savoyards, or their associates, joined the household at this time <sup>1</sup>, as did several of the Poitevin alignment <sup>2</sup>.

The household was thus a mixture of different elements, weighted heavily towards those introduced into Gascony and the local administration by Henry III. This was largely unavoidable; while Edward was based in Gascony his recruiting opportunities were limited, although the occasional person came out from England to join him after autumn 1254. Also, if Edward required recruits with any useful experience, administrative or military, especially in Gascony, they were almost certain to have gained it in royal service. Hence, the composition of his entourage was inevitably biased towards former royal servants. There was an element of policy here also. Edward was still young and inexperienced, and his father had taken great interest in the composition of his household and advisers, as in all aspects of Edward's life at this time. Not until some time after Edward's return from Gascony did he have the opportunity or perhaps the inclination to alter the arrangements of those early years.

1) e.g. Stephen and William de Salines, Ebulo de Geneva, and William de Pemes from Franche-Comté. Geneville, from Champagne, had an obscure genealogical connection with Savoy, advancing his career in England.

2) Hugh de Vivonia, Segur de Castelnaud, Maurice and Guy de Rocheford.

CHAPTER EIGHT: HOUSEHOLD OFFICES AND DEPARTMENTS

i) **Size and Structure of the Household**

The size of Edward's household must remain largely a matter for conjecture. We may be certain that it was subject to considerable fluctuations. Edward's place of residence, whether in England or Gascony, at court or away from court, would affect the size and composition of his establishment. External circumstances such as peace or war dictated the size of the military element of the household, and any expansion of the familia necessitated a corresponding enlargement of the domestic establishment<sup>1</sup>. Edward's recreations, tourneying, hunting and hawking, required support staff. An interest in the management and full exploitation of his estates would be reflected in the size of his estate administration and in his exchequer and chancery. Any involvement in politics could have similar repercussions, both in the size and composition of the household. Conversely, a lack of interest in any or some of these concerns could lead to a scaling-down or redeployment of personnel. Edward's increasing maturity and independence may have led to an expansion of his household, as well as to an alteration in composition as he built up his own network of friends and supporters.

Financial constraints may reasonably be considered to have affected the size of the household. The scale of Edward's household expenditure is impossible to calculate. The most useful pointer is John le Breton's wardrobe expenditure of £1,972/19/1 over 18 months (£1,315/6/8 p.a.), although this was a period of financial difficulties, of which 6 months was spent overseas (3 months in Edward's own domains and 3 months on

1) For a discussion of the size of the royal household and definitions of domus and familia see Given-Wilson, The Royal Household and the King's Affinity, pp.1-9,22,28.

visits) <sup>1</sup>. This may be compared with the royal household annual expenses at the same period of £7,500 <sup>2</sup>. The earl of Lincoln, Henry de Lacy, in 1304-5 spent £1,823 on domestic expenses out of his total wardrobe expenditure of £2,641 <sup>3</sup>. Thomas of Lancaster, who is thought to have maintained an enormous and lavish household, on an income only slightly higher than that promised Edward, spent between £3-5,000 p.a. on domestic expenses from a total household budget of over £7,000 <sup>4</sup>.

From the 1255 and 1261 issues of robes, we may tentatively infer that Edward maintained perhaps forty knights, serjeants and valletti, and twenty other attendants, including clerks, in his immediate entourage <sup>5</sup>. Clerical estimates from other evidence are problematical. In 1260 three clerks were given protections when they accompanied Edward to the continental tournament circuit <sup>6</sup>. His keeper of the wardrobe, John le Breton, although not awarded a protection, must also have been with him for that expedition. Clerks did not feature often as witnesses, but on one occasion four attested simultaneously <sup>7</sup>. Clerks generally served in the wardrobe, chancery, and chapel. Edward's physician was almost certainly a university graduate, probably in clerical orders. Clerks were detached from Edward's service to operate the local exchequers, and some also served in administrative and diplomatic capacities. John le Breton was the only identified clerical constable.

Generally speaking, household members below a certain level were rewarded by a combination of allowances of food and drink, wages and

1) below, 8.iii.

2) Tout, Chapters, VI, pp.76-7. Given-Wilson, p.14, following Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, pp.196-7, puts this higher at c.£9,000, for total wardrobe expenditure.

3) Baldwin, EHR 42 (1927), pp.188-9.

4) Baldwin, pp.190-199: JR Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster, pp.23-8.

5) below, 8.iii,v.

6) William de Windsor, Nicholas de la Leye and Robert Burnell, CPR 58-66, p.181.

7) CPR 66-72, p.733.

robes. Senior staff received daily allowances, robes and a yearly salary or fee, often commuted for an estate or benefice of a certain value. The concept of retention in the household is not entirely clear-cut. At its simplest, it was the means of attaching and rewarding Edward's servants of every kind, knights, domestics, clerks. Some of the recipients would only rarely be in Edward's company, for example if appointed to govern one of the overseas territories. Fees were also paid to important vassals, such as Gerard de Meseroles or Gaston de Bearn in Gascony, to ensure their loyalty and to supply assistance in times of need. The retention of Leyburn and his associates in 1263 reads more like an oath of loyalty than a normal retaining indenture:

"ke nos toz ensemble emes de more de la meigne mon syre Edeward fiuz le roy dengleterre e heir. E luy avoms fet homage por ben fet il nos a fait. E emes tenuz a le vant dit mon syre Edward a venir a soen maundement totes les ioures ke il nos maundra nos e tos nos amy e lui servir e aider a toz nos poers en totes ses besognes" <sup>1</sup>.

The retention of Henry de Burn <sup>2</sup> may have been more typical. Contractual associations of limited-term, such as were used for the crusade, may have been employed when the military household was expanded at other times <sup>3</sup>. Retention in the household will have served as a protection for the recipient. The rebel Londoners, Thomas FitzThomas and Michael Tovy, evidently hoped for advantages from Edward's adoption "tanquam hominem nostrum proprium" on their release from his custody <sup>4</sup>.

The separate and overlapping elements of the household; the chancery and wardrobe, domus and familia, the external officers and offices, and council, are discussed below.

1) E36/274 f.233v; Larking, Archaeologia Cantiana V, p.176.

2) below, 8.vi.

3) Chapter 8.v.

4) Chapter 4.i. This policy may be compared with Henry II's retention in his household of the clerks who had been fined for their implication in the dispersal of the assets of the Archbishop of York in 1181, Jolliffe, Angevin Kingship, p.93.

ii) **The Chancery**

Although Edward's first known chancellor was Michael de Fiennes, to whom his seal was delivered in August 1255, he had possessed his own seal since at least May 1254. The keeper of the queen's wardrobe later claimed allowance for £17/4/10 expended "in reparacione ciphorum, garlandorum, zonarum et sigilli Edwardi filii regis" <sup>1</sup>. Edward used this seal until his marriage and knighting in Burgos in November 1254, when, perhaps because of its associations with his minority, it was replaced and the old matrix kept unused until July 1255. It was then sent to Ireland where it apparently coexisted with the royal seal, until that was recalled in 1256, and was used from then until 1277, by which time its legend must have been totally outdated <sup>2</sup>.

The seal which replaced it in November 1254 was used by Edward as his personal seal until 1272, and more probably until his return to England and coronation in 1274. Unlike the king, he probably did not possess a privy seal or signet, perhaps because his administration had not reached the state of elaboration and diversification to require them <sup>3</sup>. The surviving impressions of this seal are discussed by Dr. JR Studd <sup>4</sup>.

As in Ireland, Edward's Gascon administration used a version of Edward's seal, which was probably brought into use when Edward left Gascony in late 1255, for the validation of agreements between Edward's subjects, and official acts, reinforced with the personal seal of the

1) E372/97 m.9; E352/46 m.3, account for June 1253-May 1254. This may refer to the manufacture rather than repair of the matrix.

2) "sigillum nostrum ... quo antequam arma recepissemus militaria uti solebamus", C61/2 m.7; Studd 369; RG I ii 4501: CPR 1247-58, p.475, 72-81, p.203. No impressions of this seal survive.

3) but cf. Irish Cartularies of Llanthony Prima and Secunda 152.

4) JR Studd, The Antiquaries Journal, 58 (1978), pp.310-9.

justiciar <sup>1</sup>. In Chester the justices used their personal seals alone, though in one instance (from the reign of Edward I), with the legend including the office <sup>2</sup>. During Edward's absence on crusade, his lieutenants used a one-sided seal of absence, perhaps replacing this by a new great seal on Henry III's death <sup>3</sup>.

Michael de Fiennes was formally entrusted with the seal on 22 August 1255, though he may have joined the household on Edward's return from Spain, or earlier <sup>4</sup>. Dr. Ridgeway believed that Master William de Provence previously held the office, but he may better be regarded as a free-lance notary, employed by various Gascon nobles from the 1240's onwards, and occasionally by Edward <sup>5</sup>. Fiennes was uniquely qualified for Edward's service by his relationship both with Edward's mother and with his wife <sup>6</sup>, but in some respects he was a curious choice as chancellor. Although his family had long-standing ties and lands in England, and he had held a living and received robes from the king since 1245, his background and attitudes were continental. He retained his prebend at Therouanne throughout his service to Edward, and was ambitious for further preferment on the continent. He appears to have had no experience in the royal chancery or administration, in contrast

1) e.g. RecFeod 197: T-C, admin. p.389: P.Chaplais, Annales du Midi, 67, (1955), pp.19-20.

2) Studd, op.cit, pp.314-5.

3) E372/125 m.3: Studd op.cit. p.311.

4) C61/2 m.5; RG I ii 4535: Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers, p.347, dates the association to before Innocent IV's death in Dec. 1254.

5) Ridgeway, D.Phil, Oxford 1283, pp.39,42. His activities overlapped with Fiennes' tenure, making the contention that he was a precursor to Fiennes untenable. The documents with which he was connected are not characteristic of Edward's chancery, CPR 1247-58, pp.354,358: Studd 118; C61/2 m.12; RG I ii 4334: RecFeod 419,424-9,479: Cuttino GR A 196.

6) Cuttino, BIHR, 50 (1977), pp.229-232. A better account of the Fiennes' connection can be found in The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290, pp.41-43. The actual relationship with Eleanor of Provence is not clear, but appears to have been through the Count of Savoy, e.g. Régistres d'Innocent IV, III 7693: cf. E101/349/26 mm.1,2, Isabel de Fiennes, "cognate regine".

to the majority of Edward's clerical recruits.

As chancellor he served from 1255 until at least early 1258, but his name rarely appears in the surviving records of Edward's chancery. A study of those of Edward's letters, which appear both on his chancery roll and in transcripts elsewhere, indicates that the enrolled entries were heavily abbreviated, especially in the final clauses <sup>1</sup>. This practice explains why neither Fiennes nor any other chancellor is mentioned on Edward's last surviving chancery roll, the patent roll for 1259-60. Fiennes was still chancellor in January 1258 <sup>2</sup>, but this was the last reference to him by office, or in association with Edward for some years <sup>3</sup>. His links with the Savoyard faction would have protected him in the reform of Edward's household envisaged by the Provisions of Oxford. Dr. Ridgeway's view that Edward dismissed him about October 1258 has little evidential basis, and other events at this period <sup>4</sup> make clear that Edward would not have been in a position to make a change of that kind <sup>5</sup>. He probably left Edward's household in late 1259, as Edward's successive alliances with Gloucester and (more effectively) with Leicester gave him greater control over the composition of his household <sup>6</sup>.

Fiennes can next be found in his native Flanders in attendance on Henry III <sup>7</sup>. His presence there may have been part of the king's policy

1) e.g. Studd 608; C61/2 m.1, merely "datum ut supra", and the transcripts in Cuttino GR A 158 and E36/275 f.331d. which conclude "Datum apud Aquistris per manum domini Michaelis de Froules/Fioules cancellarii nostri": similarly, Studd 553; C61/2 m.2; RG I ii 4641 and Cuttino, GR A 235: E36/275 f.322.

2) E101/349/26 m.3.

3) Ches 38/47/1, misdated by Studd to 1259, *BIHR*, 51 (1978), pp.181-2, dated by Ridgeway, D.Phil. p.338, to 1256, does not extend his service.

4) e.g. appointments to offices and the revocation of the Oleron grant.

5) Ridgeway, D.Phil. pp.338-9, citing CR 1256-9, p.334.

6) cf. Studd, loc.cit.

7) early 1260, and perhaps November 1259 as Studd suggests: CPR 1258-66, pp.106,118; CR 1259-61, p.282:

of rebuilding his personal power by recruiting overseas knights to use against his opponents in England, among whom he now numbered his son. In this context, the despatch of the queen's lady, Isabel de Fiennes, to Flanders, ahead of the royal party, laden with gifts "pro militibus Flandrensis" is significant <sup>1</sup>. His alignment with the king's supporters against Edward is confirmed by his employment as a confidential messenger to Richard of Cornwall, probably relating to the measures being taken against Leicester and Edward.

One additional piece of evidence should be brought into the discussion here. Between 22 December 1259 and July 1261, Edward's wardrobe paid Fiennes £30/15/0 in arrears of his fee <sup>2</sup>. This sum must have been paid to Fiennes after he had aligned with the king against Edward. The fact that the fee had fallen in arrears might be taken to support the view that a breach with Edward had occurred, but it may signify no more than financial difficulties at Edward's exchequer. When Edward was pardoned by his father in May 1260, he was forced to agree to certain conditions, such as the replacement of several of his constables. Conceivably, he was also required to settle the debt owing to his former chancellor, or even to reinstate him, since we have no certain evidence of another chancellor until 1262. The favour shown by Edward and Eleanor of Castile to other members of the family in later years <sup>3</sup>, confirms that no lasting breach occurred.

Fiennes' successor as chancellor was probably Ralph de Dongon, who had been succeeded as keeper of the wardrobe by John le Breton in December 1259. It should be stressed that the evidence for him as

1) El01/349/26 mm.1,2: Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, pp.225,227-8.

2) RegTC, f.48; p.173, printed as M. de Senes; C62/52 m.4.

3) to Milo de Fiennes in 1265, and to Michael's protégé, Stephen de London from at least 1261, Appendix 2.

chancellor dates from 1262<sup>1</sup>. Alternatively, another prominent chancery clerk, Nicholas de la Leye, might have held the post between Fiennes and Dongon. He was the most senior of the clerks given protection for Edward's continental visit in 1260<sup>2</sup>, and he was also listed with le Breton<sup>3</sup> as among Edward's counsellors on the occasion of his arbitration between the chapter and citizens of Hereford<sup>4</sup>. His death in early 1262 fits in with the evidence of Dongon's tenure in 1262<sup>5</sup>.

In 1263 Dongon was seconded from the chancery, to represent English interests in the long-running Bergerac case and other cases from Gascony, which were appealed to the French parlement<sup>6</sup>. His place as chancellor was probably filled by Edward's most well-known clerk, Robert Burnell, who held the office for the rest of the period, except from the crusade until the coronation, when Antony Bek is the only identified chancellor<sup>7</sup>. Burnell then served as royal chancellor until his death in 1292. The earliest references to him as chancellor occur in 1266 and 1268<sup>8</sup>, but his prominence in Edward's administration prior to that date, and the custom of referring to him as Edward's clerk well after he had succeeded as chancellor, obscure the point at which he took office.

All these men were of very different calibre and background to Michael de Fiennes. Dongon had served in Edward's childhood administration at Windsor, and had been in charge of his wardrobe since

1) Studd 877; Foedera I ii, p.417; SC1/3/75: CPR 1272-81, pp.129-31; C66/99 m.33; Studd, BIHR, 51 (1978), p.182. His nomination as proctor in the Bergerac case in 1261 need not have interfered with his office, since Edward was also in France then CPR 1258-66, p.137; DD 321.

2) CPR 1258-60, p.126.

3) keeper of the wardrobe and subsequently steward.

4) c.1259-62, Hereford D&C Ch. 2932,2947; Ridgeway, D.Phil. p.449.

5) E368/36 m.12d.

6) CPR 1258-66, pp.294,297. Although he was described as a royal proctor, virtually all the diplomats used to represent Gascon affairs in Paris were from Edward's household, e.g. la Leye, Ipegrave, la Linde.

7) RecFeod 34.

8) CLR 1260-67, p.234; Select Pleas, Starrs ... Exchequer Jews, p.39.

1254. Leye had entered Edward's service in 1255, probably on the recommendation of his kinsman, Roger, chancellor of the royal exchequer. Of subsequent chancellors, Burnell was a long-standing member of Edward's clerical household, but with no experience elsewhere. Bek, a man of higher social standing, had started his career in royal service, being involved with the negotiations for the surrender of Kenilworth, before retiring to university to complete his education, only entering Edward's service in 1270<sup>1</sup>. Like Dongon, he served as keeper of the wardrobe before promotion to the chancellorship.

The scope of the chancellor's work is only dimly suggested by the records, varying with the aptitudes and prestige of each incumbent. Michael de Fiennes appeared only in connection with the issues of documents, as a witness, and as a surety<sup>2</sup>. With Dongon, the office apparently assumed a more independent profile, since he used the seal to carry out transactions at a distance from Edward. His prestige is implied by his rôle as a witness to an agreement involving Edward's Florentine merchant, Deutatus Guillelmi. His presence in the royal exchequer in February 1262, to receive debts being levied for Edward by the exchequer, described as "clerico Edwardi", may indicate that Burnell was not the first chancellor to be concerned with Edward's finances<sup>3</sup>. Under Burnell the office wielded wide-ranging power and influence, but this was due rather to his special relationship with Edward.

For the post-Evesham period he dominated Edward's administration and presided over the council, a position previously held by the steward of the estates<sup>4</sup>. Other activities ranged from collecting

1) CPR 1258-66, p.649: CM Fraser, *A History of Antony Bek*, pp.4-11.

2) Studd 415; C61/2 m.5; RG I ii 4538.

3) El59/36 m.5.

4) below, 8.vi.

revenues and incidental cash receipts<sup>1</sup>, advancing money on Edward's instructions<sup>2</sup>, to obtaining supplies for the household<sup>3</sup>, as well as more conventional duties. A rare reference to him as Edward's chancellor occurred when he witnessed the reluctant grant by Robert de Ferrers to Roger de Leyburn of the manor of Stanford in the Vale (Berks). Burnell's formal presence among the witnesses was probably intended to give greater authority to this dubious transaction<sup>4</sup>. As Edward's influence over the king and government increased, so did Burnell's involvement. In 1266 and 1269 he issued equipment and robes the royal serjeants at arms and to two Gascons who had been knighted by the king<sup>5</sup>. During Edward's absence on crusade, while he no longer held the office of chancellor, the incapacitation by death or illness of three out of five of Edward's designated lieutenants gave him a dominant position in Edward's administration, under the supervision of the Archbishop of York<sup>6</sup>.

The size of Edward's chancery is open only to speculation. Its operations were largely modelled on the royal chancery, although on a smaller scale<sup>7</sup>. Probably subordinated to the chancery, as in the royal household, was Edward's chapel, first established during his infancy<sup>8</sup>. During childhood, one of the four chaplains at Windsor was specially assigned to the care of Edward's spiritual welfare<sup>9</sup>. After his marriage Edward maintained several chaplains and clerks of the chapel at

1) Letter-book C, ff.142-3, p.230: CR 1268-72, p.129: CCR 1279-88, pp.223-4: E159/45 m.19.

2) E368/45 m.8d: E13/1f m.12d.

3) Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals 94: CLR 1260-67, p.195: E368/42 m.5d.

4) July 1269-August 1270, E13/2 m.6: CPR 1266-72, p.497: CR 1268-72, p.126.

5) CLR 1260-67, p.234, 67-72, p.78.

6) E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5: C47/3/21/44.

7) For a discussion of the chancery, based on close study of Edward's chancery rolls, see Dr. JR Studd, Ph.D: Introduction, Chapter 3.

8) CLR 1226-40, pp.456,478.

9) CLR 1226-40, p.435: CR 1242-7, p.102: E101/349/12.

one time. Stephen de London's service overlapped with that of Richard de Houton, Gilbert de Waltham, and Nicholas de Arras. Stephen de London was introduced into Edward's service in 1261 or earlier by Michael de Fiennes, with whom he was closely associated as chaplain and protégé<sup>1</sup>. London's service to Edward extended beyond the purely spiritual. He was one of the few contacts allowed Edward during his captivity, and was employed with Burnell and Bassingbourn in the secret negotiations for the surrender of Edward's Marcher castles in return for his release. He accompanied Edward on crusade, and was one of the casualties of the epidemic in Sicily<sup>2</sup>. The value Edward placed on London is indicated by two grants to him, and his presentation to two livings<sup>3</sup>.

Gilbert de Waltham<sup>4</sup> probably entered Edward's service in 1263. He may conceivably have been a protégé of the royal justice, Henry de la Mare. His work for Edward also embraced the political sphere, since after Edward's escape he was required to swear an oath of loyalty to the Montfortian regime<sup>5</sup>. Waltham also received debts due to Edward in the exchequer<sup>6</sup>, before retiring to the Bristol hospital of St. Mark, of which he soon became Master<sup>7</sup>. Edward's endowment of the hospital was probably to establish Gilbert, whom he later helped to found a new hospital, perhaps in the Lincoln area<sup>8</sup>.

1) RegTC, f.48, p.172. Space precludes a full account of the Fiennes/London connection, but Fiennes used London to hold his English livings, Paignton in 1260, Bobbington 1262-5, Bridgnorth, 1265, even visiting England to defend him in a law-suit, Register Walter Bronscombe, p.161,218: Abbr.Plac. pp.160-1: CPR 1258-66, pp.407,416, 66-72, p.40: KB26/26/181 m.6.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.414, 66-72, p.440,611: E101/350/5 m.3: E372/125 m.3.

3) Tables 2 and 3.

4) also known as Gilbert de Winterbourne, from his parish in Wiltshire.

5) C.St.Mark 262; Bod.MS.TopGlouc.c.9, f.161, not enrolled by chancery. Protection issued on the day of the arrest of his knight, Ippegrave.

6) E368/41 m.15d.

7) C.St.Mark xxxiii,xliii,99,141, 147,158,264.

8) Chapter 4.ii: C62/50 m.8. £20 delivered to Thomas de Bolton "ad opus Gilberti capellani nostri eidem Gilberto liberandas de dono nostro ad edificacionem novi hospitalis quod idem Gilbertus edificare inceperat".

Only one member of Edward's chaplaincy continued to serve him after his accession, the clerk of the chapel, Nicholas of Arras<sup>1</sup>. He was perhaps sponsored by Eleanor of Castile's mother, the Countess of Ponthieu, or by London's Flemish contacts. Edward may have employed an almoner to distribute his charitable gifts, as in 1253<sup>2</sup>, or assigned these duties to one of the chaplains<sup>3</sup>. There is no direct evidence for alms-giving by Edward, but, given his larger gifts to the church, the consistency of his alms-giving as king, and the gifts made by his young sons in the early 1270's, we may be certain that he conformed to this recognised obligation<sup>4</sup>.

In both the chancery and chaplaincy, the work of the officers has been shown to have been flexible, varying with Edward's needs and with the abilities of each incumbent. To some extent this versatility may be seen as a consequence of the less formal, less specialised nature of Edward's household, in comparison to that of the king's. But in the royal household too, we may perceive a similar tendency for personal favourites of the king to be employed on administrative or political matters outside their normal sphere of duties, for example, Henry's chaplain, John of Darlington. This type of cabinet government became one of the issues at the heart of the controversies between king and barons, explaining why composition of the household was an issue of such political moment. In Edward's household, an examination of the wardrobe demonstrates that there too the office of keeper assumed a wider scope, according to the capacity of the incumbent.

1) C47/3/21/44 m.2: C62/51 m.8: Byerly I 1682, II 283, 2174.

2) CLR 1251-60, p.155.

3) cf. Edward III's chaplain, who combined these rôles, Willard et al. I, The English Government at Work, p.218.

4) Table 2: Johnstone, Speculum, IV (1929), p.158, BJRL VII (1923), pp.383-420: E101/350/16 m.4: AJ Taylor, in Essays presented to Marc Fitch, pp.93-125: M Prestwich, in England in the Thirteenth Century, ed. WM Ormrod. pp.120-128.

### iii) The Wardrobe

The earliest references to Edward's wardrobe date from 1254. Arrangements prior to his visit to Gascony are not clear. During his childhood, his valuables, jewels, plate, and cloth of gold, were kept by the keeper of the king's wardrobe, and transferred to the queen's wardrobe when the king sailed for Gascony <sup>1</sup>. Edward's first known keeper of the wardrobe was Ralph de Dongon, the earliest reference to him in this capacity being August 1254 <sup>2</sup>. In the 1250's the term "custos garderober" was used interchangeably with "thesaurarius" <sup>3</sup>. There was also some blurring of the distinction between the keeper of the wardrobe and the buyer. For example, le Breton's final account referred to the time when he was "emptor et custos garderober" <sup>4</sup>. The discussion of the work of the keeper will make clear that the joint title more accurately described the activities of the so-called keeper.

The wardrobe operated as Edward's private purse. It received payments from Edward's estates, e.g. in 1254-5 from the Dublin exchequer <sup>5</sup>, and in 1256-7 directly from the English and Marcher lands as a result of directives from Edward <sup>6</sup>. A few small items of revenue were habitually paid into the wardrobe <sup>7</sup>. Windfalls, such as the loan from Aymer de Valence's hoard, and part of Edward's share of the London fine, also found their way there <sup>8</sup>, as did the farm of the town of Bedford in Easter 1270, although on other occasions this was paid to the chief steward or the receiver of the estates <sup>9</sup>. Revenues from some of the

1) by Chaceporc, 1243-51, E372/95 mm.8,8d, 97 m.9: CR 1242-7, p.310.

2) Studd 43; C61/1 m.3. See Table 5 for the succession of keepers. Spatial considerations preclude detailed discussion of their chronology.

3) e.g. Studd 555,573,801; C61/2 m.2, 4 m.2.

4) Reg TC, p.172, f.48.

5) Studd 43,387; C61/1 m.3, 2 m.6.

6) SC6/1094/11 mm.2,5d,7,8,8d,15d,16d: Studd 20,124; C61/1 m.4, 2 m.12.

7) e.g. CPR 1258-66, p.154.

8) CPR 1258-66, p.6: Letter-Book C, p.230, f.142v.

9) CCR 1279-88, pp.223-4.

manors seized from Montfortian supporters were also intended for the wardrobe <sup>1</sup>. Loans obtained for Edward were paid into the wardrobe <sup>2</sup>. Presumably, payments were made into the wardrobe from the exchequers of Bordeaux and Bristol, but no record survives of such transfers.

The wardrobe was also the place of storage for valuables, such as Edward's jewels and robes, and it held a quantity of ready cash for the immediate needs of Edward and his household. We may surmise that, like the royal wardrobe, it held small gold coins and jewels for offerings. Cheaper jewels, brooches and "gemel" rings were also available for gifts or payments of debts incurred by Edward. A fragment in the Public Record Office has been identified by Dr. HW Ridgeway as a roll of jewels issued by Edward in 1263. The legible sections refer to very small gifts of jewellery to messengers, to the captain of the ship in which Edward had sailed from Gascony, and to a Dover merchant. It also recorded the issue of a length of cloth of gold in which the bodies of three of Edward's knights, Hugh de Hersy, ?William la Zuche, and ? de Croys, killed in the Welsh campaign, were wrapped for their burial at Chester <sup>3</sup>. The roll does not identify the officer in charge of issues, but there can be little doubt that this was a wardrobe record.

In 1270-2 the wardrobe contained gold reserves of a rather different kind. Antony Bek's account showed a store of gold in the form of the old imperial Byzantine "bezants" and the novel Florentine gold "florins". The presence of these gold coins in Edward's wardrobe is easily explained by the preference in the Middle East for gold over silver as a more acceptable currency. A comparison may be made with Henry III's policy of amassing gold for his intended crusade. Curiously,

1) e.g. Just1/42 mm.13d,18.

2) Studd 178,314,730-1,802,839; C61/2 mm.7,10, 4 mm.1,2,5.

3) C47/3/43/7: Ridgeway, D.Phil. p.447.

Bek did not pay out any of these coins over the period of his account <sup>1</sup>.

The size of the wardrobe budget is difficult to establish. Ralph de Dongon received at least £3,522/2/8 over four years, 1254-57, i.e. £370 in 1254, £2,743/6/8 in 1255, £408/16/0 in 1256-7. Of these sums, the ratio between loan and revenue was almost 1:4 <sup>2</sup>. Ralph's total receipts were probably very much higher <sup>3</sup>. No figures survive for John le Breton's receipts from the estates during his keepership (December 1259-June 1261), but in 1260 alone he contracted loans of £1,272/13/4 <sup>4</sup>. From another source, one of the versions of the final account for his debts to the crown, rendered after his death, it appears that his total receipts in the wardrobe over those 18 months were £1,680/0/2. This would indicate that no more than £407/6/0 of his known receipts could have been derived from the estates <sup>5</sup>. On the existing figures the ratio between loan and revenue is 5:1. We may question the state of Edward's revenues, if his wardrobe was mainly operating on credit. This affords further confirmation of Edward's financial problems over 1261-2, and suggests they may be back-dated to 1260 or earlier. Le Bretons's expenditure as keeper was said to have been £1,972/19/1, from which one may posit an average annual expenditure of £1,315/6/8, a figure close

1) 755 besants, 11 deniers, 132 gold florins, E36/274 ff.224v-225: Spufford, 'Coinage and Currency', Cambridge Economic History, III, pp.585-601; DA Carpenter, 13th.C. England, ed. Coss & Lloyd, pp.62-70.

2) £343/6/8:£3178/16/0, a proportion for which the £2,400 received from Ireland in 1255 was largely responsible.

3) Table 1: SC6/1094/11: C61/1-3. Receipts for 1258 are excluded here, since only 500 marks of the 2,000 from Aymer de Valence's hoard were specifically paid into the wardrobe. As an advance, it is not clear whether it should be classified as loan or gift. The inclusion of the 500 marks as a loan, and recalculation over 5 years reduces the loan: revenue ratio to 1:4, CR 1256-9, p.343; CPR 1258-66, pp.6,39.

4) Table 1: 802,839; C61/4 mm.2,1, excluding the value of goods taken by him.

5) The figure could have been smaller still, since loans of imprecise date have not been included, Table 1, and he may have contracted other loans of which no evidence survives, e.g. over October 1260-June 1261, when the Patent Roll, is missing.

to the total of his known loans in 1260. The level of loans had evidently not been sufficient to cover expenditure <sup>1</sup>.

Later figures for wardrobe receipts are few, beyond the £100 of the London fine and the £160/12/5 which Lovershal received in the farm of the town of Bedford. The audit of Antony Bek's account as keeper is tantalisingly brief. It survives in a compilation of the treasury of receipt, with documents relating to loans contracted by Edward and members of his household in Acre. An undated order from Edward, using his pre-accessional style, to Otto de Grandson, Joseph de Cancy, the treasurer of the Hospitallers, Hugh FitzOtto and Luke de Tany, to audit Bek's account from 22 June last when, at Edward's request, he took up the office of keeper, is recited in the (French) report of the auditors to Edward. This lists only the total sums received, expended and remaining in the wardrobe. There is no further dating information, except that the account ran to the previous Saturday <sup>2</sup>.

From the composition of the auditors, including Tany, admiral of Edward's fleet <sup>3</sup>, FitzOtto, almost certainly his household steward <sup>4</sup>, and Cancy, based at the Hospital in Acre <sup>5</sup>, it is almost certain that the order was issued while Edward was in Acre <sup>6</sup>. Thus the "22 June last" could be either June 1270, or June 1271, or June 1272. Of these, June 1272 can almost certainly be ruled out, since Philip de Willoughby rendered an account as keeper in Acre up to the time that the fleet sailed for Sicily. It seems very unlikely that both he and Bek could have held office between late June and September 1272 for long enough to require the rendering of an account. Of the other two choices, June

1) RegTC, pp.35,172-4, ff.13d,48: E372/120 m.22: C62/52 m.4.

2) E36/274 f.234v-235.

3) Röhricht, AOL II, pp.407-9.

4) Table 5.

5) Delaville le Roulx, Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte, p.412.

6) i.e. May 1271-September 1272, Röhricht, AOL I, pp.622,627.

1270 raises the problem of an overlap with Laurence de Lovershal's time as keeper, although the reference to him in August 1270 described him as "clericus garderobe" rather than keeper, which might imply that he had been demoted to serve under Bek<sup>1</sup>. A more serious objection is that, if the account ran from June 1270 until after their arrival in Acre, the minimum length of the account would have been over 10 months. The scale of the sums involved, compared to those of Willoughby, and the size of the household at the time, appears inadequate for that period. Thus, the most plausible dating for Bek's tenure of office is 22 June 1271 to a date (perhaps several months) before June 1272.

Bek is said to have received £3,714/1/1 ob. and paid out £3,668/18/5<sup>2</sup>. As the length of the account is uncertain, and the circumstances in any case abnormal, no conclusions can be drawn as to the size of the budget and the scale of the household. The expenses were divided into £806/4/6 "de hostel" and £2,862/13/10 ob. of payments out of the wardrobe<sup>3</sup>. The circumstances of Edward's stay in Acre and on campaign render Bek's account of little use for comparative purposes.

Philip de Willoughby's wardrobe account for November 1272-October 1274 began with a debit of £11/15/0 from his previous account. His figures for just under two years were enormous, with receipts of £31,457, mostly obtained in loans from continental merchants, and outgoings of £32,808<sup>4</sup>. Edward's expenses were obviously very high, travelling abroad with a vastly expanded household and the remains of his crusading force, and then maintaining a campaign in Gascony against Gaston de Béarn. However, the figure is in sharp contrast with those

1) E372/125 m.3.

2) £3,968/18/5 in the text, but the breakdown of expenses adds up to £3,668.

3) a split of roughly 30%-70%, following the accounting convention of the royal wardrobe.

4) E372/121 m.22; E101/350/8: Tout, Chapters II, pp.4-5.

known or postulated for 1254-5 and 1260-61, suggesting the comparative modesty of Edward's establishment at those times.

Payments made from the wardrobe were diverse. Some of the retaining fees for members of the household were regularly paid by the wardrobe, e.g. the 20 livres bordeaux granted to Raymond de Bouliac in 1255<sup>1</sup>. The two fees assigned in 1254-5 on the chamber may be considered as assigned on the wardrobe<sup>2</sup>. In 1259 Ralph d'Aubigny's fee was paid from the wardrobe<sup>3</sup>. Le Breton paid arrears of fees to Ralph Basset and Michael de Fiennes, and wages to several knights and valletti<sup>4</sup>. He also made a series of payments to the constables and garrisons of Edward's Welsh and Cheshire castles, which appear to have been for wages rather than for munitions or fortifications.

The wardrobe was responsible for the regular supply of robes to members of the household, and for occasional individual issues as special gifts<sup>5</sup>. In 1255 John le Tailor was sent to Paris to buy cloth for the Pentecost issues of robes. He required cloth for 40 robes "tam militum quam servientium" and scindal for 60, and he spent 1,362 livres tournois (£340/10/0) on this trip "tam in pannis cindali quam aliis garderobe nostre necessariis"<sup>6</sup>. Edward arranged with the suppliers that they should be paid at a later date by his exchequer in England. This may indicate a cash shortage in the wardrobe, since the Irish treasure had not yet arrived. Tailor was sent back to Paris that August,

1) although this fee was soon replaced by a charge on the custom of Bordeaux, Studd 126; C61/2 m.12.

2) Studd 45,171; C61/1 m.3, 2 m.10. It seems unlikely that the chamber existed as a separate institution in Edward's household cf. Tout, Chapters I, pp.179,214.

3) Studd 731; C61/4 m.5.

4) John Ferre, Stephen de Montferrand, William de Wauton and Walter de Langley.

5) e.g. Studd 292; C61/3 m.2.

6) Studd 228-231; C61/2 m.9; RG I ii 4408, gives "quadringsentas" rather than "quadragintas": Studd 341; C61/2 m.7; RG I ii 4486.

perhaps to make final purchases from continental stocks before Edward left for England<sup>1</sup>. Ralph de Dongon also purchased cloth at a cost of 460 livres tournois (£115) shortly before the household left Gascony<sup>2</sup>. Known purchases of cloth for the wardrobe in 1255 amounted to £455, although the wardrobe only bore a small part of the cost.

The 1255 purchases can be compared with those made by John le Breton for the wardrobe. His executors claimed allowance for 24 robes "partitis de scindali" and matching gold-embroidered cointises purchased for Edward and his knights for Easter 1261, probably representing a purchase additional to the conventional twice-yearly issues<sup>3</sup>. These were not le Breton's only purchases. In 1260 and 1261 he bought cloth at all the great fairs, Stamford, Northampton, Winchester and St.Ives, filling six carts with his purchases. A later buyer of the wardrobe, Robert le Clerk, favoured Lincoln fair, when buying cloth for Edward in 1266 and 1268, perhaps for the Christmas issues of robes. Interestingly, rather than paying for his purchases out of wardrobe money, or buying on credit, he instructed the local bailiffs to pay his debts out of the farm of the town, which was not one of Edward's assets<sup>4</sup>.

The wardrobe supplied arms and horses to those knighted by Edward. Ralph de Dongon equipped two new knights at Easter 1255, and le Breton provided palfreys and saddles at a cost of £10 to Peter de Waldringham and William Turpyn. The quasi-wardrobe account for the period of Edward's absence, which discharged many earlier debts, claimed 10 marks for the issue of harness to a new knight, Hamo de ?Ducklingham and £6/8/0 for silks taken for the knighting of E. le Boner by Edward's

1) Studd 402; C61/2 m.6; RG I ii 4529.

2) Studd 555; C61/2 m.2.

3) see 8.v. for a discussion of the significance of this purchase.

4) £40/4/4 and £27/4/4, CLR 1260-67, p.195: E368/42 m.8d.

tailor, Adinettus<sup>1</sup>. Le Breton also supplied Edward's chaplain, Stephen de London, with new vestments for the chapel in 1261, which Ralph de Dongon had also re-equipped in 1254<sup>2</sup>.

The wardrobe was involved in the purchase of food supplies for the household, and ultimately responsible for the discharge of debts incurred for this purpose. Le Breton paid £37/17/8 for grain purveyed by a clerk of the marshalsea, £7 to the clerk of the kitchen, and additional sums for the carriage of wines to the panterer and the butler. Acting jointly with the estates steward, Roger de Leyburn, he bought large quantities of wine for the household at Boston fair, and in London and Bristol at a total cost of £432/10/2 in 1260<sup>3</sup>. The keeper was not solely responsible for purchasing. At least two officers were formally designated as "emptor garderobe". Robert le Clerk, buyer of the wardrobe, purchased cloth at the fairs in Lincolnshire in 1266-8. Hugh de Gamaund, another buyer, was sent overseas in October 1265 with two merchants, probably to purchase wine<sup>4</sup>. The timing of Gamaund's activity overlaps very closely with Robert le Clerk's, who acted before January 1266. It is probable that the two were simultaneously employed, but with a designated sphere of operation, wine and cloth.

Robert and Gamaund are the only instances (apart from the keeper, John le Breton) of specifically designated wardrobe buyers. In Gascony during Edward's first visit, purchases of cloth were mainly carried out by his tailor, John (above). He was never described as buyer but only as tailor, or, on one occasion, as "serviens et familiaris noster". However his actual duties approximate very closely to those carried out by later buyers. His successor as tailor, Adinettus de Bidik, had

1) EL01/350/5 m.4.

2) CR 1253-4, p.270.

3) 777,801,838; C61/4 mm.1,2,3.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.460: below, 8.iv.

entered Edward's service in the early 1260's, and continued as tailor/buyer, purchasing wax, harness, furs and cloth, until old-age forced his retirement in the 1290's <sup>1</sup>. Beneath the keeper and professional buyers existed a whole stratum of buyers for the domestic household, under the direction of the steward, but responsible to the wardrobe, which had to discharge the debts they incurred <sup>2</sup>.

Willoughby's surviving account as keeper was confirmed by the controller, Thomas de Gunneys. Since this account began in Sicily, on the return journey from Acre, it seems probable that Gunneys had been on the crusade and served in this capacity during Willoughby's earlier period of account, and perhaps for his immediate predecessors as keeper. He continued as controller until his death in 1283 <sup>3</sup>.

A brief survey of the backgrounds and achievements of the keepers reveals a remarkable diversity. Dongon was probably the most conventional, with long experience in the royal administration and coming to Edward directly from the queen's household. Le Breton rivalled him in experience, but of a different kind, as a sheriff and castellan on the Welsh march. Virtually nothing is known of Lovershal beyond his service to Edward as a clerk for some years before he was promoted to the keepership <sup>4</sup>. Antony Bek came from a more patrician background, better-born, better-educated, with experience in the royal administration before he joined Edward's household for the crusade. Willoughby may have been appointed as a stop-gap, for his only known experience had been as a collector of the Twentieth for Grimsby <sup>5</sup>.

Of those men tentatively identified as keepers, Ipegrave,

1) London Eyre of 1276 170: CPR 1258-66, p.514, 1292-1301, p.185: E372/119 m.22, 125 m.3: C62/51 m.12: Byerly I 1688,2312.

2) below, 8.iv.

3) Tout, Chapters II, pp.14-5, VI, p.28.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.645: Table 3: below, 8.vi.

5) E372/117 m.6. Tout, II, p.5, claiming his account began in 1269.

unusually, was a layman, knighted by 1260. He had been associated with Edward for a number of years, but his qualifications for the post are unclear, although he was involved in purchasing for the wardrobe in 1255<sup>1</sup>. He evidently possessed fiscal and administrative skills, since he was later responsible for levying a Jewish tallage in 1265, before serving as seneschal of Gascony and constable of the Tower<sup>2</sup>. Pivelesden had been a clerk of Edward for some years, and may have exchanged with le Breton in July 1261 the office of estate steward for wardrobe keeper. His tentative identification as keeper is based on his receipt of various revenues in 1262-3 to discharge Edward's debts in London. His London connections, through his marriage to Michael Tovy's niece, would have added to his efficacy as keeper<sup>3</sup>.

The subsequent careers of these men were also widely different. Ipegrave was high in Edward's administration when he died. Dongon, after promotion to the chancellorship, was seconded for diplomatic duties, and later reappeared as keeper of Eleanor of Castile's wardrobe<sup>4</sup>. Lovershal and Willoughby continued in the financial administration, the former at the Bordeaux exchequer<sup>5</sup> and Willoughby in England, ending up as chancellor of the exchequer<sup>6</sup>. Bek held the chancellorship briefly, and was a trusted member of the royal administration for many years before election to the see of Durham, where his altered loyalties led to a coolness between him and the king. Pivelesden's subsequent changes of fortune are described above<sup>7</sup>. Le Breton, after promotion to the estates stewardship, apparently fell out of favour, perhaps as a

1) CPR 1258-66, p.73: Studd 403; C61/2 m.6; RG I ii 4530.

2) CR 1264-8, p.62: CPR 1266-72, pp.215,248: Table 5.

3) Table 6: C62/52 m.4: Chapter 4.iii.

4) CLR 1267-72, p.119: CChR 1257-1300, p.204: Appendix 2, n.4.

5) T-C admin, p.373: E372/125 m.3: SCl/8/13: CPR 1272-81, p.102.

6) Tout II, p.7: CPR 1292-1301, p.615.

7) Chapter 4.i.c.

scapegoat for the administrative errors revealed in the 1262 audit. He became one of the royal justices and was elected bishop of Hereford in 1269, apparently in spite of Edward's hostility <sup>1</sup>.

The scope of wardrobe activity and the duties of the keeper were flexible. Ralph de Dongon's work fell into a traditional pattern of purchase and issues of robes, fees, arms etc. and the receipt of money for these expenses. From the scanty evidence Ippegrave's work seems to have been along similar lines. However, le Breton, the keeper of whom we know most, was much more than this. He was far more mobile, leaving Edward's side to travel all over the country on his lord's business. He visited all the principal fairs to make purchases for Edward, but he also carried out duties which indicate a wider interpretation of the keeper's work. He was one of Edward's counsellors <sup>2</sup>, was appointed to hold an inquiry into the grievances of the Cheshire men, and sent to Bristol to assess the tallage <sup>3</sup>. His previous administrative experience qualified him admirably for such work, and it would appear that the office of keeper expanded to suit the abilities of the holder.

A clear parallel can be drawn here with the very diverse and influential work carried out by Burnell as Edward's chancellor. The series of payments made by le Breton to the Welsh and Marcher constables may have been a consequence of his special experience on the March, or it may show the wardrobe stepping in to pay expenses and fees, which in happier days would have been covered by the local issues. The wardrobe was capable of expansion in special circumstances, as in the crusade, when it catered for the greatly-expanded household and the additional complications of residence and campaigning overseas. Its success may be inferred from the businesslike account rendered by Willoughby.

1) GC II, p.249: Appendix 2, n.2.

2) below, 8.vi.

3) Studd 821,844,852; C61/4 mm.1,ld,2.

iv) **The Domestic Household**

Joined with the keeper of the wardrobe in control of the household was the steward, as in the royal, subsidiary and some seigneurial households. Generally the keeper dealt with financial matters and the steward was responsible for discipline and personnel. This division was a flexible one, and the steward's work could cover a much wider range, as the varied activities of the stewards of the Black Prince in the 14th. Century show <sup>1</sup>. The office of household steward, "senescallus hospicie", must not be confused with that of the steward in charge of the administration of the estates, "senescallus terrarum". In Edward's household the risk of confusion is accentuated by the tendency to describe either steward merely as "senescallus domini", and by the still more frequent omission of any title when referring to these officials.

For this period there are no references to a "senescallus hospicie" in Edward's household. In one instance, a member of Edward's household used the title of steward, and he can definitely be distinguished from the estate administrator. William de Cheny, in a personal agreement with the dean and chapter of Rouen, for a lease running from 25 June 1257, was described as "militem senescallum tunc tempore domini Edwardi" <sup>2</sup>. William de Cheny's service to the crown dated back to the 1240's, and he had previously been joint household steward to Eleanor of Castile. He may have acted as steward from 1256 or 1257 to 1263, after which point he seems to have retired from active life <sup>3</sup>. Hugh FitzOtto may have held

1) Tout, Chapters, V, pp.317-8, VI, pp.40-1; Willard et al. The English Government at Work I, pp.219,229; Denholm-Young, Seignorial Administration in England, p.13.

2) E159/30 m.1d. One alternative explanation would be the accidental omission of "consortis", giving 'senescallum ... consortis domini E'.

3) CLR 1251-60, pp.243-4; CPR 1247-58, p.144; Studd 622,694,700,713, 866,892,957,1003,1009,1040; CChR 1257-1300, pp.7,24; C. Ormond Deeds I 123; BL Add.Ch.46918: C61/4 m.5; KB27/70 m.6d; Cartulaire des Iles Normandes, pp.166,205, 440; E101/349/26 m.3.

the office later in the 1260's, almost certainly by 1270. He confirmed the delivery of wine to a member of the household, and during the crusade audited the account of the keeper of the wardrobe <sup>1</sup>. On Edward's return to Europe, he remained co-steward until his death in 1283 <sup>2</sup>.

The organisation and personnel of Edward's domestic establishment are obscure. Infrequent use of surnames, and overlapping of offices and function, hamper analysis. We may expect it to have been departmentalised into various offices, probably on similar lines to the royal household. This view is confirmed by references to these places or officers, even when the individual cannot be identified. The domus then was divided into the kitchen, with its sub-divisions of scullery, sausery, larder, poultry, spicery, pantry and buttery, napery and laundry. Outside were the office of the stables or marshalsea, with responsibility for horses of the household and guests, and for carts and draught animals for transport, besides the mews and kennels, for Edward's hawks and hunting dogs, and their support staff <sup>3</sup>.

Within certain limits, the demarcation between the duties of the various officials was elastic. Specialist buyers existed, such as the inept one who was tricked out of his horse by two fishermen <sup>4</sup>, but many of the cooks, bakers etc. were responsible for the purchase of supplies as well as for their preparation. Salvagius, cook in 1260, went one step further, and went fishing to supply his lord <sup>5</sup>. This close relationship

1) "per visum domini Hugoni filii Ottonis", Studd 1013; E101/547/25: above, 8.iii.

2) The Addenda to Tout named Thomas de Clare as steward to Edward during his imprisonment in 1265, apparently from the chronicler's description of Thomas as Edward's "familiaris et cubicularius", Tout Chapters, VI, p.116: AM IV, p.162. This evidence is inadequate.

3) e.g. Byerly I 974-5: Tout, Chapters II p.159: Tout, Place of Edward II, pp.256-266: Wardrobe book of William de Norwell, pp.lv-lvii: Given-Wilson, op.cit. pp.56-63.

4) Abbr.Plac, p.157.

5) Studd 761; C61/4 m.4.

between food supply and preparation is also seen in the larder, where Hugh de Malvern combined the custody of the forest of Kingswood and the chase of Bristol with the positions of keeper of the larder and cook <sup>1</sup>.

Many of Edward's domestic staff are known to us only from very brief references. A few men are less shadowy, and an analysis of their backgrounds and careers may throw light on the general composition of the household. The career of Adam de Vaux offers an example of advances made in Edward's service. He came to Edward from the royal household, where he had been a huntsman, ranked as serjeant, and held the post of usher or buyer of the kitchen for some years, before being appointed as bailiff of Odiham with an annual fee of 10 marks p.a. <sup>2</sup>. His progression from buyer/clerk to bailiff can be seen as a final promotion, perhaps even a retirement post. Adam de Chetwynde, a member of a Shrophire family holding land from John FitzAlan, illustrates career development and the interaction between the domestic household and estate management in his advances from kitchen buyer into the estate administration to the offices of escheator and chamberlain of Chester <sup>3</sup>.

Matthew and Thomas le Charron were serjeants in charge of the transport sections of the marshalsea in the 1260's <sup>4</sup>. Instead of accompanying him on crusade, Edward arranged that they be transferred to the royal pay-roll <sup>5</sup>. Although officially based at the Tower, they were occupied obtaining provisions for Edward's children and the coronation, discharging old debts of Edward, overseeing the work on the mews at

1) C62/50 mm.5-7, 52 m.7: CCR 1272-9, pp.29,73,202.

2) CR 1253-4, p.185, 54-6, p.22: SC6/1094/1 m.16d: RegTC, p.173: C62/51 m.6, 52 m.4, 53 m.4.

3) E372/119 mm.20,21d, 125 m.3: C47/11/2/3: C62/51 m.4: CPR 1266-72, p.129, 72-81, pp.5,95: CCR 1279-88, p.224.

4) CR 1268-72, p.61.

5) CLR 1267-72, p.208: CR 1268-72, p.225.

Charing, and making a new cart for Eleanor of Castile's return <sup>1</sup>. Matthew then settled down in charge of the Charing mews, while Thomas remained responsible for the royal carts as late as 1287 <sup>2</sup>.

Another buyer of the kitchen, although never referred to by this title, was John le Moine. His employment in this capacity illustrates that not all domestics were of low rank or confined to service in a narrow sphere. He seems to have been the son of a wealthy Cambridge knight of the same name, one-time steward of the earl of Winchester, a tenant of the Fiennes family, linked also to Aymer de Valence, and with a long record of service in the royal administration <sup>3</sup>. It may have been John senior, rather than his son, who joined Edward in Gascony in 1255 <sup>4</sup>. His son <sup>5</sup> made purveyances for Edward from c.1263 onwards all over England, and specifically in Exeter in 1268, on the occasion of Robert Aguillon's marriage to the earl of Devon's widow. In 1266 Edward employed him in another capacity, to investigate the opposition shown to the collection of his customs dues in the North-East <sup>6</sup>.

The supply of Edward's household occasionally became a political issue, as in the complaints by the men of Southwark in 1258, which they aired in the unique opportunity of the special eyre <sup>7</sup>. In comparison to the complaints made about other nobles, Edward does not appear to have been one of the worst offenders. Payments made during Edward's absence on crusade indicate that at least five years had elapsed before small traders were repaid for goods supplied to Edward's household, mostly as a

1) C62/49 mm.2,3, 51 mm.5,7: E372/117 m.6d, 118 m.20, 121 m.22, 125 m.3: C47/3/21/44: OCR 1272-9, p.183.

2) Byerly I 389,1685: CPR 1281-92, p.373.

3) CR 1256-9, p.235: Justl/1207 m.4: E159/43 m.18: GG Simpson, in Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland, ed. K Stringer, p.115.

4) CPR 1247-58, p.409.

5) presumed son, differentiated by his rank of serjeant.

6) CPR 1266-72, pp.1-2: E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.3.

7) Justl/873 m.8d: Select cases of procedure without writ, p.93.

result of purveyance made during the 1265-7 campaigns. Complaints expressed almost a decade later in the Hundred Rolls inquiry show that Edward's seizures were minor, compared to the activities of the king's buyers at that time<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless the problems, abuses and facilities offered by purveyance were evidently well-established long before the Welsh and Scots campaigns of Edward's reign.

It must be emphasised that the organisation and functioning of the domestic household had an importance far outside its seemingly routine and petty activities. Supply involved a considerable degree of liaison with the estate personnel, for example in the provision of venison from the Peak, Chester and the New Forest<sup>2</sup>. The logistics of meeting the varied needs of a group of fluctuating size and composition, and largely itinerant, required considerable organisational and accounting skills. Method and routine were obviously vital to the smooth-running of this unwieldy structure. Those abilities were not isolated from the activities and responsibilities of the wider household. It was not only the case that the enlargement of the military household put additional demands on the domestic supply chain, as at the siege of Kenilworth, where at least 5 purveyors from the kitchen and marshalsea ranged the Midlands, from Abingdon to Northampton and Coventry to Leominster, seeking supplies of fodder and foodstuffs. A similar expansion can be detected when Edward was based at Stratford (just outside London) during the occupation by Gilbert de Clare<sup>3</sup>. Even the everyday scope of the household functions impinged on Edward's wider sphere of action.

Thus, it was the task of the marshalsea, in addition to the care of horses in the stables, to organise imports of horses from Spain and

1) Cam, The Hundred and the Hundred Rolls, pp.101-2.

2) e.g. C47/11/2/3, where successive justices of Chester took deer for the household's use.

3) El01/350/5 m.3: Letter-book C, p.229-30, ff.143,143v.

Ireland, for pleasure, and for war and the scarcely-less serious tournament. They maintained a stud and training stables for young horses, perhaps at Eyton on the Cantilupe estates, although Eleanor of Castile later based her stud at the Peak. They organised the transport of horses from the stables to tournaments, e.g. to Blyth in 1257<sup>1</sup>, and supplied fodder at these events, e.g. the occasion when the grain bought for this purpose from the executors of J le Franceis was stolen<sup>2</sup>. They operated a system of restor for horses lost by members of the household in war, tournament or otherwise in Edward's service. At least 35 instances of replacement of horses occur in the surviving records<sup>3</sup>. The system was not always smooth-running, as in the failure to compensate those who had lost horses in the continental tourneys of 1262-3 until 1285<sup>4</sup>. When preparations were being made for the crusade, a marshalsea clerk, John Hardel, was sent to Marseilles to make arrangements for the reception of the expedition and its horses. He was later sent to obtain additional horses in Paris and Montpellier and escorted these to Acre<sup>5</sup>. Edward's activities, from sports such as hunting and falconry, to tournaments and war, and his freedom of movement, depended on the efficiency and competence of his stables, and in a wider estimation, of his domestic economy.

1) SC6/1094/11

2) Cl45/16/26.

3) cf. Byerly II pp.xxviii-xxix.

4) below, 8.v.

5) CLR 1267-72, p.126: CPR 1266-72, p.574: E101/350/5 mm.1,2.

To illustrate this truth for every department of the household would require more space than this study permits. However, an examination of one department should provide some idea of the detail and logistics required for all, while demonstrating further the interlocking of the domus with the wider sphere of Edward's administration and life. The butlery has been selected for this study, since it illustrates also the diversity and professional calibre of the members of Edward's household.

a) **The butlery and wine supplies for the household**

Wine was the one major essential supply for the household which could not be produced in England to a standard acceptable to the continentally-oriented palate. At this period almost all wine drunk in England came from Gascony, and the household butler had the option of making his purchases there, or, more commonly, buying in England at the principal ports and fairs from stock imported by a wine merchant, Gascon or English. Wine of several qualities was required, the best for Edward and his immediate familia, a lesser quality for the subordinate members of the household, and a rougher type still for castle garrisons and troops on campaign, besides supplies of ale and cider. Subordinate members of the household were entitled to a fixed ration of ale each day. Stocks had to be maintained at Edward's castles and supplied to other residences for his visits. This involved the hire of carts, horses, guards etc. Given the poor keeping qualities of medieval wines, which rendered the autumn vintage virtually undrinkable by the following summer, these stocks had to be carefully used and replaced to avoid waste or shortage<sup>1</sup>. Wine was also required as gifts for favoured members of

1) Labarge, A Baronial Household of the Thirteenth Century, pp.102-113; James, Studies in the Medieval Wine Trade, pp.6-10, 137-141; Carus-Wilson, Medieval Merchant Venturers, pp.266-7,270; Jolliffe, Angevin Kingship, pp.195-201.

the household or affinity.

The extent of Edward's purchases of wine is difficult to ascertain. An upper limit can be assumed from the estimated consumption of the royal household of 2,000 tuns p.a.<sup>1</sup>. In the two best documented years of the period, 1255 and 1260, he can be calculated at least to have received 217 tuns at a cost of £336/9/6, and c.230 tuns at £605/9/8<sup>2</sup>. If these figures are in any way accurate, it must be accepted that the total sum he can be shown to have expended on wine from 1254-72, £1,515/13/5, falls hopelessly short of reality<sup>3</sup>. The pronounced variation in the price per tun can partly be explained by the purchase of the 1255 supplies in Gascony, cutting out the charges of the importers. Alternatively, Edward may simply have been ordering more expensive wine. James estimates that the average price of wine purchased by the crown, excluding prise wines, was 60s. per tun<sup>4</sup>. Edward's own purchases from 1254-72, where the price per tun can be estimated, varied between 7s.10d. and the high 93s.4d. for the wine given to Tiptoft, averaging at 40s.-50s. per tun. The record of Edward's purchases and obligations, in spite of their admitted incompleteness, can be used to trace some kind of pattern in Edward's household needs and the methods used to supply him.

As lord of Gascony, Edward was in a favourable position to obtain good terms from the wine suppliers, who now had a virtual monopoly of

1) James, *op.cit.* p.71.

2) Studd, Ph.D; C61/1-4, *passim*.

3) These figures exclude purchases specifically known to have been made for the garrisons of castles, which total a further £109//0/8 besides 90 tuns and 117 gallons, value unknown. Some of the remainder will certainly have been intended for garrison supply, SC6/1094/11 mm.4,16,16d: E372/125 m.3: Studd 642,818,827,845: C61/4 mm.1,2: Lydon, p.21. They do not include wine bought with local revenues. Carriage payments by the wardrobe over 1259-61 may have been for additional purchases, RegTC, p.173, f.48.

4) James, *op.cit.* p.10.

the English trade. Initially and erroneously, the Gascon merchants believed that his position in the duchy would be a protection to them against the restrictive practices and excessive exactions of the royal buyers <sup>1</sup>. Edward himself initially believed that he could grant exemptions from the royal prise <sup>2</sup>, but he was similarly disillusioned. He continued to exempt selected merchants from local tolls and customs in Gascony and perhaps also in England after 1265 <sup>3</sup>. In Ireland he did exercise the crown's right of prise, which was in the custody of Theobald Butler from at least 1266. This was a source of profit, and of cheap wine which may have been used to supply the Welsh garrisons <sup>4</sup>.

While Edward was resident in Gascony, his purchases of wine were made from local merchants. Before his departure for England he bought considerable quantities of wine from the new vintage, arranging for these to be shipped back to England, some in the merchant's ships, but at Edward's risk <sup>5</sup>. He probably took advantage of subsequent visits to Gascony, in 1260 and 1261 to build up his stocks in England, but there is no direct evidence for this <sup>6</sup>.

After he returned to England, he continued to import wine directly from Gascony, generally hiring the ship, perhaps once using his own <sup>7</sup>. A two-way trade often operated, as in 1272 when his lieutenants sent a cargo of grain to Gascony, when the duchy was on alert against an

1) Paris CM V, p.538. cf. their petition to the crown dated by Lloyd to 1256, TH Lloyd, Alien merchants in England, p.87: E175/1/1.

2) e.g. Studd 539; C61/2 m.3; RG I ii 4632.

3) Studd 575, 916; C61/2 m.3; RG II lll.

4) 36 RepDKI, p.73: C47/10/13/20: Studd 842; C61/4 m.1.

5) Studd 418,456,529,565,599-600; C61/2 mm.5,4,3,1,2, the risk clause signifying that any losses in transit, or by shipwreck, would be borne by Edward. That this was a serious hazard is shown by a later consignment, where 4 tuns out of 50 were washed overboard, E101/350/5 m.4: E372/125 m.3.

6) wine taken from Gascon merchants may have been imported, RG II 8888,1516: CPR 72-81, p.62: cf. James, op.cit. pp.70-92.

7) E372/111 m.28d. This is an inference from the shipload of wine and cider sent to munition Rochester castle in a ship of Edward.

invasion scare from France, and the ship returned with a cargo of wine<sup>1</sup>. In late 1265 the buyer of the wardrobe, the wine merchant, Hugh de Gamaund, was sent overseas to make purchases for Edward. This trip was almost certainly for large-scale purchases of the new vintage<sup>2</sup>. Occasionally Edward's own bailiffs sent wine to him in England, e.g. 10 tuns from the island of Oleron in 1260, perhaps produced on vineyards belonging to Edward, or received as rent in kind<sup>3</sup>. Edward's imports will almost certainly have been for his own use, or for his household and friends, or for garrison and campaign supplies. References to sales of wine by his officers do not represent commercial transactions, but disposal of old stocks, hence the low price per tun<sup>4</sup>.

On occasion, Edward benefited from the cheaper supplies available to his father in England by the right of prise, entitling the king to buy 1 tun at a reduced price<sup>5</sup> from each importing ship carrying between 10 and 20 tuns, and 2 tuns from any ship carrying over 20 tuns. The king is generally thought to have sold most of the prisage wine, and did not use it to supply his household<sup>6</sup>. However, in June 1270 the king's buyer was ordered to deliver 20 tuns of wine to Edward, charging him at the rate of 20s. per tun. The price suggests that these tuns had been set aside from the prise. The date of the order indicates that these were rack wines from the spring shipment<sup>7</sup>, perhaps intended to supplement supplies being assembled for Edward's crusade force.

The royal stores and purchasing network were made available to Edward in other ways. At an unknown date the king's butler, John de

1) E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.4: a common practice, cf. Carus-Wilson, op.cit. p.270.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.460.

3) Studd 806; C61/4 m.2.

4) E368/36 m.6d: £106/13/4 from the sale of 66 tuns, E372/125 m.3.

5) standardised as 15s. per tun in Bristol and 20s. elsewhere.

6) TH Lloyd, op.cit. pp.87-8.

7) CR 68-72, p.204: James, op.cit. pp.36,124-5.

Somerset, bought 11 tuns at Southampton for Edward at 36s. per tun, evidently not prisage wines. It is not clear if Edward was to be charged at this rate or given the wine <sup>1</sup>. He did not pay for £5/8/0 worth of wine taken at Southampton c.1263-4, for this obligation was discharged by the sheriff of Southampton on the king's orders <sup>2</sup>. The 50 tuns of wine delivered to him by the king's buyer between September 1262 and Michaelmas 1264, were specifically noted as a gift from the king. This was a very generous present, unprecedented according to the enrolled accounts of the king's buyers/chamberlains during this period. The date of the gift cannot be ascertained, but most probably it was intended for the Welsh campaign of 1263 <sup>3</sup>.

On other occasions Edward bought his wine in London, Southampton, Sandwich, Boston and Bristol, taking delivery in advance of payment as was the common practice. Later orders show that repayment was often long delayed e.g. payments in 1289 and 1285 for purchases in 1261 and 1259 <sup>4</sup>. Among Edward's suppliers several names recur, e.g. London merchants such as Philip le Tayllur <sup>5</sup>, Reginald of Suffolk, sometime royal chamberlain <sup>6</sup>, the Gascons, Pons de Mora, also king's chamberlain and buyer <sup>7</sup>, Arnold John de Contis <sup>8</sup>, Raymond Moneyeder and various other merchants of Bordeaux, Agen, Bayonne, Cahors and Toulouse <sup>9</sup>. Some were specially designated as merchants of Edward, e.g. Hugh de Gamaunde, Bernard Nicholas, and the Florentine, Hugh Pape <sup>10</sup>. Edward's favoured merchants

1) C47/3/7/34.

2) E372/108 m.9.

3) E372/109 m.12. The gift is unlikely to have been made before Edward's return to England in March 1263.

4) RG II 888,1516.

5) Studd 777,1013; C61/4 m.3: E101/547/25.

6) Studd 800; C61/4 m.3: E101/350/5 m.3: E372/111 m.28.

7) CPR 66-72, pp.422,715: CR 68-72, p.43: E372/117 m.7d.: C62/49 m.5.

8) Studd 780; C61/4 m.3.

9) Studd 874: RG II 888,1516.

10) CLR 1267-72, p.46: E372/113 mm.6d,20.

received other benefits from him, such as fees or farms <sup>1</sup>, or assistance with legal difficulties <sup>2</sup>. Pons de Mora, more surprisingly, was made keeper of the East Anglian lands of the honours of Chester and Richmond for Edward <sup>3</sup>.

The butlery was headed by the butler, assisted by or combining the duties of a buyer. This arrangement was flexible and fairly informal. Two butlers, Alexander and Walter de Capeles, and a buyer, Hugh de Gamaunde, overlapped in Edward's service <sup>4</sup>. A number of lesser agents were also involved in purchasing, e.g. John of the chamber, Richard de Eveblanc, Colin le Butler <sup>5</sup>. Purchasing was shared with other departments, such as the chamberlainship of Chester, which had a special responsibility for the supply of local castles <sup>6</sup>. Higher officials of the household, such as the steward of the estates, the keeper of the wardrobe and even the chancellor, also played a part in purchasing. Thomas de Ipegrave, who bought a consignment in 1255, may then have been attached to the butlery, or already on the wardrobe staff <sup>7</sup>. The wine given to Robert Tiptoft in 1270, supplied by a London merchant was "by view" of Hugh FitzOtto, steward of the household <sup>8</sup>.

On the distribution side, there was a degree of co-ordination between the butler, the chamberlain of Chester and the local administration in Bristol, Dublin and perhaps Bordeaux, although this may have been only for the special circumstances of the Welsh campaigns <sup>9</sup>.

1) e.g. Aycard Fortonis, RG II 1819.

2) e.g. Gilbert de Coleville, El3/lf m.9: Reynold de Frideystreet, CPR 66-72, p.467.

3) CFR, p.4.

4) Alexander acted from at least 1255-60, Studd 324,777,800; C61/3 m.3, 4 m.3: RegTC, p.173. Capeles in 1257, 1262, 1265, Studd 780; C61/4 m.3: SC6/1094/11 m.16d: E368/36 m.6d: CPR 1258-66, p.466. Gamaunde c.1265-7.

5) Studd 800; C61/4 m.3: CPR 72-81, p.62: El01/350/5 m.3.

6) Studd 800; C61/4 m.3.

7) Studd 403; C61/2 m.6.

8) Studd 1013; El01/547/25: cf. Jolliffe, op.cit, pp.200-1,220-1.

9) SC6/1094/11 mm.4,16,16d.

The marshalsea may have assisted in the supply of carts, although Alexander hired carts at the places of purchase, and had three yeoman, William, Roger and Viger, under him to carry out deliveries <sup>1</sup>.

The purchasing of wine was a specialised activity requiring considerable expertise. Medieval wine was of very variable quality, and a fraudulent merchant could disguise a poor quality or defective wine by blending or adulterating it with a sweetening agent. Simple dilution, to compensate for leakage and evaporation, or merely to stretch the profit margin, was not unknown. Experience was required to ensure that the wine purchased was in good condition and reasonably priced <sup>2</sup>. In Edward's butlery a number of professionals can be identified, such as Hugh de Gamaunde and Walter de Capeles, both professional wine-merchants. They held other positions in Edward's administration and that of the king, where their experience was an asset, e.g. as chamberlain/royal buyer, and mayor of Bordeaux <sup>3</sup>. The other known butler, Alexander, might perhaps have been Alexander of Hereford, a London vintner and supplier to Edward <sup>4</sup>.

Other members of the household involved in supply or supervision of consumption may be considered to have been recognised as fitted for their posts, from their continued employment in this field. Shelfhanger was promoted from the chamberlainship of Chester to be buyer of the king's wines at St.Ives. FitzOtto, Edward's household steward, had earlier held the chamberlainship of London in conjunction with the Tower <sup>5</sup>. Ippgrave, keeper of the wardrobe in 1259, had been involved in wine supply previously. Burnell, the chancellor, who bought a shipment at

1) RegTC, f.48, p.173; C62/52 m.4.

2) James, op.cit.pp.161-2.

3) Letter-book C, p.230, f.142v: E371/32 m.11: E372/11 m.28, 113 m.20d: CPR 1266-72, p.205.

4) Studd 642; Lydon, p.21.

5) CR 68-72, pp.85,153: CLR 676-72, pp.126,130: E372/113 m.1d.

Sandwich in 1267, with Robert Walerand and the constable of Dover, Stephen de Penchester <sup>1</sup>, was a large-scale importer of Gascon wine, either for his own use or even commercially <sup>2</sup>. Castellans and ex-castellans, such as Walerand, Leyburn, le Breton, Penchester, must have developed experience through responsibility for garrison stocks.

Several large-scale purchases of wine were made by the wardrobe or the estate steward, without apparent reference to the more experienced butler. For example, in 1260 Edward's steward, Roger de Leyburn, and his keeper of the wardrobe, John le Breton, were responsible for several large purchases, at Boston fair, and at London and Bristol <sup>3</sup>. One explanation for this apparent anomaly may be found on the 1259-60 patent roll, where letters of obligation, for wine taken by Leyburn and le Breton, originally stated that the wine had been taken by Alexander the butler. His name was erased and replaced by those of Leyburn and le Breton <sup>4</sup>. Conceivably, the explanation for the alteration lies in a joint purchasing expedition, where selection was made by the professional butler, but finance arranged by the senior officials, so that the record highlighted their rôle at the butler's expense.

Besides the supply of the needs of the household and castle garrisons, issues were also made from the wine-stocks as gifts. In 1255 the only surviving Close Roll of Edward's chancery records gifts of tuns of wine to one household knight, two clerks, one domestic officer and one vallettus <sup>5</sup>. Curiously, in 1255 these issues were mostly the responsibility of the constable of Bordeaux, and in one instance the constable of St.Macaire from the stocks in his castle. The gift of four

1) Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals 94.

2) London Eyre of 1276, 240.

3) Studd 777,802,838;C61/4 mm.1-3; cf.the purchase at Sandwich in 1267.

4) Studd 777; C61/4 m.3.

5) Geoffrey de Percy, Alexander the butler, Nicholas de la Leye, John de London, and William FitzWarin, Studd 224,246,375,479; C61/3 mm.1,2,3.

tuns to Tiptoft in 1270 was very generous, unparalleled in the surviving records for quantity and cost, at 93s.4d. per tun<sup>1</sup>.

This discussion, from the nature of the evidence, has dealt more with the question of supply than with that of consumption, but it should be apparent that the provision for the needs of Edward's household and administration was a wide-ranging and complicated operation.

1) Studd 1013; E101/547/25.

#### v) The Military Household

The military household consisted of knights, valletti, serjeants at arms, and their support staff. Within this group were contained the men who were closest to Edward, in both peace-time and war, and inevitably influenced his attitudes and actions. Although considerable disparities of wealth and social standing could be concealed by the rank of knight, they will for the most part have enjoyed a common background of education and experience <sup>1</sup>, and shared the same interests and aspirations. Among Edward's knights it will be demonstrated that recruitment tended toward the younger, more sporting and athletic scions of the magnates and gentry, with a particular bias towards those interested in the tournament and the other great challenge of the age, the crusade. It should not be assumed that Edward's household knights were entirely given up to the pursuit of arms or the chase. From this nucleus, Edward drew many of his estate administrators, constables, diplomats and special envoys. They also played an advisory rôle, as can be seen from their presence on the council, and as witnesses to charters, and served on judicial commissions relating to Edward's affairs. Examination of the military household tends to focus on the knights, partly from the availability of evidence, perhaps a necessary distortion, in view of their dominating rôle in the full household.

The rank of serviens, which can signify "serjeant" or "servant", covered a wide range of duties. For example, Edward's tailor, John, and his constable of Barsac, John le Parker, were both serjeants, as was his baker, Master Robert le Pestur. So too was Thomas de Bolton, his chief steward from 1262 and justice of Chester from 1267. He was still a serjeant as late as 1266, but had been knighted by 1269 <sup>2</sup>. Some at least

1) N Orme, From Childhood to Chivalry, especially Chapters 1,4,5,6.

2) CR 1261-4, p.218; CPR 1266-72, p.15; C66/85 m.36: E159/43 m.24.

were Edward's personal bodyguard. As a child 6 serjeants had been employed for this purpose, and as a king he kept at least 20. Like serviens, vallettus can be a misleading term. Those in Edward's service were often in training for knighthood, for example, Nicholas de Yatingden and Robert de Beaumes, but the process could take a number of years. William de Montrevel, the son of a Gascon knight, remained a vallettus for at least 15 years (1254-69), but took part, presumably as a knight, in the Windsor tournament of 1278, and in 1286 was one of the king's household knights <sup>1</sup>.

Permanently retained knights made up the nucleus of the military household. They received a money fee, or were in possession of a wardship or even a permanent grant of land, generally as a progression from an earlier, more temporary arrangement. Geoffrey de Neville, a household knight by 1259, was granted land in 1262. Their number is a matter for speculation, fluctuating with Edward's means and activities. The rôle of the knights in the administration also reduced the number in attendance at any one time, although attestations to Edward's charters indicate that a surprising number of castellans and other officers considered that their duties as advisers and attendants on Edward justified long absences from their bailiwicks. Attestations made by household knights with no known administrative positions indicate that from three to eight such knights were in attendance on Edward at such times. The inclusion of those with administrative posts brings the number to nearer fifteen <sup>2</sup>.

Evidence from payments of fees and from grants of land in lieu of

1) CPR 1272-81, p.193; C66/96 m.22: E372/111 m.14d.: RG II 945: CCR 1272-9, p.509: T-C admin, pp.79,96.

2) calculated by combining attestations from charters issued over a brief period, such as at Bermondsey, from 26 October to 7 November 1259 Studd 716-20: C61/4 m.5: Just1/1167 m.6: CJRI I, p.153: RG I ii lxxxvii no. 2: CPR 1272-81, p.435: Barraclough, THSLC 103 (1951), p.52.

fees presents difficulties, in view of chronological factors and political and military-induced fluctuations in the size of the familia. However, over 1259-62, a period where political ambitions and visits to the tournament circuit caused Edward to enlarge his retinue, Edward was paying annual fees to six household knights and had made grants of land or wardships in lieu of fees, to a further 15. A number of other knights, valletti and serjeants were receiving payments which were described as wages rather than fees. If we include household knights then on secondment as castellans or other officers, perhaps 10 additional fees were being paid<sup>1</sup>. These figures may be compared with those derived from issues of robes, noting the similarity to the 24 robes issued in 1261.

Some comparisons may be helpful here. Dr. RF Walker has estimated that Henry III kept 30 household knights permanently retained and in his entourage or on detached service<sup>2</sup>. Edward himself was maintaining an average of fifty knights in the later 1270's<sup>3</sup>. Working principally from charters, Dr. GS Simpson has identified 28 knights in the familia of Roger de Quincy, earl of Winchester<sup>4</sup>. Roger Bigod, the Earl Marshal, had a suite of 16 "familiares", all deemed essential to his person when he visited London in 1257<sup>5</sup>. Turning to a later period, Dr. Maddicott has calculated that in 1318-9 (a year of campaigns) Thomas of Lancaster had a retinue of 50-55 knights, falling to 25 at other times, as at the tournament of Dunstable in 1309. Surviving contracts indicate that from this core he could expand still further to 200 knights and 350 foot<sup>6</sup>.

1) Tables 2,4 & 5. 1 serjeant and 2 valletti were also granted land.

2) capable of expansion to 90-120 at need, Walker, op.cit. pp.66-7,85-6.

3) M Prestwich, Edward I, pp.147-8.

4) These he divides into 15 "inner" & 13 "outer circle", GS Simpson, in Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland ed. KJ Stringer, pp.102-129.

5) this included some domestics, CR 1256-9, pp.151-2.

6) JR Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster, pp.44-6: Tomkinson, EHR 74 (1959) pp.70-89. Other earls brought or sent retinues of 20-25 knights.

In 1261 the royal administration, in calculating troops available to the king against hostile alignments in England, estimated Edward's force at 50 knights<sup>1</sup>. This force would have represented an expansion of Edward's household above peace-time requirements. A variety of circumstances could call forth such an expansion, military needs being the most obvious. The quasi-military needs of the tournament also necessitated recruitment, as will be demonstrated below. Edward's political aspirations will also have led to a desire to overawe opposition, and perhaps enhance his credibility by a large and lavish retinue. For example, in April 1260, the high point of his alliance with Simon de Montfort, he is reported to have expanded his military household to intimidate the regency council and force the holding of a Parliament at the end of the month<sup>2</sup>. This may be compared with the issue of 24 robes with gold-embroidered cointises to Edward and his knights for Easter 1261<sup>3</sup>. Edward's wardrobe followed the custom of the royal household in issuing robes at Christmas and Pentecost, so this issue fell outside that pattern. These robes were probably bought in France, for use on Edward's return to England (c. Easter) for the arbitration between the king and council, apparently postponed until Edward could be present<sup>4</sup>. He may well have wished to appear with his (probably expanded) household knights in some splendour.

It has long been established that expansion of the military household was one of the most effective methods employed by the crown to build up a military force and co-ordinate a larger campaign<sup>5</sup>. This

1) in comparison to 10 knights each from the king's half-brothers, and Gaston de Béarn, and 20 from the Count of St. Pol, C47/2/1/12: CR 1259-61, pp.495-7.

2) A.Lond. pp.54-5.

3) April 24, C62/52 m.4: RegTC, pp.172-3, f.48, notes the purchase but not the recipients.

4) Ridgeway, *BIHR* 61 (1988), pp.236-7: Flores II, p.466.

5) JO Prestwich, *EHR* XCVI (1981), pp.1-35: Walker, *op.cit.* pp.66-94.

practice was utilised also by the greater magnates. The classic example for Edward is the systematic enlargement of his household for the crusade, by the use of formal contracts, probably copied from those employed by the French king. Initially, 18 magnates and knights<sup>1</sup> engaged to serve with a probable total of 225 knights, for payments of 100 marks per knight<sup>2</sup>. The contractual arrangements and Edward's forces have been examined in detail by Dr. SD Lloyd<sup>3</sup>.

It is sufficient therefore to note an additional contract, hitherto unreported, between Edward and Geoffrey de Geneville, a long-established member of his affinity, and his vassal through the lands he held in his wife's right in Ireland. Geneville contracted, in terms virtually identical to the agreements made in England, to provide 10 knights. This agreement was made in late September at Roquemaure, only shortly before the expedition sailed from nearby Aigues Mortes<sup>4</sup>. It may be that other crusaders with Irish or continental lands joined Edward at this time, such as John de Verdon and Otto de Grandson, and entered into similar contracts. Thus, a simple expansion of Edward's long-established household knights supplied perhaps 80 knights of his total force<sup>5</sup>.

It has been argued that the use of the contractual system for the crusade was of great significance as a precedent for Edward's later campaigns<sup>6</sup>, but this expedition was not the first time that Edward had expanded his familia for military or quasi-military purposes. The stereotyping of the contracts, and the use of sub-contracts raises the

1) of whom 10 were long-standing members of the household, in receipt of fees or lands. Their share of the force totalled 68 knights.

2) E372/117 m.6d: BL Cotton Ch. XXIX 65; Add.Ch 19829.

3) SD Lloyd, Oxford D.Phil, 1983, pp.298-315,423-438 and pp. 120-133, in War and Government in the Middle Ages ed. Gillingham & Holt.

4) E36/274 f.233v.

5) 68 -12 delayed with Lestrangle, +10 with Geneville, + perhaps the same with Verdon and Grandson and others.

6) SD Lloyd, in War and Government, pp.120-1.

possibility that Edward had used a similar system before. (The earliest known tournament contracts date from the beginning of the fourteenth century, but the practice of recruiting additional knights for the team was as old as the sport itself <sup>1</sup>. An examination of the earlier instances of expansion throws interesting light on the composition of the household and Edward's relations with his knights, besides putting the 1270-72 experience into better perspective.

For the Welsh campaign of 1257, it is difficult to separate knights of Edward's household from those hired or serving on a feudal basis for the royal campaign of summer 1257. However, Edward maintained forces in the war zone both before and after the failure of his joint campaign with his father. From the protections issued after the royal army had dispersed, 22 names can be isolated as remaining in the March with him <sup>2</sup>. Protections issued during the main campaign included six other knights previously linked with the household, and two valletti and three clerks.

Of these knights, several were tenants of Edward from Chester, e.g. Walkelin and John de Arderne, Fulk de Orreby. Several were from the March, e.g. Fulk FitzWarin, Ralph de Oswestry, Roger de Somery. John de Langley was perhaps a connection of Edward's steward, Geoffrey. A few can be identified from East Anglia, e.g. John de Vaux and Robert de Ufford, at the beginning of long associations with Edward. We cannot say whether their presence in the March was due to direct recruitment by Edward, or the consequence of the tenurial links of Marcher families

1) Tomkinson, *op.cit.*, p.71: JRV Barker, The Tournament in England, 1100-1400, pp.27-8.

2) not all these were knights; they included his buyer and his sauser, CPR 1247-58, pp.601-2; C66/71 m.2d. Some of these men may have been acting to defend their own lands, but there was a clear distinction between men "qui moram faciunt in Wallie in servicio Edwardi" or "qui profecti sunt in Wallia cum Edwardo", and others merely given protections on their own account, CPR 1247-58, pp.658-9.

like the FitzAlans and Lestranges with East Anglia. However, it may be that it was their service to Edward at this low point in his career, which led to their permanent recruitment into his household <sup>1</sup>.

For Edward's campaign of 1263, similar calculations produce a group of 20-25 knights <sup>2</sup>. From a fragmentary wardrobe account, we can name three other knights who died on the campaign, Hugh de Hersy, William la Zuche, and (illegible) de Croys <sup>3</sup>. A charter Edward issued at Worcester in May supplies an additional 8 names <sup>4</sup>. Erard de Valéry's presence confirms the assertion of the St.Albans chronicle that Edward brought overseas knights back with him for the campaign <sup>5</sup>. Thus we have a conjectural total of 35 knights for this expedition.

It is significant that most of those mentioned in the protections were not drawn from known members of Edward's household, but from the royal and subsidiary households <sup>6</sup>, or from personnel who had served Edward in the early 1250's <sup>7</sup>. Edward's quarrel with the Leyburn/Clifford affinity posed serious drawbacks to the normal policy of household expansion to meet a military need, especially in Wales. This explains the secondments from the royal households, and the overseas recruitment carried out to make up the numbers required.

Moving from the Welsh campaigns, where the involvement of local landowners blurs the rôle of the household knight, a similar policy of

1) cf. other marchers entering Edward's service in 1257, Chapter 9.i.

2) CPR 1258-66, pp.253-3,286; C66/79 m.13d. cf. CR 1261-4, p.273: the group of 4 given protection in April, although serving with Edward, were all of John FitzAlan's affinity, CPR 1258-66, p.256.

3) C47/3/43/7.

4) CChR 1257-1300, p.147; C53/59 m.5, Erard de Valéry, John de Grailly, Ebulo de Montibus, Walter de Langley, Warin de Bassingbourn, John de Grey, Peter de Montfort and James de Audley. We may infer the presence of Robert Tiptoft, the recipient of the grant.

5) Flores II, p.478.

6) e.g. Rabeyn, Valers, Musgrove.

7) Wodeham, Cogenho, Montferrand. Cf. the reappearance of Montibus as a witness after three years absence.

expansion operated for the quasi-military demands of the mêlee-style tournament, in which Edward had been involved since 1256. Over 1259-60 he attended several in England, perhaps intended as a political rallying-point. In late 1260 he resolved, or was encouraged, to test his prowess on the continental circuit, and in consequence spent October 1260-March 1261, July 1261-February 1262, July 1262-March 1263 abroad<sup>1</sup>. The first of these visits is the best documented, and affords interesting proof that the composition of his retinue was specially adapted for the purpose of the expedition.

Edward was accompanied by several newly-made knights, his brother-in-law John of Brittany, his cousins, Henry of Almain, Simon and Henry de Montfort, and by Earl John de Warenne. He may have been joined by his Lusignan uncles, who met him in Paris in November. We can identify James de Audley, Warin de Bassingbourn, Roger de Clifford, Thomas de Ippegrave, Adam de Jesmond, Roger de Leyburn, Hamo Lestrangle, Robert de Stuteville, John de Vaux and William la Zuche as established household knights, but a majority were unfamiliar. Besides two French knights, Erard de Valéry, and John de Britaud, Edward brought with him John de Berners, Baldwin de Rosey, Hugh de Dokesworth, Baldwin de Akeny, (and Peter de Anesy and Gilbert de Dunton, accompanying Warenne), Hugh de Neville, William de Beauchamp of Bedford, William le Latimer and John de Lymar, as well as his cook, Ralph, his vallettus, Robert de Beaumes, and three clerks<sup>2</sup>.

1) including two visits to Gascony, in December 1260 and October-December 1261.

2) Flores II, p.456: R.Glos II, p.735: Studd 862; E368/94 m.47; Larking, Archaeologia Cantiana V, p.166: cf. GC II, pp.221-2: CPR 1258-66, p.181; C66/76 m.21d. The protections described them as going overseas in the service of Edward. but the overlap with the chronicle account prevents any ambiguity. Montibus, Lucy and Segrave, whose objectives elsewhere were given in the protections have been excluded. The presence of the witnesses from the Leyburn charter is inferred.

The Lusignans and Valery were well-known enthusiasts for the tournament <sup>1</sup>, as were Clifford, Lestrangle, Leyburn, Audley, and perhaps Vaux of Edward's regular household knights <sup>2</sup>. John of Brittany, Warenne, Henry of Almain, and the Montfort brothers were less experienced, but, from their later careers, equally enthusiastic <sup>3</sup>. Of the knights not previously associated with Edward, at least three, Baldwin de Rosey, Hugh de Neville, William de Beauchamp, can be identified as tournament habitues <sup>4</sup>. Shared enthusiasms undoubtedly led to their recruitment for this expedition. It may well be that the other knights in Edward's retinue were also regular tourneying enthusiasts, specially recruited for the expedition.

Edward was accompanied by about twenty knights (excluding his uncles, cousins, Warenne and Warenne's two knights), as well as his clerical and domestic support staff. With the addition of Warenne and the others, Edward brought to each tournament a force of thirty knights or more, of whom perhaps ten were regular members of his household.

Edward's other two continental tournament visits are less well-documented. His companions in 1261-2, when he is said to have visited Burgundy and Lyons, are almost unknown <sup>5</sup>. The composition of his 1262-3 visit may be partly recovered from a charter issued to Geoffrey de Neville and Robert de Ufford in Paris in September 1262. The witnesses may be compared with those to the November 1260 grant to Leyburn. Present on both occasions were Erard de Valéry, William le Latimer and

1) e.g. Paris, CM IV p.633, V, pp.17-8,54,83,265: Gualtaruzzi, Libro di novelle et di bel parlar gentile, 1572 ed. pp.57-8, for a later anecdote concerning Valéry.

2) CR 1242-7, p.363, 61-4, p.133: Paris CM V, p.318-9: Appendix 2 n.14.

3) AM III, pp.238-9, IV, pp.161-2, 212: JRV Barker, pp.117-133,191-2: Copy of a roll of purchases made for the tournament of Windsor park, pp.303-4: A.Lond, pp.65,67.

4) CR 1242-7, p.363, 59-61, p.478: CPR 1258-66, p.150.

5) CPR 1258-66, p.162, Neville and Ufford.

John Britaud. Other knights on the 1262 charter were Robert Walerand, John de Grailly, Peter de Neville, William de Longres and John Roygnet. Edward's new seneschal of Gascony, Henry de Cusances, was also present<sup>1</sup>. It is possible that another Champenois, Hugh de Conflans, a close associate of Valéry and a tournament enthusiast, also joined Edward, since he acted in Edward's affairs with Grailly and Valéry at this time.

Further light on the composition of Edward's suite is provided by a series of payments made over 20 years later of debts incurred on the circuit. These show that Edward was also accompanied by William de Montacute, Pain de Chaworth, Guy de Asseles, Peter de Neville, Peter de Bretigny, and Florent de "Warenne"<sup>2</sup>. The date of the expedition is not given, but references to the tournaments at Senlis, and "Maroell" held "while the king was a bachelor", allow us to assign these tournaments to the 1260-63 period. The presence of Peter de Neville, who was on the September 1262 charter, makes the 1262-3 tour the most likely. Additionally, Senlis in 1262 was the scene of of a large-scale religious translation, sponsored by King Louis. The French court and many visiting nobles, such as Thibaud of Champagne and Navarre, were present, and it is quite possible that the occasion was also marked by a tournament<sup>3</sup>. The unknown John de Chavernin may also have been on this tour<sup>4</sup>.

Again, a number of the participants can be shown to have regularly taken part in tournaments. The interesting point about the 1262-3 evidence is that it reflects a change in the composition of Edward's

1) C47/10/13/16b.

2) Byerly I 637, 2231-6. I am grateful to Dr. JRV Barker for pointing out this reference and discussing its significance.

3) RHGF XX, p.76: Jubainville, Histoire des Ducs et Comtes de Champagne IV, pp.383-4.

4) He lost a horse at the tournament of "Mainte", which fits in with the evidence of the 1286 payments that Edward was in the vicinity of Rheims, E372/125 m.3: Byerly I, loc.cit.

companions. Several of the knights have not been identified <sup>1</sup>, but Florent de Varennes was a Fleming (below). The surnames of the unknown knights suggest continental origins, which may explain their absence from the English records. There was an increased French presence, with Valéry, Britaud, Conflans and perhaps Cousances. The proportion of continental knights to Anglo-Norman was much greater than in 1260.

Most of the English knights of the 1260 tour were absent in 1262; only William le Latimer can be shown to have been present in both instances. One particular group was conspicuous by its absence, the Lestrangle/Clifford/Leyburn affinity, estranged from Edward since mid-1261 and actively hostile from mid-1262. The only marchers in the 1262-3 tour were Robert Walerand, one of the targets for Leyburn and Clifford in 1263, and Pain de Chaworth, who was aligned by marriage ties with the Tiptoft/Ufford/Neville grouping, as was William de Montacute <sup>2</sup>. Peter de Neville has not been identified on the Neville family tree, but it seems reasonable to class him as another kinsman of Geoffrey de Neville, a long-established household knight. Also missing were Edward's more prestigious companions of 1260-61, his cousins and John de Warenne, from whom he was also divided by his rejection of the Provisions. They seem to have staged a rival continental tour at this time <sup>3</sup>. The quarrel with Leyburn and Edward's alignment with the royalist camp had damaged his ability to recruit knights in England. Recruiting in France and Flanders may have been easier, or even a shrewd political move, to

1) Guy de Asseles, Peter de Bretigny, William de Longres, John Roygnet and John de Chavernin.

2) GEC IX, p.77, XII, pp.148-9; Moor, Knights of Edward I, III, pp.247-8; KB26/162 m.25, 166 m.23. Montacute was connected with Geoffrey de Neville of Laceby, rather than his cousin of Raby, but he also held land near Ufford, Appendix 2 n.12.

3) GC II, p.219, notes their return separately to Edward. It was not until late summer 1263 that Edward was able to win Henry of Almain and Warenne to his party.

strengthen ties there and acquire useful allies for the future. Some of the knights who participated in the tour came on to England for the Welsh campaign. Edward's shifting political attitudes as well as his personal quarrels had a profound effect on his ability to muster knights and on the composition of those he did retain in his service.

The tournament expeditions show that many of the knights permanently retained in Edward's household, including several of his constables, accompanied him on these occasions. Overall, his military household was assuming a younger and more independent profile. The additional recruits were selected for their sporting abilities and enthusiasm for the tournament. Politics did play a part, as the presence of the Montfort sons in 1260, and their absence and that of the Leyburn group in 1262-3, showed. The extra knights of 1260 did not become a permanent part of Edward's household. Significantly, three of them became committed Montfortians<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, as for the crusade, the nucleus of the men who went on the tournament circuit with Edward was provided by the knights retained in his household.

Before leaving the tournament it should be pointed out that many other members of Edward's household were tournament enthusiasts. At the problematic tournament of Compiègne<sup>2</sup> were present in the English contingent, Roger de Clifford, John de Grailly, John de Vescy, Otto de Grandson, and William de Say. Listed as Champenois were Simon de Geneville (Geoffrey's brother), and Hugh de Conflans, and as Flemings, Guy and Hugh de Castillon. Varennes was in the force of the Count of Artois<sup>3</sup>. At the Windsor Park tournament of 1278, besides John de

1) Berners, Dokesworth, Hugh de Neville.

2) allegedly held in 1238 but with a list of participants more suited to 1268-70, or even 1278, cf. J Vale, Edward III and Chivalry, pp.22,109

3) A de Behault Dornon, Annales du Cercle Archéologique de Mons 22 (1890), pp. 87-103: JRV Barker, *op.cit.* p.133.

Warene, John of Brittany, William de Valence, and Clifford, were Hugh FitzOtto, William de Montrevell, Robert de Tiptoft, Pain and Patrick de Chaworth, Bartholomew de Briancon, William de Gunneville, Robert FitzJohn, and Geoffrey de Picheford, all of whom can be linked with Edward's pre-1272 household <sup>1</sup>. Other members of the household interested in the tourney were Thomas de Clare and Mortimer, though he was responsible for production rather than participation <sup>2</sup>.

Some of these men may have been present, although unrecorded, on the continental circuit, or tourneyed with Edward in England, e.g. c.1256-60 or 1267-70. Although the last tournament in which Edward is known to have participated was at Chalons in 1273 <sup>3</sup>, he continued to maintain a keen interest in the sport, turning to production and regulation of the spectacle. He was well aware of the propaganda aspects of the tourney, as well as its value for recruiting for campaign <sup>4</sup>. It is significant that among his chosen companions and intimates were so many enthusiasts for the tournament.

One of the more neglected aspects of Edward's military household is the presence of continental knights, in numbers which increasingly dwarfed the Savoyard and Poitevin elements. This tendency is first seen in the early 1260's, evidently in consequence of Edward's residence overseas, and expansion of his household for the tourney. However, it takes on a greater significance when it is realised that these knights were associated with him on the continent, and with his Gascon administration, and returned to England with Edward in mid-1261 and 1262, and again in spring 1263. From 1261 on Edward also endowed them

1) Copy of a roll of purchases .... tournament of Windsor, pp.303-6.

2) A.Lond, pp.65-7; Barker, p.125; ME Giffin, Speculum 16 (1941), pp.109-120.

3) Flores III, pp.30-1.

4) Loomis, Speculum 28 (1953), pp.114-127.

with fees and revenues from his English estates. These grants, and their prominence as witnesses to his charters, indicate the extent to which Edward's entourage and advisers were dominated by this group.

In 1263 they provided greatly-needed reinforcement to his Welsh expedition, and summer campaigns, and were installed by Edward in the garrison of Windsor <sup>1</sup>. After their expulsion from the country, on the surrender of Windsor, some were involved in the maintenance of Edward's administration in Gascony and in the diplomatic, fund-raising and military attempts to assist the royalist cause after Lewes <sup>2</sup>. They took part in the pacification campaigns and the measures against the earl of Gloucester in 1267 <sup>3</sup>. Some owed their acquaintance with Edward to the tournament field, but they proved equally serviceable in war-time. Indeed, perhaps we should see Edward's absorption with the tourney as another means of preparing and recruiting for campaign.

Two principal groups can be identified here, one centring on the vassals of Thibaud, count of Champagne and king of Navarre, and the other emanating from the Low Countries regions of Flanders, Artois, Picardy. In the first group, the most prominent were Erard de Valéry <sup>4</sup> and John de Britaud <sup>5</sup>. William de Pemes had been introduced to England by the Savoyard faction, but he held lands in Navarre, and was a

1) Erard de Valery, Roger de Moretayne, the Poitevin, Guy de la Marche, the Savoyard, Ebulo de Montibus, William de Pemes from Franche-Comte, and some Anglo-Norman knights, CPR 1258-66, pp.271-2: AM III, p.224.

2) Valéry, Henry de Cousances; Valéry, Guy de Castillon, Moretvane, Crequy, Varennes: above, p.27; below, pp.265 n.4, 266 nn.3,5,6, 267 nn.1,3.

3) Guy de Castillon, Crequy, Lianes, above, p.120; Letter-Book C, ff.142-3.

4) Jubainville IV, pp.494-8: Anselme VIII, pp.405-6: RHGF XX, pp.236,390-1: For his links with Edward, E368/94 m.47: CChR 1341-1417, p.315: Just1/1167 mm.4,12: Cuttino GR A 113, as "Graido de Valery": C47/10/13/16b: Livre des Hommages 1,505: Livre Noir de Dax 23: CPR 1258-66, pp.158,391: CR 1264-8, p.106: Jubainville IV/V 3558.

5) lord of Nangis, Seine et Marne; Fontaines, Mâcon; Houdrevilliers, Navarre, C47/10/13/16b: CPR 1258-66, p.158: Anselme VIII, pp.605-6.

close associate of the Champenois Geneville family <sup>1</sup>. Here, we may also note Hugh de Conflans, a close kinsman of Count Thibaud, who, with Valéry and the Savoyard, John de Grailly, was described as a counsellor of Edward in 1262-3, but who is not known to have visited England <sup>2</sup>. Their recruitment into Edward's service may be explained by Thibaud's close friendship with his father-in-law, King Louis, and by the strong Champenois links maintained by Edward's knight and Irish baron, Geoffrey de Geneville, or Joinville, lord of Vaucouleurs in Champagne and brother of the famous crusader. Many of these men were favourites at the French court in their own right, e.g. Britaud, appointed Panterer of France in 1260, and Valery, a veteran of the disastrous Seventh crusade.

In the Low Countries group can be identified Guy de Castillon, Count of St. Pol, and also a tenant of the Count of Champagne. He was in Edward's entourage in 1262-3, and again during the occupation of London <sup>3</sup>. Hugh de Castillon, another household knight in 1262-3, still receiving a fee (paid in Paris) in 1289, was probably a kinsman <sup>4</sup>. Roger de Moretayne, one of the Windsor garrison, and responsible for contracting overseas loans and other financial services for Edward and the royalist cause, was also of Flemish extraction <sup>5</sup>. Florent de Varennes, one of the 1262 tourney force, and perhaps a member of the royalist force raised in Flanders in 1265, came from Artois <sup>6</sup>. Hugh de Cregy, a cadet of a noble family with lands in Artois and Picardy, may

1) Jubainville IV, p.223: CPR 1258-66, pp.616,628: Beauséjour, Pesmes et ses seigneurs, pp.43-64.

2) Livre des Hommages, 1, 505.

3) CDS I 2456: CPR 1258-66, pp.153,402,516, 66-72, p.73: CR 1261-4, p.154: Letter-book C, pp.228,230, ff.142-3.

4) E372/125 m.3: RG II 1232: E101/349/26 mm.6,8. He and Guy were at Compiègne together. Gifts from the queen mean that he can be almost certainly separated from Guy de Lusignan's knight of similar name, Studd 326; C61/2 m.7.

5) E159/41 m.14: E372/115 m.1d: E101/601/24: Table 1.

6) CR 1259-61, p.487: CPR 1258-66, p.161, 66-72, pp.216,224: Byerly I 637.

also have been in Edward's service in the civil war period. In June 1266 he was owed arrears of his fee and compensation for horses lost in Edward's service. He received a fee until his death<sup>1</sup>. William de Lianne, a retained knight in 1268, presumably came from Lianes in the county of Boulogne<sup>2</sup>.

Outside these territorial groupings, but known at the French court, were Henry de Cousances, from the Gatinais, Louis' bailiff of Mâcon from 1254-60, who became Edward's seneschal of Gascony<sup>3</sup>, and Wynemer de Gymery, perhaps of German origins, who was high in Edward's favour in the 1260's, and served on the crusade in Louis' household<sup>4</sup>.

The Champenois knights were most prominent over 1260-65. It is conceivable that Edward's deteriorating relations with their Count led to a reluctance to revive the connections after Evesham<sup>5</sup>. Relations with Edward improved during the preparations for the crusade, and the truce negotiated by France between England and Champagne/Navarre. In forming ties with these continental knights, Edward was pursuing a new policy, evidently in response to the new friendships and associations he had made in France. His recruitment in the Low Countries more conventionally followed the policy and connections initiated by his

1) Studd 932; SCl/12/8: Letter-book C, p.229, f.142: E372/125 m.3: CPR 1272-81, p.152: Anselm VI, pp.777-80,793-4.

2) Letter-book C, p.230, f.143: Anselme, V, p.826.

3) Layettes IV 4975,4977: Stein, Annales de la Société historique et archéologique du Gatinais IX, pp.203-219: RHGF XXIV, pp.173-4: C47/10/13/166: Livre des établissements de Bayonne 15: T-C admin, pp.28-9: Anselme VI, p.622.

4) Tables 2,4: CPR 1258-66, p.154: CChr 1257-1300, p.62: E101/350/5 m.2. He may have entered the household through Richard of Cornwall or his son, Henry of Almain, who later granted Gymery a fee, CPR 1272-81, p.250. Later, 1272-1281, Edward wrote to the King of the Romans, Rudolf of Hapsburg, about a castle Gymery claimed to hold from him, SCl/14/10. \* 5) at a nadir in 1266 over Thibaud's pressing of claims to Bigorre, and acquisition of the Montfort interest in the county, and the seizure of Gramont, where Edward's Gascon knight, Seygnoron de Clarac, was killed. CPR 1266-72, p.318: Archivo de Navarre 363: Jubainville IV, pp.379-82.

\*n.4. Also connected with Brabant. See J Vale, Edward III and Chivalry, p.162, and sources cited there.

father, and were perhaps assisted by the marriage link between Flanders and Savoy, reinforced by Edward's own connection with Ponthieu and Flanders through his wife's family. While the Low Country knights were more prominent after 1265, and of particular value in the 1267 crisis, we should not underestimate their earlier contributions from 1262-5.

These continental knights differed fundamentally from the young and inexperienced Savoyards and Poitevins entering Edward's service in the 1260's<sup>1</sup>. They were men of considerable military experience, prominent in their own lands, and favourites at the French court. While they remained friendly and in receipt of fees after Edward's accession, they made their long-term careers elsewhere. For example, Valéry went to Palestine in 1265, and remained there over 1266-7, at the head of a force of 50 knights, maintained by King Louis<sup>2</sup>. On his return to the West, he became involved with Charles of Anjou's campaign for the kingdom of Sicily, as did John Britaud and Henry de Cousances. Cousances, already a Marshal of France, was leading one of the columns at the battle of Tagliacozzo, where he met his death. Victory was reputedly due to Valéry's strategy<sup>3</sup>. Many of them rose to high office. Valéry was appointed Constable of Champagne in 1268, and Chamberlain of France in 1271, Britaud was already Panterer of France when he joined Edward, and he became Constable of Charles of Anjou's Sicily<sup>4</sup>. Conflans became Marshal of Champagne in 1270.

Again, unlike the Savoyards and Poitevins, they can in no sense be

1) John de Grailly, Otto de Grandson, Stephen de Montferrand; Stephen de Buet, Peter de Castro Novo/?Castelnaud.

2) G. Servois, Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes IV iv 19 (1858), pp.130-1,283-93: L'Estoire de l'Empereur Eracles, p.454: Röhricht, AOL II, pp.210-12,381.

3) RHGF XX, pp.430-5, XXII, pp.200-2, XXIII, pp.31-5,200-203: Martène & Durand, Thes II 586: Durrieu, Les archives angevines de Naples II, pp.230,241,247.

4) Durrieu II, pp.230,241,294.

regarded as rapacious. They made little drain on Edward's resources, receiving only wardships and life-fees and making no long-term gains from him. Collectively, they possessed considerable knowledge of the Holy Land and devotion to the idea of the crusade. Valéry was a veteran of Mansourah, and took the cross again in 1264, spending 1265-7 in the East. Wynemer de Gymery had been on pilgrimage to Palestine in 1261<sup>1</sup>. Geoffrey de Geneville's relationship to his crusading brother may have been another source of information on the Holy Land. Edward's decision to join the crusade was a matter of personal choice in the face of opposition from his father and even from the Pope. The experience and influence of these members of his household may have fired his determination to join King Louis' new expedition.

Their feudal and other ties with the French court explain why Edward could not draw on them to expand his household for the crusade. Britaud, Conflans, Gymery, Valéry, Varennes, and perhaps Moretayne, were retained as knights of King Louis' household for the crusade. Varennes was appointed admiral of the French fleet<sup>2</sup>. Guy de Castillon was part of the force led by the king's brother, Robert of Artois<sup>3</sup>. Valéry is thought to have transferred to Edward's expedition after Louis' death<sup>4</sup> but he was back in France by mid-1271, so his service can only have been brief at most<sup>5</sup>.

Over the 1270's these knights, e.g. Varennes<sup>6</sup>, Valery<sup>7</sup>, and

1) CPR 1258-66, p.154.

2) RHGF XX, pp.305-7, XXIII p.733: Jubainville 3674,5635,5707: Layettes IV 5707

3) Layettes V 844.

4) RHGF XX, (Baldwin de Avesnes), p.172, followed by Röhricht, AOL I, pp.622 and SD Lloyd, op.cit. p.128.

5) RHGF XXI, p.424: Jubainville V 3677.

6) RHGF XX, pp.306-7, XXIV, p.244: La Roncière, Histoire de la Marine Française I, pp.184-6: CPR 1272-81, p.354. It will be seen that the allegations of his death in the naval battle off Tunis were false.

7) C62/50 m.5: CPR 1266-72, p.661: RG II 62.

Britaud<sup>1</sup>, remained on terms of friendship with Edward, still receiving fees or gifts, and carried out occasional services for him. However, their contacts were less close than previously. As king Edward's household was even more cosmopolitan, with knights from Germany, Italy and Spain, as well as Gascony and Savoy. In numbers and influence, however, these knights were much less significant. The phenomenon of the well-born, well-connected nobles, of French allegiance, permanently retained as knights, is peculiar to Edward's pre-accessional household.

The rôle of the household knight was a flexible one. He might serve as a constable, as a diplomat, or as an officer of the household. On campaign he would be required to recruit and direct less-experienced knights or the rank and file. In 1263 Edward used a detachment of continental knights from his household to garrison the castle of Windsor against the barons. After the siege of Northampton, Edward's most important prisoners were committed to his household knights and constables, such as Roger de Leyburn, Drew de Barentin, William la Zuche and James de Audley<sup>2</sup>.

His knights were also capable of independent action, and this was greatly to Edward's advantage after his capture at Lewes. The force which defended his castle of Bristol and attempted to rescue him from Wallingford, was principally a group of long-serving household knights, Pain de Chaworth, Robert Walerand, Robert Tiptoft, Nicholas de Cogenho, John de Musgrove, Warin de Bassingbourn, and the less well-known Nicholas de Haversham and Geoffrey Gacelin<sup>3</sup>. Another group, headed by the justice of Chester, William la Zuche, with James de Audley, and, surprisingly, Dafydd ap Gruffydd, had been attempting to defend Edward's

1) C62/49 m.1.

2) CPR 1258-66, pp.318,476 cf.p.396.

3) CPR 1258-66, pp.350,396-7,412,428: Just1/42 m.10: R.Glos, pp.751-5.

county of Chester both from the marauding Robert de Ferrers and from Montfort himself. La Zuche even summoned those of Edward's tenants whose tenure included war service, and outlawed those who, like the Montfortian, Richard de Vernon, did not respond <sup>1</sup>. Edward's household knights played a shadowy part in his escape from Hereford. While Gilbert de Clare and his brother, Thomas, orchestrated the escape, Mortimer, Leyburn and Clifford were all involved in the planning, and perhaps in the diverting of pursuit, and Geoffrey de Geneville made his castle of Ludlow available for negotiations with Gloucester <sup>2</sup>.

After Edward's escape his knights quickly rallied; Audley and Urian de St.Peter took responsibility for the siege of Chester <sup>3</sup>. The campaign against the Montfortians in the north was led by Adam de Jesmond, John de Balliol, and Dafydd ap Gruffydd, They succeeded in seizing Alnwick from John de Vescy <sup>4</sup>. Audley and Edward's serjeant and estate steward, Thomas de Bolton, were also delegated to receive repentant rebels into the king's peace <sup>5</sup>. Others remained with Edward for the manoeuvres which led to Evesham.

After the victory, his knights were Edward's principal agents in the process of recovery and pacification. Besides their rôle in the seizure of rebel estates <sup>6</sup>, they were responsible for negotiating the surrenders of rebel towns and garrisons e.g. Nicholas de Yatingden (under Edward) at Wallingford <sup>7</sup>, and Leyburn and Walerand at London <sup>8</sup>. Warin de Bassingbourn, whose presence with Edward after the siege of

1) AM III, p.235: A.Ces, pp.86-9: KB26/198 m.17.

2) CR 1264-8, pp.124-5: CPR 1258-66, p.427: AM IV, pp.162-4.

3) CPR 1258-66, p.427: AM III, p.239: Flores III, p.2: Rishanger CA, p.34: A.Lond, p.68.

4) CIM 847.

5) 4.i, above.

6) Chapter 4.

7) Studd 905, misdated; SCL/8/19; Shirley II 291: Justl/59 m.18.

8) dALL, pp.74-6,81.

Northampton had been so costly to the abbot of Peterborough, was the principal lay negotiator for the release of Richard of Cornwall from Kenilworth <sup>1</sup>. Edward's knights were also entrusted with the custody of surrendered strongholds, e.g. Geoffrey de Neville at Dover <sup>2</sup>, John de Musgrove at Ludgershall <sup>3</sup>, and John de Verdon at Odiham and Windsor, where he led the seizures by members of Edward's household, including his physician, on the possessions of the Montfortian constable, John FitzJohn <sup>4</sup>. William la Zuche was later appointed keeper of Ely <sup>5</sup>.

Household knights were sometimes detached from Edward to lead separate expeditions, as Leyburn did in Kent and the Weald, and Bassingbourn and John de Balliol were said to have done against Robert de Ferrers <sup>6</sup>. Roger Mortimer and Hamo Lestrangle, assisted by Edward's newly arrived Irish vassals, were entrusted, unsuccessfully, with the task of combating the increasing power of Llywelyn in Wales <sup>7</sup>. Musgrove was detached from the siege of Kenilworth to cut off possible supply lines to the rebels <sup>8</sup>. Others remained with Edward. In his campaigns against the Cinque Ports, Axholm, Kenilworth, and Alnwick, Edward was accompanied by a group of household knights. At Axholm the arrangements for the surrendered rebels give some idea of the force with Edward. The principal pledges were Edward himself, and his knights, Robert de Tiptoft and John de Courtenay, and his Peak tenant, William de Mortain <sup>9</sup>. The pacification process was arduous and apparently chaotic, but

1) Walter de Witlesley, Historia Anglicanae Scriptorum Variarum pp.135-8: Layettes IV 779.

2) GC II, p.243.

3) E371/29 m.9: CPR 1258-66, p.350.

4) KB26/ 174 m.10d, 175 m.23d: Table 5.

5) CPR 1258-66, p.494.

6) A.Lond, p.73.

7) AM II, pp.366,370.

8) Just1/42 mm.13d,18. He was later allowed 400 marks for his expenses in Edward's service during the war, C62/49 m.1.

9) CPR 58-66, pp.534,536,538.

Edward's task was infinitely facilitated by the body of experienced, loyal and apparently competent knights attached to his household.

It has been said that the chief value of Edward's crusade was in drawing together round Edward a devoted band of knights to serve him in peace and war as king <sup>1</sup>. However, the crusade actually added very few names to the circle of knights, who carried their service into the next reign. Their loyalties had already been tested to the limit in the hard times between Lewes and Evesham. They had already fought for Edward on the tournament field, in Wales and in England. Nothing was more natural than that Edward should have turned to his proven followers, when his mind turned to Palestine, and indeed to Wales, Gascony and Scotland in the years ahead.

1) Lloyd, in War and Government, p.121: M Prestwich, The Three Edwards, pp.7-8.

## vi) "Foreign Service": The Household At Large

A considerable number of household members served their lord at a distance, detached from the household to administer his affairs and estates. The most important of these were the Justiciars of Ireland and Chester, the Seneschal of Gascony, and the senescallus terrarum, in overall charge of Edward's scattered English and Welsh lands. Ranking a step lower, were the bailiffs and constables of the individual estates and strongholds, such as the constable of Carmarthen or the bailiff of Stamford. Such men were generally in receipt of fees assigned on the revenues of their bailiwicks or, if these proved insufficient, paid from the wardrobe. Confirmation that these officers, even when funded out of local revenues, were considered as members of the household is provided by the appointment of Henry de Burn as bailiff/escheator of Hastings in 1259. Simultaneously with this appointment, he was retained in Edward's household at a fee of £20 p.a., payable from the revenues of Hastings<sup>1</sup>. Unless Burn was a special case, we may conclude that that all constables and senior bailiffs in Edward's territories were similarly retained. Lesser bailiffs and prevosts in the localities received wages and robes according to their positions, but are unlikely to have ranked as members of the household.

Also in this category of extended service should be considered members of the central administrations, exchequers and judiciaries of Edward's more autonomous territories, although their fees and robes were generally issued locally. We should include also the household knights attached to the Justiciar of Ireland, and perhaps to the Seneschal of

1) Studd 732-3; C61/4 m.5, "Henricus de Burn, quem dominus retinuit de familia sua, cui dominus Edwardus commisit escaeteriam rapi de Hastings libris annui feodi percipiendi de exitibus balliva sua .... ad se sustinendum in servicio domini Edwardi".

Gascony <sup>1</sup>. These knights were principally intended to serve locally <sup>2</sup>, but Edward could summon them at need, as in 1257, when an Irish contingent sailed for Wales under two "constabularii de familia" <sup>3</sup>. They were generally recruited from the affinity of the justiciar, or from leading Anglo-Irish families <sup>4</sup>.

Other members of the household, lay and clerical, were also detached in long- or short-term diplomatic service, especially at the Papal curia or the French court. These latter were often described as royal appointments, but virtually every diplomatic appointment to Paris on Gascon affairs was of a member of Edward's household. For example, the proctors for the Bergerac appeal were successively Edward's clerks, Nicholas de la Leye and Thomas de Pivelesden, and his knights, William de Wilton and Thomas de Ippegrave. We may conclude that these diplomats were still considered as retained in the household while serving Edward's interests overseas.

Also retained in the household, but often seconded for special business, were legal experts. The policy of paying retaining fees to royal justices has been traced back as far as the 1230's and 1240's in the greater ecclesiastical houses. Evidence for the magnates is less easy to discover, but the practice was evidently well-established by the 1280's. Such men were valued for their advisory capacities on councils, and expected to defend their client's interests in legal cases <sup>5</sup>. It is

1) e.g. the 10 knights and serjeants whom Drew de Barentin was required to maintain out of his fee, Studd 720; C61/4 m.5; RG I ii LXXXVII 3. In Ireland they were described as "de familia domini E", but the justiciar was responsible for their maintenance, E101/230/2 mm.1,3; CDI 890-1.

2) cf. the retention in 1261-2 of Gaelic warriors to keep the march of Ulster, Curtis, p.11.

3) Studd 631,674; Lydon, pp.21,23.

4) cf. protections issued to La Zuche's company, CPR 1247-58, pp.512-3, and the men brought by Audley to Ireland, CDI 889-891; E101/230 mm.1-3.

5) GO Sayles, Law Quarterly Review, 56 (1940), p.248; JR Maddicott, Past and Present Supplement 4, pp.1-15; RAL Smith, Canterbury cathedral priory, pp.68-70.73.

hardly surprising that Edward's large and complicated territories required such advice and attention. Nevertheless, it is interesting that, in spite of his special relationship with the crown, he established formal ties with individual justices.

In 1259 Edward retained the notorious Chief Justice, Henry of Bath, at a fee of £20 p.a. from his wardrobe "ad se sustinendum in servicio nostro" <sup>1</sup>. In view of Henry's position and legal background, there can be little doubt of the ways in which he could be useful to Edward. The retainer may have formalised an earlier association, for in 1257 he had served on the commission inquiring into the heirs of John de Monmouth <sup>2</sup>. Another royal justice, Henry de la Mare, may well have been retained by Edward, although no formal agreement has been found. In 1254 and 1255 he was much occupied on Edward's affairs <sup>3</sup>. Roger de Loveday, who was in receipt of a fee by 1270 was later a professional justice, and may have been retained to advise Edward <sup>4</sup>.

Circumstances enabled Edward to avoid retaining justices on a large-scale. By accident or by design he could draw on a pool of legal talent within his own administration. Geoffrey de Langley, the estate steward, and a senior bailiff, William de Wilton, were both experienced royal justices. Langley represented Edward personally in at least two cases before the justices in eyre; in Stamford in 1258 and at Warwick in 1262, both cases of novel disseisin <sup>5</sup>. William de Wilton appeared for Edward in 1258 at the Oxford Parliament in the case between John de Verdon and the abbot of Mellifont, which had been transferred from

1) Studd 736; C61/4 m.5: Paris, CM V, pp.213-5,223-4: Crown Pleas of the Wiltshire Eyre, 1249, pp.128-9.

2) with other members of Edward's affinity, FitzGeoffrey, Walerand and Wilton, SC6/1094/11 m.16d.

3) CR 1253-4, p.76: Studd 52; C61/1 m.2: CPR 1247-58, p.430.

4) Table 4.

5) Just1/1187 m.23d; Just1/954 mm.11d,13d; Plea Rolls t.H.III ... affecting Staffordshire tenants pp.150-1.

Ireland<sup>1</sup>.

Other members of Edward's administration, of whose forensic experience nothing is known, also appeared in legal cases concerning him. The estate steward, Thomas de Bolton, appeared as crown prosecutor Coram Rege against the Montfortian, John de la Haye, who was said to have infringed the terms of the pardon, which Edward had negotiated for him<sup>2</sup>. Bolton was an experienced administrator and served on many judicial inquiries over the next decade. Alexander de Hampden, an ex-sheriff and bailiff of the Longvillers and Segrave custodies, brought Edward's case against a defaulting bailiff before Hugh Bigod in 1258<sup>3</sup>. Laurence de Lovershal, an established clerk and perhaps already keeper of the wardrobe, presented the case for the king's right to present to the living of Badsworth, in which Edward also had an interest. Lovershal's involvement is easily explained, as the candidate selected by both Edward and the king<sup>4</sup>. In cases in the court of the exchequer of pleas Edward was generally represented by his exchequer clerk, William de Middleton<sup>5</sup>.

The use of a professional pleader or narrator was becoming much more widespread during this period, as the complexity of the law increased, together with the risks of losing a good case and incurring other sanctions through a technicality or non-attendance at a hearing. From 1247 the king employed his own pleader to see cases in which the

1) CDI, p.95; KB26/158 m.12, "Willelmus de Wylton venit per dominum Edwardum dominum suum". Edward's interests were affected by the abbot's claim that cases concerning the abbey could only be heard before the king.

2) KB26/175 m.15.

3) KB26/158 m.18d: Just1/1187 m.3. The culprit had been Hampden's subordinate. Another bailiff, Walter de Shelfhanger appeared for the king in 1261, but no cases have been found where he acted for Edward, KB26/167 m.21.

4) KB26/195 mm.4,18, a more comprehensive account than that in R.Giffard, pp.24-6.

5) e.g. El3/ld. m.6d..

crown's interests were involved through the courts. A similar officer represented Edward and the king in Ireland <sup>1</sup>. "Laurence", who brought Edward's case against William de Ros and the bishop of Lincoln in 1258 over the advowson of the church of Hanby, can be identified as the king's pleader, Laurence de Brok <sup>2</sup>. He also represented Edward in 1265 against trespassers in his forest of Skipton (Fors wardship) and in 1267 against Robert de Hardsacre, when Edward was summoned as guarantor of the manor Hardsacre had seized from the Temple <sup>3</sup>. This work was evidently compatible with his duties for the king, for Brok was also in receipt of retainers from the abbeys of Ramsey and St. Albans, and Durham priory <sup>4</sup>.

Other members of the royal administration also acted for Edward in court. John de Kirkby, the chancery clerk, and future deputy to Burnell and treasurer, acted for him in 1268-9, successfully prosecuting his claim against William de Weyland for the advowson of Eston <sup>5</sup>. In these instances (Brok and Kirkby), Edward may have been provided with legal assistance by his father, without any formal payment. Parallels may be seen in the work royal clerks such as John Clarel and John Mansel carried out for Edward on secondment from their other duties, and in the assistance provided on occasion by the royal exchequer.

Other pleaders and attorneys are more shadowy. John de Ponte, appointed in 1269 to prosecute a series of cases of trespass against Edward in Somerset, Lincoln, and Devon <sup>6</sup>, was probably the John del

1) Maddicott op.cit. pp.11-12: Select cases in the court of King's bench under Edward I (1936), pp.xci-cxv, discussing the rôles of attorneys and pleaders: R&S admin, pp.40,174,230.

2) KB26/158 m.11d: Just1/1187 m.3 "Laurencius qui sequitur pro domino Edwardo".

3) KB26/174, m.19d, 178 m.8: AbbrPlac, p.159.

4) Maddicott, op.cit. pp.5-7,13.

5) KB26/184 m.18d: CPR 1266-72, p.475: Tout, Chapters II, pp.13,61-3.

6) KB26/192 m.1 cf. KB26/191 mm.5,5d, 193 mm.11d,21,22,28d. where the cases continue, but Edward's attorney is not named.

Ponte connected with members of Eleanor of Castile's administration in 1275. A man of this name was royal pleader and justice of the bench in Ireland from 1295 onwards, but no references to bridge the intervening decades have been found<sup>1</sup>. In 1260 Edward appointed Hugh le Sommeter or John de Brummer as attornies for him against the persistent Monmouth claimants<sup>2</sup>. Brummer or Brummore appears to have been trained as a yeoman in the Windsor household, and was a member of the royal household in 1259. There is no evidence that he possessed any legal skills or experience<sup>3</sup>. In autumn 1265 John of Oxford, otherwise unknown, presented Edward's case against two Kent fishermen who had tricked his buyer out of a horse<sup>4</sup>.

Such men presumably received payment from Edward, perhaps a single payment, rather than a regular fee, like Henry of Bath. Frequently such services were rewarded by presentations to benefices, although Edward does not appear to have employed this expedient. Unusually, a majority of his retained justices, attornies and pleaders were laymen<sup>5</sup>. One instance where Edward did present, presumably in return for advisory services, was of Henry de Wengham, ex-royal escheator and soon-to-be chancellor, to Dungarven in 1254. Wengham was not a justice, and the measure can most plausibly be explained as an attempt to build up a nexus of support in the inner circle of the royal administration. A loose association between Edward and Wengham can be observed for some years subsequently<sup>6</sup>. This policy was also followed by religious houses

1) CPR 1272-81, p.253; CJRI I pp.29,87,306-7,313-5; R&S admin, pp.142,151,174.

2) KB26/168 m.4.

3) CR 1253-4, p.75, 56-9, p.105, 59-61, p.334.

4) AbbrPlac, p.157; KB26/174 m.9d.

5) except for Kirkby and Richard de Shirburn, sent to hear a dispute in Chester in 1272, The Chartulary or Register of the Abbey of St. Werburgh, Chester I 32,33,38.

6) Studd 37,92,700; C61/1 m.1, 2 m.12; CDI, p.66: C.Ormond Deeds I 123.

and Edward's own clerks often benefited from it <sup>1</sup>.

Edward derived considerable advantage from a royal policy of appointing members of his household to hear cases or hold inquiries in which he was concerned. Langley, Bath, de la Mare and Wilton heard several cases of trespass against Edward, as did Robert Walerand, Alan la Zuche and Warin de Bassingbourn <sup>2</sup>. An accusation of unlawful arrest alleged against Edward himself was investigated by his under-sheriff, Bartholomew le Jovene, and a Jew, Hagin, son of Moses, with whom Edward had had many transactions <sup>3</sup>.

Retainers were also paid, as the king did, to continental lords to buy loyalty and stability in Edward's territories overseas. Among Edward's pensioners were the Count of Perigord and the Count of Béarn, and lesser nobles such as Fergeant de Estissac and Gerard de Méseroles. Such men were less vassals than allies, sometimes even holding their lands allodially or from other lords. The payments were intended to promote good-will, perhaps producing tangible benefits, for example, Edward's abortive hopes that Gaston de Béarn would accompany him on crusade, but at least reducing the possibility of attachment to other lords <sup>4</sup>.

The separation between members of the household, with external responsibilities or detached for special duties, and those who remained attached to Edward and itinerating with him, was very far from absolute. The very fact of itineration brought Edward on various occasions into

1) Maddicott, op.cit. pp.5-6: *Durham Annals*, pp.87,213:

2) CPR 1247-58, pp.430,437,512, 58-66, pp.103,228,234, 66-72, p.279: KB 26/158 m.6: cf. CPR 1266-72, p.727, and the appointments of Wilton, Langley, de la Mare, and William Trussell, Edward's bailiff of Abergavenny, to hear various disputes tending to destabilise the March, CPR 47-58, pp.432,440.

3) CPR 1266-72, pp.278-9, cf. CR 1259-61, pp.396-7.

4) Studd 171,239,240,277,979; C61/2 mm.8,10: Cuttino GR A 223,277: Martène & Durand, *Collectio* 1375: RG II 1753: E36/275 f.269v..

the orbit of his more isolated officers. His household knights and clerks were also frequently employed on commissions away from his immediate presence. The estate administration and that of the household were very closely interwoven. Not only did the estates supply the household with funds and supplies, but the administrative officers also stepped outside the narrow bound of estate management to serve their lord in capacities which were both more domestic and more political. Of the chief stewards, Langley was responsible for the despatch of money, supplies and troops to Gascony <sup>1</sup>. Leyburn was closely involved in the purchase of supplies and contracting of loans for the household <sup>2</sup>. Thomas de Bolton was delegated to receive rebels into the king's peace in 1265 and 1267 <sup>3</sup>. An examination of one further aspect of Edward's household, the council, should demonstrate the interdependence between the various departments, internal and external.

In the operation and composition of Edward's advisory body may be perceived the interaction between the various elements of the household and Edward's wider affinity of vassals, friends and kinsmen. Little evidence for the formal organisation of the council survives, but it appears to have combined some of the attributes of the royal council, and those of the ecclesiastical houses and sees with the less formalised arrangements of the lay magnates <sup>4</sup>. The royal council had developed an institutional nature, together with a heightened awareness of its responsibilities to the realm as well as to the king. It was able to operate in the king's absence, although it remained essentially a

1) e.g. Studd 158; C61/3 m.3: CR 1254-6, p.189.

2) Studd 81-2,809-11; C61/4 m.2.

3) CPR 1266-72, pp.15,90.

4) Baldwin, The King's Council, pp.1-37, EHR 42 (1927), p.187; Durham Annals 4-6: RAL Smith, Canterbury Cathedral Priory, pp.68-76; Denholm-Young, Seignorial administration in England, pp.25-30; Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster, pp.18-20.

personal body, deriving ultimately from the feudal duty of a vassal to advise his lord <sup>1</sup>.

In Edward's case also, his personal council had developed an independent rôle in the supervision of his affairs. This was in addition to the councils which advised his representatives in Gascony and Ireland <sup>2</sup>. This may have been an inevitable consequence of the scale of his possessions and resultant pressure of business, conflicting with his other activities. In 1259 it was presided over by the estate steward, Roger de Leyburn. Leyburn's position is inferred from the statement in November 1259 that the lands of David de Malpas were to be extended by jurors appointed by Edward and his council "ad dictas terras exigendas et dividendas sicut coram domino Edwardo et consilio provisum fuit" <sup>3</sup>. Barely two weeks later, these same jurors were said to have been appointed "coram domino Rogero de Leyburn vicem domini Edwardi gerenti" <sup>4</sup>. The probability is that both references were to the same episode, and that the jurors were appointed by Leyburn, acting in council in place of Edward. The title given to Leyburn probably referred to his position on the council, with no undue political significance <sup>5</sup>.

In 1268 the council, with the chancellor, Burnell, presiding, met to negotiate payment of the debt of the priory of Gisburn. The prior:

"venit in presencia Roberti Burnel domini Edwardi cancellarii et aliorum de consilio domini Edwardi et finem fecit cum eodem domini Edwardi" <sup>6</sup>.

There may be a parallel here with the royal council, where the

1) Ganshof, *Feudalism*, pp.92-3; Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward*, pp.290-296, 336-8; Denholm-Young, *EHR* 58 (1943), pp. 401-23.

2) space precludes fuller discussion, cf. Richardson & Sayles, *Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages*, Chapters 3, 12: E101/230/2 m.1: CDI 890: T-C admin, pp.14, 191; Chaplais, *Annales du Midi* 67 (1955), pp.19-29.

3) Ches29/1 m.1; Stewart-Brown, *Plea Rolls*, 3, but translated by him as "according to the rules made by the Prince Edward and his council".

4) Ches29/1 m.1; Stewart-Brown, *Plea Rolls*, 7.

5) cf. Ridgeway, D.Phil. Oxford 1984, p.346, who implausibly sees it as evidence of royal refusal to allow Leyburn the official title of steward

6) *Select pleas ...in the Exchequer of Jews*, pp.39-40: KB26/183 m.3d.

chancellor was responsible for its summoning and operation <sup>1</sup>. A council operated in Edward's name while he was absent on the crusade <sup>2</sup>.

The cases where the operations of the council are known were mostly legal issues, especially where the jurisdiction, competence or probity of the original court was called into question. For example, the dispute between Roger de Venables and the abbey of St.Werburgh of Chester, where the abbot claimed an error in the assize <sup>3</sup>. Vexatious cases also came to the council for settlement, such as the dispute over the Malpas inheritance. The refusal of one party, William Patric, to accept the partition carried out in 1259 brought the case back to the Chester court, and probably back to the council as well in 1262 <sup>4</sup>. Similarly, the process over the advowson of Mobberly had been heard in Chester before 1256 and again 1256-7. The record was sent to the council in late 1259, but their ruling in 1260 did not end the matter, for the losing party, the priory of Mobberly, then appealed to Rome <sup>5</sup>. The Gisburn case had probably come to the council after the prior's refusal to honour his predecessor's debt.

Obviously, the council considered matters of greater moment e.g. in 1255 the king's order to Edward to settle the Soler case on the advice of John FitzGeoffrey and his other faithful men <sup>6</sup>. In 1261 Soler and Bertrand de Ladils complained to Henry III that misrepresentations to Edward and his council had caused them to lose his favour <sup>7</sup>.

1) Select cases before the King's Council, pp.xxiii-v.

2) CPR 1266-72, p.539; C66/89 m.14, "ipsi qui de ipsius filii nostri consilio existunt".

3) A.Ces. pp.76-8: Stewart-Brown, Plea Rolls 143,223,225; Studd 772,779,819; Ches29/1 mm.7,11,12: Cartulary of St.Werburgh, I, 331-2.

4) Stewart-Brown, Plea Rolls 2,7,237; Ches29/1 mm.1,ld.

5) Stewart-Brown, Plea Rolls 227; Ches29/1 m.1ld; Studd 753,788

6) CR 1254-6, p.188.

7) "inimici nostri cum domini Edwardi et eius concilio procurant ...", Shirley II 541; SCl/5/47: Trabut-Cussac, RHB 1-2, 1952-3, pp.197-9. It is not proposed to discuss the "consilium" and concilium" question, but this is the only occurrence of "concilium" for Edward's councils.

Membership of the council is open to speculation. It is unlikely to have been rigid, e.g. the king's instructions in 1256 that Edward was to admit Guy de Lusignan "ad consilia sua" <sup>1</sup>. When Edward arbitrated in the dispute between the chapter and town of Hereford, c.1259-62, he was advised by "consiliarii sui", Roger de Leyburn, Gilbert Talbot, John de Turberville, Adam de Montalt, Hugh de Clifford, and John le Breton and Nicholas de la Leye, his clerks <sup>2</sup>. These men held the offices of estate steward, senior bailiff, three household knights, keeper of the wardrobe and perhaps chancellor. We may compare that occasion with Edward's entourage on other occasions of moment, e.g. in 1260 when Edward heard the complaints of the men of Cheshire on the administration of the forests. He was attended by the target of the complaints, the forester/escheator of Chester, the justice of Chester, the keeper of the wardrobe, the castellan of the Three Castles, unnamed household knights, and by Hugh le Despenser, soon to be the baronially-appointed Justiciar of England, and a local landowner, as were the justice and escheator. Here too, we have a combination of officers and household knights, with an increased presence of local men, appropriate in the circumstances <sup>3</sup>.

The attestations to Edward's charters add further information, since the subject-matter of many charters, dealing with grants and appointments, will have been considered by the council. At Bermondsey, Edward was attended by 1 bishop (Worcester), 2 kinsmen/magnates (Henry of Almain and Warenne), his justice of Chester (Orreby), his estate steward (Leyburn), 3 Marcher castellans (Montfort, Clifford, Hamo Lestrangle), the household steward (Cheny), his legal adviser (Bath), the ex-estate steward (Langley), the ex-justice of Chester (Montalt),

1) CR 1256-9, p.107.

2) Hereford D&C 2932, 2947.

3) Studd 844; C61/4 m.1d.

and 5 household knights. One of the decisions made then, the grant to John FitzThomas, was opposed in Ireland on the grounds that Edward had been badly-advised when he made the decision <sup>1</sup>. On other occasions, charter evidence suggests a greater presence of vassals, with geographical correlation to the subject of the charter.

As with the royal council, composition could become a political matter, hence the appointment in 1258 of 4 approved councillors <sup>2</sup>. Since two or three were already council members, inferred from their positions in the administration and attestations, the significance of the measure is reduced. It was probably intended that the councillors' recommendations should be binding on Edward. On other occasions, the king, especially in Edward's youth, appears to have influenced the representation at the council. We may be fairly confident that the council regularly contained the senior officers of the household and estate administration, subject to availability, and relevance to the matters under discussion. Legal advisers, senior clerks and household knights were also regularly in attendance. On a less regular basis, those who held land from Edward attended, and perhaps also curialists and ecclesiastical dignitaries. In 1262-3 it included one Savoyard and two Champenois knights, perhaps only for the duration of the negotiations for the purchase of land from Arnaud-Garsie de Navailles <sup>3</sup>. In the final analysis, the council represented a coalition of the various elements of household and affinity into a body of expertise on which Edward could draw at will, and to whom he could delegate matters with which he did not wish to become personally involved.

1) 26 Oct.-9 Nov. 1259. CDI, pp.278-80,424-9: Table 2, Chapter 6.ii.

2) AM I, p.445.

3) "dominorum Erardi de Valery, Hugoni de Conflanx et Johannis de Grailly consiliariorum domini Edwardi", Livre des Hommages 505. As these men had been in Edward's company, their "counsellorships" probably related to his personal council rather than to the council of Gascony.

CHAPTER NINE:

SOME ASPECTS OF HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION, ASSOCIATIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

i) Political Influences on the Composition of the Household

In 1254 Edward's new circumstances and responsibilities necessitated an expansion from the nucleus of his childhood household and administration. While established figures such as Stephen Bauzan and Nicholas de Yatingden, Ralph de Dongon, Ebulo de Montibus were retained, the expansion drew on protégés of both king and queen, and recruited also from Edward's new territories. These new arrangements remained little altered until after Edward's return to England.

A very interesting study has been made of the Savoyard and Lusignan factions, which interprets the political dichotomies of the time almost exclusively in terms of the tensions between the two groups<sup>1</sup>. According to this interpretation, Edward's household and administration were heavily dominated by the Savoyards until in 1257/8 Edward began to assert his own preferences. His alignment with the Poitevin faction and recruitment of Poitevins into his household accelerated the political crisis of 1258, giving both curialists and Savoyards a compelling reason to exclude the Poitevins from present and future positions of power. However, while the struggle over patronage and the intrusion of the discordant Poitevins into the equilibrium between the Savoyards and curialists was of great significance in 1258, it is both an exaggeration and an over-simplification to see the composition of Edward's household only in this context.

It is certainly true that Edward's household began to assume a more independent profile in 1257-8, but it would be a mistake to interpret this only or largely in terms of Poitou and Savoy. Several other factors

1) Dr. HW Ridgeway, D.Phil. Oxford 1983, pp.172-9,271-8, 291-3,337-8,351, and pp.89-99 in 13th.Century England, ed. Coss & Lloyd.

should be taken into consideration. Edward's return from Gascony had enabled him to travel widely in England, to visit his new dominions, and to make his debut on the tournament field. He thus had the opportunity to make contacts with more of his tenants and contemporaries among the baronage and gentry. The disastrous turn of events in Wales accelerated this process of familiarisation and emancipation from old ties. The organisation and prosecution of the defence of his territories made expansion of the household, military, clerical and support staff, imperative.

Of new entrants into Edward's household, his specific needs influenced their selection. His clerical recruits, Robert Burnell and Thomas de Pivelesden, came from Shropshire, and their local knowledge is likely to have been of value in the complicated logistical demands of supply and distribution to the threatened garrisons and expeditionary forces. Walter de Shelfhanger, who entered the Cheshire administration to co-ordinate supplies to the army, had probably trained with his kinsman, Eudo de Shelfhanger, the queen's buyer. On the military side, the difficulties of identifying recruits into the household at this time are discussed above <sup>1</sup>, but Edward's first associations with household knights such as Roger de Clifford, the Lestrangle brothers, Robert de Ufford, and John de Vaux occur at this time. Roger de Leyburn had evidently joined the household before the summer campaign, since he was one of the few of Stephen Bauzan's force to escape at Cymerau.

The Marchers are reported to have been largely unsympathetic to Edward's troubles at this time, but prominent magnates such as John Lestrangle senior, Patrick de Chaworth, Peter de Montfort, John FitzAlan, the earls of Hereford and Gloucester, and Edward's own tenants such as

1) Chapter 8.v.

Audley and Urian de St.Peter can be shown to have played an active part in the disposition of Edward's forces and defence of the border. Their connections may explain the entry of East Anglian as well as Marcher knights into Edward's service. One effect of the Welsh campaign of 1257, and the continuing pressures on Edward's garrisons after the withdrawal of the royal army, was the heightening of the "native" presence in his household.

In the ties Edward established at this time, the Poitevin/Savoyard tension was irrelevant. Only 2 or 3 Poitevins, Hugh de Vivonia, perhaps Guy de Rocheford, and the constable of Corfe, Elias de Rabayn, and one Savoyard, the clerk, William de Salines, were with Edward on the campaign. All but Rabayn had been with him in Gascony. Examination of recruitment into the household over 1256-8 does not show any new Poitevin entrants <sup>1</sup>, although it is true that Roger de Leyburn was seen by contemporaries as closely aligned with the faction, through his friendship with William de Valence <sup>2</sup>. The deaths of Maurice de Rocheford (1258) and Hugh de Vivonia (killed in Wales in 1258) reduced their number to negligible proportions by mid-1258. Of Savoyards, only Peter de Allinches was introduced between 1256-8.

The composition of the household did begin to alter at this time. Besides the increasing preponderance of native entrants, there was an age-related shift toward the younger recruit, with less experience and no background in the royal administration, and interested instead in sport and the tournament. The introduction of this younger, perhaps wilder element, if we give any credence to the gossip of Matthew Paris, could well have caused alarm in the curialist and Savoyard factions. There is no need to see this in terms of growing Poitevin influence or

1) Edward's serjeant, Roger de Auboeuf should be classed as Gascon rather than Poitevin.

2) Justl/873 m.18: Ridgeway, D. Phil, p.430.

dominance in the household. If Edward drew closer to his half-uncles in 1258, it was in consequence of their links with the tournament cliques and the younger members of the court circle, with whom Edward was already associating. One of the strongest influences on Edward at this time was not his uncles, but his cousin, Henry of Almain<sup>1</sup>. It was the interference contemplated in Edward's household and perhaps already in his estate administration and the restrictions on his father's (and ultimately his own) freedom of action, which led Edward at the Parliament of Oxford and after to make common cause with the Poitevins, as the other party most threatened by the "reforms".

During the period 1259-60, in parallel with Edward's move into the Montfortian camp and away from the supporters of the Treaty of Paris, the independent profile of his household continued to develop. A greater proportion of his affinity and household were now those with similar political alignments, and even committed to the maintenance of the Provisions. These men also shared Edward's sporting interests. It is not entirely clear which was the priority here, whether the tourney was to Edward an end in itself, or a means of building up his household knights and winning for himself a more influential and independent position in government. Certainly, the correlation between his tournament attendance in 1259, and his other ambitions is striking<sup>2</sup>.

The same policy may have been behind Edward's recruitment of continental knights over 1260-63<sup>3</sup>, reminiscent of Henry III's build up of Flemish knights with whom to oppose the reformers. Again, the political motive may have been less than deliberate. Edward's increasing

1) Edward's temporary withdrawal from the Parliament of Oxford, presumably to plan tactics, took him to Beckley, which, in Richard of Cornwall's absence will have been in his son's custody, Studd 697; C66/73 m.13; CPR 1258-66, p.13.

2) above, Chapters 6, 8.v.

3) above, Chapter 8.v.

preoccupation with continental affairs and politics <sup>1</sup>, and his protracted residence on the continent, and immersion in the tourney circuit, drew him into the circle of the French court. His household composition may merely have begun to reflect these new associations.

Ironically, it may have been Edward's increasing French orientation which drove a wedge between him and the reformist factions. The difficulties facing the English king will inevitably have been of great interest to his brother-in-law of France. The different attitude to the baronial aspirations, later epitomised in the Mise of Amiens, may have influenced Edward, damping his enthusiasm for the Provisions. It is probable that Edward's parents approved his closer relations with the French court, which Henry facilitated by discharging Edward's debts to Louis. The recruitment into his household of the older, more prestigious French knights met with the king's approval, hence his grants of fees to Valéry, Britaud, Guy de Castillon and Varennes in 1261 <sup>2</sup>.

Edward's alienation from Roger de Leyburn and his associates, which occurred in mid-1261, while clearly relating to the rejection of the Provisions and the failure of the arbitration process of Easter 1261, may have been influenced by the rise to prominence of the continental knights. To those already established in the household, Valéry and his associates could have represented competition for patronage and influence over Edward, especially when backed by royal approval. Edward's own grants over 1261-2, even excluding his continental faction, indicate the transfer of patronage away from the Leyburn affinity, to the East Anglian/Lincolnshire groupings and those linked with the

1) e.g. his involvement with the tangle of claims to Bigorre: cf. his appointment as arbitrator in another continental case, SCl/3/34, 2) perhaps an extension of the policy of granting fees to other established members of Edward's household of whom the king approved, such as Warin de Bassingbourn SCl/5/26: Ridgeway, D.Phil. pp.391-2.

queen's faction<sup>1</sup>.

We may also see a correlation between the partial withdrawal of Edward's continental knights in autumn 1263, and his reconciliation with Leyburn. The withdrawal, one of the conditions of the short-lived peace agreement preceding the Mise of Amiens, both facilitated the reconciliation, by removing the competition for Edward's favour, and rendered it more necessary to Edward, to whom the loss of his continental supporters represented a serious fall in household strength. His new agreement with Leyburn may have led to a reluctance to disturb the balance by reintroducing these knights for the 1264 campaign. After Evesham the Champenois presence did not reappear, presumably on account of the poor relations with Navarre, since Edward's other continental knights were employed in the pacification without discernible hostility from other elements in the household. Wider opportunities for gain and influence had apparently put an end to this particular tension in the household. Perhaps wisely, the continental presence was never again raised to the level of importance it had assumed in the early 1260's.

This aspect of the household has been discussed in some detail, in part because of its influence on the factional alignments of the mid-1260's, but also because it puts the Savoyard/Poitevin presence in the household into better perspective. It will be appreciated that the entrance into Edward's service of the Savoyard, John de Grailly, in 1261, and of Otto de Grandson at a later date, and that of the Poitevin, Stephen de Buet, c.1260, fits better into this wider pattern of recruitment than into the constraints of a Savoy/Poitou rivalry for dominance of Edward's entourage. The presence of these overseas knights in Edward's household added to the tensions of the period, but it gave

1) e.g. William Charles and his Provençal wife, Table 2.

Edward greater independence and closer associations with his French overlord and fellow-vassals. His early commitment to the French crusade plan may well have been the result. Nevertheless it must be remembered that even the joint groupings of Savoyard/Champenois/Low Country knights made up only a small part of the familia. These men did not dominate his counsels or his patronage, and they did not take up positions of power in the household or estates <sup>1</sup>.

Changes in the composition of the household in the 1260's were nevertheless influenced by political conviction as much by more personal factors such as ambition and rivalry over patronage. The retainers and grants, by which Edward reinforced the reconstruction of his household in late 1263, were of limited scope and efficacy. Ralph Basset and John Giffard had left the household again by spring 1264. Other former associates were already permanently estranged from Edward's affinity. Overall, perhaps thirty members of the household and administration were aligned with Montfort at his death. Of these, four had only entered Edward's orbit briefly during his reformist phase and first continental tour <sup>2</sup>, and another five were linked only by service in the Welsh campaigns <sup>3</sup>. Excluding also those linked to the administration by fortuitous circumstances <sup>4</sup>, or of uncertain identification or peripheral significance, we may isolate a nucleus of ten men.

Among Edward's administrative officers, Henry de Lee, one-time keeper of the Ferrers lands in Lancashire and of the Levinton custody, surrendered to James de Audley before Evesham <sup>5</sup>. Three former

1) one exception being Gascony, where Henry de Cousances and Grailly were appointed as seneschals.

2) Berners, Blund, Dokesworth, Hugh de Neville.

3) Humphrey de Bohun junior, Nicholas de Cantilupe, the Amundevilles, and William d'Aubigny.

4) Richard de Grey and his son, and John FitzJohn.

5) CPR 1258-66, p.632.

constables of the Peak lost their lands as rebels. Gervase de Bernak was one of the Northampton garrison, which also included Geoffrey Russell, former keeper of the Fors wardship<sup>1</sup>. Ralph Bugg, the Nottingham merchant and Nicholas de Marnham took part in Robert de Ferrers' attacks<sup>2</sup>. The Peak was evidently a centre of disaffection, closely linked to Ferrers, with his family claim to the honour<sup>3</sup>. The Montfortian constable of 1265, Richard de Vernon, held land from Ferrers, as did Bugg<sup>4</sup>. Vernon had been constable of the Peak until its transfer to Edward in 1254, and was also Edward's vassal for his Cheshire manors. His involvement in the campaigns against Edward caused his outlawry by the county court of Cheshire in late 1264<sup>5</sup>. Lee's activities may also have been linked with Robert de Ferrers, since he could have been transferred to Edward's service along with the Ferrers custody.

A more serious commitment to the Provisions probably operated in the other cases, although both Peter de Montfort and William Trussell, former constables of Abergavenny, were long-standing associates of the earl of Leicester<sup>6</sup>. Peter had been most strongly attached to Edward, as constable and counsellor from 1254. In 1263 he had saved Edward's Abergavenny from the Welsh attack. Ralph Basset of Drayton had geographical and familial ties with the rebel cause, although he had been a household knight by 1259, and perhaps even as early as 1256-7<sup>7</sup>. He was the only member of the Leyburn group to fight against Edward at

1) SCR 372: CPR 1258-66, pp.321,396: E159/36 m.4d.

2) the Marnham identification is not certain. A clerk of this name was implicated, but Marnham's employment as a justice in 1267 may appear incompatible.

3) CIM 302,648; C145/25/36: VCH Derby, I p.405.

4) 1258-66, p.436: RH II, p.317: CH Knowles, University of Wales PhD. 1959, citing KB26/26 m.13d.

5) KB26/198 m.17.

6) E368/32 m.18: R.Glos II 764.

7) SC6/1094/1 m.1d: CPR 1258-66, p.265: RegTC, p.173: Beauchamp Cartulary Charters 352: SCR 454: Rishanger CA, p.35.

Evesham, and, like Trussell and Peter de Montfort, died in consequence. Thomas de Pivelesden's rebel activities and fate are described above <sup>1</sup>.

In other instances personal rivalries may have played a part. While John Lestrange junior consistently supported the baronial cause, his activities seem to have been closely related to the custody of Edward's castle of Montgomery, for which he and his brother, Hamo, vied for control in the 1260's. The influence of his royalist father and brothers apparently saved him from forfeiture. Guy de Brion perhaps only manifested Montfortian sympathies as a means to replacing his neighbour, Nicholas FitzMartin as castellan of Edward's castles in West Wales. At the time of his appointment as castellan by Montfort in 1265 he was carrying on a law-suit against FitzMartin <sup>2</sup>. He may have held back from military service against the king, for he was not apparently penalised after Evesham.

None of the survivors returned to Edward's service. Lee achieved a degree of rehabilitation as a collector of the 20th. and sheriff in the 1270's <sup>3</sup>. An examination of recruitment into Edward's service after Evesham suggests that only a few ex-Montfortians were included. They possessed either connections in the royalist camp, as with Thomas de Sandwich, Leicester's clerk and member of the Dover garrison, who was also father-in-law to William de Leyburn <sup>4</sup>, and John de Picheford, who had two kinsmen in the household. Picheford may also have been a protégé of James de Audley, under whom he served as sheriff of Uryel. Robert de Lisle's appointments as constable of Odiham and sheriff may have been

1) Chapter 4.i.c.

2) KB26/210 m.21.

3) CLR 1267-72, p.138; CPR 1272-81, p.243.

4) Thomas' brother Ralph, the Montfortian keeper of the wardrobe, also benefited from this connection. In 1272-3 he was one of the auditors for Dover, and he was later appointed co-steward of the demesne.

the result of intercession by his brother-in-law, John de Musgrove <sup>1</sup>. Special circumstances rendered others acceptable to Edward, such as the Haverings (father and son) who had recommended themselves to Edward by their respectful treatment when he was a prisoner at Wallingford, helped by their prompt surrender after Evesham <sup>2</sup>.

In some instances the reason for recovery of favour is unclear. Roger de Reymes, formerly in the household of Robert de Ferrers, and associated with Godberd's group after Evesham appears to have joined the familia by 1268. At some point before 1270 he was also in the household of the earl of Gloucester, and Gloucester or one of his associates could have interceded for him <sup>3</sup>.

In the preparations for the crusade, there are indications that some of the more prominent rebels were coming back into public life. John de Vescy accompanied Grandson and Clifford to Ireland in 1270, on a mission very probably connected with preparations for the crusade <sup>4</sup>. In Sicily in 1271 he witnessed Edward's charter to William FitzWarin, which again indicates his return to a position of favour. Lloyd points out that Vescy had been brought up at Windsor, and old associations may have promoted his recovery <sup>5</sup>. Luke de Tany, the Montfortian justice of Chester, who surrendered after Evesham but may later have joined the Disinherited in Ely, became Edward's admiral of the fleet <sup>6</sup>. His prominence on the crusade is confirmed by his appointment as one of the auditors to Antony Bek's wardrobe account <sup>7</sup>. The agent of his

1) CR 1268-72, p.415.

2) CR 1264-8, pp.131,257: Studd 905; SC1/8/19.

3) CIM 259: CPR 1258-66, p.629, 66-72, p.7,11: KB 26/198 m.6.

4) Chapter 2.ii.

5) SD Lloyd, D.Phil. Oxford 1983, p.325.

6) CPR 1258-66, p.638, 66-72, p.442, 72-81, p.443: CR 1268-72, p.97: CLR 1260-67, p.222: CCR 1272-9, pp.104,381-2: RG III, pp.xix-xxiii: RH I, p.112: Röhricht, AOL II, pp.407-9.

7) Chapter 8.iii.

rehabilitation was Henry of Almain, who had obtained his pardon in 1266 and appointed him constable of Tickhill and Knaresborough. Almain's influence also extended to Tany's clerk, John de la Bere, who followed him on crusade and to Gascony <sup>1</sup>. Both Tany and Vescy continued to advance in royal service after the crusade, the former as a controversial seneschal of Gascony and Justice of the forests, and Vescy as household banneret, envoy, constable and justice. Edward's attachment to Vescy is shown by the offerings for his soul after his death <sup>2</sup>.

Perhaps ten to fifteen men entered Edward's service, despite their rebel backgrounds, between 1265 and 1270. Only 12 <sup>3</sup> took part in his crusade. Dr. Lloyd has exploded the theory that the crusade was promoted as an instrument of reconciliation between victors and defeated, and demonstrates that most crusading ex-rebels had already re-established ties with royalists <sup>4</sup>. However, the crusade may have aided further rehabilitation of participants with Montfortian associations.

Edward's attitude to ex-rebels on his return from the East may be described as ambivalent. He was strongly hostile where a degree of personal injury was involved <sup>5</sup>. In 1274 he opposed an ecclesiastical appointment on the grounds that former rebels were of no use to him and should not be promoted <sup>6</sup>. Individual such as Segrave, Eville, John FitzJohn, Norman Darcy, Vescy and Tany, and the Sandwich brothers, rose to high positions in his household and administration <sup>7</sup>. Yet in general, promotion and favour remained the prerogatives of the victors.

1) CPR 1266-72, pp.373,440: RG II 9,147: CCR 1279-88, pp.242,346.

2) Byerly II 2493,2497,2502.

3) including Reymes, Vescy, Tany and la Bere. This figure has been calculated from the tables in Lloyd, *op.cit.* pp.423-434, excluding those in Edmund's force such as Segrave, and perhaps Eyville, and adding Tany, whom Lloyd does not class as a rebel.

4) Lloyd, *op.cit.* pp.318-326.

5) e.g. Ferrers, Pivelesden, Guy de Montfort.

6) CCR 1272-9, p.66.

7) cf. M Prestwich, *Edward I*, pp.56-9.

## ii) Patterns of Recruitment and Associations within the Household

Entrance into the household was influenced by a series of geographical, tenurial and family associations, besides those who entered from the royal households or administration or from Edward's estates. Considerations of space preclude detailed analysis, but it is hoped that reference to Appendix Two will throw light on the backgrounds and associations of individual entrants. A few general points and examinations of particular associations may stand for the whole.

Personal recommendations accounted for many recruits. Peter of Savoy may have introduced not only his relations, but also his tenants, such as John de Vaux, a tenant-in-chief who also held from Peter's honour of Richmond. Richard of Cornwall and Henry of Almain introduced a number of proteges, e.g. Henry of Knaresborough, Luke de Tany, perhaps Wynemer de Gymery. Frequently, one prominent knight or clerk brought a series of connections or protégés into Edward's service. Some of these are unexpected, for example, the patronage given by Michael de Fiennes to Stephen de London, which obtained him a post as Edward's chaplain. John Hardel the Londoner may have been introduced into Edward's service through his father's association with Ralph de Dongon. John FitzGeoffrey died in 1258 but the men he had introduced had long careers ahead of them in the Irish administration and further afield in Edward's service<sup>1</sup>. More obvious are the groups of brothers or kinsmen such as the Beaumes, Chaworths, Chetwyndes, Lestranges, Nevilles, and Pichefords.

We can expect posts in Edward's household to have been in demand, carrying prestige as well as infinite future promise. It takes little imagination to envisage a scenario of ambitious parents and well-wishers

1) i.e. Richard and William de la Rochelle, Fromond le Brun, William de Bagepuz, William de Dene, Roger Crombe, Urian de St. Peter, CPR 1247-58, pp.27,44,551: Documents Illustrative of English History ed. Cole, p.93: Lydon, p.20: C47/3/43/6: E163/1/9 m.13.

seeking to establish their clients in Edward's adult household, just as fifteen years earlier Nicholas de Molis had planned to install his infant son at Windsor to be reared with the infant Edward<sup>1</sup>. Once established, such people may have sought to return the favour where possible, and also to benefit their own favourites and dependants, building up a complex series of interlocking networks of kinship and affinity. For the majority of cases, it is not difficult to explain entry to the household, via these routes, or from the royal administration or Edward's own territorial connections<sup>2</sup>.

A cautionary note should be sounded here. Many associations are still unclear, and may have been the consequence of propinquity in the household rather than the cause, such as the link between Geoffrey de Neville and Robert de Ufford. Similarly, the marriage alliance between Robert Tiptoft and the Chaworth family cannot be fully explained while its date, and the exact identity of his bride is in question. The marriages of the Vipont heiresses with the sons of Leyburn and Clifford, again took place almost a decade after their fathers' friendship was well-established<sup>3</sup>.

Patterns of recruitment in the Welsh campaign have been discussed above, where reference was made to the tenurial and kinship networks which linked the March and East Anglia. These had origins in enfiefments by Henry I of "new men" such as the FitzAlans and Lestranges<sup>4</sup>. Subsequent marriage alliances reinforced these associations, as one example will demonstrate. The death of the earl of Arundel in 1242 led to the partition of the earldom among the families of his four sisters,

1) CR 1242-7, p.30.

2) but cf. preliminary notes to Appendix 2.

3) Tout, Collected Papers II p.60, is one of several historians to attribute these marriages to Clifford and Leyburn senior.

4) Lestrangle Records, pp.4-10,23.

and the resultant territorial settlement makes it possible to trace the ramifications with comparative ease.

Sister 1 (Maud or Mabel) married Robert de Tattershall, and their son Robert was a household knight of Edward's. His son later married Robert Tiptoft's daughter.

Sister 2 (Cicely) married Roger de Montalt, later Edward's Justice of Chester, and two members of his family became household knights.

Sister 3 (Nicola) married Roger de Somery, prominent for many years in the affinity. One daughter married John Lestrangle junior, Edward's constable of Montgomery. Another daughter married his household knight, Ralph Basset of Drayton. Joan de Somery, guardian of Edward's son and widow of his knight, Ebulo de Montibus, was probably Roger's sister.

Sister 4 (Isabel) married John FitzAlan of Clun, and their son John was Edward's captain of the March in 1257. He was married to a sister of John de Verdon, Edward's Irish baron and constable, and their son married the daughter of Roger de Mortimer, one of the powerful barons of Edward's affinity.

The collateral connections stemming from this one family defy description, but it may be noted that John Lestrangle's brothers were especially prominent in the household. Hamo married Isabel d'Ibelin, an heiress in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and Roger married the daughter of William de Beauchamp of Bedford, who had accompanied Edward to the continental tournaments. Roger thus became brother-in-law to Thomas FitzOtto, husband of William's other daughter, and a connection of Thomas' brother Hugh, Edward's long-serving household knight, constable and steward. From this example, one can envisage the tangle of similar relationships which will have enmeshed most of the better-born members of Edward's household. It illustrates also the process whereby a Cheshire lord such as Montalt became a powerful landholder in East

Anglia, and the Norfolk/Lincolnshire landholder, Tattershall, might become involved in the Welsh campaign in which his FitzAlan and Lestrange kin were so closely involved <sup>1</sup>.

Less conventional, but perhaps placing the whole in better perspective, were the associations Edward formed outside the baronage and landed gentry. With certain offices, it is not surprising that recruitment depended on professional qualifications rather than other associations, such as Edward's medical attendants. Among his physicians <sup>2</sup>, a high proportion appear to have been English natives, surprising in view of the domination of continental universities, such as Montpellier and Bologna, and their graduates in the profession <sup>3</sup>. Robert de Picheford had several kinsmen in the household, perhaps because the family lands adjoined those of Robert Burnell. Abbéville was the only obvious non-native, and as a native of Ponthieu, may have entered the household through the recommendation of Eleanor of Castile's mother <sup>4</sup>. William de Farnham was probably a connection of Master Nicholas de Farnham, once professor of medicine at Bologna, who returned to England and became court physician and bishop of Durham <sup>5</sup>. Hugh de Evesham, who attended Edward's second son, Henry, was the most eminent, being physician also to Queen Eleanor of Provence and to the Pope <sup>6</sup>. Rewards

1) Lestrange Records, pp.154-8: Blomefield, Norfolk I, pp.371-3: GEC I, pp.239-40: El3/le mm.2,13.

2) Alexander de Branfield, Hugh de Lisle, William de Farnham, Giles de Abbéville, Hugh de Evesham, Robert de Picheford, Master Richard.

3) Some of Edward's physicians may have studied abroad, especially William de Farnham, in view of his family links with Bologna. Rashdall, The Universities of Europe I, Chapters 3,4, II, 8, III, p.156: CH Talbot, Medicine in Medieval England, pp.1-95. Oxford was also just beginning to recognise medical studies as a discipline, and Branfield and Evesham are thought to graduated from there, Emden, Biographical Record of the University of Oxford I, pp.248,656.

4) Eleanor later had a Spanish physician, hardly surprising, given her origins and the high reputation of Spanish/Arab medicine, Talbot & Hammond, Medical practitioners in Medieval England, pp.228,245.

5) Talbot & Hammond, pp.223-5.

6) T&H, pp.92-3: El01/350/16,18: H Johnstone, BJRL 7 (1922), pp.400-420.

for these men took advantage of their clerical status, although Abbéville and Farnham also received fees and robes <sup>1</sup>.

Of particular interest is the process whereby members of the mercantile class extended their rôles as suppliers to Edward into entrance into the household, e.g. Hugh de Gamaund, the wine merchant <sup>2</sup>. In London, in spite of Edward's poor relations with the populace, a number of citizens entered Edward's service, such as John Hardel, son to the London merchant, William Hardel, who accompanied Edward to Gascony in 1254 and became clerk of the marshalsea and keeper of his horses, in which capacities his duties took him to the siege of Kenilworth, Marseilles, Paris and Acre. John's London connections may have assisted him in procuring grain and other supplies for the stables, but in some respects it is surprising that he should have been able to combine his duties with his trade in wine and bullion. John's choice may perhaps be explained in personal terms, a craving for excitement and travel, and a love of horses <sup>3</sup>. From the Hadstock family, Edward later recruited another marshal, but in the 1260's William acted as Edward's attorney and receiver of the London fine <sup>4</sup>.

His fellow-receiver Bartholmew de Castro or Castello, another London citizen and alderman, had a much closer association with Edward, probably originating from commissions to him as a goldsmith. In 1265 he narrowly escaped lynching by a Montfortian mob, singled out for his friendship and support for Edward <sup>5</sup>. After Evesham he stood high in the city and in Edward's favour. He was made keeper of the exchange in 1266 and was involved in the negotiations for the release of Edward's

1) Tables 3,4.

2) Chapter 8.iv.

3) CLR 1267-72, pp.54,126: CPR 1247-58, p.375: E159/33 m.5d: E101/350/5 mm.1,2,3: C62/50 m.8, 58 m.4.

4) Letter-book C, p.230, f.143: C62/51 m.4.

5) C47/3/43/7: English, pp.228,231; SC6/1078/7: dALL, pp.114-5.

Londoner prisoners, and in the collection of the city's fine for goodwill <sup>1</sup>. By 1270 his rôle in Edward's finances was more prominent. He was involved in the delivery of cash to the fleet, and during Edward's absence worked with John de London and Burnell, receiving revenues and discharging debts and making payments on Edward's behalf. He held the exchange until 1279 when it was handed over entirely to Edward's Luccan merchants <sup>2</sup>.

Other members of Edward's household had strong connections with London. Most well-known is Pivelesden, but his steward, Hugh FitzOtto, another knight, Robert Aguillon, and his serjeant, John le Moine, also had family connections and property in the city. Hugh's connections may explain his appointments as keeper of the city <sup>3</sup>. Two of Edward's clerks may be classified as possible Londoners by their surnames, John and Stephen of London. In Stephen's case the probability is substantiated by his association with a citizen of London, the bureller John Prest <sup>4</sup>. Ralph de Dongon's links may only have been the result of his prebend at St.Paul's, but his associations were strong enough for him to serve as executor to William Hardel.

Edward also built up some degree of relationship with the mercantile communities in his own towns, especially in Bordeaux <sup>5</sup>, Bristol and Chester. One objective was undoubtedly sources of supply and credit, but in both Bordeaux and Bristol local merchants became involved in the administration of Edward's exchequers, e.g. Raymond Macayn in Bordeaux <sup>6</sup>, and Roger Cantok, Sampkin Reveward and Alexander de

1) CR 1264-8, p.543, 68-72, p.104: Letter-book C, p.230, f.143.

2) E159/45 m.5: E372/117 m.7, 120 m.22, 125 m.3: E101/350/5 mm.3,4,6: CPR 1272-81, p.301.

3) E13/1e m.2: CFR, p.40: Ruding, Archaeologia 17 (1814), pp.207-213: dALL, pp.xvi-lxxi.

4) Calendar of Wills of the Court of Hustings I, 391-2.

5) see Trabut-Cussac, RHB 1-2 (1952-3), pp.185-99.

6) RG II 888.

Denesway in Bristol <sup>1</sup>. As in London, these relationships became of greater significance when control of Bristol became an issue in the civil war, and the favours shown to Cantok at the expense of the Montfortian la Warres, were his reward for his support for Edward <sup>2</sup>.

The series of interlocking tenancies, feudal obligations and kinship networks contributed to the coherence of the household. Mutual interest and loyalty to Edward bound the disparate elements more closely. New associations arising from tenancies, financial transactions and marriage alliances, either provided by Edward or arranged between individual members, were superimposed on existing ties to create a still more closely-knit group. Members of the household borrowed money, sold or granted land, acted as attornies or sureties, and married within their own circle.

These transactions were not in themselves a guarantee of harmony, since the multiplication of financial and kinship associations brought a risk of disputes arising from dissatisfaction with the arrangements. In 1263 Roger de Somery sued his son-in-law, Ralph Basset of Drayton, for a debt <sup>3</sup>. However, this litigation occurred when Basset's association with Leyburn had estranged him from Edward, the court, and his wife's curialist family. Similarly, John de Verdon's eviction of Leyburn from the manor he held from Burnell in Shropshire probably occurred, with Burnell's complicity, in retaliation for Leyburn's attacks on Edward and his supporters <sup>4</sup>. Thus, both these examples relate to the divisions and hostilities of the "tempus turbacionis" rather than to discords within the household. A brief survey of the Plea Rolls does not suggest many internal dissensions. While factionalism and rivalry may explain the

1) C62/49 m.1.

2) Table 2.

3) KB26/172 m.6d.

4) KB26/175 m.2ld. It appears that Leyburn did not recover this manor, since by 1268 Burnell had conveyed it to Otto de Grandson.

tension between Leyburn and the continental recruits in the 1260's, in general the household was surprisingly free from such frictions.

The cumulative effect of the associations was to build up the strength and unity of the household, and perhaps increase its value to Edward. We may speculate whether this unity led to any inflexibility or difficulty in recruiting from outside a recognised group. It is also significant that the rewards of serving Edward were enhanced by the possibility of mutually-beneficial arrangements within the household.

The financial transactions within the household ranged from the petty to the transfer of quite large sums. Some arose from the requirements of daily activities and recreation e.g. Nicholas de Yatingden's debt of 10 marks to Warin de Bassingbourn's surgeon<sup>1</sup>, and Edward's loan from Richard de la Rochelle to wager at dice<sup>2</sup>. Other arrangements related to marriage obligations or transactions in land or wardships. In 1256 John, Edward's tailor, bought a wardship near Havering from Edward's Savoyard knight, Ebulo de Montibus<sup>3</sup>. By June 1261 another overseas knight, Erard de Valéry, had sold the remainder of the wardship of two manors which Edward had granted him, to Roger de Leyburn and Nicholas de Leuknor<sup>4</sup>. In 1267 Geoffrey de Geneville sold a wardship to Edward's butler, Walter de Capeles<sup>5</sup>.

There was particular traffic in the custody of rebel lands and in redemption fines. Hugh FitzOtto demised to Edward's buyer, Master Humphrey, land which had been confiscated from Thomas de Pivelesdon, a transaction in which buyer, vendor and former owner were all present or former members of the household<sup>6</sup>. Adam de Everingham's lands were sold

1) CR 64-8, p.373.

2) repaid 1277, E101/350/24.

3) CPR 1247-58, p.496: CR 1256-9, p.47.

4) CPR 1258-66, p.158.

5) CR 1264-8, p.381.

6) Just1/1207 m.3d.

by Tiptoft to Robert Walerand for 420 marks <sup>1</sup>. Walerand appears to have specialised in such acquisitions, cf. the transfer to him from John de la Linde of the redemption fine of Robert FitzPayne <sup>2</sup>.

In some cases it is not clear whether a transfer was the result of a sale, lease, gift or fee. Hamo Lestrangle enfeoffed Urian de St.Peter with the manor of Drayton in Sussex, who in turn enfeoffed Robert de Standon and Geoffrey de Picheford, keeper of Edward's children<sup>3</sup>. A transaction between Robert Burnell and Otto de Grandson in 1268 or earlier was said to be a grant, but Grandson returned the manors of Shene and Hamme to Burnell when he left for the crusade. In 1280 Burnell repeated the grant to Grandson and his heirs, but nevertheless the manors were listed as part of Burnell's estate at his death. Not surprisingly, the jurors of the Inquest Post Mortem disclaimed full knowledge of the arrangement <sup>4</sup>. Burnell also farmed land in Ireland to William de la Rochelle, son of Edward's former justiciar <sup>5</sup>. The circumstances in which Walter Giffard, son of Edward's tutor, Archbishop of York and lieutenant of Edward's estates for 1270-74, acquired the manor of Radene, Somerset, from Pain de Chaworth are unknown<sup>6</sup>. The grants which have survived in the records probably represent a small fraction of the whole, but they give an impression that fellow-members of the household were often in the market for sales and leases, even apart from grants of land made as retainers or for friendship.

Clerical members of the household were also able to benefit from livings in the gift of their colleagues. Burnell was an obvious recipient. Lesser men like the clerk, James de St.Victor, who was

1) E159/43 m.24.

2) KB26/186 m.4.

3) CIPM II 144.

4) CIPM III 65: CPR 1272-81, p.357.

5) CDI 1177.

6) CIPM II 314.

deputy constable of Bristol under John de Musgrove, could also benefit. He was presented to a benefice in 1265 by Warin de Bassingbourn, although it is not known whether he was already a member of the household at that point. Bassingbourn may have been assisting a protegee of his fellow-knight Musgrove, or Musgrove's choice of him as deputy may have stemmed from Bassingbourn's patronage <sup>1</sup>.

These friendly associations are reflected in many other transactions. Members of the household acted as attornies or sureties for each other, and as executors, as Walerand did for Stephen Bauzan <sup>2</sup>. For example, in 1260 Gilbert Talbot and John de Vaux were pledges for Roger de Clifford's debt to the executors of John FitzGeoffrey <sup>3</sup>. Household colleagues would also act as intermediaries in less formal transactions. John de Musgrove became entangled in the payment of Robert Bagod's debt to Hugh FitzOtto for the farm of an Irish manor <sup>4</sup>. When Richard de la Rochelle went on crusade he left his son, William and his steward, John de Eston, as his attornies, yet it was a fellow-knight, Urian de St.Peter, whom he designated to receive the money Edward owed him for a horse he supplied at Acre <sup>5</sup>. Household ties cut across national boundaries. In 1270 Florent de Varennes named Robert Walerand as his attorney, and in 1274 it was Otto de Grandson who delivered Edward's parting gift to Florent <sup>6</sup>.

Friendly associations within the household also extended to co-operation in obtaining favours from Edward or the king. Evidence of the extortion to which the abbey of Peterborough was subjected in 1264-5 indicates how local ambitions and personal profit could be fostered by

1) Registers of Walter Bronescombe, p.156.

2) KB26/160 m.11.

3) E159/33 m.10d.

4) CCR 1272-9, p.125.

5) SC1/12/7; E372/120 m.22: C62/49 m.4.

6) CPR 1266-72, p.416, 72-81, p.354.

attendance and influence on Edward <sup>1</sup>. Even Eleanor of Castile took advantage of these associations, instructing John de London, a long-standing member of Edward's household and her steward, to use Leyburn as an intermediary to obtain land grants for her from the king, in such a way that she should not appear "covetous" <sup>2</sup>. Care must be taken not to read too much into the protestations of friendship contained in various requests directed to Merton, to Burnell, to John de Kirkby, when they had attained high office under Edward I. In some instances, long-standing associations add credence to the claims of affection, as in Dongon's letter to Burnell, which also used Antony Bek as an intermediary <sup>3</sup>. These personal ties could survive retirement or separation from the household, and even the divisions of the civil war. For example, Thomas de Clare appealed to Walter de Merton, then the royal chancellor, to expedite the law-suit of Elena de Pivelesdon, whose husband was still Edward's prisoner <sup>4</sup>.

In many cases the reasons for associations within the household are unclear. Geoffrey de Neville and Robert de Ufford already held land jointly in Ulster when Edward enfeoffed them with the manor of Kilmedan, but whether this represented an earlier grant, a joint inheritance or a purchase by two friends is unknown. Their closeness is demonstrated by the frequency with which their names were linked e.g. auditing William de la Rochelle's account in Ireland c.1263, or standing surety for another household knight, Wynemer de Gymerly <sup>5</sup>. Pain de Chaworth and Robert Tiptoft were close enough by 1270 to make a joint indenture with

1) Whitlesey, Historia Anglicanae Scriptores Varii ed. J Sparke, pp.135-9: Chapter 4.id.

2) SCl/11/26.

3) SCl/22/190.

4) SCl/7/78. The Clare/Pivelesden link was probably extra-familial in origin, as Pivelesden entered Gilbert de Clare's household on release.

5) BL Add.Ch. 26515; Curtis, p.4: CR 1268-72, p.105: Table 2: Appendix 2 n.12.

Edward for the crusade. Tiptoft had probably already married into the Chaworth family. It is unclear whether the association between the two was initiated by Tiptoft's marriage, or whether that was only a confirmation of existing ties <sup>1</sup>.

Frequently, it is only chance that supplies evidence of personal ties. Richard de la Rochelle owed his patron John FitzGeoffrey so much, in terms of grants of land and advancement in Edward's service, that it is not surprising that he gave land to the abbey of St.Mary's in Dublin for the saying of masses "pro salute anime domini mei", John FitzGeoffrey <sup>2</sup>. Evocative of friendship rather than patronage is the gift of Pain de Chaworth to the abbey of Blanchland in Carmarthen for the souls of his Chaworth and London relations, dead and living, and for the soul of Warin de Bassingbourn <sup>3</sup>.

In some of these instances, particularly Neville/Ufford, and perhaps also Chaworth/Tiptoft and Chaworth/Bassingbourn, a possible explanation lies not in untraceable family links, but in a different kind of association, based (formally or informally) on the bond of "brotherhood-in-arms". Most of the non-literary evidence for contracts of fraternity derives from the fourteenth century or later <sup>4</sup>. However,

1) GEC XII ii, pp.89-93: E101/350/24: BL Add.Ch. 19829: SD Lloyd, D.Phil. p.438. The date of the marriage and the identity of the bride are unclear. If she were Pain's daughter, the marriage is unlikely to have occurred before 1275 since Pain himself was only born in 1244. Tiptoft's heir was not born until 1279, but his daughter was under thirteen but approaching marriageable age in 1276. A marriage with Pain's sister is more plausible, and could have occurred at any point in the 1260's. It should be noted that Tiptoft's friendship was particularly close with Pain, rather than with his brother Patrick and the rest of the family. Tiptoft's children were all named out of the Chaworth/London connection. Pain's Blanchland grant, below, made after 1268, does not mention Tiptoft, or a sister or daughter named Eva, unless she can be identified with the Eva de Tracy there listed, in which case Tiptoft could have been a subsequent husband.

2) Chartularies of St.Mary's Abbey, Dublin I, pp.254-5: E163/1/9 m.13.

3) Monasticon Anglicanum, William Dugdale, V, p.591.

4) MH Keen, History 47, 1962, pp.1-17.

the thirteenth century Osney Cartulary alleged that the eleventh century knights of the Conqueror, Robert d'Oilly and Roger de Ivry were "sworn brothers united by faith and oath". The validity of this tradition may be open to question, but it indicates that the concept of a fraternal contract would not have been foreign to Edward's knights. The joint tenures and other associations between d'Oilly and Ivry are a striking parallel to the relationship between Ufford and Neville <sup>1</sup>. The question whether friendships among Edward's knights included formal oaths of association must remain open, but it is clear that the inner circle of Edward's household was bound together by close personal associations.

These were not always to Edward's advantage, as may be seen in 1262 when Edward's quarrel with Roger de Leyburn separated him from a sizeable group of his household knights. Their bond to Edward as lord was less compelling than the social and political associations among themselves. At other times the cohesive qualities of household associations served to reinforce their loyalty and value to Edward. The unity of the household is demonstrated in 1264-5 when household knight, clerks and serjeants operated together to defend their lord's possessions and ultimately contrived his escape. The difference between behaviour in 1262 and 1264-5 may be explained by changing attitudes to Montfort's ambitions, but it must also reflect Edward's increasing success in binding his household together. In 1270 the crusade project was similarly facilitated by the household's capacity for expansion from that same solid core. It is no coincidence that in government, in campaign, in recreation, Edward as king drew on the tightly-knit group which had been serving him for the previous decade and earlier.

1) VCH Oxfordshire I, pp.383,413-6: The Cartulary of Osney Abbey IV 1, "fratres iurati et per fidem et sacramento confederati"

### iii) Opportunities and Rewards

As king, Edward did not have a great reputation for generosity, except to his especial favourites. Even when providing for members of his own family he was quick to seize on expedients which reduced his own capital outlay <sup>1</sup>. During the last decades of his reign, with ever increasing demands on his resources, he attempted to transfer responsibility for his superannuated servants to the religious houses <sup>2</sup>. Before his accession his resources were still more limited, and one would expect this to have been reflected in his treatment of his household. Thus, instances of open-handedness or generosity to individuals assume greater significance during this period.

Edward had several means of provision for his servants and favourites, paying wages for lesser servants, and, for established members of the household, a money fee paid from his wardrobe or exchequer, or allowed against estate revenues for those holding administrative posts. This fee could be converted into an assignation on a farm, or the grant of a wardship, or into a life-grant or permanent grant of land <sup>3</sup>. Those in clerical orders could be granted fees, but more frequently received grants of livings in Edward's gift <sup>4</sup>. Virtually all of Edward's established knights and clerks had received grants of land, life-fees or livings by the time of his accession.

Edward also used his influence with his father to obtain appointments, fees, livings or other privileges for members of his household <sup>5</sup>. A very high proportion of Edward's knights continued to receive fees and robes from the king after they had formally entered

1) e.g. McFarlane, *History* 50 (1965), pp.145-59.

2) e.g. *Chronicon Abbatiae Ramsiensis*, pp.291-5: CCR 1302-7, pp.76-7,84-6,91,100,104,107.

3) Tables 2 and 4 demonstrate the extent of these grants.

4) See Table 3.

5) e.g. CPR 1247-58, p.499.

Edward's service <sup>1</sup>. His clerks frequently benefited from livings in the royal gift <sup>2</sup>. Members of Edward's household could also profit from grants of lands or livings from landholders or ecclesiastical houses who wanted to build up contacts in places of influence <sup>3</sup>.

The royal records provide ample examples of intercessions by Edward with his father or the administration on behalf of members of his household, on legal, financial or territorial matters <sup>4</sup>. Such interventions were especially marked when Edward was preparing for the crusade, enabling his fellow-crusaders to raise funds for the expedition or arrange for their estates in their absence <sup>5</sup>. While on crusade he tried to protect their interests in England, and assisted those who fell into financial difficulties in Palestine, acting as guarantor for loans <sup>6</sup>. Edward's agents in England also made arrangements for the dependants of some of his overseas household, apparently acting on instructions from Edward himself <sup>7</sup>.

Edward's favours to his household extended into their personal affairs. He took an interest in their marriage arrangements <sup>8</sup>, and attended some weddings, such as that between Robert Aquillon and Baldwin de Lisle's widow, where Edward supplied the provisions for the wedding banquet <sup>9</sup>. Occasionally he provided contributions towards a dower

1) Appendix 2.

2) e.g. Burnel, CPR 1258-66, pp.580-3; Michael de Fiennes: William de Windsor, CR 1264-8, pp.558-9.

3) e.g. Burnel held livings from Eudo la Zuche, Chester abbey, Ashby Priory, Durham Priory, and a retainer from Durham, Rot.R.Gravesend, pp.124,126,194; R.Giffard, p.57; Durham Annals, pp.87,213; John de London held livings from Bermondsey Priory, Henry de Lacy, Stephen de Chenduit and Hugh de Culworth, Rot.R.Gravesend, pp.152,182,192,242.

4) e.g. remission of debts, E159/36 m.13d, CPR 1266-72, p.467; pardons, CPR 1258-66, p.250; quittances, CPR 1266-72, p.390.

5) e.g. CPR 1266-72, pp.435,447.

6) e.g. to Hamo Lestrange, Roger de Clifford, John de Grailly, E36/274 ff.226,235; Röhricht, AOL I, p.618.

7) e.g. for Walter de Saundon's wife, C62/51 m.7: E372/125 m.3.

8) e.g. Grandson's projected marriage, Kingsford TRHS (1909), p.131.

9) E101/350/5 m.3.

settlement, as in the marriage of Eleanor's Provençal attendant, Joanna de Vauvert to Edward's knight, William Charles, when £30 p.a. was promised with the bride. Significantly, their son was one of the few to bear Edward's name <sup>1</sup>. Bogo de Knoville, whose links with Edward are little known, was given a generous grant towards his marriage <sup>2</sup>. Robert Tiptoft was later given 100 marks towards his daughter's marriage <sup>3</sup>.

For those who met a violent death in Edward's service particular honours were reserved. The fragmentary wardrobe account for 1263 records that the bodies of three knights who had been killed during the Deganwy campaign were wrapped in cloth of gold at Edward's expense and buried in the abbey church at Chester. One of these knights, Hugh de Hersy, was Edward's tenant and the wardship of his heirs and lands fell to Edward. Contrary to usual custom, Edward arranged for the revenues to be devoted to masses for Hugh's soul, and any surplus was reserved for Hugh's heirs <sup>4</sup>. Another of Edward's knights, John de Vaux, was killed during a tournament at Thirsk, and Edward sent his body to the monks of Durham with instructions for its reception and prayers for the dead man's soul <sup>5</sup>. Offerings for long-established members of the household who died after Edward's accession also indicate Edward's continued favour and affection, e.g. for Hugh FitzOtto, the ex-Montfortian, John de Vescy, and for John de Vaux of Shotsham, who also received the thirteenth century equivalent of a state funeral, with his body and coffin wrapped in cloth of gold <sup>6</sup>.

When Stephen Bauzan, whose service to Edward dated back to his childhood at Windsor, was killed at the battle of Cymerau in 1257,

1) Table 2.

2) Appendix 2, n.8.

3) E101/350/24.

4) C47/3/43/7: CPR 1272-81, p.110.

5) *Durham Annals* 22: Appendix 2 n.14

6) Byerly II 2549; 2493,2497,2502; 1633-4.

leading the defence of Edward's West Welsh lands, Edward provided for his widow, Agnes <sup>1</sup>. Edward's favours to the Bauzan family did not end there. Stephen's heir was his brother, Richard, who evidently viewed the inheritance of lands in Carmarthen as a very poor prospect in view of the Welsh advance. He was enabled to exchange them for lands in Edward's custody in England <sup>2</sup>. Another of Edward's commanders, Patrick de Chaworth, was killed in Wales in 1258. His family were wealthy enough not to require subsidising by Edward, but it is probably significant that his sons Patrick and Pain entered Edward's household at an early age and made very successful careers in his service.

Just as he showed resentment of special injuries or ingratitude, as in the cases of Thomas de Pivelesden, Robert de Ferrers and Guy de Montfort, and later of John de Grailly, Dafydd ap Gruffydd, and various unfortunate Scots, Edward showed gratitude for good service or for particular favours. His foundation of Darnhall, later Vale Royal, apparently made in fulfilment of a vow made during a perilous sea-voyage, was placed under the jurisdiction of Dore Abbey, near Hereford. This was said to be in token of the kindness shown by the monks of Dore to Edward while he was a captive at Hereford <sup>3</sup>. His Montfortian jailer, Richard de Havering, was later treated leniently in recognition of his conduct while Edward was in his charge. The men who had held his castles and attempted and then achieved his rescue were favoured in the allocation of confiscated lands, and remained in Edward's favour until their deaths. Virtually all the lands confiscated from rebels, which came into Edward's possession, were distributed by him among the members

1) CPR 1258-66, p.177: E368/36 m.6d.

2) LW 72: Walker, op.cit. p.654.

3) The Ledger Book of Vale Royal Abbey, ed. J Brownbill, p.4.

of his household <sup>1</sup>. The cluster of deaths among his most favoured knights in the late 1260's and early 1270's is the principal reason why the transfer of knights from his household onto the royal payroll was not even more wholesale <sup>2</sup>.

There were good opportunities for promotion within Edward's household. Many of his administrative officers progressed from custody of one castle to a greater office. Gilbert Talbot successively held Chester, Edward's Gwent castles, and the stewardship of the estates. Thomas de Bolton was promoted from the Bristol exchequer, via the 1265 campaign to the stewardship of the estates. Burnell advanced from a clerk, perhaps to the keeping of the wardrobe, and then to chancellor and lieutenant in Edward's absence, before becoming chancellor on his lord's return to England as king. The careers of lesser men such as Walter de Shelfhanger and Adam de Chetwynde were discussed above<sup>3</sup>.

Success in Edward's service was also a stepping-stone to promotion in the royal administration. Warin de Bassingbourn, who held no administrative or domestic office in Edward's household, but whose influence was very strong, as the abbot of Peterborough discovered, must surely have owed his appointments as sheriff and justice of the forest to his position with Edward. It is noticeable that these positions did not affect his almost constant attendance on Edward. Other examples where advancement by the crown was due to Edward's favour were Adam de Jesmond, Hamo Lestrangle, and Leyburn, although the latter's achievements were due as much to his own abilities and fortuitous circumstances. From

1) e.g. to Itier Bouchard, William Charles, Thomas de Clare, William de Gunneville, Adam de Montgomery, John de Musgrove, Robert Tiptoft, and perhaps also to Warin de Bassingbourn, Roger Mortimer, Hugh FitzOtto, John de Vaux, John de Verdon, see Chapter 4, Table 2.

2) e.g. Warin de Bassingbourn who was with Edward virtually without interruption from 1255 until his death in 1269, Hamo Lestrangle, Roger de Leyburn, Robert Walerand.

3) Chapter 8.iv.

1265-70 a remarkable number of posts in the royal administration were filled by Edward's affinity, demonstrating again his increasing influence in all matters pertaining to the government.

On his accession the majority of his existing household, domestic, military and external, continued to serve him. Domestic staff, once established, tended to remain for life; for example his tailor, Adinettus, his groom, Richard Foun who both served him for over 30 years, and his baker, Robert, his falconer, Gillet, and his sumptermen, the le Charron brothers, all with twenty years service. Notoriously long-serving among knights was Otto de Grandson, but the terms of service of Roger Lestrangle, Robert Tiptoft, Robert Ufford, and the less prominent Stephen de Montferrand, William de Montrevell, and John Ferre were almost as protracted. Among clerks could be instanced John de London, Itier Bouchard, Peter Lef, Philip de Willoughby and of course, Burnell. After Edward's coronation his old associates became key instruments in the implementation of his policies and benefited also from his greater opportunities to employ and reward them <sup>1</sup>.

1) see Appendix 2, with especial reference to Burnell, Thomas de Clare, Grailly, Grandson, Reginald de Grey, John de Havering, Roger Lestrangle, John de London, Roger de Mortimer, FitzOtto, Tany, Tiptoft, Hugh de Turberville, Ufford, Vescy, Willoughby.

### CONCLUSION

This study<sup>has</sup> been concerned with an examination of Edward's assets, his financial and territorial resources, and the human resources contained in his household and affinity, and the opportunities they afforded him. A number of significant points have emerged.

The previous emphasis on the Savoyard and Poitevin presence in Edward's household, with the rivalry and confrontation between them which ensued, must be revised in favour of an interpretation giving a more heterogeneous non-native element. This provided an international dimension to the household, drawing Edward more deeply into the circle of vassals and kinsmen of the French king. French attitudes to the Montfortian regime may have been hardened in consequence, and Edward's recruitment to Louis' crusade was inspired and facilitated by the associations previously established.

The restrictions on Edward's utilisation of his endowment emerge as largely nominal, until exploited by the supporters of the Provisions and then turned against Edward and the reformers by the conservative reaction. In financial terms, the original endowment is shown to have become entirely inadequate to Edward's needs. The additional resources made available, and the expedients he employed to meet his commitments, form interesting precedents for his policies as king.

The examination of the household, justified because of its central importance, has led to findings in general accord with those of historians who have examined households in other periods. The evidence of patterns of recruitment and service, with personal recommendations and associations outweighing territorial connections, largely confirms Dr. Given-Wilson's observations for the royal household at a later

period<sup>1</sup>. There are opportunities for further work here, particularly on the groupings within the household, and the question of internal tensions within what appears to have been a very coherent working unit.

The value for his future governance of the connections Edward formed in these years is endorsed, and it has been possible to backdate these from the crusade period to the civil war and even to the late 1250's. Edward's rôle in the pacification and his territorial acquisitions, or rather his abstention from them, have been examined in some detail, as has his use of his household knights to implement his military strategies. It appears that it took Edward some years to overcome his prejudice against the defeated Montfortians and admit them to his household. With a few notable exceptions, such as John de Havering and John de Vescy, the key to his favour for many years remained evidence of royalist alignment, and more particularly membership of his affinity, during the war years.

It has not been possible to attempt a full account of Edward's developing political experience and skills. His use of the tournament, both in England and abroad, as a means of expanding his affinity for military and political purposes, has been discussed, but would repay further exploration. Edward's increasing political stature and influence on government also requires more prolonged consideration. The progression from the isolated instances in the mid-1260's where Edward acted as an arbitrator, or representative of the crown<sup>2</sup>, to the

1) C. Given-Wilson, The Royal Household and the King's Affinity, pp.58,217-8.

2) e.g. his arbitration in the Hereford dispute, although it is not clear that he achieved the final settlement, Hereford D&C 2932, 2947E, but cf. 2947 C,D and RegTC, pp.91-3. His involvement in the protest to the Lambeth Council in 1261 may have been symbolic only, GC II, pp.212-3, but cf. his freedom to use his own judgement to deal with Gaston de Bearn's petition, SCl/14/123.

accumulation of evidence of his involvement in adjudication and law-enforcement <sup>1</sup>, legislation <sup>2</sup> and government in the post-Evesham period, and the whole question of his rôle in government over 1265-70, merits closer examination.

While this work has established the commanding position which Edward had achieved by the time of his departure for the crusade, as witness the arrangements made for the security of his inheritance, it could not explore the process whereby Edward reached this position of authority in England. Much more must have been involved than his successes on campaign, although these undoubtedly served to enhance his prestige. It is sometimes implied that he and his supporters moved into a power vacuum after Evesham <sup>3</sup>. It is more realistic to ask what kind of accommodation and intrigue occurred between his affinity, the king and the other interest groups which surfaced after the royalist victory. Much valuable work has been done on the politics and personalities of the 1258-65 period, and on the conflicts and stresses of the years immediately after Evesham. The remainder of the reign, from 1267 onwards, still awaits a deeper analysis.

1) e.g. CChR 1257-1300, p.415: CPR 1266-72, pp.152,278.

2) not only relating to his own interests, such as the tournament provisions, but in the statutes of Jewry and Marlborough.

3) e.g. Powicke, Henry III and the Lord Edward, p.503.

APPENDIX ONE: THE EXTRAORDINARY AUDIT OF 1262

The exchequer-managed audit of Edward's bailiffs of 1262 is worthy of closer examination, both for the information it sheds on Edward's estate management and financial affairs, and because of its implication in the quarrel between Edward and Roger de Leyburn, which seriously affected the stability and government of the realm. A few preliminary points should be made. Leyburn was serving as Edward's estate steward by December 1259. During his period of office there is no evidence that Edward was dissatisfied with his work. He accompanied Edward on his first visit to the continental tournament circuit <sup>1</sup>. It seems plausible that he had surrendered the steward's office before the party left England. Thomas de Pivelesden may have succeeded, or alternatively deputised for him, during this period. John le Breton took office as steward on 1 July 1261 <sup>2</sup>. Leyburn did not accompany Edward on his next continental sortie <sup>3</sup>. He was already estranged from Edward, not for any reason connected with the stewardship, but because the political crisis of Easter-May 1261 had left Edward aligned with his father and showing signs of hostility to the Provisions.

At Michaelmas 1261 the new steward, John le Breton, presided over a general audit of the accounts of Edward's bailiffs, including Leyburn, probably an annual event <sup>4</sup>. As far as is known, this was the first occasion on which the audit was held in London rather than Bristol, but the evidence is too slight to read great significance into this. The auditors were all drawn from Edward's financial and estate administration, assisted by the abbot of Tintern and by Arnold de

1) October 1260-March 1261, Chapter 8.v.

2) Table 6.

3) July 1261-February 1262.

4) RegTC, p.174, f.48: the audit must have occurred after le Breton took office and before the end of the regnal year in October.

Berkeley from the royal exchequer. External auditors were a feature on other occasions, and Edward's administration frequently drew on the expertise of members of the royal administration, so again there need not be anything unduly sinister about Berkeley's presence. Cumulatively though, these are indications that a departure from custom was taking place <sup>1</sup>. The events that followed were quite unprecedented.

Towards the end of the Michaelmas term (probably in December 1261, judging from the assignation of attendance dates in early January), the king ordered a general audit of the accounts of Edward's bailiffs, using the exchequer machinery to make the arrangements, with auditors appointed by Edward but under the supervision of the king's treasurer, the abbot of Peterborough, John de Caux. Edward was still overseas, as he had been when his administration carried out their audit.

A key question is whether Henry III or Edward was the instigator of the audit. The preamble to the first summons stated that the king was taking action because Edward was overseas. This need not imply interference on the part of the king. The new audit stemmed from that carried out by le Breton; this at least is implied by the timing, and the statement <sup>2</sup> that "multi ballivi sui sibi teneantur in ratiociniis in compotis reddendis". Arrangements for the new audit were closely coordinated with le Breton, and the choice of the royal treasurer to preside may have been due to his friendship with Edward. Similarly, when Leyburn's assets were seized, two members of Edward's household, albeit with connections with the Queen's faction carried out the inquiry.

It may be that the earlier audit was also targetted on Leyburn, for the auditors were specifically said to have audited the accounts of Leyburn, Clifford, Stoke and other bailiffs. This grouping of names

1) Chapter 6.i.

2) E159/36 m.4d: Chapter 6.ii.

occurs in one of the royal writs sent to the exchequer about the audit:

"omnes illos quorum nomina eis (baronibus) liberarentur ex parte senescalli domini E coram illis ad audiendum compotos de terris eiusdem Edwardi venire facerunt auctoritate cuius mandati predicti barones venire fecerunt Rogerum de Leyburn, Rogerum de Clifford, Rogerum de Stok. et quosdam alios ballivos eiusdem Edwardi ad compotos suos reddendum de tempore quo fuerunt ballivi sui..."<sup>1</sup>.

Nothing in the offices held by Clifford and Stoke really explains their prominence in this list. All three were probably appointed by Edward during autumn 1259, in his attempt to shake off conciliar control of his estates (Stoke and Leyburn certainly were appointed the, and Clifford probably, since he was removed from office in May 1260). All three featured on the list of those found to be indebted to Edward. Against this argument, it must be pointed out that no other exchequer summons linked the three men, and while Clifford and Leyburn were summoned before Christmas, Stoke was not summoned until over a month later. The number of other bailiffs summoned also points against the penalisation of this trio. When the mechanics of the audit are examined, it can be seen that more than Leyburn's activities were involved.

The first exchequer summons went out before Christmas, scheduling bailiffs to appear before the auditors on various dates in January 1262. Through defaults, repeated examinations and new summons, the affair continued through 1262, with summons issued for attendance at the octaves of Michaelmas 1262<sup>2</sup>. Overall, 41 former officers, 1 newly-replaced constable, and 7 current bailiffs were summoned to the audit. The names of those selected for audit were supplied by Edward's steward, John le Breton. 17 men were summoned in the Michaelmas term, to appear

1) E159/36 m.8d; E368/36 m.10.

2) E159/36 mm.4d,5d,7,8d,9d,11,13-5,17; E368/36 mm.6d,10-12,14d-15d.

in January <sup>1</sup>. In Hilary a further 15 were summoned <sup>2</sup>. In the Easter term were added 1 more constable <sup>3</sup> and a series of 11 prevosts and deputies <sup>4</sup>, and in Trinity, 2 constables <sup>5</sup>, 2 bailiffs <sup>6</sup> and le Breton himself <sup>7</sup>.

Can any pattern be detected in the summons? Some of the officers had served in the early years of Edward's lordship, (such as Ivo de Elinton, Imbert de Montferrand), and had already rendered account in 1257 (e.g. William de Horsendon, Nicholas de Marnham). While some had been appointed during Edward's radical phase (e.g. Leyburn himself, Stoke, Clifford), the vast majority had not. Many of the Savoyard faction were themselves singled out, e.g. Peter and Boniface of Savoy, Peter's agent in Hastings, John de la Rede, Imbert de Montferrant and Ivo de Elinton. One of the more curious aspects of selection was that it included those who had held office when the estates were out of Edward's control, such as John de la Rede, Gerard la Grue and William de Eggemere (agents for Aymer de Valence in Tickhill), and John Mansel (the government-appointed keeper of Tickhill after the Lusignan expulsions).

1) Geoffrey Russell, Fors wardship; Ivo de Elinton, Peak; Warin de Bassingbourn, Ellesmere; William de Wilton, Ferrers wardship; John Mansel, Tickhill; Drew de Barentin, Channel Isles; Boniface of Savoy, Hastings and Elham; Geoffrey de Cauz, Monmouth; Ralph Bugg, Peak, Henry de Lee and Eustace de Balliol, Levinton wardship; Peter de Savoy, Hastings; John Lestrangle, Montgomery; Imbert de Montferrand, Montgomery; Roger de Clifford, Three Castles; Henry de Burn, Hastings; and Leyburn.

2) Agnes Bauzan, Totnes; Roger de Stoke, Stamford, Tickhill, Cantilupe wardship, and the collectors of murage for Stamford; John de Hadenham, fees Chester; Robert de Ludham, FitzRobert wardship; Pain de la More, Channel Islands; John de la Rede, Peter of Savoy's Hastings bailiff; Simon de Ribeford, Builth; William de Montagu, Three Castles; Maurice de Berkeley, Cardigan and Carmarthen; Peter de Montfort, for his deputy Robert le Waleys at Monmouth; Gilbert Talbot, Chester; Gerard la Grue and William de Eggemere, Tickhill (keepers for Aymer de Valence); Walter de Capeles, wines; executors Edmund de Lacy, Longvilers wardship.

3) William de Horsendon, for the Peak.

4) for the New Forest and Cantilupe and Ferrers wardships.

5) John FitzJohn, for Bristol, Grosmont and Ewyas Lacy; Nicholas de Marnham, for Tickhill.

6) Thomas Bacon, Montalt custody; Thomas Waleton, Cantilupe custody.

7) for all offices he had held, including the wardrobe.

The omissions from the audit also conform to no obvious system <sup>1</sup>.

Geographically, the summons appear equally unsystematic. Not all the summons were for the English and Welsh lands administered by the chief steward. Gilbert Talbot was also summoned for Chester <sup>2</sup>, and Hadenham for the East Anglian fees attached to Chester, besides Barentin and de la More for the Channel Islands. For some estates, several previous bailiffs were summoned <sup>3</sup>, while for others only one bailiff was required <sup>4</sup>. Robert Walerand was summoned as steward of the New Forest, but not as Constable of Bristol. No summons were issued for Abergavenny, Kilgaran, the Cheshire and North Welsh castles, the Segrave wardship, and some of the lesser wardships. The scope of the inquiry was not exclusively territorial, since it included the account of the butler for the sale of wines, and that of le Breton for the wardrobe.

The summons issued late in the audit are worthy of comment, in that they may have been made as a check on claims made by earlier bailiffs. Additional constables of the Peak and Tickhill were summoned, and a number of lesser officials and deputies from the Cantilupe and Ferrers wardships. Some of these later summons were for estates not previously covered by the inquiry <sup>5</sup>. It is conceivable that these extra summons were part of a validation process, a means to check on the accuracy and veracity of other bailiffs. However, it is significant that the only keeper of the Ferrers custody, for which 10 under-bailiffs were additionally summoned to account, William de Wilton, was not held to be in any way at fault.

1) as a comparison with bailiffs listed in Table 6 will demonstrate.

2) he was described unusually as "quondam custode comitatu Cestrie", E159/36 m.5d.

3) e.g. Hastings, Peak, Tickhill, Monmouth, Montgomery.

4) e.g. Builth, Chester, Carmarthen and Cardigan.

5) Ewyas Lacy; New Forest; English estates of the Montalt custody.

It seems more probable that, in the course of the audit, revelations about some accounts had occasioned concern that the problems could be still more widespread. The apparent illogicalities may only be apparent to historians, lacking the actual accounts rendered. It is possible that all those summoned were in default or in arrears from earlier accounts. If so, the scope of the audit must be taken as a sweeping indictment of Edward's administration for allowing this.

It is remotely possible that the accounts under attack were those of bailiffs or ex-bailiffs whose political opinions were at odds with those of Edward and the king. These would include Leyburn, Clifford, perhaps Stoke, Peter de Montfort, John Lestrangle, John FitzJohn, and perhaps Marnham<sup>1</sup>. Other bailiffs holding the same offices might have been summoned in a validation process. Against this argument, other bailiffs from the same estates or of radical views, were not summoned at all, such as Hamo Lestrangle. Moreover, this explanation does not account for the inclusion of bailiffs of other estates, or of consistently conservative political opinions e.g. Walerand. An examination of the audit's results may permit the discarding of some of these hypotheses.

The audit revealed that a number of bailiffs were in debt to Edward. Henry de Burn and Ralph Bugg were said to be in arrears for the posts they were currently holding<sup>2</sup>. This was hardly surprising since the whole system of medieval accounting made it likely that a prudent bailiff would have some cash in hand at any given time. In Bugg's case it seems improbable that he could have been in debt at all, given the arrangements for the payment of his farm agreed earlier<sup>3</sup>.

The majority of the debtors were held to be in arrears for posts

1) cf. Chapter 9.i.

2) Burn owed £18/2/3 for Hastings and Bugg £30 for the Peak.

3) Studd 783,809: C61/4 mm.3,2. Under this agreement, Bugg had already paid the farm up to May 1262, and the tallage had been granted to him in repayment of a debt.

which they had earlier given up. Records of the royal exchequer make it clear that such a situation was not uncommon. These debtors were Drew de Barentin and Pain de la More <sup>1</sup>, the executors of the widow of Walter de Scoteny <sup>2</sup>, Roger de Stok <sup>3</sup>, Roger de Clifford <sup>4</sup>, William de Horsendon <sup>5</sup> and Roger de Leyburn <sup>6</sup>. Thus the audit revealed eight bailiffs in arrears, out of almost fifty who had been examined. Leyburn was by far the largest debtor; his arrears were noted in two sections. In the Easter term (probably in April), it was discovered that he was in arrears of £382/7/3 ob. In Trinity (probably in June) he was said to owe a further £1,820/17/10:

"quas recepit tam de warderoba ipsius Edwardi quam de Ricardo de Bedeford et aliis mercatoribus et debitoribus eiusdem Edwardi, et de quibus debet respondere in compoto suo coram auditoribus compoti ipsius Edwardi et non respondit" <sup>7</sup>.

The smaller sum may have been the deficit for the account rendered at the earlier audit in Michaelmas 1261 or in January/February 1262. The larger sum probably consisted of receipts which had not been included in his account. It was certainly connected with the loans he had contracted for Edward in mid-1260 at the fairs <sup>8</sup>. This was an accounting deficit only, caused by a failure to account fully, or to produce sufficient writs of allocate to justify disbursements, leading to all his receipts being charged against him as debts. The nature of his expenditure could also have been brought into question. Edward's change of political direction could well have led to the repudiation of expenditure incurred in the attempt to force a parliament in early 1260.

- 1) £126/4/7 ob. and £44 respectively for the Channel Islands.
- 2) £6/9/2.
- 3) £200 or £207/5/4 for Tickhill, Stamford and Grantham, and the Cantilupe wardship.
- 4) £239/12/0 for the Three Castles.
- 5) £27/5/7 for the Peak.
- 6) £302/7/3 ob. and £1,820/17/10.
- 7) E159/36 mm.8d,13; E368/36 m.15.
- 8) Table 1.

In all the cases where a debt was discovered, orders went out to the appropriate sheriffs to levy the required sums from the personal goods and lands of the debtor <sup>1</sup>. Several of the bailiffs at this stage offered pledges that the sums would be settled by an appointed date, and this would have led to a relaxation of the distraint (e.g. Burn, Clifford, Horsendon). Pain de la More did not apparently offer pledges until the following year. In Easter term 1263 it was ordered that no distraint take place on his lands, since he had offered pledges to settle the debt at All Saints <sup>2</sup>. This evidence establishes that the findings of the audit were being followed through, even at this late date, again confirming that the scope of the inquiry extended beyond Leyburn's affairs. The only case in which actual confiscation was recorded was that of Leyburn, although his debts were in any case on a different scale. The other financial arrangements reached with Clifford during Easter term 1262 do not indicate a vendetta against him <sup>3</sup>.

Leyburn, in spite of earlier offering a pledge, William Heleman, that he would appear before the exchequer to answer in late July, defaulted. His pledge appeared before the exchequer in October, and could not explain Leyburn's failure to appear, which, as he then been in open revolt for some months, was scarcely surprising <sup>4</sup>. As early as April 1262 his lands, including the manor he held from Edward, had been confiscated, and by the end of July he was held to be in open revolt against the crown <sup>5</sup>. In association with William de Detling, a former

1) E159/36 m.17.

2) E368/37 m.16.

3) cf. Ridgeway, D.Phil. p.389n. Action taken on his other debts represented a scaling-down of his obligations, for his father's debts, and for those incurred as a pledge for John le Breton. These debts were of some antiquity; the exchequer was displaying flexibility and patience in rescheduling the terms, E159/31 m.13d, 36 mm.10d,14d.

4) E159/36 m.17.

5) CR 1261-4, pp.117,170-1.

associate of William de Valence, he made attacks on the lands of the Savoyard Archbishop of Canterbury. With Clifford, Hamo Lestrangle, John Giffard, John de Vaux, and Ralph Basset, all seceders from Edward's household, he allied with Simon de Montfort, and attacked Edward's Marcher lands and those of his allies, such as Robert Walerand <sup>1</sup>.

Leyburn and his affinity continued at odds with Edward until late summer 1263, when a combination of political realignments and bribery returned them to his household. The account question was never resolved, and is not mentioned in the surviving documents relating to the reconciliation. After Leyburn's death, his son obtained an assurance that none of his father's outstanding accounts, including the one for his service as Edward's steward, would be pursued <sup>2</sup>.

Why did the king and Edward react so strongly to Leyburn's deficit? Edward had previously shown impatience with even very petty bailiffs, who had left office without rendering account or discharging small sums outstanding. William de Fossato, bailiff of the Segrave manors of Sileby and Dichesworth in Leicestershire from 1254-58, was pursued for two subsequent years through the courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, and Bigod's special eyre for his failure to render his final account and for a debt of £15/13/4 <sup>3</sup>. Given this persistence in a very minor matter, it is less surprising that the number of defaulting bailiffs and the sums involved provoked much more trouble in 1261-2. Many of these debts or failures to account should have been apparent to earlier auditors. Edward's whole administrative organisation was being called into question by the inquiry, and placed under examination together with the individual officers. Edward's acute financial problems may have been

1) GC II, pp.221-4, 226: Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, p.310: Ridgeway, pp.397-9, gives the fullest account of the attacks of 1262-3.

2) CPR 1272-81, p.334.

3) KB26/158 mm.12d,18d, 162 m.10d.: Just1/1187 m.3.

considered due to poor administration or fraud. This explains the breadth of the inquiry and the seriousness with which the king treated the affair, who claimed to regard the deficits as a personal loss:

"Et quia reputavit predictam pecuniam de predicti arreragiis tanquam suam, precepit quod per vicecomitem suum levarentur predicti denarii de bonis et terris et catallis" <sup>1</sup>.

Why did this administrative matter develop into a national crisis? The continuation of Gervase of Canterbury may have been correct to attribute Leyburn's disgrace to the queen. It is certainly true that Leyburn had been associated with the Lusignans and therefore may have been perceived as aligned with them against the faction headed by the queen's Savoyard relatives. After his disgrace he singled out the lands of the Savoyard Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishop of Hereford.

Against this the audit is unlikely to have been instigated by the Savoyard faction at court, given the involvement of several Savoyards bailiffs. Nor was Leyburn the only victim, although he was the greatest debtor. Perhaps it was his intransigence that escalated the problem. Interestingly, another of the indebted bailiffs, Roger de Clifford, joined him in opposition, although earlier he had rendered his account and promised to settle the debt. Hamo Lestrangle, although a former bailiff of Edward, was not summoned to account. The vast majority of those who accounted were not involved in the trouble that followed. Others in the group that clustered round Leyburn and Clifford as far as can be seen were in no way involved in the original dispute.

Undoubtedly there was a political dimension to the crisis. The pardons granted to Leyburn and his friends in late summer 1263 by the king attributed their actions to the royal failure to implement the Provisions. This represents Leyburn's version of the dispute <sup>2</sup>.

1) E159/36 m.8d.; E368/36 m.10.

2) CPR 1258-66, p.278,284,382.

There was a connection between the group and Simon de Montfort. Two of the group reconciled to Edward in August 1263 broke with the royalists after the Mise of Amiens and returned to the support of Montfort<sup>1</sup>. Otherwise, the strongest links between Leyburn and his supporters were their enthusiasm for the tournament, probably being used as a rallying point for their campaign<sup>2</sup>, and their service to Edward. This latter point was where they were vulnerable. Clifford, Leyburn, and Hamo Lestrangle had all been forced to give up castles held for Edward, after his capitulation to his father in May 1260. Although they had maintained their positions in Edward's household during his continental tour of 1260-61, it may be that continuing royal hostility and Edward's own political realignment and increasing ties with other groups, such as his continental knights, had eroded their ties with him. Even the Michaelmas audit occurred after their connection with Edward had been cut, rendering it more likely that the accounting procedure was carried out in a hostile spirit.

To some extent the financial and political motives can be have revealed a wider series of problems. Many of these should have been dealt with earlier, such as the deficits of Horsendon and de la More, reconciled. An audit instigated against a particular bailiff could well which had been overdue even before Leyburn took office. Thus, while not losing sight of the political implications, there was still an administrative dimension to the crisis. Dr. Ridgeway's suggestion that Henry III considered that mismanagement was at the root of his son's financial problems, and insisted on the inquiry before bailing him out, is persuasive, although Ridgeway's view of the restrictions then placed on Edward is unacceptable<sup>3</sup>.

1) John Giffard and Ralph Basset.

2) CR 1261-4, p.133.

3) Ridgeway, D.Phil. p.389.

Ironically, the chief casualty of the affair may have been not Leyburn, but John le Breton, who gave up the office of steward at the height of the crisis. He held no further posts for Edward, and Edward's reaction to his election as bishop of Hereford suggests that he had entirely lost Edward's favour. Another consequence of the affair may have been the reorganisation of the estates in June 1262, and the appointment of two stewards to administer them. Conceivably, the new arrangements were intended to stabilise Edward's finances and to put a check on negligence or criminality on the part of the steward.

The statute of Westminster II introduced a series of legal sanctions for the great landowners to use against bailiffs found to be in arrears or default. It is very unlikely that the government's motive in introducing the legislation was influenced by the Leyburn case. It is significant that the facilities being made available to landlords in 1285, i.e. the use of the exchequer audit machinery for disputed accounts, and the extension of the legal sanctions to include outlawry and confiscation of assets, were precisely those expedients which Edward had enjoyed in 1262. If there was a connection between the measures of 1262 and 1285, it was that Edward was prepared to allow other landowners the facilities which he had enjoyed two decades earlier <sup>1</sup>.

1) Plucknett, The Legislation of Edward I, pp.153-6; Prestwich, Edward I, p.275

APPENDIX TWO: ANALYSIS OF HOUSEHOLD AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Over 1254-72 more than 700 persons served Edward in his household or administrations. The information available on them is presented here in tabular form to permit comparisons and analysis. Several key questions have been addressed: origins, experience, relations with the royal administration and later careers.

While reluctant to impose generalisations on individuals whose rank and service varied from the purely domestic to the highly political, a few points may be made. In the early years, Edward's recruits were drawn from the royal service, whereas by the end of the following decade, it was Edward's men who moved into the royal household and administration and assumed a dominant rôle. This reversal is indicative of Edward's changing position in the country and government.

Surprisingly few of Edward's own tenants entered his service, except in local administration. There are some geographical patterns, e.g. the high proportion with marcher connections, but entry to the household operated rather through personal connections or recommendations. There are a significant number of dynastic recruitments, e.g. of brothers or sons, such as the Beaumes, Chaworths, Lestranges and Charrons. At a domestic level, some of the professional families in the royal administration succeed in introducing cadets into Edward's household, such as the Erlham family (falconers) and the Saundons (cooks). A brief analysis of the households of Eleanor of Castile's household and their children is included. This reveals a striking insularity, with virtually no attendants from her own country, and almost all staff drawn from Edward's household, and a few women from that of the queen.

With regard to future service, it is noticeable that many of Edward's pre-1272 household remained with him until death or ill-health forced retirement. Political shifts in the composition of the household

are only poorly represented in the table, but have been discussed in Chapter Nine.

Some minor figures from the local estate administrations have been omitted, but in general the survey is as comprehensive as possible. It does not include those taking part in the crusade, unless they can be shown to have been previously associated with Edward. The information has been heavily compressed and abbreviated to accommodate it to a tabular form. Spatial constraints have also required the omission of full references, although this is partially compensated in Tables 2-5. Otherwise, the information presented here has been drawn from the sources, printed and unprinted, listed in the Bibliography. A few additional notes are given at the end, principally concerned with problems of identification.

The layout of the table requires further comment:

**Column 1.** Name.

**Column 2a).** Rôle in administration of Edward's estates.

**2b).** Rôle in household.

Activities overlapping these categories run across the column.

**Column 3.** Dates in service Edward. Those listed are firmly established by evidence. In all probability, a man known to have served Edward in 1255 and 1257 continued in service in 1256, but while such information can be extrapolated from the table, it appeared desirable to confine entries in the table to factual ones only. Qualification by "?" indicates some doubt or the deduction of a date from other evidence. "T.date" =witness, "S.date"=Surety, in that year.

**Column 4.** Grants by Edward of land "G", fee "F", wages "W", robes "R", livings "L", horses "H", or other, e.g. wine, venison or timber "P".

**Column 5.** Attendance on crusade. Compiled from known presence with Edward in Acre or Sicily, or from contracts, letters of protection or appointment of attorneys. Where the subject only set off in 1271 with Edmund, or formed part of the French force, the "C" is qualified "(C)".

Where the subject's attendance is in doubt, "?C" is used.

**Column 6.** Military service. This covers

- 6a). The Gascon campaign of 1253-4 "G".
- 6b). The Welsh campaign of 1257 "W".
- 6c). Battles of Northampton, Lewes and Evesham "N","L","E".
- 6d). The Kenilworth campaign of 1266 "K".

This formula had been adopted to avoid confusion, especially in 1254 and 1257, between those serving with Edward as part of their military obligations to the Crown, and those serving Edward by fee or wages. Those serving Edward in Wales in 1263 or at other times are noted in Column 2a).

**Column 7.** Political affiliation. It will be appreciated that the shifting loyalties and political realignments of 1258-65 cannot be satisfactorily expressed in such a small space. The following conventions have been used: "R" for those supporting the king and Edward at Evesham (and earlier). "M" for those supporting Montfort and the baronial government from Northampton onwards, or serving at Kenilworth or elsewhere among the rebel forces. The term "BR" indicates support of the reform programme of 1258-60, "BR/R" a later alignment with the king and Edward.

**Column 8.** Provenance and principal estates. Only exceptionally are surnames used as indications of place of origin. "T.place" indicates land held from Edward. "T.person" indicates another lord, "TiC" tenant in chief, but space restrictions permit entry of tenancies, only where such information adds materially to an interpretation of actions and alignments. "X:" signifies an affinity, whether by kinship or marriage or another factor.

**Column 9.** Career under H.III.

**Column 10.** Career under Edward I.

Spatial constraints have reduced these to only the most note-worthy and concrete activities.

### Abbreviations

A:attorney	Aud:auditor	Ass:assessor	
B:bailiff	BR:baronial reformer		
C:constable	C:crusade	C:Chester	Ch:chamberlain
Canc:chancellor	Cap:chaplain	Cit:citizen	Cl.:clerk
CI:Channel Isles		D:diplomat	
E.:earl	E:Edward	E:Evesham	Eng:England
Ep:bishop	Esc:escheator	Ex:Exchequer	
F:fee	Fr:France	G:grant	G:Gascony
H:horse	HH:household	I:Ireland	
J:justice	Jb:justice King's bench		Jf: justice forests
Ji:justice in eyre	Jp: justice common pleas		Jtd:de terris datis
K:keeper	K:Kenilworth	Kp:keeper peace	Kt:knight
L:living	L:Lewes		
M:Montfortian	Mch:merchant	MS:summons to military service	
N:Northampton	Nav:Navarre	O:overseas	O&T:oyer and terminer
P:present (wine, venison, timber)			P:Prevost
R:king	R:royalist	Re:receiver	Rb:robes
S:sheriff	S.:surety	Sc:Scotland	Sen:seneschal, steward
Sv:serviens			
T.:teste, witness (col.3)	T.:tenant (col.8)		Thes:Treasurer
V:vallettus, yeoman	X:Links		
w.:Wardship	W:wages	W:Wales	Ward:wardrobe

Many of these are used jointly e.g. RF:fee from king, VR:king's vallettus, JC:Justice Chester, JiI:justice in eyre in Ireland, SenG:Seneschal Gascony

**People:** Only the most prominent have been abbreviated.

HA:Henry of Almain, E:Edward, EC:Eleanor of Castile (QEC,1272<),  
 Ed:Edmund of Lancaster, MQS:Margaret of Scotland, PEC:Edward of Caernarvon,  
 EM, SM:Eleanor and Simon de Montfort, PS:Peter of Savoy, QEP:Eleanor  
 of Provence, RC:Richard of Cornwall, AV, WV:Aymer and William de Valence,

APPENDIX TWO: ANALYSIS OF EDWARD'S HOUSEHOLD AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Name	Office held estate admin. Household	Dates in service E	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance/ Lands held	Seignourial/ Royal service	Career under Edward I
M. Giles de Abbéville	Physician	1267-72	F				Ponthieu		RF 1272<
Robert de Acton	Clerk	1265	G						
Robert Aguillon	E at wedding in Exeter Knight	1268; co-S.68 T.68, 70, T(EC).70			G/W L	R	Sus/Sur/I;m C'tess Dev. X:London	RF 61<;council 67;steward HH 63-70;S:Suss 67	K:Arundel 72-4;O:86 d.1286
William Aguillon	B:Hastings	1253-4					Sussex	1258-9 C: Tower	Gaol del. 79;O&T 81
Baldwin de Akeny	Tourney Kt	1260			G	R	Norf/Camb	66< C:Hadley	
John FitzAlan	captain March Montgomery; in Wales with E	1257,63			G/W	R	Arundel/Os- westry/Clun	D:W 59;R garr. Rochester 64; Kp:Suss 66	d.1272
Amanieu d'Albret	Sen.G:council in G: J on Sault campaign	1266, cf 64 T.1255	G			R	Meilhan,G	G rebel 54 RF 54<	d.1274:son in service R in England and G
Alexander	Butler	1255,59-60					?vintner	?RF >1262	
Peter de Allinch	?K:Horse	1256-7					Savoy/Burg.	V MQS 53;QEP 71	
Richard & Robert de Arundeville	in Wales +E	1263				M	Lincs.	in Germany +RC	
Elias de Angouleme	C:Virelade,G Serviens	1255:T.55					?Angoumois		
Bertrand de Angulis	knighted by E	1255		P			Gascon		did fealty in G 74
Robert Anketil	Esc. I	1256						Cl.R, D:Curia	
John de Anna/Aune	Panetarius	?1257,60-2							
John de Arderne	?Knight	1270-72	G	C			T.Cheshire		
Philip de Arderne	?Knight	c.1270-74	H						
Ranulph de Arderne	?Knight	1270-72;T.68		C		?R	T.R.Somery	S:Essex 54-5	
Simon de Arderne	Vallettus	c.1265-6,70-2	?C			?R	Cheshire	Ferrers HH 1264	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
M. Nich. de Arras	Clerk chapel	c.1270							chaplain R 1286,89
Walter de Arundel	B:Oleron	1254-5			G			SvR;B:CI,Oleron, 1240's & 50's	
Guy de Asseles	tourney trip Knight	1262	H/W				?alien		
John de Athy	DepS:Kildare	1271-2							
Robert de Auberville	Sv pantry	1242-3						SvR	
Ralph d'Aubigny,kt	Jing:CI Knight	by 1259,63,72	F		G		Sam/Linc/CI	claimed Morm.	W:1277,82; d.92
Walter d'Aubigny	B:Ferrers	1256-7					Wilts/Kent	Sen:QEP 65-6	K:QGold 1273;d.73
Roger de Aubos/Auboeuf	V/Sv;?K:Horse	1256-7	?G				Gascon:CI	C:Sauvey,inst.E	d.by 1290
James de Audley	JC;S:Salop; JI	1265-7,70-72 T.1263,64,70			W	BM/R	Salop/Staff T.Cheshire +RC to Germ	HH RC;50< C:N. u.Lyme;C:Bridgn 60<;S:Salop 62	d.1272
Matthew d'Aunay/Alneto	garr. Fronsac Serviens	1255					Gasc/Poitou		
William d'Aunay/Alneto	knighted with E C:I castles	1254,c.70-72	F				" "		?d.1291
William de Aure	Clerk	1271-2			C		Gascon		
Will-Arnold de Auros	P:Bazas	1254-5					Gascon		
John Ayquell	garr.Fronsac	1255							
M. Bernard Ayzon	C:Bord:Aud Clerk	1254-7	L/F				Canon Bazas	Cl.R 54;RF	
Thomas Bacon	B:Framesden	c.1262			G			Cl.Jewry 65-6	
M. Will de Bagepuz	Esc.I;S:Uryel	1254-71	F				Canon Dubl.	Cl.R; EscI	
Master Osbert (de Bageston)	C:St.Macaire C:Bordeaux	1255 pre 1273					by 97 Canon Salisbury		Cl.R;C:Bord>74;82-92 Controller G.Ex;d.1316<
Robert Bagod	Dep. S:Lim.	1260-73							D:Ch.Jb.I 75<;ThesI 85
William Bagod	S:Warks	1271-2					?Sen:Ed 70	prof.S & K	D:W 74;O&T 81
Roger Ballard	?marshalsea	1265,67							

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Eustace de Balliol	B:Levinton	>61,70-72				R	N'humb/Cumb	C&S 62-5;RF 57<	d.1274
John de Balliol, sr.	"Councillor"	1258				BR/R	N'humb/Gall	C:1255,S:1261-2	d.1269
Drew de Barentin	B:CI;SenG G campaigns C:Windsor	Knight 1254,58,59 -60,63	F			R	Norm.origin Cam/CI:X:J de Plessis	RF 22<;SenG 53; Sen:HH R; 1265 captive barons	d.1265
James de Barentin	B:Stanford	1256-7					?kin Drew		
William de Barentin	B:CI	1267-9				R	Oxon/Mx/CI son Drew	VR 1260;64 garr Wind;?HH W 65	d.91
David de Barry	JI;?S:Cork	?1261,66-8,					Cork/W		
Basculus	Vallettus	c.1270-74					Gascon		1286,89,93 SvR
John de Baskerville	S&C:Dungarvan	c.1270-72	F				Lanc/Heref /I	Dep. Audley at Bridgnorth	W:77,86;C:Dungarven >81;d.86
Philip Basset	C:Bristol, ally Devizes,Tower;Lieut/A	59,60,70-1;S: 68;T.59,68,70	F			BR/R	S.England; TiC;T.RC	57 Sen:RC;RF; JEng 61-3;S&C	d.1271
Ralph Basset	HH Kt	1259-63;T.61	G/F			M	Drayton		d.65, Evesham
Warin de Bassingburn	with E in G B:Ellesmere garr:Bristol	HH Kt;ally; tourmeyer var.campaigns	F/G P			G/W N	R Cams,T.W de Cheney, T.Ep.Ely	65-69 K:For;R garr.Ludg.64; 66 S:N'hants	d.1269
Richard Bauzan	C:Fronsac	1255	G			G/W	bro.Stephen	HH K 1245	
Stephen Bauzan	SenG;C:Cam	Knight 1252,54-57 T.54,57;S.55	G			G/W	I/W/Dev;kin Molis;HH & T.Marshals	G:42,52;S:Glam 43-7;HH royal children 51-2	d.1257, in battle with Welsh
Henry de Bath	J inq. retained,?for legal advice	1257-8,59 T.59,60	F			?BR	B:Rivaux>35 X:Mansel	RF;prof,J & administrator	d.1260/1
Will. de Beauchamp	Tourney Kt	1260				W	TiC Bedford		d.1262
Hugh de Beaumes	Vallettus	c.1262-3				R	son Will.	VR 1264-71	W:1277;d.1302
Robert de Beaumes	Vallettus	1254,57-64	G			W	R son Will.	with R 1262	d.1269
William de Beaumes	to I for E	1256					Salop; X: A. la Zuche	C:Degarwy 50	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Aymeric Becket	"in service" Kt	pre 1266	W/H				3Dioc/Poitou		1275 K:horse R;RF 89<
Anthony Bek	executor Clerk:K;ward ?Chancellor	1270-72 T.1270		C		R	son Lincs. baron	Cl.R 1264-6	Cl.R;C: Tower 75;D; Ep.Durham 83-d.1311
John Bench	Vallettus	c.1257-8							
Amanieu de Belhade,kt	C:Bayonne,Ustarritz	1267-pre74	?F						
Elias de Berkwey	S/Re:Salop; Clerk Re:fines,20th.	1270-72	W				Ulster (by 1302)		Canc. & Esc.Ulster 73<
John de la Bere	Clerk			C		M	X:Tany,HA		Cl.R;C: Bordeaux 74-6
Richard de la Bere	with E in Spain	1254			G		Cambs		
Arnold de Berkeley	In I for E;Aud Eng.bailiffs	1259,1260-1					Heref	Cl.R 50<;Baron Ex 63-4	d. by 1270
Maurice de Berkeley	C:Carm & Card	pre 1262 T.1259			G/W	R	Glos/Essex	Kt R 1261	
Maurice de Berkeley, jr.	garr.Bristol	1264-5				R	HH Clifford		d.79 in tourney
Gervase de Bernak	B:Peak	1256-7				M	T.Peak/York		
John FitzBernard	service in G Knight "karissimus miles noster"	1254-5	H		G/W		Essex/Herts	VR 53;C:Oxford 58:K hawks R	d.1259
Walter FitzBernard	with E in Gascony	1255					son John		d.by 1281
John de Berners	tourneyer Knight	1260			G	M	Essex		
Baldwin de Berry	"in service E"	?pre1270	W/R						
William de Berewyk	co-Re:Ex Bristol	1261,69					mch.Bristol		K:wool licenses 73<
John de Besevill	service in G	1255	W		G/W		Yorks/Bucks	marshal HH R	
William de Beverly	Clerk	1271					dioc.York		Cl.R >89;C:taxes 86:O; 86-9 Canc I
Robert Beysin	Poulterer	pre 1266					Salop		d.by 1266
Matthew Bezill	kted +E;garr: Wind;C:Dover	1254,63,65 -7			G	R	Touraine; Dev/Wilt	S&C Glos 51-63: Sen:QEP 54-61	d.68

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Adinettus de Bidik	Tailor	1265<					Ess/Midd/Sus		tailor R 72-96,1302
John de Bikenor	B:Ludgershall ?K:hawks	1270-73					Kent	KtR 71;K:hawks	78-86 K:hawks R
Thomas Biset	to I for E	1256				M	?X:Zuche		
Elias de Blaye/Blavia	K:small custom Bordeaux	1255 T.1258	F				citizen Bordeaux		73-4 made further loans to E
William le Blund	?Knight	T.60				G/W ?M	Sam/Ess/Suff T. E.Glos		?d.1264
William de Blyburgh	admin.clerk	c.1271					Rotherhythe		Cl.R 77<;1305-7 HH PEC
William de Boleville	captured by Welsh in war	1257,	G			W R	Camb/Hunt	66-72 Sen:W	77-9 C:Card for Ed
Thomas de Bolton	Aud;Ch.Sen; JC;S:Linc	Serviens/Kt Pleader	1258,60-2,65, 67-72:T.61,70				R	Leic/York	S:Linc 74;Aud.73;Jinq d.1275
Henry de la Bone	C:Degannwy	1260					W		
Peter de Bordeaux	C:La Reole; SenG	Knight	1255,57,64 T.55				R	Gascon lord	C:Gramont 52;53 SenG;D:Fr 55,57
Itier Bouchard	Re:20th;D	Clerk	1268,71,72	G				Angouleme	Rb 72<;D;Cl.R >d.1299
Raymond de Bouliac		Clerk;almoner	1255	F				canon Bord.	
Hugh de Boulogne		?K:horses	1272					?Boulogne	
Roland de Boulogne		Buyer horses	1259					?Boulogne	
William de Boyville	S:N'hants.		1270-72				C	Cumb.	C:Orford;Cl.R: S:Suffolk 64
John de Bradene	Auditor	Clerk	c 1271-2	W?					Esc n.T 74: S:Warks 80-83,Cumb 88; Cl.R
M. Alex. de Branfield		Physician	1252-4	R					
Peter Braunche		Knight	1254-5,57	H/W			G/W	Norfolk	RF 47<;D:Rame
Henry de Bray	?Esc.clerk		1272						d.1259
Thomas de Bray	S:Buck & Beds.		1270-72					Sen John de Verdon,1263-5	C:Aberg.73-7,79-81, Esc.s.T. 83-88
							Beds./I	C:Mornmouth for Ed pre 70;T.Ed	J;K:Clare estates 90 C:Tutbury pre 93;d.99

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Milo le Bret	C:Athlone	1266-8,?69					Ireland		?S:Cork
Peter de Bretigny	Tourney Kt	c.1262	H/W				?alien		
John le Breton	C:Aberg. & 3 Clerk;K: Castles:SenT wardrobe Jinq	1256-7,59-61, 61-62: T.61,62			K		N'han/Norf ?X:Burgh: Ep.Heref 69	S:Heref.54-7; purveyor at K. Jitin;D;W	quarrel with E over election as bishop, d.1275
Bart. de Briancun	W service Tourney Kt	1257,62-3,70-2		C	G/W		T:Ess/Buck		HH KT R >d.86
Nicholas de Brichulle	"in service"	1254					?Bucks		
William de Brichulle	Chamb:Chester	1270-1							
Guy de Brion	C:Carm & Kilgaran	1257,58,(65)			W	M	W.Wales/I	67 D:W;63,67:I	W:77;d.1307
John Britaud	Knight	60-2;T.60,62	G	(C)			French	RF 61<	C:Sicily: RF >d.78
Laurence de Brok	Pleader	1258,65-6						pleader/J R	
Hugh de Broy	P:Belin Serviens	1255			G				
John de Brummore	Pleader/A Vallettus?	1256,60						1250< HH Ed,R	
Fromond le Brun	Chancellor I	1260-72	G/F				I/papal cap	C to JI 1248	Chancellor I 72-83
Robert Brun	C:Tutbury,Dungarven	1256-7,62-3					X:Audley		
Arnold de Buch	D:Lieut:SenG Clerk	1255,70-2					Gascon		agent SenG 77
William Buder	K:G shipworks Clerk	1255							
Stephen Buet/Buwes	Knight	1262;T.60-2					?Poitou	RF 56-62:KtR	
Ralph Bugg	B:Holm,Peak	1257,60-62				M	Notts mch: X:Ferrers	1259 K:vacant priory	
John Burdet	?Knight	T.57,58,59					X:P.Montft	?HH EC 57	1286 son in HH R
Walter de Burgh Earl Ulster	K:lands R de Clare in I	1262-4 T.1263,66	G			R	Ulster/Conn	campaign W:65	d.1271
Thomas de Burgeis	B:Heacham,Elham	1254,58-9							
John le Burgoynun	Knight	1255	Rb						

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
James de Burningham	C:Randon	c.1270							
Henry de Burn	B/Escheator retained in Hastings HH	1259-61 T.1260	F				?Kent; X:R. Leyburn	55 K:See Cant; 63-8 DepS:Kent	d.1269
Robert Burnell	to I,W for E; Clerk;Exec; Lieut/A/Re Chancellor	1257,60-72 T.70,72	G			R	Salop/Desmond	Cl.R 66,69	Canc>d.92;78:G 1275 Ep.Bath
John de Burningfeld	Re:I;Canc:I	1254,56-60						53-6 Baron Ex:I	d.by 1279
Stephen de Buterleigh	?estates Clerk	c.70-74	W				Salop/Heref	Esc:Salop 56-66	d.by 1280
Adam Butler	Purveyor	c.1266			G/K		?B:Mortimer		S:Glos 74-8;d.1283
Colin Butler	Buyer ale	c.1266-7							
Nicholas Butler	Vallettus	1266				R	Kent		
Ralph Butler	?Knight	by 1269	G		W		Beds		
Theobald Butler	S:Tipperary;K: prise wines I	1264-6,65-72					lord Ormond X:Verdon		K:prise wines I>83 d.1286
Peter Caillau	Jing: adviser to SenG	1255;S.1255 T.55,58	W				Cit.Bord.	D:Fr;loans to king & E	?C:Bordeuz 1303
William de Caister	Ji:I, adminI	1269-72			G	M	Norf.		Aud:I Thes:Ji I>74
Brunus Calzad	Envoy;P:Medoc Knight	1255,66					?Bordeaux		
William de Camville	"pro servicio suo"	1270-72	W				?Devon		W:82;C:Carm 93;Sc:1301
Thomas de Cancell	with E in Wales	c.July 1269							
Br.Joseph de Cancy	in Acre +E;Aud	c.71-2;S,71-2					Hospitaller		Thes 1273-80
Nicholas de Cantilupe	with E in Wales	1257			W	M	X:Ep.Worc.		d.1266
Roger Cantok	B/Re:Ex Bristol	1260-61	G			R	Cit:Bristol	reeve Br: 68	d.1284
Walter de Capeles	Butler	1257-65	G			R	Salop.	67< Chamb.Lond	d.?1269
Richard de Carew	Sen:Desmond	>1272					Ireland		d.1272
Fortaner de Case-neuve	C:Lavardens;SenG Mayor Bordeaux	1254,1269-70					Gascon	C:1253,kted by R: RF<55	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Bart. de Castello /Castro	Re:debts & Clerk other revenues	1261-3,66-7, 70-72				R	London mch & alderman	K:exchange 62<	robes72<; K:exchange 1272-9
Guy de Castillon, Count of St.Pol	Knight	1262,1267 T.62			(C)	R	St.Pol; France	RF 61<;with QEP 64-5;D:Fr 66;	
Hugh de Castillon	Knight	1262,					X:St.Pol		D:Navarre 1273:RF 1289<
Peter de Castro Novo	D:Fr;in Acre Knight	1267,70-1, T.67,68,70	W	C			?Gascon;? kin Segur		d. in Sicily 1271
Segur de Castro Novo	G campaigns	1254,55					kin R;Poit	RF 53<	
Thomas de Caukewelle	E paid debts	1255		H			?Ireland		
Bidau/Vitalis de Caupennes	garrison La Reole:army Soule	1255, c.56-7	F/W/ H				Gascon		with E in G 73-4
R-W de Caupennes	C:Lourdes	1260					G/Bigorre		
Geoffrey de Cauz	Re/C:Bristol, C:Mormouth	1256-65,72						39< HH QEP & R children:admin	d. 1272
Robert Charles	with E in Acre	1270-72			C				74 co-K:HH children R;d.78
William Charles	B:Colchester; Knight assessor 20th.	1270	G		K	R	Yorks/E Anglia	kt EC:70-1 Sen HH R	d. by 1272; son Edward HH R
Matthew le Charron	Sv/sumpterman	>Sept.70							R;Rb 72-6;buyer;K:mews R
Thomas le Charron	Sv/sumpterman	1269,70					bro Matthew	1270-72 SvR	Rb 1272;sumperman>89
Warin de Chaucumbe	B:Crioll w. ?Clerk	1271-2						Cl. Burnell	robes Dec.1272
Jordan le Chaundeler	Sv/chandler	Aug.1265							d. by 1266
R. de Chaury,Ep.Carl.	S:Cumb.	1270-72						50's HH QEP	d.1278
John de Chavernin	tourney tour Knight	c.1260-62	H						
Pain de Chaworth	garr:Bristol Exec. Tourneyer;Kt +E in Acre	1260-62,64-5 1271;T.68	H	C		R	son Pat sr. X:Tiptoft		W:1277, captain army tourney 78:d.1279
Patrick de Chaworth sr.	C:Camrthen	1257-8, T.57	?G		G/W		Kidwelly/Gl.	RF by 1257	killed in Wales,1258
Patrick de Chaworth jr.	?Knight	1270-72	?F	C			bro.Pain		78 tourney;79;O;d.1283

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Thomas de Cheddeworth	I Chanc.Ex; K:See Dublin	pre 1270,71	F			canon Dublin		Rb 72-3:K:Dublin >79 Jb.I 84;DepThesI 05
Robert de Cheny	V/K:dogs	1256			R		Kt R 64	K:Forest Bradene 78
William de Cheny	C:Bazas garr:Windsor	1255-8,63 T.54,57,58,59	G/W	G		T:Cl/Camb /Som	40's:W,G;46 Sen Leinster;Sen:EC	blind 1267,d.70
Adam de Chetwynde	Aud;Esc/Ch:C	1266,67-72	F	K	R	Salop.		Esc.C>75;79 J;d.82
John de Chetwynde	in Wales +E	1263		G		T.JfAlan		74-75 local admin;d.82
Geoffrey de Childwick	?with E in G	1255	P	G	R	Heref./Derby X:Mansel	RF 46<;61,4 garr Tower & Windsor	
Robert de Clahull	S & DepS:I	1260-62,65-7					S:Kerry pre 53	
Séygnoron de Clarac d'Espes	C:Meilhan, P:Bazas;	1254,55,?66	?F	G		Gascon;cit. Bazas	P:Bazas 1242	killed when Navarre seized Gramont 1266
John de Clare	S:Kilkenny	1265-7						?Cl.le Breton
Thomas de Clare	"familiarius" Knight	1265,70-72; T.67-71	W/G	C	M/R	son E.Glos	S:Forest Essex, C:Colchester	favourite;Lieut G 73 S & C in Eng & I >d.83
John Clarel	A;Cl.	1254,1270-1				cl. Mansel	D;Cl.R 1250<	Cl.R;D:Fr,Curia >d.1292
Cleker	Vallettus	1266			K			
Robert le Clerk	?estate admin	1257,1265-8		?C			?V EC 1270	?73-4 Esc.
M.John de Cleydon	Re:20th. I	1270-71						Re:10th.1274
Roger de Clifford	garr:Carm; C:3 Castles, sent to I;	1257,59,60, 65,70-72; T.57-60,70-1	G/W	C	G/W /K	BR/R Marches/Yk/ Midlands; X:Leyburn	RF <61;C:Glos, Marlboro,Ludg; J:Forests	tourney 78: d.1282
Thomas Coc	Re;repentant	c.1265-6			R			
John de Cogan	S:Kilkenny	Oct.1261-2				Cork,I		d.c.1267
Nicholas de Cogenho	var.campaigns garr:Bristol:	1254,56,63-6		W/K	R	Warks/ Northants	1272 marshal HH R	K:forest Brigstock 1278: d.1281
John de Cokefeud	C:Colchester	1272				Suffolk	Cl.R;Ji,b 57<	

Name	Estate admin.	Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Hugh de Conflans	Counsellor	?Tourney Kt	1262-3		(C)			French;X: Valery	1279< Marshal Champagne	Governor Navarre 1289
Arnold-John de Contis	B:CI		1271<					Cit.Bayonne		B:CI >75;merchant R 76
Milo de Courcy	S:Kerry		1269-72							
John de Courtenay	in G, Axholm C:Totnes	Knight	1255,61-2 65-6	W/H		G/W	R	Devon TiC kin R	G:42;RF<1254	d.1274
Henry de Cousances	SenG		1261-4				R	France; Marshal Fr.	Fr B:Macon 54- 60, Sen3D 64-6	Knight Charles of Anjou killed Tagliacozzo 1268
M. Richard de Cradleigh	admin Cl		1254					Hereford		
Hugh de Créquy		Knight	1266-8,70-2	F				Fl/Picardy	RF>d.1276	
Simon de Crey	K:C.Ports; C:Rochester		1265-6,70-2	F			R	Kent;T.Re Bigod	C:Cant,65, C: Roch,68, J	C:Rochester>74; RF 85-6
Richard de Creppinges	S:Cumb		1272							S:Cumb>74;J>80;O:80
Nicholas de Crioll	C:Rochester		1270-72			G/W		Kent etc.	C:Dover 60;S: Baron Ex 65	d.1272
Peter de Croun	C:Richmond		?after 1268							
? de Croys		Knight	1263	P						killed in W campaign
Gervase le Cu/Keu	to I for E		1256						?59 HH Ep.Norwch	
Elias de Cumb	Re:Bristol,Aud		1254-60	F				Glos/Devon	?canon Exeter	living 1278
William de Dalby	to I for E	Clerk	1258						72 HH Ed	
Richard Danyell	S:Wexford		1262;T.66			?K		T:Peak	1268 I Sen:W	d. 1286
Alexander de Deneswey	Re:Bristol		1269					?local		
Thomas de Degannwy	garr:Degannwy	Clerk	1260							
William de Dene	?S:Kilkenny; DepJI:JI	lent large sum to E	1258-60, 1260-61					?Hereford	S:Wexford,Cork 41-5,dep JI 53	d.1261
Hugh de Dinninton	C:Orford		1272					Surr/Middx		Rb<72,C:Orford & Hay >75;
Hugh de Dokesworth		Tourney Kt	1260				M	Cambs.		d. by 1269

Name	Estate admin.	Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
M. John Dominici/ Domingo de Tolosa	A:law-cases in Fr court	Clerk:D	c.68-71	?G/W				French;?Fr J in 3D.	co-A:E & R at Fr.court	A & Cl.R >77; Aud. 75;d.by 85
Ralph de Dongon	W service	K:Ward. ?Chancellor	1254-62,70-2 S.55;T.59-62	L				X:Rouen/ London	Cl.R 40<;many posts:D:Fr;	Cl.R: canon St.Paul's, Thes:QEC 77;d.86
William de Dover	Re:scutage	Clerk/Buyer	1265,66							chaplain >76;C:Hastings>1301
Nicholas de Dunheved	Sen:Ulster	Kt. HH in I	1259-61,65-71	F			Ireland			C:I castle 1278
Walter de Dunheved	to I in service E		1260,61,71				Somerset			O:for R 83
Martin de Dunstable	Re:New Aid in I		pre 1273							
John de Dunton	+E in Wales		1263				Norfolk			
M. Rostand Durand	D:Castile,G		1258	G			Bordeaux;		D:57;papal chap	d.by 1262
Stephen de Eddeworth	S:Wilts		1270-Jan.72, T.EC 1270			R	Beds		RF 57<;Marshal HH R 66,Sen 71 C: Tower 68-9;	W:1277;Sen:Pembroke for WW;poor 1290
Ivo de Elinton	B:Peak,Tickhill		1254,(72)				Berks;?X: Savoy		52 C:Tickh;63 K land Sav. exile	C:Tickhill, 72, by commission QEP
Arnold-William Emeric	D:Sp,G;council G/dep.SenG		1256-8,64, ?70				Cit & mayor Bordeaux			?Gascon admin 1289
William le Eroedeacon	S:Waterford		1261							
Gilbert de Erlham		Vallettus	1253							
Ralph de Erlham		K:hawks,dogs	1249,51-55						K:hawks;SvR 50<	falconer R 1286
Rob. de Esmundethorpe	B:Freemantle		1254-60						SR;hunter 55-60	d.1260
Walter de Essex	C:Colchester, S:Essex & Hert		1270-72				Essex		S:Essex 1269	S: Ess >74;K:See Lond. 80; d.1285
Fergeant de Estissac	service in G		1255	F						
John de Eston		Clerk	pre 1266	G			X:Rochelle			74 I Sen. Rochelle
Robert del Estre	S:Cambs&Hunts		1270-72				Northants.		B:Yorks 68;SvR; buyer wine 68<	S:Cambs&Hunts >74 Gaol delivery 77

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William Esturmy	B:Richmond	?1270-72							B:fees Chester 1272-3
Richard de Eveblanc	Buyer wines	pre 1270							
Osbert de Bw/Augo	Vallettus	c.1265-6,70-2		C		R		war grant	
M. Bartholomew de Exeter	B:Oleron	1260					English,m. X:Oleron		resident in Oleron 1282
Jordan de Exeter, sr.	S:Connaught, JiI	1258	?G				Connaught	RF 1250<	killed by pirates
Jordan de Exeter, jr.	S:Connaught	1268<					Conn/Desm		S & C in I >80
Ranulph de Exeter	Ch:Chester	c.1252-5							
Richard de Exeter	C:Roscommon; JiI depJI; I council	1261-60, 66, 70-72; T.68	F				Connaught:		DepJI>1277; other posts I and W; d.by 1302
Robert le Eyr	B:Kington	1255-7						B:Woodstock68<	B:Woodstock>7EI
Roger le Eyr	B:Eyton	1256					Norfolk		
M.William de Farnham	?on campaign Physician	1265,70-72	L/W			R			Rb 72;+E in G 74: L 75
Ralph Faylle/Foylle	K:Dogs	1254						6l pensioned	
M.Will. de Felmersham	Cook	?1252-5,66<	W/G		G				Rb 72-3; +E in G 74
Garsie Ferranc	?Knight	1257					?Gascon		
Peter Ferrandi	C:Montcuq	1254,60	G		G		G/S'hants;	1253 SvR	1286 HH Kt R; RF
John Ferre	Vatlettus	c.1260-62	?W	C	?K	R	Linc(G EC) /Ireland	RF 1266<, 66- 70 HH EC	Kt QEC 74;P:Barsac 77 82 D:Fr;Sen QEC 87;d.91
Stephen de Feugeres	K:lands Eu	1250-54					Dep/SenPS>57		
Michael de Fiennes	Chancellor	?1254,55-9 T.57	F				Fleming;kin EC, & QEP	L 42;Rb 44<;59 Fr with R;	elected Ep.Therouanne 1265 d. by 1268
John de Fishide	S:Uryel, Clerk	1267,70-71		C					Cl.R in I >82
John de Fleury	P:St.Emilion. Serviens	1254-7	H/W				Somerset	W:1245	B:Oleron>75;P:Entre-d-M >81
Sampson Foliot	in Wales +E	1263			W		Berks	S:Oxon 1267	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI	
Geoffrey de Forestel	Dep.JI	1259						Sen:Longespee		
Aycard Fortonis	C/Mayor:Bourg	1255,?72	F				mch Bourg			
William de Fossato/ Sibley	B:Ferrers w.	1254-8					Norfolk;X: R.Tattershal	?66 HH Jesmond		
Richard Foun	?K:Horses	?1257,70-72			C		S'hant/Derb		77-95 K:horse;SvR	
M.Peter Francon	D & adviser G Clerk	1255<		W			Canon Bord.			
Elias de Freis	C:Military HH in I	1257								
M. Ralph de Frenningham	Clerk	by Feb 70-71 T.69,70,71				R	Kent;59 Cl. Ep.London	Cl.R 65;67 D:Fr 70 D;Rane;	Cl.R72<; D:74,76;W:77-8 Jitin/b 76; d.by 87	
John de Freschevil	Kt garr:Cam.	1258				G/W		Rb 56,58-62		
Ralph de Freschevil	Alnwick campaign;Kt	1267				R	Hunts			
Gry de Fretun/Frethorn	Knight	1255		W				?HH EC		
William de Frethorn	Ktd with E Knight	1254,55		H		G		HH QEP 52;RF 54<		
Richard de Frompton	"loyal service"	by Oct.1266		G		?R				
Roger de Frompton	C/Re: Bordeaux	1254-5					?English			
Stephen de Fulburn	?Dep Thes I	1270-72			?C		Kt.Hospital	1270 B:QEP in I	Thes.I & JI:Ep.& ArchEp.d.88	
Thomas de Furnival	C:Peak	1264				?R	Sheffield		d.1291	
Geoffrey Gacelin	garr:Bristol	1264-5			W	R				
Hugh de Gamaund	Mayor:Bord. Buyer	1265,68,71-2					Gasc.mch.	68 buyer wine R		
Hamo de Gayton	to Wales +E ?Knight	1263,70-2			C	W				
John de Gayton	Vallettus	1270-2		W/H	C		Bucks		C:Eardisly 76;Kt HH R>d.77	
Ebulo de Geneva	?Knight	T.1254					X:PS;Savoy	VR 54; Kt.R;C	d.1259	
Geoff. de Geneville	served G & I acting JI Knight;	1254-7,64-5, 70-2;T.56-7; S.55			C	G	R	Champagne: Meath/March X:Savoy	RF by 54;55-6 C:Windsor; 67, D:W	JI 1273-6;D:Fr,Curia; W:82;Marshal Host 97, Sc:1301;d.1314

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI	
Geoffrey	Clerk	unknown	L				?Ireland			
John FitzGeoffrey	JI;C:Bristol, Counsellor E 3 Castles:	1254-8;S:54-5 T:55-8	P			G/?W	Bwas/Ire. son E.Essex	JI 45<, RF 50<	d.1258	
John FitzThomas FitzGerald	S:Limerick	1257-9	G				Desmond 1259<	RF 1251<,	d.1261, battle Callan	
Maurice FitzMaurice Fitzgerald	S & C in I acting JI,JI	1257-61,68,72 T.1266				?K	Ireland		campaigns in I 74-6, d.1279	
M. Will. de Gerama/ Rama/Larrama	Re:Bordeaux; J inq. in G	1261: 1270 T.sale to E					G;canon St.Sever,	Re:cross;Cl.R 61-2;D:Fr 62,72		
Hugh Giffard	Tutor/Keeper E	1239-46					cousin John	Kt R;C: Tower 35	d.1246	
John Giffard, sr.	Knight	1263	?F			M/R	Glos baron	K:Dean >63		
Osbert Giffard	garr W.Castle Knight	1256-7,67	H/W			W	M/R	Sam/Glos/Ox Devon/Dors.	Kp:Oxon 65-6 1284 outlawed for abduction nun;	
Roger Giffard	Vallettus	by 1270						inst E,K:For. Porchester	by 1274, entered Premonstratensians	
M.Walter Giffard	C:Hadley, Tower S:Notts;Lieut/A	1270-72;T.70 S.69-70	F				R	Wilt/Sam/Ox Here;s.Hugh	C:Oxon 56,65;D: Fr 61;Canc.65-6	Ep.Bath, AEp.York 66-d.79
William Giffard	S:Norfolk	1270-72				?C	R	Norf;s.Hugh	K:Peverel >71	S:Norfolk>74;d.by 92
Gillet	Falconer	by 1270							+son, falconers R 1285-9	
Arnold de Gindres	Knight	1254	F				G	55 paid W for G		
Robert de Glastonbury	C:Bristol	c.Oct63-64					?G	R	Glos/S'han	63 C:Dover d.1268
Walter Glen	to I for E	1256						M	Beds.	garr.Kenil 66
Gaston de Gontaud	P:Bergerac	1254;T.55	G				G			due arrears W 57
Henry de Gorham	S:Dublin	1271-2								other I posts >91
M. Arnold-G de Got	service in G Clerk	1255	L					Agenais	Ep.Agen 1271-81	Aud:ExBord.76 & admin in G
Andrew de Goys	service E in G	1255	?W				G	Cambs.	C:Montg.>48	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
John de Grailly	D:Fr,Nav:SenG Knight; C purveyor Counsellor	1261-4,66-72 T.62,63,68	G	C			Savoy;G T.64 PS	MS 61;RF>62,G; 67-9 D:Fr	on C >76;in G 76;SenG 78-86 dismissed;on C 87;d.1301
Otto de Grandson	S:Tipp; to I Knight; ?for C; Aud Executor	1266-72 T.68-71	?G	C		R	Savoy		S:Tipp>76:council R; D:Fr,Sp,Cur; Offices in W,G,Sc >1303;d.1328
John de Grey, sr.	adviser in G,W "councillor"	54,57,63;T. 54,58-9,63-4	G		G/W	BR/R	Hereford.	JC 47-50;RF 61< SenG 53;S&C:var	d.1266
Reginald de Grey	JC	1270-72 T.1270				R	son John sr	R garr.Nott 64 S:Nott 66-7;RF	JC 72-4,81-99;W:77-9; council PEC; d.1304
Richard de Grey	K:CI;G service D:G	1254-5;T.54			G	M	Codnor,Kent Norf/Essex/	S&C:Var 1230< SenG 52	d.pre 1271
David ap Gruffydd	defence Chester	1264-5	G			R	Gwynedd		executed 1283
William de Gunneville	Knight	1265-6;T.66	G			R	Norfolk	war grant	RF 1286;T.Is.de Fors 1292
Thomas de Gunneys	?controller Wardrobe	by 1272		C			canon Dubl.		co-K:Ward.72-8;W;d.83
William ap Gurwaret	C:Cardigan	1258-60,62-3	F				X:Marshals, Walerand	S:Glam;47-52 B: Card;D:W 58,67	
Imbert Guy	campaign v. Knight rebels;Sen:3 Dioeses	1265,66-68				R	Poitou; 47 Kt/Sen WW	RF 54<;war G; D:Fr 67-8	74 +E in G;74 D:Fr;76 agent R in 3D;d.86
Wynener de Gymer	Knight	1260-1;T.66	G	(C)			French;X:HA	Kt.R 61	HH King Louis for crusade
Simon de Gynes	?Vallettus	after 1270	H				?Guines		
John de Hadenham	B:EAnglian Clerk fees Chester,Richmond	pre 1262, 1264-5,71				R	Norfolk		killed in EAnglian rising c.1274
William de Hadestock	A/Re:London fine	1266-7				R	cit.London	pledge TfThomas	
Alexander de Hampden	B:Segrave w. Pleader	1255-8						S:Bucks >63,	d.1264
John Hardel	crusade preps V/Clerk France;Acre; Marshalsea,	1266-7, 70-72	W	C	G/K	R	cit London; son Will.H.	1256 Cl.Exch. Lond;garr: Tower	K:Horses E 1273-4;O with R; Rb 73; SR;
Robert de Hargesacris	S:Kildare	1261-2				M	York/Nott;	M garr.Knaresb.	
M. William de Hasel- bech/Haselbury	J:Jewry; settled debts E	1263-4,65, c.70-74						56 Chambrlain 58-9 Cl.Ex	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William de Hastentot	?Knight	1255;T.55			G	R	N'humb	RF 52<;v.Weald rebels 1266	d.by 1274
Matthew de Hastings,	C:Hastings	1272				M	T:Hastings Suss/Kent	65 M garr.Dover 1270 S:Sussex	S:Suss>74;C:Hastings >76:B:Rye 75;d.77
John de Havering	C:Devizes	1272				M	son Richard	64 V EM;M garr. Wallingford 65	C&S:var;DepJ/J.n.W/JW 85-1301;SenG >08;d.1309
Richard de Havering	B:lands J de Beauchamp	1267				M	S.counties 1249 Sen SM	C:Wallingford B'hamstead 64-5	d.1267
Nicholas de Haversham	garr.Bristol	1264-5				R	Buck/Ox/Wil	C:Northants 64	d.1273
Walter de la Haye	Re:20th;DepK: See Dublin	c.1270,71-2	F/?	G			Heref/Desm		S:Waterf, Lim 73-82; JiI 79-83;Esc I 85-07
Simon Hedon	B:Hersy w.	c.1268-72					?lead mch.	S:Nott 58,64,68	d.by 1272
Henry le Falconer	Falconer	c.1270-72		W					
Henry FitzHenry	S:Wexford	1260-61							
Hugh de Hersy	Knight	1263							killed in W with E
Michael de Hocle	Sv/V	1268					T.Cheshire,		d. by 1279
Robert de la Hoge/Hore	in G;B:Forest Peak	1255,>70		W				67 X:W. Cheny	
Peter de Hom	C:Castelsarrasin	1255		G			Gascon		
M. Will de Holdernesse	Cl.Marshalsea	1260-62							d. by 1274
Walter de Hopton	S:Salop	c.1268-70					Salop/Heref	J.I 1272	Baron Ex.74;J 72-86
William de Horsendon	B:Peak;sent to I for E	1257-8,65			W	R	T:Peak/Hert X:Marshals	B:Peak 49-53;S: York;garr.Dover 63;65 Ch.S'wich	d.by 1268;debts to R assigned to E
Richard de Houton	Chaplain	1266					?Linc;N'hant		
Master Humphrey	Cook;Buyer	1264,66-70			K	R			retired by 1278
Henry Huse	campaign v.rebels	1265					Sus;m.kinR	C:Porchester 65	C:Porchester 89;d.90
Robert de Huxley	C:Chester	1269-72							C:Chester >74

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
John de Hynterburg	S:Tipperary	1260-62							d.1270-72
Thomas Inge	B:Eyton Serviens/Cl.	64-5,68,71-2				R	(Bucks)		Rb 72;B:Eyton,Brill>74
Thomas de Ippegrave	I service:Ass ?Buyer;K: wardrobe; SenG;?JC	1255,59,64-5,68-9;T.60	G/F ?H			R	54 A SM	D:Fr 60,68-9; RF<;C: Tower 68	d.1270
Gerald Itier	P:La Reole	1254,61					?Fronsac		
Stephen de Jarum	Re:New Aid	1266					Lincoln Tic		d.1283
Adam de Jesmond	B:Bingley Knight; Re;loan for E	1254,60-1,70-72; T.1257,59	G	C	G	R	N'humb.	CI 52;RF 54<;S: N'humb 61-3,7-8	d. by 1274
John FitzJohn	C:Bristol & 3 Castles;K:Lacy w.	1258-9,pre-62				M	s.J.fGeoff Kent/Bed/Es	M C:Windsor 64 -5;pardon 67	74 D:Lyons; d.1275
Richard FitzJohn	C:Athlone, Councillor & Rand,Rosc. Kt HH in I	c.1254-5; 1270-72	F				son JfGeoff heir JfJohn	in I c.61-3, 70<	d.1297
Roger FitzJohn	garr.Fronsac	1255					Notts;w.WV		d.1259
John of the chamber	Taker wine	by 1260							
John	Falconer	1256-7		W					
Bartholomew le Joevene	K: Beds lands; S: Bucks	1266,67-70;					Dunstable; A: SM 1252		K:Midland lands 72-3 C: Bristol 75-d.77
John de Kam	Messenger Vallettus	1263							
Walter de Kanun	Usher chamber	1243							
Hugh de Kendal	Re:20th,Jewry Clerk	c.1270-72					Lond/Leic	Cl.R 67<	Rb 72<;purveyor W:77; Chancery,HH Ex.Cl. 93
John de Kenley	Chancellor IEx	1270<	F				Salop		CancI Ex>89
M.Ralph le Keu/Key	W & I service	1263,71							
Richard de Kilkenny	knighted +E;G Knight	1254,55	P		G		Kin Ep.Ely	D:Spain	
Br.Walter de Kilkenny	?to I for E	c.70-72					Dominican		85 to Bologna chapter
John de Kingston	Purveyor	?pre 1270							

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/P	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
John de Kirkby	Pleader	1268-9					?X:Burnell	Cl.R 6l<	DepCanc: Thes 84-90:Ep.Ely d.90
Henry of Knaresborough	Knight	1255					?T.RC	54 W;57 Rb;67 Kt E.Glos.	
Bogo de Knowille	?Knight	by 1266,70<	P			R		war grant	S:Salop,C:Oswes,Montg.75-90
Edmund Lacy,E.Lincoln	K:Longviler w in service E	1256-7				G/W	Linc/Yorks	raised:Windsor	d.1258
Henry Lacy,E.Lincoln		T.1270					Linc/York	C:Knaresboro'72	held high office in Eng,G,W;d.1311
Bertrand de Ladils	agent SenG	?1261,70, T.59					Bazas/Bord S.G Soler	G rebel>54; 61 MS	S:Bigorre 89;adviser to SenG 90;RF 91
Baldwin de Lamprenesse	?Knight	1255	H			G			
Geoffrey de Langley	chief Sen;Aud (B:Stafford w)	1254-57,58? 60-62;T.57-8	F/G			W R	Warks/Glos X:Rivaux	R admin 35<;64 64 R garr:Wind.	d.1274
Walter de Langley	in service E Knight	1254,57,60-2 T.57,62,63	W/H			G/W R	Salop/Wark /Glos;s.G.	54 envoy R	1279 T. G to Ed;d.80
John de Langtoft	Clerk	152,57-8	L/P			W	Yorks	chancery Cl.R	d.1261
William le Latimer,sr.	Tourney Kt	T.60,62,64					R Bed/N'hant	S:York 55-60,66 D:Fr;Esc. 58-64	d. 1268
William de la Launde	G service	1255,56					Lincs/Barsac		d.c.1267
Henry de Lee	B:Lanc/Cumb w.	1256-7	F			M	Lancs.	Re:20th.Lanc	S:Lanc 77
Peter Lef/Lek/Lof	Re:Bordx; Arbitrator Cl; paid HH debts	1255,58, 59-60					?Gascon		Cl.R; RF 1275-87; K:W works; 83 C: Bordeaux; d.1296
Robert Legrand	C:Granont	1255						53 garr:Bazas	
Hamo Lestrangle	C:Montgomery HH Kt,tourney var.campaigns Ally	1257,59-65,70 T.57,59,60,70	G/F	(C)	G/W	BR/R	yr.s John L X:Leyburn	S&C:Salop 63-4 65,67;D:W 63	d. 1273-4 in Palestine
John Lestrangle,jr.	C:Montgomery	1260-1,63-4 T.1261	W		W	M	son J.L.	garr Heref.63	d.1275
Roger Lestrangle	B:Peak S:York	1265-72; T.1267,70	F			R	yr.son J.L York/Salop		B:Peak>75;C:Osw'y 77-9;banneret HH 86<; Jf 83-97, d.1312

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William de Lesur	Re:20th;admin clerk	c.1270-72							
Nicholas de Leuknor	A;Re:scutage	1266				R	Middx/Essx	K:ward R 65-8	d.1268
Roger de Leyburn	C:Bristol;SenT;Ally;Knight C:CPorts,Notts;tourney SenG; var.campaigns	1257,59-61, 64-6,69-71 T.59-61,66,8	G/F	?	G/ W/ K	BR/R	Kent/Salop X:WW 58	RF 53<;S:Kent 63,66<;SenHH R 63,65<;C: Tower	d.1271
Nicholas de la Leye	Clerk/?Canc.	1255-7,60-1	?L		W		X:Canc Ex R	Cl.R;Ch.Ex	d.1262
M. Hugh de Lisle	Physician	1254,56,59	L						d.1268
Robert de Lisle	C:Odiham	1271-2				M	Cambs/Warks	M C & S 1264-5	B:Odiham>75;d.1285
William de Lisle	S:Oxon	1270-71					N'hnt/Buck	S:N'hnt 52-3,56	d.by 1278
Robert Locard	I admin	1257,65	F			R			
Alan Lombard	Cl:Degarwy; Buyer Re:I Ex	1261,pre 1270 1270-72	F						
John de London	Re:G;Aud; Clerk co-Re:estates;	by 1252-7, 70-72;T.70	F/H		G		?Cl.Mansel; X:Dispenser	HH EC 55-66;C: Windsor 65-6;	K:jewels R 72-77;Aud;Esc 74 C:Windsor 1299-1305;d.1306
Stephen de London	Chaplain	61,64-5,70-2	G	C		R	X:London		d. on crusade late 1271
William de London	B:Grantham; campaigns S:Waterford v.rebels	1261,65,70-2	F				Waterford		S:Tipperary c.78;d.83
Roger Longespée, Bishop Cov. & Lich.	S:Oxon	1271						K:lands RC 72	d. by 1297
Stephen Longespée	C:Bourg;SenG; "Councillor" JI Ally	1254-7,58-60 S.55;T.58	F			BR	kin R:Essx/ I/Ox/N'hnt	44,46:I for R; 58 C:Corfe	d.1260
William Longespée	service E in G	1254,55			G		Middx/Glos	53 VR	?d.1257
Roger Loveday	?Knight	1271-2	F			M	Cambs/Suff	66 X:E.Glos	Ji, O&T 1276-81
John Lovel	service E in G	1255		C	G	R	Norf/Ox/Wil	RF:S&C:var 61<	?d.1273
Laurence de Lovershal	C:Bord;Pleader:Cl;K:Ward	1266,68,70-2	L	(C)					C:Bordeaux 74
Robert de Ludham	B:Eyton & w. W.f.Robert	1256-7,58					Norf/Suff Buck/Camb	62 Cl.R;K:towns E.Angl;Cl.Jewry	J Jews 73-83;O&T 74 83

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Walter de Ludham	B:Hersy w.	1268-72					?Linc/Nott 49 B:E.Linc	Dep.K:See Linc. 58;Jing 66	d.1272
Alice de Luton	Nurse	1243-54,55	G/P		G		N'hant/Buck	midwife:QEP,EC	Rb 73; P 79;d.94
William de Luton	B/Esc	1255					s Alice;MA	Rb 63;L 64	W:77 purveyor;J 79;d.95
William de Lyanne	Knight	1268	F				Boulogne		
John de Lymar	tourney Kt.	1260			G	R	Linc/Leic	K:see Lincoln	
William de Lyndes	S:Dublin & I admin	1254-5,57,63					I;X:JfGeoff	S:Dublin 50<	?d.1282
John de la Lynde	C:Bourg;Mayor:Knight Bord:D:Fr,G	1255,60,63-72 T.68;T.EC 70			G		Surr/Linc/ Sam/Dor/Sus	RF 61<;Sen3D 61 -3:C: Tower 65-7 SenFH 68;Jb 69	d.1272
Raymond Macayn	C: Bordeaux	1259					mch Bordx	Rb 1255,57	
Eynon Maddoc	garr.Builth	1256-7							
Henry Malemayns	S:Kent	1271-2					Kent	55 garr.Dover; DepS:Kent 68	S:Kent>73;d.c.74
Hugh de Malvern	K:Kingswood K:Larder	1265-7,72	F				?Bristol		K:Kingswood & larder >75
Henry de Mandeville	Ulster campaign C:S:Sen in I	1254,59-63 71-2					Ulster		replaced, complaints abused position,
John Mansel	(C:Tickhill) clerk D:Castile	54,(59),c.63 -5;T.1258				R		Cl.R; D 34<;Sen G 43;C: Tower 61	d.1265
Hugh de Mappilton, Bishop Ossory	Thes.I	1254-60						Thes I 1251<	?d.1260
Guy de la Marche	garr:Windsor	1263				R	Lusignan		
Henry de la Mare	to W for E;?J contracted loans	1254,55					X:Mansel, W.Longespee	D:Fr, Cur.45<;RF 53<;council R	d.1257
Philip Marmion	C:Roguebrun;to G on Bigorre mission	1254,60 T.1260 (Paris)			G/W N	R	Salop/Leic/ Warks/Heref	S:var 49<;RF 54<;J 59<	d.by 1276
Nicholas de Marnham	B:Stamf, Tickhill	1254-8	F			?M	?Lincs	Jtd 67	
Arn-Will. de Marsan	C:Roguefort, Sault	1255			G		Gascon	66 W due >54	d.by 1272

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Raymond de Marsan	C:Casteroz, Espes	1255					Gascon		
Nicholas FitzMartin	captured in W in service E C:Cardigan, Carm, Kilgaran, Totnes	1256-7, 58-60 62-3, 65-72	?F				Cemaïs, W; Sam/Dev/Dor T.E.Glos.	46:W; Jtd. 67-70; O&T 71-2; C:Carm for Bd 70<	C:Kilgaran>73; O&T 76; d.1282
John Mautravers	to I for E	1256, 57					N'hants		80-81 in I; 85 in Eng.
Bernard Mayconis	"loyal service"	1267, 69	G				Bordeaux		
Stephen le Menler	Huntsman	pre Aug. 70	P						
Gerald de Méseroles	retained	1255<	F				Gascon		
Will. de Micheldever	to W in service E	1254					S'hants.	S:Surrey 52-4	
William de Middleton	K:rolls Jewry Clerk/A Re:revenues	1265, 66, 68, 70-72					HH Ep.Durh. 71 A:Burnel	Jing 52; Cl.R 65<	Rb 72<; Cl:Jewry>75; Cl:Bench 76< admin & D; Ep.Norwich 79-d.88
Thomas de Mirmes Mymnis	Cl. I admin; supplied W war	1259-61, 67	W						Rb (Eng) 72<; SvR; S&C in I; RF 80<
John le Moine, sr.	G, W service Knight	1255, 57			G	R	Hunt/Cam; X: Fiennes, PS	S:var; J:Jews; Jf; Esc 53-70	d.1275
John le Moine, jr.	Re:New aid Sv; Buyer	1266, 68					?s. John		
William de Moleford	Vallettus	pre 1270			(C)			HH QEP, EC 62<	
Henry de Moles.	?Falconer	1252							
Hugh de Molianville	estate admin	1256-7							
Nicholas de Molis	Capt. W army Knight	1251, 54, 57			G/W	R	Sam/Wilts	S&C:var 34-58 SenG; 43-5; W; garr:Wind 64	?d. by 68
Richard de Monet/ Monetto/Munet	?Knight	T.54			G	R	alien	RF by 54-69, 70<; HH Kt 59; MS 61	
William de Montagu	Welsh service; Knight C:3 Castles tourneys	1255, 60-62	H		W		Sam/Ox/Buck X:G.Neville		d. by Oct.1269
Adam de Montalt	B:Farnley Knight	1259, 70-72 T.59	W	C	G		N'hnt/Leic/ kin Roger	S:Lancs 61-3; RF 61<	W:77; d.1290

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
John de Montalt	Vallettus/Kt	?1270-72	W	C	W		York/Not/Suf		W:77;RF 85<;banneret 86<; Sen HH 86;d.90
Roger de Montalt	?in G +E;JC; "Councillor"	1254,57-9 T.57,59			G/W	BR	T.Chester; Sen.Chester	council 53<;59 D:W;59 Ji	d. by July 1260
Imbert de Montferrand	C:Montgomery; I,W service	1254-8,63, S.54;T.57-8, 60,63	F		W	R	Savoy;Dor; Sen:Ep.Herf HH PS 64	RF 56<;marshal HH 58<;D:Fr,Cur v.Kent rebels 66	RF in 74; 75,79-80 HH QEP 77 C:Glos
Stephen Montferrand	Vallettus/Kt.	1260		W/G			bro I;S'hnt	HH QEP	RF & G: C:Saintes 80;d.88
Peter de Montfort	to Spain +E, Kt;Counsellor C:Aberg,?Momm Defence march	1254,59,62-3 S.54;T.57-60,3		W/G	G/W	M	Salop;X:SM, Audley	C&S:var 57-65 D:Fr,W 56-8	killed at Evesham 1265
Will. (Mont)Gauger	C/Re:Bord. Clerk	1261-9,70		G			Bucks	Cl. AV 1256	CL.R;posts in Eng.& G >83
Adam de Montgomery	C:Montgomery,	1265		G		R	T.Mont,fAlan		C:marcher castles >d.1290
Ebulo de Montibus	C:Benauges; Kt;?Sen; garr;Windsor agent in G;	51,53-6,62-5 S.54,55;T.54- 5,57-8,60,63		G	G	R	Savoyard; Buck/Surr/ Kent/Camb	Rb 46;RF;D:Fr; Sen HH 62-3 C:Wind.66<	d.1268; QEP:executor
Hugh de Montmainard	Sen:3 Dioceses	c.1268-72							?squire R 1289, or son?
William de Montrevell	to Spain +E Vallettus	1254,57,66-9		G	G/W	R	son G Kt R; Cit.Bordx	RF 53<;VR 54-7 O:QEP 64-5;	78:tourney;"familiaris" R;82 MS +10 kts;90<B:Entre-d-M;d.97
Payn de la More	B:CI	1256-7			G		Sussex/Oxon	44:G	
Pons de la More	K:Richmond; Re:W.fine	c.68-72,					mch Cahors	buyer wine R 68<;72 Ch.Lond	
Roger de Moretagne	Garr;Windsor Knight Re:goods rebels	1263,66,69-70 S.c.69-70				R	Fleming A:HA 65	S,R in treaty with Fl. 1270	
William de Mortain	with E in W,Axholme S:Warr	1263,65, 66,70-71				R	T.Peak; Derby/Linc	KtR;RF 61<;Kp: Nott 67;Re:20th	S:Warks 72-3; W:77; d.1283
Hugh de Mortimer	S:Salop	1271-2			K	R	Heref;X:Rog	D:W 67; K:For	d. by 74
Robert de Mortimer	?W. service Vallettus	1265			?W		?son Hugh		W:77;d.1287
Roger de Mortimer	C:Builth,Card Knight planned escape C:Corfe;Lieut/A	1260,64-5, 70-72;S.69-70 T.64,70		G	G/W K	B/R	Marcher;I/ Radnor/Here	W wars 57-66;60 HH KtR,council; S&C:var 60-72;D	76-9 captain/K:mid,west W d.82

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William de Mortimer	In W with E Vallettus	63,?70-2	W		?G		Heref.		pilgrim 73;86 O with R
John de Musgrove	in W with E; Knight; var. garr. Bristol; campaigns S:Lim;C:Bristol;Lieut I	1263,64-7, 70-72; T.63,67,69			G/W/K	R	Glos/Chesh. T.E.Glos son SenQEP	56:HH QEP;VR 59 RF 61<;C:Marlb 58,65-7;S:Devon	C:Bristol >74; campaigned in I 72-d.75
Geoffrey de Neville	C:Dover "familiaris" Aud; Tourney,HH Kt	1259,61-5, T.1264,66	G			R	X:Ufford		See note;?identical with Geoffrey N. of Raby, below
Geoffrey de Neville	C:Scarborough	1270-72				R	bro.Robert	RF 60<;Jf 70-2	Jf >85;W:77;O&T 73-81;d.85
Hugh de Neville	Tourney Kt	1260				M	son/Essex;	at K/Axholme	d.69
Peter de Neville	garr.Windsor Tourney Kt	1262,63;T.62	H		G/K	R	son Hasculf Leic/Rutld.	C:Sauvey 52-60; RF;marshl HH 59<	
Robert de Neville	Welsh service;Knight C:Bamburgh	1263,70-72			W/K	R	Raby,Yorks	northern C&S 58 65;RF 62<;Jtd	C:Bamboro,Scarboro >76;d.by 85
Ralph de Norwich	Canc:I;C:Dublin	1254-6,65-6					Bucks	Canc:I 49<;JiI	d. by June 1259
Alex. de Nottingham	JiI;Council I;Kt HH in I	1254-8,72							
Ralph de Nymet	equipped as knight by E	1255							
Richard del Oke/Hoke	S:Hereford	1269-70							
Richard de Ore		T.1260				M	Sussex	52:CI + R Grey	d.by Dec.1265
Fulk de Orreby	Esc:C;JC	1254-9,59-61 T.59,61			W		T.Chester; ?s.Phil,JC	Esc.C 1249<;45: W;Pleader R 53	d.1261
Richard de Orreby	Chamberlain C	1259-60,62-3	W/H				Chester		d. c.1276
Thomas de Orreby	Esc:C;JC	59-62;T.59,61				R	son Rich.	K:Ferrers w.66	d.1290
Hugh FitzOtto	C: Tower;Aud Kt;?Sen HH	65-6,1269-72 T.66,68,70,71	F	C	?K	R	Suff/Essx/ X:London	65 K:London; Ch.London 69	Sen HH 74-83;O&T 77,81; tourney 78;d.1283
Ralph de Overe/Evere	S/C:Dublin	1258,64-5							
Roger Oweyn	purveyor:W war;Pleader in I	1257,c.61-66	(F)				Ireland		d.1281
John de Oxford	Pleader	1265			G				
Jordan de Oxford	P:E-d-Mers, Montsegur	1254-6,58,69						P:EdM 53<	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/P	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Theobald le Palfreur	?Purveyor	pre-Aug.1270							
John le Parker	P:Barsac, Serviens Belin,C:Sault	1254,55-6, ?68,70-72	F	C	G		?Hereford	42:G;garr.Montg RF>d.by 78 45:53 SvR;56 KER	
Richard de Parrelt	Buyer	pre-Aug.70							
Bartholomew Pech	Guardian	1246-54			G		Berks/Midx X:Savoy 44<	R admin & D 1236-52;RF 46<	d.1257
Herbert Pech	Ktd +E; in G +E; Knight	1254,55	W		G		son Bart	42 VR;Rb 55	
William de Penes	garr.Windsor Knight	1263;T.55,57			G/W		Fr;X:Savoy, Champagne	RF 54<	
Roger de Penbroc	S:Kildare	1260-61							
Stephen de Penchester	K:C.Ports; C:Dover;S:Kent	1265-72,				R	S'hants/ Bucks/Kent	Kp:Kent 63	C:Dover & CP >1299 J:Jews 79
Geoffrey de Percy	garr.Meilhan Knight	1254,55,?57	H/P		G/W /?K	R	Leic/Kent	VR 46;RF 62<;65 -8 usher HH R	d.by 1286
William de Percy	D:Fr;C:Scarboro;Clerk	1261,72					canon York	MA Ox,Par;Cl.R	C:Scarboro>74;W:77;86:O+R
Count of Périgord	retained	1255<	F						
Peter the huntsman	?C:Chester	1260					Cheshire		
Martin FitzPeter	crossbowman	1264				R			
Reginald FitzPeter	?W service ?Knight B:Freemantle	1257,62; T.59,64			W/K		I/Hants	RF 61<;S:S'hant 1261-4	c.1273 raided Brecon;w:1277
Alexander de la Pevere /Pebree	?Knight	T.1268					Gascon;lord B'gerac 72<		banneret HH 86<;mayor Bordx 1293-4
Bartholomew le Peytevin/Poitevin	garrison Cam. to I for E	1257,71 T.1266					s.Peter le P,SvR;Sam;	T.Ed 69	77 A:T de Clare;GR by 79;84:I with T de C.
John FitzPhilip	in service E "hospes"	1254,56			G/W	?M	Linc/Staff	wife in HH QEP	d.67
John de Picheford	S:Uryel	c.1270-72				M	X:Audley		d.85
M. Robert de Picheford /Outhenby/Lindesey	Physician/ Clerk	1265-72	L				Salop:?kin Geoff,John		

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William Picot	Cl.I Ex;Purveyor campaigned v.Geraldines	1254,57,64-5, 70-72	F				Dublin	Cl.R 61	73:G;79 remembrancer, >83 marshal Eng Ex;d.83
Richard de Pictav.	B:Bridgewater	1256-8	F				?Poitevin		
William de Pisa	Proctor for G loan to E;Kt	1263							
M.Thomas de Pivelesdon /Pulesdon	Cl,Sen:estates;Cl,?K:Ward D:G,Fr;J:Jews	1257,58, 60-63			L	M	Salop;X: London	56-7 Re:Cross; 65<captive E	released 75, inst.AEp.Canterbury 79< HH E.Glos.
Alan Plogonet	C:Corfe,Sherborn, S:Som	1270-1 T.66				R	nephew/heir R.Walerand	VR 59;Kt R 60< C:Corfe 65<	O&T 1275; W:77,87;87-9 C:Rhuddlan;d.98
Hugh Plogonet	?Knight	55,70-2;T.60		?C	G	R	X:Bass'born		
Bertrand de Podensac	C,P,Mayor:Bayonne	1254-6	G				Podensac,G		
Andrew le Poher	S:Connaught	1269							
John le Poher	C:Dungarven	1258					Cork		?S:Cork 1277-8
Aldebert le Prevost	garr.Meilhan	1254,55	F/W				Bergerac	RF 52<;D:Fr >63	
Oliver le Prevost	Re:fouage	1255	F				Bergerac	54 swore fealty	
Guy de Provence	Serviens	1259-60	G				?Provence/C		
Robert de Pulford	C:Degarwy,:C	1260,63-4	F				Kt Cheshire		d. by 1277
Ebulo de Puyguillelm	Vallettus	c.1261-9	H/?G				Entre-d-M,G		VR 1286: 1300:Sc
Roger le Quener	Purveyor	1266			K				
R. scissor E	Tailor	1252							
Elias de Rabeyn	?W service Knight C:Devizes,Corfe	1257,63,70- 72		?C	G/W	R	Poitou;Dors Som/Oleron	48 VR;S&C 51-8 exiled 58-61	C:Corfe 72<;disgraced 80; C:Sherbourne 82;d.85
Master Ralph le Acatur	Buyer;Cook	1257,60-1,66- 67,70			W			61 to Brittany + daughter R	
M.Ralph le Sauser	Sv;Sauser	1253-9,70-2	W	C	G/W	R	?Ely;	60 to Fr +R	SvR, RF 72-82;W:77;ill/?d. 82
John de la Rede	Esc/B:Hastings,Elham Supply Cl. in W war	1255,57-9				R	55< Sen:PS		d.1271;son Cl.Wardobe >1297

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Roger de Reymes	?Knight	1270-2;T.68-9		C		M	Essex/Norf	HH E.Derby,Glos	
Alexander Reyner	Vallettus	1251,52,54					?X:Giffard	RF 54<	
Peter de Repentery	S:Ulster	1254-5						JiI 52-3	
Samkin Reveward	Re:Bristol	c.1268-9					Cit.Bristol		
Robert Reynel	C:Military HH I	1257			W				
Simon de Ribeford	C:Builth	pre May 1260					X:Mortimer	Esc.Worc 51	
Richard	Cl.kitchen/Buyer/Sauser	c.1266-70							
Richard	Cl.marshalsea	c.1256-7			?W				
Master Richard	Physician	1265					?M'pellier	?physician QEP	
Master Robert	Physician	1265-6						pres to L by R	
Robert	?Sv.wardrobe	?1265	G/F						d. by 1275
M. Robert le Pestur/Baker	Sv;?Baker /Buyer	1260,68,70			?W		X:Ep.Cov; London	57 dep.Buyer kitchen R	Rb 72-3;SvR; buyer kitchen 85;RF 90<
Meiler de Roche	S:Connacht	1261-2					?Connacht		
Henry de Rocheford	S:Connacht	?1260-1							S:Connacht 80-2
Guy de Rocheford	Welsh service Knight	1257			W		Poitou		
Maurice de Rocheford	in G with E	1254,55			G		son Guy; I	RF 51<;VR, KtR	d.1258
John de la Rochelle	rebel seizures on order E	1265-6				R	Kent;?X:Ric	K:Ospring 69	
Richard de la Rochelle Rokele/Rupella	DepJI/Sen.E Knight; +E in in I;JI;C: Acre Athlone,Bristol	1254-6,58-9 61-66,70-72 T.71	H/G /W	C		BR/R	T.JfGeoff, Connacht; Kent/Essex	G:42;I dep JfG; RF 43<;C:Hadley 58;67 to I for R	d.1276
William de la Rochelle	I admin;C&S:var	1256,61-3,70					son Richard	?Rb 61	
Roger	Marshalsea	1256							
Roger	barber	1265							
John FitzRoger	Knight	1255	W		G/W			G:42;W:45;SR 51	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Sicardus de la Roke	Knight	1255	W				Templar		
Baldwin de Rosey	Tourney Kt	1260			G		Norf/Camb	X:Tiptoft	
Herbert de Ruilly	S:Ulster;D:Fr	1254,72					Ulster/Essx	I service R 47<	
Baldwin de Rumely	"service" Knight	1255	H		G		I;X:Mortimer		
Philip de Ryoken	Knight	1259	F						
William Russe	Purveyor	?pre-Aug.70							?W:1277
Russell	Sumpterman	?1270-72	W	C					
Geoffrey Russell	B:Fors w.	c.1261				M		O&T1265	O&T 1270's
John Russell	V;Tourney Kt	1253,60					Glos/Camb	VR 54;Kt R 59;	?d.63
Ralph Russell	Kt;Huntsman	1256-7				?R	Glos/Som X:Walerand	61 S:Wilt;65 C: Sarum;S:Som 67	d.81
Mauger de St.Albino	to I; K:Lundy	1256,>64,?71		C	G	R	?Devon		1270's Jinq; W:77
Will-R de St.Dizier	?retained	1255	G/F				Bergerac,G	rebel in 1254	Sen:3 dioceses 1279
Michael de St.Edmund	garr.Builth Sv C:Cardarthen	1256-7,60-1	W		G		bro.Ralph	W 54; Rb 61	?Sv HH R 1279-85
Ralph de St.Edmund	garr.Builth	1256-7	W/?G		G		bro.Michael	SvR;61 Kt.Hospl	
Robert de St.Edmund	I Pleader;campaign +JI;Sv	1270-72	F				X:Audley Norfolk	B:Camb 52	S:Tipperary 78;Sv R >85,
Gerard de St.Laurence	Acre with E Knight	1270-72	W/H	?C					72-5:G,Sp;tourney 78;C:Flint>81
William de St.Ledger	Purveyor	1266			G/W /K	R	N'hnt/Suss/ I; X:W	W:45;RF 54<;R garr.Wind 62-4	d.1273
Urian de St.Peter/ St.Pierre	C:Hawarden;S:Salop; Knight defended Chester	?1255,60,65 69-71;T.71	P/F	(C)	G/W	R	T.Ches/Oxon X:JfGeoff	64 intermediary SM /R Marchers	abroad 80,91:ill 92-d.95
John de St.Valery	S:Som	1271-2				M	Oxon; X:RC, Giffards	64-5 S:Ox;67 C: Corfe 67	S:Som>74;Jinq. 74-5; Baron Ex 75;d.76
James de St.Victor	DepC:Bristol	by Jan.72					Bucks;X:W. Bassingborn	suspended 1272 for extortion	J RH 74;Ass:15th 75; 87 Cl.R;K:abbey Wint.

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Gerard de Salines	?Knight	1255	?W				Savoy;bro.S.		
M. Peter de Salines	Cl:shipworks Bayonne	1255					cit.Bayonne ?X:Savoy		
Stephen de Salines	A/D:Toulouse	1255;T.55	?W		G		Savoy	C:Hadley 50-55; Kt R RF 49<;D:	d. 1256
William de Salines	Re:Ex.Bordx Clerk Re:goods Leyburn	1254,57,59 60,62;T.62			W		Savoy: favour QEP	68 Re:Agenais rent from Fr	K:HH children R 74-7;Cl.R Archdeacon Dublin 75-d.79
Salvagijs	Cook	1260							
John de Sandford	Esc I	1270-2	F				?kin Fulk;		EscI>85;JI 88; AEp.Dublin 85-90
Thomas de Sandwich	Cl.B:Sandwich	1268,70-72				C	M Kent;Cl.SM X:Leyburn	M.garr Dover; DepB:Sandw.65-8	S:Ess 74-5;Sen:Ponthieu 79<:O&T in CI 92
M. Walter de Saundon	Cook	1270-72	G/W	C			?kin cook R		Cook R 1275
Hugh le Sauvage	C:Chester	c.69,70-72		C					
William le Sauvage	Sv kitchen	1261					?mch.Lond	Rb 61	
Bernard de Savoy	K:estates co-Guardian	1244-47					Savoy	C:Windsor 41-7;	
Bruno de Saye,kt	F:Fronsac & Sen3D;Dep SenG	1255-6,67-9, 72	G				Kt Vicante Fronsac;52	Rb 43<;C:in G 53;D:Fr 69-72	Mayor Bordeaux 75-7 P:Barsac 74-d.78
John de Say/Sey	Panterer	1254,257			W		?S'hant/Suss		1286: HH E.Glos
Robert de Sele/Sete	to I for E	1256,57					?58 HH AV		
Walter le Serjeant	agent I supplies for W war	1257			W		Worc	63 HH Mortimer	
Arnold-Garsie de Sescas	C:Roquefort Re:fouage Bazas	1255		W			G, Bazas		?son in HH R 1286
Walter de Shelfhanger	Ch:Chester Cl;Buyer wine	1256-7,60-62					Norf;X:Eudo de S,HH QEP T.Aberg.	58 K:Fair;61 R Pleader:B:Vaux	S:Camb,Linc,Norf 73-7 Cl.R 81
Philip Skyret	killed in service E in W	c.1257							
Gaillard de Soler	agent Bordeaux reform campaign v. Navarre	c.1260-1,66 T.1259	(G)		?N	R	Cit,Bord. Belin	G rebel>54;freed 55;	
Roger de Samery	Welsh service Knight	1257,68;T.70			W/L	R	Worc/Staff	S&C march;Jtd	d.1273

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Hugh le Sommeter	Pleader	1260							
Nicholas de Stafford	S:Tipperary	1266,68-9					X:Langley	ex-ward E	
Richard de Standon	Xbowman;in I & G for E;Sv	1270-72	W/H	C			?X:Musgrove		?+ E in G 73-4
Stephen	rebel campaign Marshal	1265							
Robert de Stockport	C:Chester	1266-7;T.70	G				T.Ches/Lanc	coroner Lanc.65	d. pre 1281
John de Stoke	B:Coldoverton	c.1255-6					?X:Roger		
Nicholas de Stoke	Ass:tallage Peak	1260					?X:Roger		
Roger de Stoke	B:Stanton,C: Serviens Tickh,S&G;Ass	1255-7,59 60	W/F				?X:J,N,W		
William de Stoke	P:Pirie	1256-7					?X:Bauzan		
Henry de Stratton	JiI;Aud:ThesI	1272					?bro.Adam		
Robert de Stuteville	B:Appleby Tourney Kt Welsh service	1255,60-63	F/P				?Norman; Yorks/Norf	Rb 61	d.1270; son transferred to fealty France
Walter de Stirchesly	S:Wilts	1272					A:Burnell		S:Wilt,Nott,Linc,Glos >80;d.89
Bartholomew de Sully	S:Hereford	1270-72					Glos/Wo/Kent		S:Heref>74;J;council;d.80
Hugh Taghmon, Ep.Meath	Thes.I:Councillor I	1264-72	F						Thes I >74; d.1282
John le Tailor	Tailor;Sv;Buyer	1255-7					?X:Montibus		
Gilbert Talbot	JC;C:Mormouth & 3 Castles co-Sen;Aud:J	1254,55-7, 60-62 T.258,59,60	G			BR	Heref/Glos T.Mormouth HH Ed 69<	C/S:Heref;58 secret envoy; O&T 59;D:W 67	active on March 73-4 d.1274
Simon Talbot	Re:Bristol	1254,55					Essex,T.JfG		d.1265
M.Raymond de Taleyson	Re:Bordeaux Clerk	?1255,60,66	G				Bazas		C:Bordeaux>d.1274
William Talun	S:Uryel	1260-62							S:Uryel 1272-6
Luke de Tary,kt	(JC);SG;Aud:Admiral C fleet	(1265),70-72		C		M	Herts/Rutl/ N'hurb;X:HA	62:Sc;66-70 C: castles HA	SenG>78; 79 O with R; Jf s.T 81-d.83
Br.William de Tarrant	"Sen"/Re:estates	1257					Cistercian	A/Sen:QEP 51-8	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Will-Arnold de Tartas	B,C:Labourd,Gramont	1254,55					Gascon		
Robert de Tattershall	Welsh service	1263	?G			W/L R	Linc/E.Angl T.E, RC	captured Lewes KP:Linc 66	d.1272
Thomas	garr.Aberg.	1258							
Thomelinus	Barber	1257			?G			?barber R 54-8	
Robert de Thirleby	S:Dublin	c.1271-2					?son J R		
Richard de Thunderle/ Underleigh	C:Builth C:Carmarthen	1256-7,64-5	W			R	Heref;X: J Monmouth	DepC:Carm 44;SvR 62<;garr.Tower67	
Aymo Thurberd, jr.	Vallettus	1262					?Savoy;son C:Windsor		
Peter Thurberd	in HH E	1265				R	?bro Aymo		
Robert de Tibetot/ Tiptoft	garr.Bristol; HH Knight Axholme campaign;Tourney Executor	1258,60,63, 64-5,66,70-72 T.65-6,68,70-1	G/F	C	G	R	Suf/Norf/Es Nott/York;m X:Chaworth	R garr.Ludg'hal 64;C:Porchester 65-6;	C:Notts 1275<; J inq: J.W.Wales 82-d.98 tourney 78
William Trussell	?B:Aberg. Kt;Buyer	1255,c.56				M	Warks;X:SM	S:Leic 46;J>57	killed at Evesham
Hugh de Turberville,	C:Carm;in rescue bid;HH Kt +E in siege London B:CI:SenG	1263,64,67 68,70,71-2 T.66	?F		?N	BR/R	Heref/Brec ?X:exSenG; X:Leyburn	62 +Leyburn revolt;S:Heref 63-4; 68 Jinq	73 besieged H. Bohun at Brecknock;RF 85<;W: 77,86<;C:Bere 86-d.92
William de Turberville	C:Bourg Knight	1254,?57	G		G		Irel;?X:H	D;Kt HH R 43<; marshal HH 60	dead or retired R by 1266
William Turpin	equipped as kt by E	c.1260-62	P						
Walerand le Tyes	B:Skenfrith	1254-7	G				German	C&S;March 34-54	d.1257
Robert de Ufford/ with E in W,Tourney,Acre	Aud;JI Knight with E in W,Tourney,Acre	1257,61-3,68 -72;T.62-4	G	C	W		E.Angl;X:HA & G.Neville	C:Porchester	J 74:C:Orford 74-5; JI 76-80,80-81;d.98
John le Usser/Ulbeston	V;Usher	1265-71				R	E.Anglia		Usher chamber R 75-86
Andrew de Valenuiz	P:Dax	1254-5					Citizen Dax		
Erard de Valéry	Counsellor;Kt;"familiaris" Welsh service;garr.Windsor	1260-5 T.1260-3	G	(C)		R	French;C: Champagne	RF 61<;HH Louis for crusade	RF >74: agent in Fronsac 76 Ch:Fr 72<;d.77

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Florent de Varennes	Tourney Kt	1261-3	H	(C)		R	Artois	RF 61<;Admiral Fr.C Fleet 1270	74 gift £100, leaving R for own parts
Amauvin de Vares/Bares	Sen:Landes;A; Knight to G +T de Clare	1254-5,61, 70-72;S.55		?C			Gascon;59< K:Bigorre	C:St.Emil.42;RF 42<;D:Fr 51-60	
Adam de Vaux/Vallibus	?C:Odiham Cl/hostiarius kitchen/Buyer	1257-8,60-2, 64,70?	(F)		?W			1255 SvR & huntsman	RF >d.75
Stephen de Vaux/Vall	W Service E Sv	c.1257-64					bro. Adam		?HH Thomas de Clare
John de Vaux/Vallibus of Shotsham	in W with E. HH Kt;Ally rebel campaigns; Tourney	1257,59,63, 65-6 T.59,60			G/W /K	R	E.Anglia T.Richmond X:Leyburn	64 marshal HH R; Kp:E.Anglia 65-7	D:Lyons 74; SenG 83-d.87 HH banneret >d.87
John de Vaux, Keswick	?Knight	T.64				R	E.Anglia	S:Norf 64	living August 1270
John de Vaux	Tourney Kt	unknown							d. pre-Aug.1270, tourney Thirsk
Nicholas de Vaux	?C:Chester; C:Dublin	1254?,56,57, 60-61?					Wilts;X: La Zuche	dep JC to Zuche 53;Sen LaZ 64-5	72 A:Ellen la Zuche
Eble IV, Vicante de Ventadour	ktd by E on crusade; returned early;mission in G	1270-72	W	C			Gascon		Sen 3 Dioceses 74-5; in service WV in G 74
John de Verdon	Irish admin Kt;campaigns & defence; v. Welsh & C:Odiham M rebels	1257,59,1261-63,65,68,70-2 T.71	F	C	G/W	BR/R	X:T.Butler, Geneville & JfG;Heref/I	C:Windsor 65-6;Kp:Worc 66	d.1274
Walter de Vernon	G & W service Knight	54-5,57-8,70	G/F		G/W		T.Ches/Worc		
Robert de Vipont	service in I	1256				M	Westm/York	C:Richmond 63	
John de Vescy	to I for E Knight	1270-72 T.1271	W	C		M	N'humb/York X:Lusignans	educated at Windsor	C:Scarboro 73-d.89; W:77; D:Fr,Aragon;council
Vigrosus	huntsman	1260						1261 huntsman R	
Hugh de Vivonia	in service E in G; killed in W.service	?1255,57-8	P		G/W		Wilts/Pemb; Poitou	G:1248-9	
Robert de Wainfleet	B:Ferrers w.	1256-7							
Peter de Waldringham	ktd by E	c.1260-62	P						

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
Robert Walerand	C:Bristol; HH Kt:Ally;in Commanded W Temple raid; force; rescue bid; Lieut/A in absence E	1257,59,62-5 69-72;T.54,58 61-3,66,68-70 co-S.69;S.67	G		W	R	Heref/Glos Som/Dors; X:Cantilupe 1268 A:RC	RF 44<;C:Carm 48-54;Sen HH 51 -3,57,62;S:Kent 61;D;Council	d.1272-3
Madoc, son John Waleys	garr.Chester	1268<	W						garr.Chester 1276
Robert le Waleys	C:Mormouth	c.1257-8,60	F			?M	Leic;X:P Montfort,	C:Builth, dep. W de Cantilupe	?Sen:T.de Verodn 1270; W:77;O&T 80;I 82;
William le Waleys	DepS:Tipp;?Esc	1267,70-72				?M			pre 79 Aud in I
Walter	Falconer	1253							
Gilbert de Waltham/ Winterbourne	K:W.Gunnor A/Receiver	Chaplain 1263,65,67 ?70-72	P				?Lincs;?X: H d l Mare	69-72 Master Hosp.St.Mark	c.72 built new hospital; ?Canon Spalding 78
Thomas de Walton/ Waleton	B:Calne & Calston	c.1262					Norfolk;	67 resp.kthood at inst. EC	
William de Walton	?Sv or Kt	c.1260-62	W				X:Montibus		
William le Waraner	K:O'Connor	1263-5					Cl.PS 1253		
Robert FitzWarin	K:Dungarven, O'Connor;Jif	1258-9,61-2, ?63	W						
William FitzWarin	service in G; Serviens C:Mormouth; S:Ulster	1255,56-7, 60,70-72 T.70,71	P/H W/F G	C	G		N'hant/Wilt Berks/?I	SvR 42-54:O:42; W:45;Re 20th.	S:Ulster 72-5,77-80; C:Oswestry 76-7;86:O;d.90
John de Warene, Earl Surrey	Tourney companion;Ally	1259,60,63, T.59,60,64 66,70;co-S.67,	G		L/E	R	Surr/Suss; X:Lusignans educ.Winds.	C:Rochester 64; 65 +R force in Fl;70 Zuche d.	W & Sc campaigns >90 C:Hope 1300<;K:Scotland 1296-7;d.1304
Robert la Warr/Ware	Baker/V	by 1266,70-2				C	?SvR 1260		Panetarius/SvR 73-d.85
John de Wellhopp	B: ?S'hants	1261							78,G for long service;d.83
Henry de Wengham	Clerk	1254 T.54,58	L				42 Cl.PS;60 Ep.London	CL.R 42<;Re:G,W Esc;Canc;D:G	d.62
Richard de Wigeton	Sv.Degarwy	c.1256-62	W						
Philip de Willoughby	Cl: K:Ward	1272				C	Linc/Not/Mx	C:20th.Grimsby	K:Ward>74;CLR;Canc.Ex 75-d.1305

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William de Wilton	B:Hastings;A Knight K:Ferrers w; organiser I supplies for W	1254-8, T.56-60	W		L	R	Sam/Kent;46 X:Marshals m.X:R	Ji 47<;Jp 61<; D:W,Fr;RF 53<	killed at Lewes 1264
Adam de Winchester	Re:Bristol Clerk Aud;K:Rolls Ex; J:Jews	1258-72	F	?C		R	N'hant;Wint Cl.G Cauz		Aud >79;K:Rolls Jewry 76-80; RF>d.1302
William de Windsor	Cl/Buyer	1260,66	?L		K	R	Berks;I	Cl.R<67;	Aud;Buyer 74;Cap 79;Cl 86,ill
William de Wiresy/ Wysery	sent O to E;D:Fr	1262,?63				R	?Savoy;Suf X:Montibus	61 RF;62 D:Fr 60 V QEP,ktd.	d.1266, execs J.Ferre & E. de Montibus
Walter Wither	garr.Aberg.	1257,?64-5					Glos,T.Morm	G at inst.E	d.1270
Ralph de Woodberg	campaign v.rebels;Knight	c.1265,70-72	H	C		R	Notts		O +E 1273-4;O&T 75-8;W:77
Giles de Woodham	Served v.W & rebels;Marshal	1252-5,63,65	H				Ox/Bucks		d.by 1268
Hugh de Woderton	Re:Honour Montgomery	1260					T.Montg.		1290 leased waste Montg;d.93
Nicholas de Yatingden	Ktd +E; V/Kt. campaigns +E v.rebels	1252,54-7,65	G		G	R	Ox/Suss/E Anglia;?X: QEP	C:Colchr 63;Kp: :Ox 66-7;RF 66< Jtd;C:Wind.68<	d.1272
Alan la Zuche	JC:JI:sent to defence Chester	1254-8,62-3; co-S.68-9;T.61				R	Leic/Dev/ Suss/Sc;kin Brittany;	JC 50-4;S,C,J 1260<;RF 61< K:Lond.67-8	killed 1270 by Warenne
Eudo la Zuche	(C:Chester) Knight	1262-3;T.57-60			G	R	bro.Alan; Ess/Leic	RF 61<;Kp;Ess 67;banneret R	W:77; d.79
William la Zouche	to I for E; Knight:Ally K:Lundy;JC; defended Chester for E	?1254,56,57, 59,63-5 T.59,61			G	R	?kin Alan; T.Ches;Sus Ess/Hant/	42:G;K:L'dy >54 S&C 61-3;RF 61< K:Ely 68	d. by 1272
William la Zuche	Welsh service Knight	1263							killed in Wales 1263

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
<u>HOUSEHOLD ELEANOR OF CASTILE</u>									
Alfreda	Lady; laundry	1260,67						P from QEP 60	
Aymenin	Vallettus	1268							
John de Beaumes	Vallettus	1265-72	W/R				kin in HH E		
John Burdet	?Steward/Buyer	pre Nov.1259					Lincs		
William Charles	Knight	1264			K	R		HH E	
William de Cheny	Steward HH	1255-6			G		CI/Herts	HH E	
Robert le Clerk	Vallettus			C				HH E	
Robert de Derlee	bailiff; seized rebel lands for EC	1265-6					Derby/Notts		d.1276
John de Draycott	Re:estates	1271							
John le Espaynol	long service			C		R			
Guy de Fretun	Knight	1255			G			waged by E 55	
Gullostus/Gillet	Tailor	pre 1268							Tailor QEC 89-94
Milo de Fiennes	V/huntsman	1264					kin EC		
John Ferre	Knight	126-70						HH E	HH QEC
Robert de Halstead	Vallettus	?1268,70					wife served in R nursery		80 VR;86 to G;89< kt QEC 97 Brabant +daughter R
Bartholomew de la Haye	Chaplain	1268	W				X:Giffard	K:R house Ox	settled debts E c.73-4; L 1277
Walter de Kent	A;Sen:estates Clerk ?steward	c.65-6,70<					Leic	C:Peak 72	K:Q.gold;steward QEC >80; 82 D:Fr;d.by91
John de London	agent to gain R grants K:wardrobe/ steward HH	1255-64,66						HH E	
Alice de Luton	long service ?midwife/nurse	1262,67						HH E	robes 73, gift 79
William de Moleford	to France Vallettus	1262		(C)				HH QEP/E 53	

Name	Estate admin. Household	Dates service	G/F	C	MS	PolA	Provenance	Other service	Career under EI
William de Somerfield	Tailor	1265				R			
Edmund Thurberd	Vallettus	1268				R		V E	
Robert de Walpole	Clerk pantry	c.1263							cf. Robert le Clerk
John de Weston, sr.	Steward	1264				R		J Jews 1262-3	wife in HH QEC; Sen HH sons R
Roger ?de Wautham, rector Werplesgrave	Chaplain	1264					Papal pres. ?X:Gilbert		d.1272
John de Woodstock	to Fr +EC Cook/Serviens	1256-9,67,70-2	G	C				SvR 70	EC left legacy to widow 1291
William de Yatingden /Tackley	in Sicily & Acre +EC; Clerk	1264,70-72		C			kin N de Y L:Tackley, Y		d.on crusade

HOUSEHOLD EDWARD'S CHILDREN

Adam de Bradeham	K:John & Henry	c.1270							
Alexander chaplain	K:John & Henry	pre Aug.71						chaplain QEP	
Cecilia de Cleware	nurse to daughter	c.1270-74							nurse to Margaret D.R
Amice de Derneford	HH boys	c.70-74							robes 73
Geoffrey de Picheford	K:sons at Windsor; Knight	1270-72					Salop; X:HHE	C:Windsor	C:Windsor/K:sons; HH Kt R
John de Rede/Rading	tutor sons	1269					?son SenPS		
Joan de Somery	took John to Fr as pledge	1270					m. Montibus		
Mary de Valoynes	K:Children	1269,70							
John de Weston, jr.	Vallettus Henry	by 1273					son SenEC		

NOTES TO APPENDIX TWO

1) **Ralph Basset.** The references to Ralph as a household knight and witness do not fully identify him. Several men of this name were active at this time, of whom the most well-known were Ralph Basset of Sapcote and his cousin, Ralph Basset of Drayton. The latter has been identified as Edward's knight, because of his links with Leyburn, with whom he was pardoned and received back into the household in 1263.

2) **John le Breton.** Another man of this name was keeper of the peace and justice in East Anglia in the 1270's. This renders the earlier evidence relating to le Breton in E.Anglia suspect. However, it is certain from the final account that the sheriff of Hereford, constable, keeper wardrobe and steward became the bishop of Hereford. The future bishop also definitely held the living of Aylsham in E.Anglia, and was very likely also the farmer of the manor. Since he retained the farm as his fee as justice, some of the references to his work as a justice must be valid. It seems reasonable also, given his knowledge of the area, that he was also engaged in negotiations with the Welsh in 1268.

3) **William de Cheny.** Ridgeway (D.Phil. p.413) used the gift from the queen (E101/349/26 m.3) to classify Cheny as a *vallettus* of her household. However, since the gift occurred in a series to members of Edward's household, it may only confirm his links with Edward. Tout VI, p.116, used the form "Chauncy", but there are no usages of this form in the original sources. Care must be taken not to confuse him with the more prestigious Poitevins, William de Chauvigny, lord of Chateau Roulx and William de Chabanais, as CR and CLR are prone to do. Jolliffe (Angevin Kingship, pp.143-4) demonstrated the family's Norman/curialist background.

4) **Ralph de Dongon.** R.Giffard, p.91, contains a presentation to a church vacant on the death of Sir Ralph de Donjon, and this has been taken by Studd to date Ralph's death to 1269. However, Ralph, king's clerk and canon of St.Paul's, was certainly alive long after this date. He made a will in 1282, proved in 1286; C.Letterbook A, p.517; HMC 9th.Report, p.46a; C.Wills Hustings, p.77: cf. CCR 79-88, pp.410,482; CChR 57-1300, p.204,

4) **Bartholomew de Exeter.** Studd gave name as "Oxonia", but original read "Exonia", which matches Vendômois cartularies, "magister Bartolomeus Anglicus de Exonia". Archives historique de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis VII, Chartes Saintongeaises de l'Abbaye de la Couronne, 36, XXII 1893, Cartulaire Saintongeais de la Trinite de Vendôme, 104.

5) **Stephen de Fulburne.** Although letters of protection were issued for the crusade, with special (financial) responsibilities, his journey was called off at the last moment, and he went to Ireland. He was not appointed treasurer until 1274, but the justiciar's account (to June 1272), shows that some of the Irish revenues were passing through his hands. He is likely to have met Edward when he was Treasurer at Clerkenwell.

6) **Thomas de Furnival.** His royalist alignment has been presumed from the reception he gave the king and Edward after the battle of Northampton, but summer/autumn 1264 he was said to have received the issues of the county in association with Vescy and Eyville.

7) **Thomas de Ipegrave.** C62/50 m.3 refers to debts incurred in the munition of the castles of Chester and Beeston "tempore quo Thome de Ipegrave fuit justiciarius noster comitis supradicti". No other reference to Thomas as justice has been found. The succession of justiciars for this period is fairly complete, but he might have held office in the confused period, 1263-5. The recipient of a war grant (Hunter R5el, p.249) was probably his son.

8) **Bogo de Knovill.** Edward gave Bogo the large sum of 100 marks to buy his marriage. No date was given for the transaction, but as the money was raised from the issues of the New Forest, when these were in the custody of Robert Walerand, we can assign a date pre 1270, and probably pre 1266, when Edward transferred the Forest to his wife (C62/52 m.7). Knovill was also given wine by the constable of Bristol between 1270-74 (C62/50 m.6).

9) **John de London.** The tracing of John's career is hampered by his common name. He is unlikely to have been clerk to the bishop of Durham, since this John de L. was still in the bishop's service in 1260 (CChR 1257-1300, p.140: CPR 1247-58, p.177: A.Dunelm, p.13). The identification with Mansel's clerk seems more plausible. During Edward's reign a number of clearly separate persons of this name existed, eg. CPR 1281-92, pp.421-3,473 1292-01, p.398, 1307-13, pp.270,507: CCR 1307-13, p.386: RG II 1706. John's long-standing connection with Berkshire has been used as a means to separate out references to him, and on this principle his career has been traced into the 14th.C.

10) **William de Montrevell.** Care must be taken to avoid confusion with his father, a Gascon knight with a long record of loyalty to Henry III, eg. CLR 45-51, p.188, 51-60, pp.22,34: Ridgeway, D.Phil, p.78, conflates father and son.

11) **John de Musgrove.** Some confusion over his political affiliations has arisen from the existence of two men of this name during the civil war period. One was in the rebel garrison of Kenilworth and obtained a pardon from Edward on his surrender. The other was appointed castellan of Marlborough immediately after Evesham, and was detached by Edward from the siege of Kenilworth to seize rebel lands. The Montfortian died in 1266. The other continued in Edward's service in England and Ireland until his death in 1275.

12) **Geoffrey de Neville.** Prior to 1267 there were two Geoffrey de Neville's in circulation. One was from Laceby in Lincolnshire and died in 1267 (CIPM I 660). The other was his distant cousin, younger brother to Robert de Neville of Raby. All the references to the household knight of Edward predate 1267, suggesting identification with the Lincolnshire Neville, a view followed by Moor, III, pp.247-8. However, if all the pre-1267 evidence is attributed to Geoffrey of Laceby, his namesake appears from nowhere in 1270 on his appointment as constable of Scarborough (for Edward) and chief justice north of the Trent (for the king). The payments of a fee by the king to the knight, Geoffrey de Neville, during the 1260's were sometimes delivered through the sheriff of Northumberland, making it very probable that the recipient was Geoffrey of Raby. This in turn makes his identification with Edward's knight more plausible. Moreover, Neville of Raby was in 1268 married to Margaret de Longvillers, whose marriage Edward had granted to his household knight, Wynemer de Gymery.

Another point, not hitherto appreciated, is that Edward's household knight had a very close association with another member of the household, Robert de Ufford. They held land jointly in Ulster even before Edward enfeoffed them with the manor of Kilmedan in 1262 (C47/10/13/16b). In 1263 they went together to Ireland, where they audited the account of one of Edward's sheriffs (Curtis, p.4). This connection was not broken in 1267 (as one would expect if Moor is correct), for in 1269 Wynemer de Gymery, the household knight mentioned above, named Ufford and Geoffrey de Neville as his securities for a debt (CR 68-72, p.105). By this time Neville of Laceby was dead (CIPM I 660). This supports the identification of Edward's Geoffrey with Geoffrey de Neville of Raby. So too does his relative wealth and social standing, making it more likely that his name would appear without territorial qualification. Against this, there are no further instances of the Neville/Ufford connection after 1269. Even so, the balance of the evidence is towards the Raby identification. Nevertheless, in the table all the information referring to Edward's household knight is presented separately to the entry for Geoffrey de Neville of Raby.

13) **Robert de Stuteville.** During the 1260's there were several men of this name, all of Norman descent. Edward's knight has been assumed to have been Robert son of John de Stuteville, receiving a fee from the king in 1261, as was a namesake Robert son of Robert. Robert son of William was also a royalist, captured at Lewes.

14) **John de Vaux.** Again, there were at least two knights of this name, John, son of Oliver de Vaux, known from his estates as J de V of Shotsham (Norfolk) and John, ?son Alexander de Vaux, known as John de Vaux of Keswick (Norfolk). Both of these men were active in East Anglia, and it is rarely possible to differentiate between them. Edward may have

been linked with both men. The charter Edward issued at Boulogne in January 1264 was witnessed specifically by "John de Vaux de Kesewik". Other charters and references to John in connection with Edward are not specific, and may all apply to John of Shotsham. Of the two, John of Shotsham was of higher social standing. He is known to have served in Gascony in 1254 (ExeRF II, p.160: E368/30 m.2d). He enjoyed a long and successful career under Edward I, being seneschal of Gascony at the time of his death. At some date after mid-1264 he became connected to Roger de Leyburn, through Leyburn's marriage to his widowed sister-in-law, Eleanor (originally Eleanor de Ferrers, married first to William de Vaux, and then to the Earl of Winchester). As a royalist his lands were attacked in the disturbances (Hunter RS, pp.224-8). He may have been granted lands from the honour of Richmond by Edward (CPR 1266-72, p.297: CIPM II 643).

This profile accords more with the Vaux who was a household knight to Edward, serving on the Welsh campaign, named as one of his allies in the treaty with Gloucester, with him on the continental tourney circuit, a member of the Leyburn affinity, returning to Edward's household in 1263, and assisting in the pacification campaigns. HMC 69, p.67: E36/275 f.35; Foedera, pp.433-4 (swore to observe Mise of Amiens, Dec.1263): GC II 226: AM III, p.225 (won over to support Edward mid-1263): E36/274 f.233v-235, retained with Leyburn affinity in household E in 1263: E368/94 m.47 (with E in Paris Dec.1260): Studd 828,862: C61/4 m.2

John of Keswick was also a royalist, and may have been sheriff of Norfolk in 1264 rather than his name-sake. This sheriff was assisted by two men also linked with Edward's household, Walter de Shelfhanger and Robert de Tattershall (El3/1e m.22d: KB26/174 mm.6d,11, 175 mm.11,15).

A further difficulty exists in that a John de Vaux, who was evidently a favourite of Edward, was killed in a tournament held at Thirsk, and Edward in an undated letter, using his pre-accessional style, wrote to the monks of Durham to arrange for John's burial and for masses to be said for his soul. This letter must have been written before Edward left for Palestine, at the latest by August 1270. Barlow has suggested a date of 1267 since Edward was in the north that year (Durham annals 22). Alternatively though, the tourney might have occurred rather earlier in the reign. The Vaux who was abroad with Edward on the tournament circuit in the early 1260's would be a strong candidate to identify with this death. However, he cannot have been either John of Keswick, or John of Shotsham, since both were alive in August 1270 (CPR 1266-72, p.485),

It has not been possible to represent these difficulties fairly in the table. All unspecific references to John de Vaux, except the tournament death, have been grouped with John of Shotsham. The tournament victim and John of Keswick are represented separately.

Table One: Loans and Advances obtained by Edward

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
28 May 1254	Baldwin John of Florence	£100	received in Bristol	D:February 1255	31; C61/1 m.4
4 Sept. 1254	Richard of Cornwall	4,000 m.	received by Mare & Langley	D:issues Welsh & English lands	52; C61/1 m.2
	Richard of Cornwall	3,000 m.	" "	" "	" "
	Richard of Cornwall	2,000 m.	" "	" "	" "
5 Sept. 1254	Bonusruncinus (Baruncino) Walter of Lucca	£200	S:John FitzGeoffrey & Ebulo de Montibus	D:February 1255, London	55; C61/1 m.2d.
9 Sept. 1254	Joanna, Countess of Ponthieu	2,000 m.	with H.III, FitzG. & D. Guillelmi	D:1255, fair of Lagny	56-7; C61/1m.2d.
19 Sept. 1254	A. Caillau & other Bordeaux merchants	1,200 m.		A:Gascon customs	69; C61/1m.2
26 Sept. 1254	P. Caillau et al.	5,000 m.	with H.III	P:by king	CPR 47-58, pp.335,555
28 Sept. 1254	Deutatus Guillelmi of Florence	2,500 m.		D:English lands Jan. & April 1255	73; C61/1 m.2
21 Nov. 1254	Peter de Ville & P-R de Benesse, Bayonne	372 m. 3 s.		A:local tolls; unpaid Sept. 1259	81,84,437; C61/2 m.12, 3 mm.3,1; RG I ii 4317
3 Dec. 1254	A & G Valeniuz, Dax	500 l.m.		D:Easter 1255	102; C61/2 m.12; RG I ii 4325
10 Dec. 1254	Bidunnus de Cos	140 l.b.	S:JfG & P.Montfort	D:Feb. 1255	106; C61/2 m.12; RG I ii 4328
2 Jan. 1255	William de Forges, citizen Bordeaux	100 m.		D:Mid-Lent 1255	123; C61/2 m.12; RG I ii 4337
7 Jan. 1255	mayor & commune Bordeaux	1,500 l.b.		D:24 June 1255	137; C61/2 m.11; RG I ii 4348
10 Feb. 1255	Raymond Marcasius jr. citizen Bordeaux	200 l.b.	S:W-A de Tontolon & P. Caillau	D:end April 1255	172; C61/2 m.10; RG I ii 4372
by 13 Feb. 1255	John FitzGeoffrey	44 m. 10 s.		D:from Ex.Dublin	176; C61/2 m.10; RG I ii 4379
by 18 Feb. 1255	Peter Colomb, Bordeaux	275 m.		A:Irish wool; unpaid Aug.1255	175,178,405; C61/2 mm.10,6, 3
20 March 1255	Elias de Blaye, Bordeaux	600 l.b.	goods & loan	D:May 1255	208; C61/2 m.9

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
30 March 1255	P Caillau, Bordeaux	350 l.b.	?loan or debt	A:local tolls	226; C61/2 m.9; RG I ii 4402
10 May 1255	E. de Blaye & A. Caillau Bordeaux	200 l.b.	?negotiated by Stephen Bauzan	A:Great Custom of Bordeaux	311; C61/2 m.7; RG Iii 4447; cf.290; C61/2 m.8; RG I ii 4441
by 12 May 1255	E. de Blaye, Bordeaux	800 l.b.	paid to wardrobe	A:Great Custom	314; C61/2 m.7; RG I ii 4479
by 12 May 1255	E. de Blaye, Bordeaux	30 l.b.	paid to G. de Blaye	A:Great Custom	314; C61/2 m.7; RG I ii 4479
1 June 1255	E. de Blaye, Bordeaux	400 l.b.		D:15 Aug. 1255	348; C61/2 m.7; RG I ii 4491
by 20 June 1255	Richard of Cornwall	£1,000	H.III guarantor if E died	D:Dec.1255, Wallingford	CPR 47-58,p.413; C66/69 m.8
29 July 1255	E. de Blaye et al. of Bordeaux	total of 1,688 l.b.	loans of 150 l.b. deleted	A:Great Custom	391; C61/2 m.6; RG I ii 4519
30 July 1255	Guy de Lusignan	2,000 l.t.	as £500 sterling	D:end April 1256	396; C61/2 m.6;
25 August 1255	William de Tallive et al. of Agen	500 m.	S:FitzGeoffrey & others	D:Feb. 1256 in Agen	415; C61/2 m.5; RG I ii 4538
21 October 1255	E. de Blaye & W.Chicket of Bordeaux	2,500 l.b.	S:FitzGeoffrey & E de Montibus	D:Paris, Nov.1255	522; C61/2 m.3; RG I ii 4623
21 October 1255	Elias Mounier, Bordeaux	£200		A:Ex.Bordeaux	523; C61/2 m.3; RG I ii 4624
21 October 1255	Raymond Moneyder, Bordeaux	200 m.	S:FitzG, Montibus, G. de Geneville	D:April 1255 or A: Great Custom	529; C61/2 m.3; RG I ii 4636
22 October 1255	R. Moneyder, Bordeaux	120 l.b.	repay as 134 m.	A:Ex.Bord.1256	538; C61/2 m.3; RG I ii 4631
23 October 1255	W. de Forges, Bordeaux	30 m.	rec. by S. Salines	D:Jan.1256	566; C61/2 m.2; RG I ii 4655
by 28 Nov. 1256	Richard of Cornwall	?4,000 m.	S:H.III; for W.war		CPR 47-58, p.532; Paris CM V,p.593
15 June 1257	D.Guillelmi et al. of Florence	10,000 m.	with parents to pay Pope	D:by June 1258 or penalty	CPR 47-58,pp.562-3; Powicke,p.370-3
28 June 1257 (paid Nov.57)	Colomb de Burgo/citizens Bordeaux	1,000 m.	from See Ely;owed Bordeaux by king	A:Custom;Colomb in control by Feb.58	CPR 47-58,pp.564,605,615 C66/71 m.6: E372/101 m.4
6 July 1257	Boniface of Savoy, Archbishop Canterbury	£1,000	for Welsh war	A:issues Elham & Hastings	625-6; CPR 47-58,pp.569.572

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
18 July 1257	citizens Bristol	1,600 m.	500 down, 500 Sept. 200 Dec. 400 1261	4 year farm of Bristol	CPR 47-58,p.570
by Sept. 1257	citizens Stamford	£100		P:by bailiff	SC6/1094/11 m.1
c.1255-1257	Vitalis de Caupennes	25 livres <u>mortals</u>	rec. by Longespee	P:June 1260	803; C61/4 m.2
by 3 April 1258	citizens Waterford	280 m.		part P:Dublin Ex.	688; Lydon,p.25
between Sept.1257 - August 1258	Aymer de Valence	unknown	loan inferred from transfer honour	A:Tickhill	SC6/1094/11 mm.1d-2d,20d; CPR 4758,p.644: C.Blyth priory 208
between Sept.1257 August 1258	William de Valence	unknown		AStamford & Grantham,?Mormouth	Paris, CM V,p.679: SC6/1094/11 m.16d.
19 October 1258	Henry III	£567	for Carmarthen	D:fixed terms	CLR 1267-72, p.270
5/13 Nov. 1259	R. Macayn, Bordeaux	500 m.		A:Great Custom	717-8; C61/4 m.5: cf.730
26 Nov. 1259	Wascelin Brus, Ghent	£285/15/2		D:Lent 1260,Stamfd	737; C61/ 4 m.5
27 Nov. 1259	Peter & Martin de la Touller	£80	received in London	D:Ex.Bordeaux	741; C61/4 m.4
9 Dec. 1259	citizens Bristol	£200		D:Ex.Dublin	747; C61/4 m.4; CDI,p.103
28 Dec. 1259	citizens Bristol	£100			755; C61/4 m.4
17 June 1260	Richard de Bedford, ?citizen London	1,309 m.	rec. Boston by Le Breton & Leyburn	D:Nov.1260, Easter 61, Clerkenwell	802; C61/ 4 m.2 E368/36 m.15d.
? May 1260	Ralph Bugg, citizen Nottingham	£600	£350 rec: £250 due in June	A:2 year farm Peak	783,809; C61/4 mm.2,3
by 15 July 1260	Philip le Taylor & Reginald de Suffolk, citizens London	£156/9/0	with expenses	D:Boston 1260, then A:Great Custom Bordx	807-8; C61/4 m.2
by 18 July 1260	Richard de Bedford	1,000 m.	?loan or debt	P:by Bugg	811; C61/4 m.2
18 July 1260	Ralph Bugg	£36	Boston,to creditor	A:tallage Peak	810; C62/4 m.2
18 July 1260	Ralph Bugg	1,100 m.	owed R. Bedford		811; C61/4 m.2

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
by 28 July 1260	Bishop Worcester	275 m.	obtained for E from merchants	A: farm of Abergavenny	818; C61/ 4 m.2
by 9 August 1260	William de Dene	£5,000	960 m. of total already rec.	P: 1261 100 m.; at death 4,050 m: D	E36/274 f.417; CDI, p.109; CJRI I, p.240; 35 RepDKI, pp.38-9
25 August 1260	citizens Bristol	£400	rec. by Le Breton	D: Ex. Dublin, 1261	839; C62/4 m.1; CDI, p.110
by 25 August 1260	Abbey Chester	200 m.	plus interest to merchants	A: local farms	840: C61/4 m.1
12 Sept. 1260	citizens Chester	£40		D: Ex. Dublin	845; C62/4 m.1; CDI, p.110
c.14 Sept. 1260	citizens Chester	£160	owed W. Brus, Ghent in cloth July 1260		846; C61/4 m.1
c. 1260; by August 1261	abbey Peterborough	unknown "large"	owed merchants	Sens A: issues Grantham	CR 59-61, p.448; AbbrRO, p.18 CPR 58-66, p.170: Flores II, p.448
by August 1261	King Louis IX of France	4,000 l.t.	E in "great need"	P: by H.III	CPR 58-66, p.170; CR 59-61, p.448
4 August 1261	Henry III	4,000 l.t.	owed by E to Louis	A: issues some English lands	CPR 58-66, p.170; CR 59-61, p.448
20 November 1261	Aymar Crozat, Pampelune	25 l.t.	?loan or debt	A: Gascon recoinage	T-C admin, p.25 n.141
7 June 1262	Spinellus Simonetti et al. of Florence	1,700 m.	with Queen, and others		881: BL Harl.Ch.43 C 42; Hatton, p.45
1260-13 June 1262	Hospital, Clerkenwell	£24	loan	P: by le Breton	RegTC, p.173, f.48: C62/52 m.4
by 1 July 1262	Maynetus Spine et al. of Florence	1,110 m.	by Queen to use E; plus 90 m. interest	A: Sept. 1262, on Jewry revenues	CPR 58-66, p.219; C66/77 m.8
by October 1262	John de Northampton, citizen London	£50	?loan or debt	P: Holderness sale	SC6/1078/7; English, p.228
by October 1262	Richard de Bedford	£66/13/4	?loan or debt	P: Holderness sale	SC6/1078/7; English, p.228
by October 1262	Baldwin Aldebrand, Sienna	£13/6/8	?loan or debt	P: Holderness sale	SC6/1078/7; English, p.228
by October 1262	Luke de Lucca	£166/13/4	?loan or debt	P: Holderness sale	SC6/1078/7; English, p.228
by 11 June 1263	Peter & William Beraud of Cahors	unknown; 24,800 m.	already paid over	A: 2 years issues Jewry	CPR 58-66, p.263; C66/79 m.8

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
by October 1263	Luke de Lucca	£204/10/8	?loan or debt	P:Holderness sale	SC6/1078/7; English,p.230
by October 1263	John de Northampton	£50	?loan or debt	P:Holderness sale	SC6/1078/7; English,p.231
1 Oct. 1263	Spinellus Simonetti et al. of Florence	£40	by William de Pise in Burgos for E	D:Paris, Jan.1264	EL01/601/23
by 31 March 1264	Louis IX of France	4,000 l.t.	repayment arranged by Queen France	A:in fine due for Bergerac	RecFeod. 503: <u>Layettes</u> IV 4917
by 31 March 1264	Temple, Paris	6,000 l.t.	" "	" "	" "
early 1265	William Gregge of Dover	£22	while E prisoner	P:February 1278	CCR 72-9,p.443; C62/54 m.2
21 September 1265	Bartholomew Verdiere of Arras, citizen Bray	3,000 l.p. interest of 800 l.p.	S:Queen France, R de Moretayne, et al.	D:Arras, June 1266; 1270 Pape co. to pay principal	C.Anc.Deeds III,p.34: EL01/601/22
late 1265-early 1266	Roger de Moretayne	1703/6/8 l.p.	with H.III	A:goods rebels in Flanders;not paid	930: DD 276: CPR 58-66, pp.472,590: SCL/12/6
c.1265-1268	Roger de Moretayne	£532/5/8	jewels pledged	A:Flemish seizures P:London fine	Letter-book C, pp.229,233-5, ff.143,143v,145v.
30 January 1266	Geoffrey de Lusignan	400 m.	?loan/?arrears fee	P:by king	CPR 58-66,pp.542,569
10 February 1266	citizens London	800 m.		A:in London fine	CPR 58-66,p.548; <u>L'book C</u> ,p.228
by 14 Feb. 1266	William de Valence	1,000 m.	600 m. repaid by this date	400 m. P:in London fine, 1268	CPR 58-66,p.568: <u>L'book C</u> ,p.229 ff.142,145: CLR 67-72,p.34
by March 1266	Peter Beraud, Cahors	£180/6/8			CPEJ I,p.33
by 27 Oct. 1266	Ralph Pacy & Ivo le Breton, citizens Paris	£700	?loan or debt	1266 £500 P:in London fine	CPR 58-66,p.650: <u>L'book C</u> , p.229, ff.142,125
10 Jan. 1267	Portu brothers, Cahors	15,000 l.b.	terms Jan.67<	A:Great Custom	CPR 66-72,p.24; C66/85 m.29
c.1266-67	Simon Adrian, Bristol	20 m.	rec. by marshalsea	A:Bristol 1282	C62/58 m.4
25 February 1268	S. Blacklock, Canterbury	£8	owed in Winchelsea		CPR 66-72,pp.316-7
by 7 May 1268	Bartholomew de Rapello,	100 m.	knight of Legate	P:eccl. 10th.	CPR 66-72,p.226
Oct. 1267-68	William de Montrevel	£46		P:London fine	<u>L'book C</u> ,p.230,ff.142,145v.

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
Oct. 1267-8	N. de Lyaunes, Douai	£442	"causis diversis"	P:London fine,1268	L'book C,p.230,ff.142-3,145v.
by Oct. 1268	Agnes Veyllard, Whitsand	58/9/4 l.p.	?loan or debt	P:London fine	L'book C,pp.230,234,ff.142,145v.
c.1266-68	Eustace Britoun Gervase Rous, Bruges John Waterkyne	£84 £17 £18/3/4	?loan or debt " " " "	P:London fine	L'book C,p.233, f.143 " "
by 1268	Aymar Crozat, Pampelune	1,000 l.t.	S:John de Valery	unpaid 1268,81,85	RG II 453,829
27 August 1269	Louis IX of France	70,000 l.t.	for crusade	1274< A:Gt Custom P:127789	987; DD 293-5; Foed I i,p.481: TC,financment,pp.113,120
by 1270	citizens Chester	£400		A:Ex.Dublin	CDI 891; E101/230/2 m.3
22 May 1270	Guillelmi, Pape et al. of Florence	?6,000 m. +2,000 m.	revoked Aug.1270	A:farm New Aid >Aug. 1271	dALL, p.110: CPR 6672,pp.442, 463; C66/88 mm.10,3
before July 1270	B. Verdiere of Arras	3,060 l.p.		1272 unpaid	C47/13/1/5
after July 1270	Loccer Hugelin, Sienna	60 m.			E372/125 m.3
by 8 August 1270	Beraud brothers, Cahors	4,000 m.	set against loans	A:New Aid	1017;CPR 66-72,pp.442,463
c.August 1270	unknown merchants	unknown c.10,000 l.t.	for crusade	A:4 yrs.Gt.Custom & Gascon revenues	CPR 6672,pp.367,396,455: TC,financment,p.121
4 October 1270	Pape et al. of Florence	3,000 l.p.	owed B. Verdiere		E101/601/22
unknown;c.1265-70	merchants (?Flemish)	749 m. 5 s.	with Hugh Bigod & Henry of Almain; agent: G. de Rodes	P:by May 1276, by J de London & Will. de Valence	CCR 72-9,p.338
by June 1271	Richard of Cornwall	2,000 m.	for crusade	A:Jewry tallage	E372/125 m.3: CPR 66-72, p.545; C66/89 m.12
6 June 1271	James of Lucca	over 300 m.		P:300 m. from 20th	CPR 66-72,p.539; C66/89 m.14
12 August 1271	executors Boniface of Savoy	3,000 m.	S:E's council, sent abroad to E		CPR 66-72,p.568
by Dec.1271	Benet de Winchester, Jew	unknown	loans to king & E		CR 68-72,p.451
December 1271	Guillelmi, Pape et al.	unknown		A:farm New Aid	CPR 66-72,p.617

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
6 April/25 May 1272	various merchants: Raymond de Aula, G & R Polere, Narbonne	5,000 m.t. (3,033/6/8 1,967/12/6	S:Hospital, Acre penalty clause for delay	D:Oct.72 3,000 in Acre, 2,000 Paris; P:Lucca, in issues 20th.	1026-7; BL Harl. Ch. 42 C 48; SCL/ 8/28; Shirley II 347; E101/350/ 5 m.l.: E372/117 m.6d, 125 m.3
after April 1272	Edmund of Cornwall	2,000 m.	E's lieuts pay carriage to London	P:£60 1274	E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.1 C62/50 m.5
10 July 1272	various merchants	unknown	received in Acre	A:English issues	1029; SCL/8/28; Shirley II 349
12 July 1272	Thomas Grosso et al. of Pisa	3,754/7/11+ 1,943/11/6 l.t.	S:Hospital, Acre: penalty clause	D:Jan.1273, Paris P:English issues via Guillelmi	1030: SCL/12/1,2; Shirley II 350
by 9 Sept. 1272	Philip Guisi, Venice	1,526/5/1.t.	Acre, "in emergency"	D:Jan.73, Paris	1031; SCL/12/3
May-Sept. 1272	unknown	7,000 m.	S:Hospital	D:"Marsilian" 1273	1041; SCL/8/29, partly legible
c.1270-72	Baruncino Walter, Lucca	£300	rec. by Burnell	D:English issues	E372/125 m.3
c.1270-72	Luke de Lucca	£2,000+	lent overseas	P:Ex £1,000 1273	C62/49 mm.6,5,3,1, 50 mm.6,3
c.1270-72	Philip de Berinzon, citizen Genoa	1,000 m.		P:by Luccans 1273	C62/49 m.4; cf. E101/350/5 m.l.: CPR 7281, p.132; C66/95 m.32
c.1270-72	Philip de Berinzon	100 m.		P:by A. Lupus	E159/48 m.5
c.1270-72	Alard Lupus	100 m.	owed Berinzon	P:by Ex. Jan.74	E159/48 m.5
c.1271-2	Joseph de Cancy	£233/6/8	lent at Acre	P:by Ex. 1275	C62/51 m.4
c.1271-2	D. Bonaventure, Florence	218 m. & £443/13/4	lent at Acre	E:nglish issues; P:in See Durham	E372/125 m.3; E101/350/5 m.l.:C62/51 m.12
c.1271-72	Hospital, France	5,000 m.	owed by E to merchants Acre	D:Eng. issues, 72-3, P: by L. Hugelin	E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.1
c.1271-2	Temple	3355 m.	lent in "Syria"	P:1274-9 in 10th.	CPR 72-81, pp.353-4
c.1271-2	Temple	28,189/8/4 l.tournois	Palestine & France	P:2,000 m. 1274	C62/50 m.7
c.1271-2	Edmund of Lancaster	2,600 m.	crusade grant; taken by E in Acre	D:1,700 in 1275; P:1276, by Lucca	CPR 66-72, p.514, 72-81, p.167; C62/51 m.7
c.12712	unknown merchants, Acre	£880	lent to E in Acre	P:Laon 1272, Lucca	CPR 7281, p.132; C66/95 m.32

Date	Lender	Sum	Details	Repayment	References
c.1271-2	unknown merchants, Acre	2,000 m.	lent to E in Acre	P:Provins 73, Lucca	CPR 7281, p.132; C66/95 m.32
c.1272	Baldwin Aldebrand, Sienna	£16	rec. Hardel, Paris	P:English issues	E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.1
c.1272	Loccus Hugelin, Sienna	60 m.	rec. Hardel. Paris	P:English issues	E372/125 m.3: E101/350/5 m.2
unknown, 1254-72	citizens Waterford	2,080 m.			Gilbert, <u>Viceroy</u> , p.518
unknown, 1254-72	Pons de Mora	160 m.	?loan or debt		C62/49 m.5
unknown, 1254-72	citizens Bayonne	unknown		part P:c.1274	RG II 170
unknown, 1254-72	Reg. de Panes, Bristol	£120		execs P:1276	C62/52 m.2

Other Cash Advances, Gifts and Sales

10 May 1257	Queen & Peter of Savoy	6,000 m.	sale	Ferrers custody	C47/9/1 m.4; CPR 47-58, p.554
23 June 1258	Stephen Longespee	3,000 m.	sale; 2,000 down, rest owing 1268	FitzRobert custody	697; CPR 58-66, p.13: E368/ 142 m.12
16 November 1258	(Aymer de Valence); govt. loan from seized assets	2,000 m.	Welsh war; 1,500 m. rec. in Nov.	no arrangements to repay known	CR 56-9, p.343; CPR 58-66, pp.6,39; C66/73 mm.14,4
by July 1262	Alexander, steward Scotland	£1,500	sale; only £500 paid E cancelled deal	Skipton (Fors custody)	CR 61-4, pp.170-1, 185-6
after July 1262	Isabel de Fors	3,000 m.	sale; instalments (below)	Holderness etc. (Fortibus custody)	CPR 58-66, p.161; English, pp.72, 228-232: SC6/1078/7; Rentals 730
11 August 1262	Henry III	4,000 m.	in fine from Jewry		CR 61-4, p.84; cf. CPR 58-66, p.233

In column 5  
 D: signifies date on which repayment was due  
 A: signifies assignation on specific revenues  
 P: signifies actual payment

The figures for loans contacted 1270-72 must be treated with caution. The overlap between the role of the military orders as negotiators and guarantors, and as suppliers of funds, has probably caused some duplication. This is compounded by the reassignment of loans throughout the period (cf. Prestwich, Edward I, pp.80-81).

Table Two: Grants made by Edward

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Walerand le Tyes	Skenfrith, Gwent	19 May 1254	£54/3/9 p.a.	life-grant in lieu fee from king. Dead by June 1257	5; C61/1 m.4, CR 56-9, p.62
Geoffrey de Lusignan	500 librates (4.5 cantreds) Connaught	10 July 1254 & 17 Jan.55	£500 p.a.	In fulfilment promise of king; problems implementing	37,149; C61/1 m.3,2 m.1: CDI, pp.49,56-8,67,70-2,78
Robert Walerand	40 librates: Russe & Balscadin, Dublin	27 Aug.1254, by 30 Aug.56	£40 p.a.	In fulfilment promise of king: service half kts. fee	46; C61/1 m.2: CDI, pp.49, 61,85: E163/1/9 m.15;
Stephen Bauzan	Kilmyhanoc & Killathy in Cork, ex T.Bluet	27 Aug.1254		In fulfilment promise of king	47; C61/1 m.3; CDI, pp.61 -2: E163/1/9 m.14
Armand le Prevost	castle of Monleyder	16 Jan.1255	£50 p.a.	ex Elie Rudel: "imperpetuum"	142; C61/2 m.11
William-Raymond de St.Desiderio	Mons & Verdon, Bergerac & 15 l.b in peage	16 Jan.1255		ex Elie Rudel	143; C61/2 m.1
Gaston de Gontaud	Issigeac, Bouane, Cougnac	18 Jan.1255	£50 p.a.	ex Rudel: for good service	150-1; C61/2 m.1
M. W. de Provence	land in Bordeaux	28 Sept.1255		site for house: sold 1260	436,925; C61/2 m.5,8 m.3
Berdonus Frozin	Land at la Samnole	12 Oct.1255		ex Gerard de Puybarban	496; C61/2 m.3
Walter de Vernon	marriage Alice de Croun	by 13 Oct.1255		widow M. de Mannoers	501; C61/3 m.1
Thos. Mainwaring	free warren etc.	Oct.1255-56		on his manor of Waverbrown	Studd 1032; HMC X, iv, p.201
Geoffrey de Lusignan	Witton, Paunton, Laughton England: Louth, Castle Frank, Ireland	6 Nov.1256	£160 p.a. & £140 p.a.	In lieu of earlier grant, with £200 p.a. fee	620; CChR 26-57, p.453: C53/47 m.3: CDI, p.86; CPR 72-81, p.99
Ebulo de Montibus	Ketton, Stamford	24 March 1257	£13 p.a.	ex William de Boeles: 1/4 kts. fee	622; CChR 57-00, p.24: C53/50 m.6: RH I, p.351
Master Rostand Durand	land ex Amanieu de Grayan in Castillon	28 May 1257	at least 15 m.morlais	on order king: life-grant or until made bishop	623; CChR 26-57, p.470: C53/47 m.4
Maredudd ap Rhys	Agwennonith & Pervedd	by 4 Sept.1257		ex-supporters Llywelyn	CPR 47-58, p.577; C66/71 m.3

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
William de Turberville	Balymadon, Ireland (3 carucates & 9 m. rent)	28 Dec.1257		life-fee from king: now "imperpetuum"	677; CChR 57-00,p.2; CDI pp.92,112: C53/48 m.5
Roger de Mortimer	land in Elvael ex-Owain ap Maredudd & Iorwerth	by 8 Feb.1258		"imperpetuum";service 1 kt. in England, 3 kts. in Wales	686; CChR 57-00,p.7; C53/48 m.4
Thos. de Widehaye	3 houses in Bordeaux	by 3 May 1258		then sold to Rostand Durand	CChR 57-00,p.10; C53/48 m.2
M. Rostand Durand	lands ex A. de Grayan	7 May 1258		instance Qu:life R +brothers	695;CChR 57-00,p.13;C53/48 m.2
Richard de la Rochelle	Oramy, Connaught & franchise return writs	3 Aug.1258	rent £20 p.a.	earlier grant by R;l kts.fee rent in arrears by 1262	700;C.Orm.Dds I 123:CPR 66-72, p.85:35 RepDKI,p.44, 36,p.73
Geoffrey de Lusignan	Henham, Norfolk :FitzRobert custody	Apr-Jun.1258	£40 p.a.	Perhaps in revision earlier agreement	CPR 58-66,p.171: CR 59-61 p.445: EL59/32 m.7d.
Guy de Lusignan	Oléron	?June 1258, revoked July & Nov.1258		life-grant;grant & annulment related to 1258 crisis and anti-Poitevin movement	701; Foed I i,p.378: CPR 47-58,p.641, 58-66, p.141: Cuttino GR A 168
Priory of St. Leonard, Stamford	6 acres in town of Stamford	by Sept.1258		escheat: at instance queen	Just1/1187 m.23d.
Franciscans	3 acres in Stamford	by Sept. 1258		escheat: at instance queen	Just1/1187 m.23d.
Priory St.Michael Cherbury, Shrops	4 messuages near the priory	8 Aug.1259			708; BL Add.Ch.20442
Abbey Mont St. Michel	rights of wreck in the Channel Isles	2 Nov.1259			713; C61/4 m.5; C.Iles Normandes I,pp.28-9
W. de Boleville	Penarthur, Carmarthen	5 Nov.1259		"imperpetuum":1/10 kts. fee	716; C61/4 m.5
John FitzThomas FitzGerald	Decies,Desmond & castle Dungarven;shrievalties Cork,Kerry,Waterford	7 Nov.1259	rent of 500 m. p.a.	hereditary claim by wife; 1/10 kts. fee;trouble taking seisin;revoked by court 1292	722;C61/4 m.5:CJRI I,p.153: CDI,p.102,278-80,424-9:CIPM II 281,437: CChR 57-00,p.417
Guy de Provence	Little Saughall, Ches.	27 Dec.1259		life-grant, 1/20 kts. fee	751; C61/4 m.4
Roger de Clifford	Weaverham, Cheshire	27 Dec.1259	£25 p.a.	"imperpetuum":1/2 kts. fee surrendered by Nov.1275	752; C61/4 m.3: CChR 57-00,p.197

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Adam de Montalt	Farnley, Yorks. :Longvilers custody	28 Dec.1259		previously farmed, now grant till majority heir	756; C61/4 m.4
Greg le Fenor	messuage and 16 acres in Bineham, Hastings	28 Jan.1260	18s. rent	"imperpetuum"; escheat: formerly villein tenure	757-8; C61/4 m.4
William FitzWarin	land in Sinosse, Gascony	20 Feb.1260	20 l.morlais	ex D. de Cigogne:life-grant	770-1; C61/4 m.3
Robert de Tibetot	land in Aston, Grantham	13 May 1260	£17/3/4	"imperpetuum": 1/4 kts. fee	789; CChR 57-00,p.147; C53/59 m.5
Wynemer de Gymer	Appleby, Yorks. :Longvilers custody	17 May 1260	£30 p.a	issues previously shared with Robert de Stuteville	797; CPR 58-66,p.154; C66/76 m.12
Wynemer de Gymer	marriage M. Longvilers	25 May 1260		?passed on to G. de Neville	797:CPR 5866,p.154
Thomas FitzLucian	market & fair at	20 July 1260		at "Molendiniis", Ulster	816; C61/4 m.2; CDI,p.108
Alice de Luton	Artigues, Schorbyan & Byer, Medoc, Gascony	3 Aug.1260		escheat:15 year term, given up 1262: for good service,	824,876; C61/4 m.2: CPR 66-72,p.733; C66/78 m.2
Archbishops Tuam	fair	5 Aug.1260		at Tuam	828; C61/4 m.2; CDI, p.109
Stephen de Montferrand	lands John de Stapleton :Cantilupe custody	by 13 Aug. 1260			CR 59-61,p.100
Adam de Jesmond	manor of Bingley, Yorks :Cantilupe wardship	by 8 Sept. 1260		terms not clear, perhaps only keeper, accounted 1262	Just1/1049 m.2; Clay, pp.97-8: E368/36 m.11
Robert de Stokport	market & fair	Sept.1260		at Stockport:grant"dum fuit Comes Cestr.vite patris sui"	BL Harl.Ms.2072 f.9:S-B,Plea Rolls,p.230:Earwaker I,p.337
Dominicans of Stamford	six acres land outside town of Stamford	20 Oct.1260			861; C61/4 m.1
Roger de Leyburn	manor of Elham, Kent	27 Nov.1260		"imperpetuum":1 kts.fee: R revoked 1262, restored 1263: advowson reserved to E	862; E368/94 m.47: CR 61-4, pp.117,171: RH I,p.203: Arch.Cantiana V, pp.166
John Britaud	Holewell & Thornton, :Fortibus custody	between Oct. 1260-June 61	£200 + £41 p.a.	sold by June 1261	CPR 58-66,p.158; C66/76 m.10

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Erard de Valéry	Dartford & Wymering :Portibus custody	between Oct. 1260-June 61		sold by June 1261	CPR 58-66,p.158; C66/76 m.10
William de Cheny	free warren	9 June 1261		on his land in Channel Isles	866; Just1/1167 mm.4,12
Robert de Beaumes	lands Peter O'Haugharne Ulster, Ireland	Nov.61	£2 p.a.	ex-farm Roger des Auters: 1281 R's brother, Hugh held	Facs II 73: Curtis,p.10: CDI, pp.110,374: BL Add.Ch.26515:
Auger de Mauleon	lands in Marensin,Gasc.	3 Nov.1261		exchange for castle Mauléon	869: T-C, BPH 1962,pp.105-7
Amanieu de L'Abret	lands ex G.Colomb held of Pierre Mote	15 Dec.1261		exchange for castle Meilhan; other lands substituted 1263	871,887-8; Cuttino GR A 95,113 E36/275 f.333d: AHG 25,p.132
W. de Montrevell	lands ex-Bruno D'Aillan	20 Dec.1261		with marriage heiress	873; CPR 72-81,p.193
Bernard Masson & Emeric Durand	rent in St.Mary de Mamizon	by 15 March 1262	15 l.morl.	in return for quitclaim lands Amanieu de Grayan	875; C53/52 m.4; CChR 57-00, p.41
John de Grailly	lands Peter D'Anglade & Amanieu de Grayan	by 15 March 1262	probably 15 l.morl.	redeemed from heirs Rostand Durand, above	875; CChR 57-00,p.41; C53/52 m.4
John de Grailly	Byer, Schorbyan & Artigues in Medoc	24 March 1262		ex-A. de Luton:"imperpetuum" 1 kts.fee & pair gilt spurs	876; CPR 66-72,p.733; C66/78 m.2
William Charles	mills of Tickhill	5 May 1262	£30 p.a.	1 year;until grant £30 p.a.; as dower J. de Vauvert	878; CPR 58-66,p.212;C66/ 77 m.11
Robert Walerand	manor of Treville, honour of Monmouth	7 June 1262		reversion to his nephew, Alan Plogonet: 1/4 kts.fee	880; CCR 88-96, p.209; C54/109 m.13
Geoff. de Neville & Rob. de Ufford	manor of Kilmedan, Ireland	14 Sept.1262		jointly:"imperpetuum":1 kts. fee: advowson reserved to E	C47/10/13/166: CJRI I, p.314
G-A de Navailles	castle of Sault,Gascony	c.Oct. 1262	150 l.morl.	on return purchase price	<u>Livre des Hommages</u> 1,2
Peter de Poysin	lease of Bella Vallis, diocese Soissons	by 3 Mar.1263	20 l.bord. p.a.	1261 leased by E from Abbey La Sauve Majeure >25 years	Reg.Urban IV,v.II 1156: Martène & Durand, Thes 1113
Dafydd apGruffydd	commotes of Dyffryn Clwyd and Cynmerau	3 April 1263, repeated July		in lieu his inheritance in Gwynedd; later revoked	885,891; CPR 58-66,p.261, 72-81,p.231; C66/79 m.9
Roger Andrew	villate "le Fithies", Dungarven, Ireland	pre Apr.1263	rent 4 m. p.a.	to hold until E came to Ireland	Curtis,p.3; BL Add.Ch.26515

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Robert de Tiptoft	manor Nettlestead, Suff.	10 May 1263		"imperpetuum": 1 kts. fee	890; CChR 57-00, p.147; C53/59 m.5
Richard Bauzan	manor of Corneworth, :Cantilupe wardship	between June 1257-June 63		in exchange land ex-brother Stephen in county Cardigan	LW, pp.47-8
Geoffrey de Langley	Stafford custody (less £20 p.a. fee R.Basset)	between June 1261-June 63	£80 p.a. (£100-£20)	with marriage heir; married Langley's daughter by 1272	CPR 58-66, p.265; C66/79 m.8: Just1/954 m.11d.
Robert de Beaumes	advowson of church of Ballimachicaln	13 July 1263		ex Peter O'Haugharne: reserved in earlier grant	892; KB26/70 m.6d, 71 m.18 CDI, pp.374-5, 451
Walter de Burgh	earldom of Ulster	15 July 1263		in exchange for his lands in Tipperary	Shirley II, p.331: BL Add.Ms.6041 f.100d.
Henry of Almain	Tickhill	c.summer 1263		to detach him from Montfort	Rish, CDB, p.17: CPR 72-81, p.191
John de Warenne	Stamford and Grantham (?with return writs)	10 Aug.1263		To J and his heirs: as freely as father had held; 4 kts.fees	893: PlacGW, p.429: RH I, pp.351, 396
Anketin Martival	Meriet custody	1256-Nov.63		held with wife, Agnes Bauzan	ExeRF II, p.406
Warin de Bassingbourn	manor of Any, ex G. de Marisco, Limerick, Irel.	by 5 Dec.1263		"imperpetuum": 2 kts.fees: 1278 passed to T. de Clare	CChR 57-00, pp.46, 210; C53/53 m.4: CDI, pp.56, 120
Adam de Jesmond	villages of Buckstanes and others in the Peak	by 15 Dec.63	£30 p.a.	1 kts. fee: bought back from his heirs	CChR 57-00, p.47; C53/53 m.4: E372/120, m.22, 125 m.3
John de Grey	Ruston, Cheshire	by 15 Dec.63	£20 p.a.	"imperpetuum": 1 kts. fee	CChR 57-00, p.47; C53/53 m.4
John de Grey	Lendengate, Monmouth	by 23 Dec.63	£10 p.a.	inherited by son Reginald: homage transferred to Edmund	CChR 57-00, p.48; C53/53 m.4 CPR 72-81, pp.422, 441-2
William Charles & Joan de Vauvert	land in Kettleburgh, Suff.	4 Jan.1264	£30 p.a.	as promised; inherited by son Edward 1305	894; CPR 58-66, p.376; C66/82 m.3: CFR 72-05, p.519
Roger de Clifford	land in honour of Monmouth	8 March 1264	100 m. p.a.	1.5 kts.fees: Ed.of Lancaster paid 1,000 m. for loss, 1281	895; CChR 57-00, p.246; C53/69 m.11sc: CPR 72-81, p.438
Eleanor of Castile	manor of Ashford in Peak	?pre Lewes, May 1264	£40 p.a.	"ad cameram suam": escheat G.ap Wenorwyn, pro Llewelyn	CIM 645, 1184: CR 64-8, p.28 RH II, p.287
Fulk de Rycote	lands ex-William Foliot	c.Aug.1265		captured by Fulk at Evesham	913; SCL/8/21

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Thomas de Clare	soke Oswaldebek le Cley	Aug-Sept.65		ex rebel, Henry de Hastings	CPR 58-66,p.512; C66/84 m.41
M. Richard,doctor	manor of Preston,	pre17 Sept.65		?ex rebel	CPR 58-66,p.451; C66/88 m.7
Eleanor	Barwick & Stokwood	18 Sept.1265		ex rebel, Peter de Montfort	CPR 58-66,p.453; Shirley II 298-9
Walter de Capeles	Mannoers custody	17 Oct.1265		transferred at instance E	CPR 58-66,p.466; C66/83 m.4
Robert de Acton	issues Herteburn	28 Nov.1265			CPR 58-66,p.513; C66/84 m.1
Hagin, son of Moses of London	1/3 goods Dieulacres, son Aaron:custody heirs	between June 1262-Nov.1265		custom Jewry:in E's gift during his custody Jewry	CPR 58-66,p.511; C66/84 m.44
John de Grailly	lands in Gascony	2 Jan.1266		ex-vicomte de Castillon & B. de Beauville:life:l kts.fee	920; CPR 66-72,pp.40-1; C66 /85 m.24
John de Grailly	Benauges, Illats & small custom on salt	2 Jan.1266		"imperpetuum":l kts.fee: some financial loss to queen	921,951; CPR 72-81,p.230, C66/96 m.4; RG II 30
John de Eston	tithes land nr.Drogheda	pre Apr.1266		recovered by E by law-suit	C.Llantony Prima,pp.107-8
Tintern Abbey	Edward's rights in Hualdsfield, Monmouth	5 Apr.1266	£3/1/5	"attendentes fidelimentae et gratia obsequia" to E	929; CChR 1300-1326,p.89; C53/93 m.11: E32/30 m.39
Nicholas Fitz Martin	custody N.Bovy,Tefcote, Cary, Cantilupe custody	by 11 May 1266		during minority heirs Will. Pipard, Cantilupe tenant	CPR 58-66,p.595; C66/84 m.16
William de Gunneville	manor of Potterspiry Northants.	4 July 1266		ex rebel, Michael Tovy: 1270 quitclaimed to Tovy	Just1/59 mm.2-3d,19d: BL Add. Ms.28024 f.40;Beauchamp C.354
Adam de Montgomery	Lidenham, Salop, ex rebel R.de Amundeville	between Aug. 1265-66	£14/10/0 p.a.	W. de Hastentot compensated by R for loss, 1266.	CR 64-8,p.207: CChR 57-00, p.147: CPR 66-72, p.711:
R. de Frompton	La Wodehouse,Ellesmere	21 Oct.1266	rent 2s.1d.	?ex-rebel	938; CPR 1343-45,p.141
Roger Cantok	40s. rent & garden in Bristol, & Jewish debts	11 Sept.1266		ex rebels John & Thomas La Warre:"imperpetuum":ld. p.a.	937;CChR 57-00,p.62;C53/56 m.11 CCR 72-9,p.520:C47/35/18/9
Eleanor	Ringwood & New Forest	by 15 Sept.66			CPR 58-66,p.638; C66/84 m.4

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Gilbert Talbot	2 parts manor of Longhope, Mornmouth,	pre June 1267		1274 held by G's son: 1281 Edmund compensated for loss	RH I,p.176: CIPM II 80: CPR 72-81,pp.422,442
Bernard Maycon	Jew, Benedict of Sparra	by 3 June 67			945; Rec.Feod.459-60
Peter Ferrandi & Arnold Garsie	lands at Soygnak & Aylans	by 10 July 1267		ex Arnold-Bertrand de Soygnak;"imperpetuum"	CChR 57-00,p.77; C53/56 m.4
Archbishops of Bordeaux	small custom in salt at Bordeaux	28 July 1267		exchange for castle of Cultur and land in Bazas	953; CChR 57-00,p.79; C53/56 m.3
John de Hamelton	lands ex Henry de Bilton, alleged rebel	1267, in siege of Alnwick		revoked Oct.1268 when Henry proved innocence	CPR 66-72,p.260;C66/86 m.4
R. de la Rochelle	free warren	11 Oct.1267		on his Connaught lands	954; C.Orn.Dds 143
John de Musgrove	land in Mundeford	Aug.65-1267		ex rebel, Gerard de Lisle	Hunter RS,p.216;Just1/569b m.ld.
John le Parker	land in villate Greywell, Odiham	26 May 1268	£4 p.a.	"imperpetuum"	CCR 72-9,p.453; C62/52 m.3, 53 m.4, 59 m.3
Henry of Almain	herbages in the Peak	c.24 June 68	£20 p.a.		C62/52 m.1: cf.786;C61/4 m.3
Itier Bouchard	London houses	14 July 1268		ex-rebels Bakerel,FitzThomas	956; CChR 57-00,p.177
John de Arderne	Land on banks R.Suke Connaught, Ireland	18 Sept.1268		"imperpetuum":1 kts.fee:1270 exchanged with Rochelle	968; CChR 57-00,p.149; C53/59 m.3: CD1,p.143
Hospital St.Mark Billeswyk,Bristol	manor of Winterbourne Gunnor, Wilts.	25 Oct 1268		leased, then granted by king ex felon, Henry de la Mare	969; CChR 57-00, p.348: C.St.Mark 264,270
Adam de Winchester	quit livery marshals on Winchester house	3 Nov.1268		E's right as holder county Chester	970; CPR 72-81, p.360; C66/99 m.24
William Charles	redemption lands ex Thomas de Chauncy	1268	50 m.	rebel	CR 64-8,p.551
Abbey of Meaux	£10 rent p.a.	9 April 1269	£10 p.a.	E given by Gamaliel of Oxon.	976:CPR 66-72,p.330:C66/87 m.19
Ralph le Butler	Ravensden, Beds.	pre-June 1269		custody by grant E	KB26/189 mm.5,6d, 193 m.27

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
William Charles	advowson Eston, Norfolk	c.June 1269		reclaimed from W.Weyland	KB26/184 m.3d, 189 mm.5,10
Robert Burnell	Harley & Wenlock, Salop	pre-Nov.1269		custody by grant E	KB26/193 mm.24,29, 197 m.6d, 198 m.3d.
Robert de Tiptoft	£30 p.a. in Bristol	by 12 Feb.70	£30 p.a.	bought back 1270	CPR 66-72,p.407;C66/88 m.22
Robert de Tiptoft	manor Streathall, Essex	1268-20 Feb.1270	£20 p.a.	ex-rebel, John de Berners; Tiptoft still holding 1298	CR 68-72,p.251, 72-9,p.458: Hunter RS,p.132:CPR 66-72, p.410: CIPM III 475
Robert de Tiptoft	Jewish debts Berners	?preFeb.70	£200	given to E 1263 by Jews	CPEJ IV 152
Thomas de Clare	custody land, marriage heir Maurice FitzGerald	before 30th. March 1270	later sold for £3,500	E's right to grant later questioned;not reversed	CR 68-72,p.259,72-9,p.45,79 -88,p.284: CPR 72-81,p.410
Bishops of Cork	advowsons Kilmanhok, Nard & St.Peter, Cork	20 May 1270		granted after law-suit v. see;attempt to revoke 1297	998; Cart.Priv.Imm,p.33: CJRI I,pp.142-3
Agnes Newcastle	2 houses in Chester	10 July 1270	rent 12d.	compensation for war-damage	1000.
Abbey of Darnhall later Vale Royal	Darnhall & Over, hay of Langwath, advowsons Peak	2 Aug.1270		to endow the new abbey	1007; CChR 57-00,p.151; C53/59 m.2: <u>Ledger Book Vale Royal</u>
William-Arnold de Cadillac	lands in Fronsac	by 25 Aug. 1270		"imperpetuum" at instance R: ex-Peter de Riveriis	1018; CChR 57-00,p.151; C53/59 m.2
Eleanor	Macclesfield	by 8 Sept.70			CPR 66-72,p.459; C66/88 m.4
Nicholas & Alina de Yatingden	manor of Redenhal, Norfolk	June 1262- Sept.1270	£60 p.a.	jointly:by 2 kts.fees: inherited by N's brother	CIPM II 57: CChR 57-00, p.253
Bishops of Killaloe	issues of Newcastle Lyons, Co.Dublin	Sept.1264- Oct.1270	£33/6/8 p.a.	compensation for surrender manor of Roscrea to E	1024; CChR 57-00,p.225: R&S,Irish Parliament,p.289
William FitzWarin	land in Connaught	15 Jan.1271	£30 p.a.		CPR 92-1301,p.58: C66/113 m.26
William de Montgauger	La Moretere, Oléron	pre Jan.1271		life-grant with reversion to Peter de Castro Novo	CPR 72-81,p.134: CCR 72-9, p.363: E372/125 m.3
Peter de Castro Novo	Rocheford, Oléron	pre Jan.1271		to hold until got Moretere; dated by death Peter	CPR 72-81,p.134: CCR 72-9, p.363: E372/125 m.3

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
Stephen de London	land in Oléron	by Dec.1271		on death given to W. Saundon	RG II 345
Stephen de London	passage Cokemarsh	by Dec.1271		later granted to Foun	CPR 72-81,p.106
Robert de la Garderobe	custody sea-shore at Bristol	1254-72			Accts Bristol Castle,p.19 n.60; Select Pleas KB 1,p.133; CPR 72-81,p.101
Richard de Bedford, merchant	Brichmerston & Rokeby :Cantilupe custody	1255-1272		granted when E held wardship holding when heir came of age	CCR 72-9, p.88
Imbert Pepyn	lands in Oléron,	Pre-Nov.1272	270 l.t	ex S.Claret:1/4 kts.fee:sold	CChR 57-00,p.188
Perin le Taylor	house in York,ex Josce le Jovene	4 June 1262-1272		came to E by custody Jewry: grant in pre-accession style	CPEJ II,p.189

Possible grants

Stephen Bauzan	manor of Kington, :Segrave custody	9 Apr.1257		terms unknown;but "per breve domini":?reward Welsh service	SC6/1094/11 m.8
Patrick de Chaworth sr.	manor Stanton, :Cantilupe custody	17 April 1257		terms unknown;?reward Welsh service;inherited by son	SC6/1094/11 m.8: CIPM II 477
Ralph de St. Edmund	manor of Marston, :Cantilupe custody	17 Apr.1257		terms unknown, but "per breve domini":transferred by 1260	SC6/1094/11 m.6d.
Roger de Auboeuf	land in Guernsey	?c.1257	£10 p.a.	when in service E:pre1290	CPR 81-92, p.366
Robert de Beauchamp	manor of Marston, :Cantilupe custody	c.1260		terms grant unknown, later passed to P. de Montfort	CChR 57-00,p.26
Peter de Montfort	Barwick,Stokwod,Marston :Cantilupe custody	Oct.1254-Aug.1265		terms of grant unknown;lost lands after death at Evesham	CIM 860,875: CPR 58-66, p.453
Warin de Bassingbourn	Bredstreet houses ex Thomas FitzThomas	15 Oct.1265		grant by king, out of rebel land assigned E, ?by wish E	CPR 58-66,p.464
Walter de Merton	houses ex Michael Tovy	17 Oct.1265		granted by king, as above	CPR 58-66,p.467;CR 64-8,p.132
John de Musgrove	Woodstreet houses ex Thomas FitzThomas	17 Oct.1265		granted by king, as above	CPR 58-66,p.468

Name	Place	Date	Value	Other Comments	References
John de Verdon	Fleet houses ex John le Chapeler	17 Oct.1265		granted by king, as above	CPR 58-66,p.466
Roger Mortimer	houses in Aldermanbury ex Stephen Bukerel	20 Oct.1268		as above;1268 surrendered & given to Bouchard by E	CPR 58-66,p.493;CR 68-72, p.102
John de Vaux	manor Muscamp, ex rebel Nich. de Cantilupe	?pre-Jan.1266		granted to E, but ?given to J by E;1266 disseised by N	SCR 379: KB26/175 m.11d.
Thos de Ippegrave	toll at Chester	1254-70		restored to his widow, 1275	CCR 72-9,p.162
Robert de Tattershall	land in East Anglia ex-honour Richmond	1262-8 (?1263)		E later asked to compensate John of Brittany for loss	CPR 1266-72, p.297
John de Vaux of Shotsham	land in E.Anglia ex-honour Richmond	1262-8 (?1263)		" "?:granted at time of his retention in the household	CPR 1266-72, p.297; AM III, p.225
Richard Tayllur	house in Bordeaux	?pre Aug.1270	£60	granted by E, bought back	E372/125 m.3
Robert de Ufford	Wykes, East Anglia, ex- honour Richmond	?1262-72		held by Robert by grant E; cf:Tattershall & Vaux, above	CIPM III 469
Geoff.de Lusignan	manor Baligvany,Dublin	1266-75			36th.RepDKI,p.31
Walter de Vernon	manor Cornwardsly,Ches.	pre 1276		then gave up to use V. Royal	CChR 57-00,p.199
John de Woodstock	messuage in Bristol	June 1261-78	rent 6d.p.a.	ex-Cresse the Jew	CR 1259-61,p.376;Sharp,pp.13,59
Walter de Saundon	land in Oléron	Dec.1271-79		ex Stephen de London	RG II 345,
Jordan de Exeter Walter de la Haye Rob. de Stapleton John de Weyland	lands in Decies & Desmond, Ireland	?pre1259 or 1261-82		?enfeoffed pre grant of D & D to John FitzThomas, or during minority his heir	CChR 57-00,p.417

Table Three: Benefices awarded by Edward

Name	Benefice	Date	Comments	References
John de Langtoft	Badsworth, York	Feb.1255-1261	Longvilers custody: ?presented by R but in gift E	KB26/195 m.18
M. Hugh de Lisle	Badsworth,	Oct.1261-Dec.67	Longvilers custody: ?presented by R vacant on death Hugh, 4 March 1268	R.Giffard, p.24: KB26/195 m.18
Laurence de Lovershal	Badsworth	after Mar.1268	presented by R & E: unsuccessful: custody expired	CPR 66-72, p.226: R.Giffard, pp.246,37,80: KB26/105 m.18
Robert Burnell	Badsworth	c.1268	alternative unsuccessful candidate	R.Giffard, p.25
Pons de Salvitate	Bingham	2 Sept.1254	Ferrers wardship	51; C61/1 m.2
M. Walter de Lynoys	Brompton	21 May 1267	ex rebel, John de Vescy	944; R.Giffard, p.154
Henry de Wengham	Dungarven	21 Nov.1254		92; C61/2 m.12: CDI, p.66
William de Salines	Elham	holding 1269	?presented by Boniface of Savoy, 1257-8, or by E, 1254-7, 58-68	CLR 67-72, p.88: E368/94 m.47
Master Robert de Picheford	Hanby, Lincoln	?1258, 1266 in possession	Segrave wardship: E lost claim to present 1258, but ?later succeeded	Just1/1187 m.3: SS v.95, p.265n.
Stephen de London	Hengstworth	Sept.1264	Cantilupe wardship	Rot.R.Gravesend, pp.169,171,178
M. William de Farnham	Hengstworth	after Dec.1271	on death Stephen	ibid. p.178: CPR 7281, p.5
Geoffrey	Kilmedan	c.1254-72	clerk of Edward, dead by 1300	CJRI I, pp.313-4
Stephen de London	Lugwardyn, Hereford	Aug.-Nov.1265	ex Simon de Montfort	CPR 58-66, p.501, 6672, p.611
Arnold-Garsie de Got	Segrave, Lincoln	April 1255	Segrave wardship	256; C61/2 m.8
Ralph de Dongon	Stanton, Lincoln	17 April 1255	Segrave or Cantilupe wardship	253-4; C61/2 m.8
Ralph de Dongon	Walton, Lichfield	7 Jan.1255	Ferrers wardship	139; C61/3 m.3: CPR 47-58, p.393
M. Hugh de Insula	Worthing	3 Nov.1259	prebend St.Mary, Hastings	714; C61/4 m.5

Table Four: Those in receipt of a fee or wages from Edward

Name	Fee or Wages	Date	Comments	References
Geoffrey de Langley	£80 p.a.	24 May 1254	to sustain in service; chief steward	14; C61/1 m.4
Imbert de Montferrant	50 marks p.a.	27 May 1254	while constable Montgomery	28; C61/1 m.4
Nicholas de Marnham	£15 p.a.	27 May 1254, paid 1256-8	while in service E; keeper Tickhill Stamford & Grantham, Segrave custody	29; C61/1 m.4: SC6/1094/11 mm.2,16
Elias de Cumb	£20 p.a.	28 May 1254	as receiver Bristol exchequer	32; C61/1 m.3
Arnold de Gindre	50 l.bord. p.a.	17 Aug.1254	"de camera" to sustain in service E	45; C61/1 m.3
Jordan de Oxford	25 s.bord p.diem	12 Sept.1254	constable/prevost of Benauges	64; C61/1 m.2
Séygnoron de Clarac	50 l.bord.	29 Sept.1254 & 6 Feb.1255	in issues: keeper lands B. de Cines & constable Castelmoron	74,167; C61/1 m.2d., 2 m.10
Guy de Lusignan	owed £100 wages	26 Nov.1254	for 6 weeks in Spain with E	95; C61/2 m.12
Raymond de Bouliac, Canon of St. Sever,	20 l.bord p.a.	2 Jan.1255	in custom Bordeaux: retained as physician E & household in Gascony	126; C61/2 m.12; RG I ii 4340
Oliver le Prévost	30 l.bord. p.a.	24 Jan.1255	in peage Bergerac: for good service	152; C61/2 m.10
John le Parker	20 l.morl	25 Jan.1255	fee for year as constable Sault	154; C61/2 m.11
Aldebrand le Prévost	10 marks p.a.	25 Jan.1255	in custom Bordeaux: for good service	155,447; C61/2 m.8,3 m.1
William Gaymard	10 m. p.a.	1 Feb.1255	at Ex.Dublin: earlier grant by king	163; C61/3 m.3: CDI p.68
John de Fleury	£200	10 Feb.1255	year farm of Castillon/St.Emilion	170; C61/2 m.10
Fergant, lord Stysac	30 l.bord "de	10 Feb.1255	"de camera"	171; C61/2 m.10
Prior castle Fronsac	15 l.bord	5 March 1255	compensation for lost alms	195; C61/2 m.10
Herbert Pech	£9/14/0 wages	30 Mar.1255		222; C61/2 m.9
Count of Périgord	150 l.bord p.a.	4/5 Apr.1255		239; C61/2 m.8
Gerard de Méseroles	25 l.bord p.a.	4/5 Apr.1255	"in feodo"	240; C61/2 m.8; Uttino GR A 223
Aldebrand le Prévost	£38 wages	21 Apr.1255	Queen made E's English admin pay	265; C61/2 m.8
Elias de Blaye, citizen Bordeaux	50 l.bord	19 May 1255	life-grant, on small custom Bordeaux in lieu 3,000 m. for castle Bourg	321,322; C61/2 m.7 cf.401; C61/2 m.6
Bidaldus de Caupennes	20 l.morl	22 May 1255	life; issues Ajustanz, Sabres, & mill	330,338; C61/2, m.7,3 m.2
Amaury Pech	100 s.	21 Jun.1255	"pro milicia sua"	358; C61/2 m.7
Bertrand de Angulis	20 l.bord	20 Aug.1255	" "	407,561; C61/2mm.2,6
Bertrand de Podensac	£74/15/0 wages	23 Aug.1255	+4 kts, Aug 54-5; +3 kts, Mar-Aug.55	593; C61/2 mm.1,5;

Name	Fee or Wages	Date	Comments	References
John de Beseville	£10 wages	Oct.1255		467; C61/3 m.1
John de Courtenay	£26/8/0 wages	Oct.1255		468; C61/3 m.1
William de Chery	£17/12/0 wages	Oct.1255		469; C61/3 m.1, 2 m.4
Guy & Peter de Waul	£10/6/8 wages	Oct.1255		471; C61/3m.1, 2 m.4
Guy de Fretun	£7/10/0 wages	Oct.1255		472; C61/3 m.1, 2 m.4
John FitzRoger	£4/8/0 wages	Oct.1255		473; C61/3m.1,2 m.4
Peter Caillau	£16/12/0 wages	12 Oct.1255		494; C61/2 m.3
R. de Rochester	unknown arrears	13 Oct.1255	for fee in Limerick castle	499; C61/3 m.1; CDI p.76
Arnold-Garsie de Sescas	157/13/4 l.bord wages & fee	16 Oct.1255	as constable Roquefort de Marsan, +20 foot-soldiers	507; C61/ 2 m.3
Master Arnold de Bogio	20 l.bord. p.a.	17 Oct.1255	adviser to Gascon admin + expenses	542; C61/2 m.3; RG I ii
Canon of St.Sever	in great custom		for work outside Bordeaux	4619: T-C admin,p.14
Peter Francon, canon of St.Sever	20 l.bord p.a.	21 Oct.1255	as Arnold de Bogio, above	520; C61/2 m.3
Bernard Ayzon	£14/10/0 wages	25 Oct.1255	as constable Bordeaux, Jan-Oct 1255	573;C61/2 m.2;RG I ii 4660
Peter Caillau	20 s.bord p.diem	26 Oct.1255	while away on business E	591; C61/2 m.1
Raymond Brun Gramont	10 l.morl. p.a.	26 Oct.1255	in great custom: to sustain him	597; C61/ 2m.1
Raymond de Marsan	£13/15/2 wages	26 Oct.1255	as constable Casteroz & Espaz	598; C61/2 m.1
Seygnoron de Clarac	25 & ?220 l.bord	c.26 Oct.55	"pro milicia sua"	604; C61/2 m.1
Jordan de Oxford	?arrears wages	c.26 Oct.55	as constable Benauges + garrison	607,611; C61/2 m.1
Stephen Longespee	unknown	27 Oct.1255	as seneschal Gascony	615,618; C61/2 m.1, 3 m.1
Peter Colamb	unknown	27 Oct.1255	retained by Peter de Bordeaux	Cuttino GR A 255, G.Cal 782
Geoffrey de Lusignan	£200 p.a. at New Temple	6 Nov.1256	to make up £500 p.a. from E: by March 1258 assigned on debts Verdon & Geneville, in arrears by death G	620,687;CChR 26-57,p.453;C53/47 m.3;CCR 72-9,p.176, 79-88, p.180;C54/99 m.7d:E36/274 f.435v
Walter Wicher	£14/7/0	Jan.-Nov.1257	garrison Abergavenny	SC6/1094/11 m.5
Osbert Giffard	£1/7/0 wages	Dec.56-Jan.57	garrison White Castle	SC6/1094/11 m.5
Walter de Vernon	5 m. (10 m. fee)	Easter 1257	probably still receiving c.1272	SC6/1094/11 m.15:E101/350/5 m.4
Robert de Wainflete	£2/9/0 wages + 1 m. for robe	30 Sept.56-15 Apr.1257	as bailiff Mersinton; Ferrers w.	SC6/1094/11 m.9
Robert le Eyr	£1/19/4 + robe	" "	bailiff Kington, Brailes; Segrave w.	SC6/1094/11 m.8
William de Turberville	£1/8/7 & robe	" "	bailiff Pirie	SC6/1094/11 m.11

Name	Fee or Wages	Date	Comments	References
Roger de Stok	£2/0/10	30 Sept.56- 17 Apr.1257	bailiff Stanton	SC6/1094/11 m.8d.
Alexander de Hampden	£19/0/20 or £19/1/8 fee	30 Sept.56- Jun/July 57	bailiff Longvilers, Segrave & Thalemach custodies	SC6/1094/11 mm.7,8d.
Rob. le Heannor et al.	£9/6/8 wages	17 Aug.1257	14 d. daily each in Welsh service E	638; Lydon, p.21
John Farnwell	£2/0/0	17 Aug.1257	in Wales from 2 Aug. at 12 d. daily	656; Lydon, p.23
Henry de Lee	£1/0/0	Apr.-Sept.57	bailiff Skelton & Levinton wardship	SC6/1094/1 m.12d.
Richard de Pictavia	£4/11/3	Sept.1256-57	bailiff Bridgewater at 4 d. p.d.	SC6/1094/11 m.5d.
John le Breton	£33/6/8 fee	Sept.56-Nov.57	constable Abergavenny & 3 Castles	SC6/1094/11 m.5
Ralph and Michael de St.Edmund	£9/2/0 wages	30 Sept.1256 -30 Nov.1257	garrison Builth	SC6/1094/11 m.5
Walter Dun	£6/13/4 wages	" "	" "	SC6/1094/11 m.5
Eymon Maddoc	£3/0/0 wages	" "	" "	SC6/1094/11 m.5
Robert le Waleys	£10 (20 m.fee)	July 57-Mar.58	as constable of Montgomery	SC6/1094/11 m.16
Thomas, crossbowman Abergavenny	£4/9/3 wages & horse	29 July 1257- 25 Mar.1258	garrison Abergavenny	SC6/1095/11 m.16
John le Poher	£6/16/10 fee	12 April 1258	Hilary/Easter 42.H.III, C:Dungarven	691; Lydon, p.25
William de Horsendon	£20 p.a.	21 May 1257-58	bailiff Peak	SC6/1094/11 mm.15,15d.
Drew de Barentin	4,000 l.bord	6 Nov.1259	1 year fee as Sen:Gascony +9 kts.	720-721; C61/4 m.5
Roger de Stok	£20 p.a.	8 Nov.1259	as keeper Tickhill	726; C61/4 m.5
Philip de Ryoken	10 m. fee	12 Nov.1259	in wardrobe: retained in household	727; C61/4 m.5
Drew de Barentin	£20 p.a.	c.12 Nov.1259	retained in household +2 kts.	728; C61/4 m.5
Ralph de Aubigny	10 m. in fee	13 Nov.1259	Further payments, 1260, 1270-72	731,766; C61/4 mm.4,5: E372/117 m.6d
Henry de Burn	£20 p.a.	13 Nov.1259	escheator Hastings: retained in hh	732; C61/4 m.5
Henry de Bath	£20 p.a.	26 Nov.1259	in wardrobe:to sustain in service E	736; C61/4 m.5
John le Breton	£30 (in fee of £20 p.a.)	22 Dec.1259- 1 July 1261	keeper E's wardrobe	RegIC, p.174; C62/52 m.4; E372/120 m.22
Warin de Bassingbourn	20 m.arrears fee	9 Feb.1260	in wardrobe	766; C61/4 m.4
Gilbert Talbot	£10 p.a	18 May 1260	keeper Three Castles	794; C61/4 m.3
John Lestrange, jr.	120 m.	18 May 1260	1 year fee as constable Montgomery	795; C61/ 4 m.3

Name	Fee or Wages	Date	Comments	References
Robert de Stuteville	20 m. fee	pre 25 May 60	issues manor Appleby: reversion to Wynemer de Gymer if R died/left hh	797; CPR 58-66, p.154; C66/76 m.12
Wynemer de Gymer	25 m. p.a.	25 May 1260	Remaining issues of Appleby,	" " " "
Bidau de Caupennes	21/14/0 l.morl.	June 1260	arrears wages in army Seul	803; C61/4 m.2
G-A de Poderie	17/9/0 l.morl.	June 1260	" " + 18/0/9 l.morl with Caupennes	803; C61/4 m2
William ap Gurwaret	150 m. & £100 in fee	c.July & 25 July 1260	as C:Cardigan: £57/16/8 paid from wardrobe	814-5,817, mistrans;C61/4 m.2;RegTC,p.174;C62/52 m.4
Richard de Orreby	12d. p.diem	13 Sept.1260	chamberlain Chester, from 4 Oct 59	850; C61/4 m.1
Urian de St.Pierre	£40 p.a.	13 Sept.1260	as constable Haworden	853; C61/4 m.1
Robert de Pulford	2 s. p.diem	13 Sept.1260	as constable Degarwy +2 squires	854; C61/4 m.1
Thomas de Orreby	£10 p.a. fee	25 Sept.1260	as escheator & K:forest Chester	858,9; C61/4 m.3
John le Breton	93/94 m.(in fee of 100 m. p.a.)	1 July 61-13 June 1262	as chief steward	RegTC, p.174; C62/52 m.4: E372/120 m.22
Gerard Balistarius	£24 wages	paid " "	paid by chief steward: crossbowman	RegTC, p.173; " "
Ralph Basset	£22 arrears fee	" " " "	later assigned on manor Maddeleg	CPR 58-66,p.265: " "
Henry de la Bone	£1/3/0 wages	" " " "	as constable Degarwy, pre Sept.60	RegTC, p.174; " "
Michael de Fiennes	£31/15/0 arrears	" " " "	fee ?as E's chancellor	RegTC, p.173; C62/52 m.4;
Walter Harcourt/ Artaud and comrades	£1/1/8 arrears wages	" " " "	crossbowmen	RegTC,p.174; C62/52 m.4: E372/120 m.22
Walter de Langley	£10/8/2 wages	" " " "	plus replacement two horses	RegTC, pp.172-3; " "
Stephen de Montferrand	£6/13/4 wages	" " " "		RegTC, p.173; " "
John Muntosin	£2/14/0 or 2/3/0	" " " "	crossbowman	RegTC, p.173; " "
Michael de St.Edmund	£29/15/5	" " " "	constable Carmarthen, 45 H.II	RegTC, p.174; " "
Stephen the Taylor	£19/13/4 wages	" " " "	at 8 d. p.diem	RegTC, p.174; " "
William de Wauton	£11/7/0 wages	" " " "		RegTC, p.174; " "
Rich. de Wigeton & co.	10s.	" " " "	serjeants at Degarwy	RegTC, p.174; " "
Aedh O'Neill & sons	£10	c.Nov.1261-2	retained to keep March of Ulster	Curtis, p.11
Henry de Mandeville	£25 p.a. & 80 crannocks meal,	Sept.1259-Apr. 63 & for life	+ £112 arrears: C:castles Coleraine Locher & Drumtarsy, & co. Coleraine	889; BL Add.Ch.26515: Curtis, pp.10-11
Abbey La Sauve Majeure	50 l.t/20 l.bord. p.a.	October 1261	"imperpetuum";in compensation for 25 year lease of Bella Vallis to E	Martène & D, Thes 1113

Name	Fee or Wages	Date	Comments	References
Nicholas de Dunheved	£32 p.a. fee	from 49 H.III	retained in Irish hh +2 kts: £208 arrears paid 1271:still paid 1274-5	E101/230/2 m.3: CDI,pp.150, 181
Roger Lestrangle	£20 p.a.	from Oct.1265	as constable of the Peak	E372/120 m.22; C62/52 m.4
Simon de Creye	8 s. p.diem	8 Nov.1265	as K:Cinque Ports:later claimed arrears at 10 s. p.d.	918; SCL/12/16: CPR 72-81, p.116
Aymeric Becket	280 l.t wages	24 Feb.1266		927; E36/274 f.225
Hugh de Crecky	£40 p.a. silver	5 June 1266	at Ex.Dublin: paid £80 in arrears 1268:£60 1270-4:£40 on death 1276	932;SCL/12/8;CDI,p.128: L'book C,p.229:E372/125 m.3: CPR 72-81,p.152
Roger de Cantok	20 m. p.a.	11 Sept.1266	in wood custom Bristol	937; CChR 57-00,p.62, 1323-30,p.449
William de Lyanne	£19 in fee	52 H.III	paid out of London fine	L'book C, p.230
Hugh FitzOtto	£200 p.a.	28 Apr.1269	as constable Tower	CLR 67-72,pp.78-9
Count of Périgord	+150 l.bord fee	29 Apr.1269		979;C61/17 ml; RG II 1753
Gaston de Béarn	2,000 l.bord p.a	17 Sept.1269	in great custom:then given to son-in-law, H. of Almain for crusade	997;E36/275 f.269v;Martène & Durand, Coll. 1375: Cuttino GR A 227
Henry of Almain	1,000 l.bord p.a by	31 Mar.70	in great custom:then pledged for 6 years ?for crusade finance	997; E36/275 f.269v; Cuttino GR A 227
Philip Basset	£100 p.a. fee	28 May 1270	as constable Tower	E371/34 m.2
John de Verdon	£10 p.a.	from Easter 70	C:Drogheda & Blathach:£50 paid 1275	CDI,p.180,1038
John de Bikenoure	£12/10/0 wages	Aug.70-Oct73	as constable Ludgershall	E372/120 m.22
John de London	£80 (£20 fee)	Aug.7074	"dum fuit clericus...R ultra mare"	E372/125 m.3
Elias de Berkwey	2 s. p.d.	Oct.70-Dec.72	clerk & receiver E	E101/350/5 m.6
Richard FitzJohn	fee:unknown	8 Aug.1270	as C:Athlone,Randown & Meihonet	C47/35/14/54
Roger Loveday	£20 (£10 fee)	Oct.1270-72	paid from estate revenues	E372/125 m.3:E101/350/5 m.4
Thomas de Cheddeworth	40 m. p.a.	from July 71	as keeper See Dublin	36 RepDKI,p.36:C62/52 m.3: C47/35/14/41
Walter de la Haye	18 d. p.diem	25 July 7172	receiver See Dublin	C62/55 m.5:CDI,pp.312,314
Adam de Winchester	£17/10/0 fee	Oct.71-Nov.72	keeper rolls/receiver Bristol Ex.	E372/125 m.3
Nicholas de Len	8 d. p.diem	Nov.71-Sept.75	as keeper forest Peak	E372/120 m.22
W.Giffard, ArchB.York	£100 p.a.	November 1271	as constable Tower	C62/49 m.4:CLR 67-72,pp.216,239

Name	Fee or Wages	Date	Comments	References
M. Giles de Abbéville	£12 p.a.	from Feb.1272	in farm Bristol & E.revenues	E372/125 m.3: C62/50 m.6
Adam de Chetwynd	£15 p.a.	from Apr.1272	escheator Cheshire	E372/118 m.21d: C62/51 m.4
Theobald Butler	20 m. p.a.	26 July 1272	C:Castle Connell (Burgh custody)	C.Orn.Dds 179:36 RepDKI,p.53
Constance de Béarn	£100 p.a.	from Sept.1272	in Peak:as widow Henry of Almain	CChR 57-00, p.192:C62/52 m.2
Gerard de St.Ledger	12 m. wages	pre Sept.1272	while in service E in Acre	C62/49 m.6
William de Alneto	100 m. p.a.	c.1270-1272	constable ..nath & Rathmond,Ireland	C47/10/13/11
John de Baskerville	unknown	c.1270-1272	C:Dungarven under Audley:paid 1279	E101/230/2 m.4
William de London	unknown	c.1270	C:Dungarven & S:Waterford;paid 1276	CCR 72-9 p.303;CDI 1242
William de Bagepuz	20 m. p.a.	c.Mich 1270-72	Irish escheator,also fee from king	E101/230/2 m.3; CDI p.150
William de Bagepuz	80 m.(40 m. fee)	" "	Irish justice in eyre	" "
Fronond le Brun	£80 (£40 fee)	" "	Irish chancellor	" "
Richard of Exeter	unknown	" "	council/household knight in Ireland	" : CDI,p.148
Alex. of Nottingham	" "	" "	" " " "	" "
Robert FitzJohn	" "	" "	" " " "	" "
John de Kenley	50 m.(25 m. fee)	" "	chancellor Irish exchequer	E101/230/2 m.3: CDI,p.148
William Picot	£5 p.a.	" "	Irish Ex. "clericus memorialium"	" "
William Picot	£5 p.a.	" "	"feodo suo quod percipiat de domini"	" "
Richard de Tuyt	£15 p.a.	" "	fee originally granted by king	" ":Curtis,p.20
William de Mortimer	£20 wages	Aug.70Oct.73	in revenues Ludgershall, vallettus	E372/120 m.22
Master Angelus	arrears 50m. fee	by August 74	clerk at Curia: paid by E's lieuts.	E372/125 m.3;E101/350/5 m.1
Baldwin de Berry	£40 arrears	" "	£53 still due 3E I	C62/51 m.6
Bartholomew	£1/8/0 arrears	" "	arrears wages as chaplain Eleanor	E101/350/5 m.1
Nicholas Briseham	£10 arrears	" "		E101/350/5m.4
Peter de Brampton	£14 arrears	" "		E101/350/5 m4.
M. William de Farnham	£13/6/0 arrears	" "	for medicine and wages	E372/125 m.3
Roger de Tunderle	100 m.	" "	C:Cardarthen at unknown date	E372/125 m.3

NB. judges & minor figures from central Irish and Gascon administrations, and English estates have been omitted.  
Also, issues robes Dec.72 & May 73 (C47/3/21/44: C62/49 m.3)

Table Five Senior Officials of Edward's Household

Office	Person	Date	Comments	References
Chancellor	Michael de Fiennes	22 Aug.1255- c.1259	arrears fee paid 1260-61	RG I ii 4535;C61/2 m.5: E101/349/26 m.3: RegIC, p.173
	Nicholas de la Leye	?1259-d.1262	speculative identification	CPR 1258-66, p.162: Hereford Cathedral Ch.2932,2947
	Ralph de Dongon	1262		Studd, BIHR, 52, p.182: CPR 71- 81, p.131: SCL/3/75; Studd 877
	Robert Burnell Antony Bek	by 1266-70 ?1271-2	perhaps from 1263, replaced for crusade speculative;acting by E's return to West	CLR 60-67, p.234 RecFeod 34
Keeper of the Wardrobe	Ralph de Dongon	Aug.1254-after Nov.1258	promoted to chancellor	Studd 43,766;C61/1 m.3, 4 m.4: CPR 58-66,p.6: SC6/1094/11
	Thomas de Ipegrave	?Nov.1259	speculative; inferred from activities	Studd 730-1; C61/4 m.5
	John le Breton	22 Dec.1259- 1 July 1261	at fee of £20; promoted to Sen:estates	RegIC, pp.35,172-5; E372/120 m.22 C62/52 m.4
	Thos. de Pivelesden	?1262-3	speculative, inferred from activities	C62/52 m.4
	Laurence de Lovershal	by Easter 1270 -?1271	served under Bek from June 1270	CCR 1279-88, p.224: E372/125 m.3
	Antony Bek	22 June 1270/ 71-pre Nov.72	see section on wardrobe: promoted to chancellor	E36/274 ff.234v-235: C62/52 m.1
	Philip Willoughby	pre Nov.1272		E372/121 m.22
Steward HH	William de Cheney	c.1257	perhaps 1256-63, from attestations	E159/30 m.1d.
	Hugh FitzOtto	?1270-72	speculative from activities; holding office on return to West	Studd 1013; E101/547/25: E36/ 274 ff.234v-235

Table Six: Constables, bailiffs and officials of Edward's administration

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
<b>English Estates</b>				
Chief Steward:	Geoffrey de Langley	24 May 1254, acting 1257	"supremus senescallus" over English & Welsh lands except Chester & 4 Cantreds	11-16,21,476,501;C61/1 m.4,3 m.1 SC6/1094/11 mm.5d,8,19d,20
	Roger de Leyburn	by Dec.1259, acting Jun.60	"senescallus terrarum": 1262 failed to render account, accused of embezzlement	G.C II,p.221:S-B PleaR 7:801;C61/4 m.2:RegTC, p.174;E368/36 mm.10,15d: E372/120 m.22:
	?Thos de Pivelesden	c.June 1261	carrying out duties steward	Just1/954 mm.11d,13d
	John le Breton	1 July 1261-13 June 1262	"senescallus"	C62/52 mm.5,4:E372/120 m.22:RegTC pp.172-4:S-B PleaR 7:E368/36 mm.10,14d. CR 59-61,p.3:CPR 58-66,p.191:SC6/1078/7 CPR 58-66,pp.233-4:CR 61-4,pp.185-6
	Thomas de Bolton & Gilbert Talbot	June 1262, acting Nov.62	appointed jointly by king and E after Jewry exchange	
	Thomas de Bolton	?1265-6:acting July 1267	"supremus senescallus"; presumably gave up office on appointment to Chester	CPR 66-72,pp.90-1:A.Cest.p.98
	Robert Burnell/John de London	c.1270-72	"custodia terrarum et alia rerum regis antequam esset R"	E372/125 m.3:CCR 79-88,p.95
<b>Bamborough</b>	Robert de Neville	Jun.70-Jun.76	constable	E371/34 m.1:CFR,p.70
<b>Bristol: Constables:</b>				
	John FitzGeoffrey	Feb.1254-Nov. 1258	in office pre 1254; absentee due to attendance on E	CPR 47-58,pp.272,360, 58-66,p.32: CR 56-9,p.350
	Geoffrey de Cauz	by 1256,acting 1263, ?> d.72	described as constable, probably deputy: also receiver Bristol Exchequer	CPR 47-58,p.488:CR 54-6,p.336: E368/46 m.12d.
	Ric.de la Rochelle & John FitzJohn	Nov.1258-July 1259	FitzGeoffrey's son & steward, joint keepers until new arrangements made	CPR 58-66,pp.29,32:CR 56-9,p.350 E368/36 m.14d.
	Robert Walerand	July 1259-Dec. 1259	appointed "on advice council", not to give up unless ordered: dismissed by E	CPR 58-66,pp.29,32,63-4:CR 59-61, p.138:Treharne,p.193:
	Roger de Leyburne	Dec.1259-May 1260	E's personal appointment; replaced after E's reconciliation with king	742;C61/4 m.4
	Philip Basset	May 1260-1261	1 yr post, approved by king & council	CR 59-61,p.42:790;C61/4 m.3;
	Robert de Glaston.	c.Oct.1263-64		E372/108 m.15
	Robert Walerand	c.May-Dec.1264	+ E's hh knights occupied after Lewes: held until forced out by Montfort	C62/52 m.5:Flores II,p.503: CPR 58-66,p.397
	(John de la Warre)	May-Aug.1265	Montfortian appointment	CPR 58-66,p.425;E101/350/3sc.
	John de Muscegros	by Oct.1269	mostly absentee: deputies unpopular	C62/50 m.6:E372/125 m.3:E159/46 m.4d:CFR,pp.44,50:RH I,pp.177-8

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
:receivers exchequer Bristol	Simon Talbot	27 May 1254, & Sept.55	with Elias de Cumb	C62/49 m.1, 52 m.5:30,423; C61/ 1 m.4, 2m.3
	Elias de Cumb	27 May 1254 -c.1260	with Simon Talbot, then Geoffrey de Cauz	" :SC6/1094/11:E372/105 m.18d: C47/35/5/2:CR 54-6,pp.132,242 CCR 72-9,p.534:C.St.Mark 113
	Geoffrey de Cauz	Oct.1255-?72	with Cumb, then Adam de Winchester	CPR 47-58,p.488:CR 54-6,p.336:C62/ 49 m.1, 52 mm.5,7:SC6/1094/11:C47/ 35/5/2:EL59/48 m.2d:CCR 72-9,p.534
	Adam de Winchester	c.1260-1266, 1270-1272	clerk to Cauz, then receiver and keeper rolls exchequer	C62/49 m.1, 52 mm.5,7:E368/46 m.12d: EL59/48 m.2d:E372/125 m.3
	?Thos. de Pivelsdon	c.Oct.1262-3		C62/52 m.7
	William Berwick	c.Oct 1268-9	jointly	C62/49 m.1
	Alex. de Denesway Samekin Revesard	" "	" "	" "
Buckingham & Bedford	Bart. le Jovene	c.Oct.1266- June 1270	deputy sheriff under E	E372/111 m.22,113 m.16d,114 m.1:E368/ 42 mm.4d,13d,44 m.19d:E371/34 m.2
	Thomas de Bray	June 1270-74	sheriff for absence E on crusade	E371/34 m.2:E372/114 m.1:CFR,p.30
Cambridge & Huntingdon	Robert del Estre	June 1270-74	sheriff for absence E	E371/34 m.2: CFR,p.31
Cantilupe: custody :Bingley :Bridgewater :Calston & Calne :Eaton & Boughton :Totnes	Roger de Stok Talbot/Boulton	Nov.1259-1260 from June 1262	overall bailiff as result Jewry exchange at farm	726,820;C61/4m.2,5:E368/36 m.6d. CPR 58-66, p.233 Clay, pp.97-8:E368/36 m.10d.
	Adam de Jesmond	pre Sept.1260		SC6/1094/11 mm.5-7
	Richard de Poitou	Sept.1256-57		SC6/1094/11 m.17
	William	Sept.1256-57		E368/36m.14d.
	Thomas de Waleton	pre June 1262		AM III,p.201:SC6/1094/11 mm.17d,18
	Robert de Ludham/ Roger le Eyr Thomas Inge	1256-Sep.1257 c.1263-1273	upset local ecclesiastics	Just1/59 m.3:E372/125 m.3:C62/52 m.4 E368/36 mm.6,14d:CPR 58-66,pp.177,192:
	Agnes Bauzan	after Jun.1257	after her husband's death in service E: surrendered into custody king, E abroad	C66/76 m.3:Paris, CM V,p.646: CPR 58-66,p.192
	Waleran de Cicestr	-Sept.1261		CPR 58-66,p.215;C66/76 m.7:E371/26 m.1
	John de Courtenay	c.Nov.1261	?appointed by king as stop-gap	CPR 58-66,p.215
	Nicholas FitzMartin	Nov.61-Jun.62 from June 1262	appointed by king, by demission E appointed on E's return to England?	
Cinque Ports	Roger de Leyburn	early Nov.1265	after grant to E, with Dover & Sandwich	E371/30 m.10
	Simon de Creye	8 Nov. 1265	probably deputy to Leyburn	918;SCL/12/16:CPR 58-66,p.664
	Stephen de Penchester	by 20 Nov.1265 & Mar. 1268-99	initially over Hastings, Rye, Winchelsea all Ports then intendant to him, C:Dover	CPR 58-66,p.507:CFR,pp.33,282,415: E372/118 m.20

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Colchester	William Charles	Jun.70-Jan.71	constable in absence E	C60/67 mm.5,4;E371/34 m.2,35 m.6
	Walter de Essex	Jan.71-Apr.72	combined with counties Essex & Hertford	E371/35 m.6,36 m.18
	John de Cokefeud	Apr.-Dec.1272		E371/36 m.18;CPR 66-72,p.642
Corfe	Alan Plogonet	from Jun.1270	in absence E:+Sherbourne & Sam. & Dorset	E371/34 m.2
	Roger de Mortimer	by Oct.1270		CPR 66-72,p.468
	Edmund of Almain	?pre Apr.1272		CPR 66-72,p.646
	Elias de Rabeyn	Apr.1272-1280		E371/36 m.18:CPR 72-81,p.289:CFR,p.129
Crioll custody	Warin de Chaucumbe	1272		E372/125 m.3:RH I,p.219:El01/350/5 m.6
Cumberland	Robert de Chaury,	by Oct.1270-	sheriff in absence E	E371/34 m.2,35 m.1;CPR 66-72,pp.470,
	Bishop Carlisle	May 1272		670-1
	Richard de Crepping	May 72-Oct.74		E371/36 m.18:CFR,p.31
Devizes	Philip Basset	Jun.70-d.Nov.71	in absence E:+forest Chippenham	E371/34 m.1, 36 m.1
	Elias de Rabeyn	Nov.71-Apr.72		E371/36 mm.1,18:CPR 66-72,p.646,663
	John de Havering	from Apr.1272		CPR 66-72,pp.659-60:E371/36 m.18
	Roger de Mortimer	after Nov.72-75	in office by Sept.73	E372/117 m.7d:CPR 72-81,p.127
Devon & Exeter	Richard of Cornwall	Jun.70-Apr.72	in absence E	E371/34 mm.2,11:C60/69 m.14
	Roger Pridias	Feb.71-Oct.73	accredited deputy to Richard	El59/45 mm.9,9d:CPR 66-72,p.515
Dover	Geoffrey de Neville	early Nov.1265	appointed by E after surrender town	GC II,p243
	Matthew Bezill	Nov.65-Dec.67		CPR 58-66,p.512, 66-72,p.171
	Stephen de Penchester	Dec.1267-1299	sometimes with Cinque Ports & Kent	CFR,pp.33,415:CLR 67-72,p.5:
				CPR 66-72,pp.171,278
Essex & Hertford	William Charles	May 1270	in absence E:+Colchester: ineffective	C60/67 mm.5,4:E371/34 m.2
	Walter de Essex	Aug.1270-1274	exchequer block succession until Nov.	"":E371/35 m.6:El59/45 m.2d:CFR,p.31
Ex-Countess Bu				
:Hastings & Burwash	Stephen de Feugeres	Feb.-May 1254	deputy to Peter of Savoy	CLR 51-60,p.182
	Peter de Savoy	May 54-Nov.59	farmer of Hastings and Burwash	23;C61/lm.4
	(John de la Rede)	Feb.55-Nov.59	as steward lands Peter de Savoy	Justl/911 m.3:733,738;C61/4 m.5
	Henry de Burn	Nov.1259	also escheator Hastings	733,738;C61/4m.5
	(Thomas de Kinros)	Aug.61-?Jun.62	while lands in hands king: surrendered when lands exchanged with Peter of Savoy	E368/36 m.6:CLR 60-67,p.106:CPR 58-66,p.170
:Elham	John de la Rede/ Thomas Burgeis	by Jan.1258- ?Nov.1260	under supervision bailiff Hastings:	Justl/813 m.15:CLR 51-60,p.182
:Tickhill	Stephen de Feugères	Feb.-May 1254	as deputy Peter of Savoy	CLR 51-60,p.182

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Tickhill	Ivo de Elinton	by 24 May 1254		17; C61/1 m.4
	Nicholas de Marnham	26 May 1254- April 1258	also keeper Stamford & Grantham	24;C61/1m.4:E368/36m.14d: SC6/1094/11m.1d,2,2d,20d:
	(William de Eggenue & Gerard la Grue)	April-Aug.1258	keepers for Aymer de Valence	Blyth Cart 208;E368/36 m.6d: SC6/1094/11 m.20d.
	John Mansel	Aug.58-Nov.59	appointed by council on expulsion Aymer	CPR 47-58,p.644:EL59/36 m.4d.
	Roger de Stok	Nov.59,?Jul.60	appointed by E, also keeper S & G	715,726,820;C61/4 mm.2,5:E368/36 m.6d.
	(Thomas de Kinros)	from Oct.1261	inferred,as keeper lands demised to king	CR 59-61,p.448
	G.Talbot/T.Bolton (Luke de Tany) (Ivo de Elinton)	from June 1262 c.1266-72 Jan.1272	as keepers all English lands E, constable for Henry of Almain constable for Henry's widow, Constance	CPR 58-66,p.233: RH I,pp.109,113-4:CPR 66-72,p.442 CPR 66-72, p.619
<b>Ferrers custody</b>				
:overall	William de Wilton	April 1254-at least July 55	appointed by king before grant to E	CR 53-4,pp.129,131, 54-6, p.119: E368/29 m.14d.
:Buckebroc	Walter de Aubigny	Sept.56-Apr.57	Constable Tutbury; received accounts	SC6/1094/11 mm.9-13;E368/36 m.12
	Robert Oweyn/Ralph de Wardinton	Sept.56-Apr.57	identical account under 2 separate names	SC6/1094/11 mm.11,13
:Duffield	Henry de Herleston	Sept.56-Apr.57	with other manors	SC6/1094/11 mm.9,10:
Hecham/Higham	Thomas de Burgeis	May 1254		171;C61/1 m.4
:Mersinton	Robert de Wainfleete	Sept.56-Apr.57	with Nedwood forest	SC6/1094/11 mm.9,10;
:Pyrie	W. de Turberville	Sept.56-Apr.57		SC6/1094/11 m.11
:Salford	Henry de Lee	Sept.56-Apr.57	with other manors	SC6/1094/11 mm.12,12d
:Stanford	James de Barentin	Sept.56-Apr.57		SC6/1094/11 m.12;E368/36 m.12
:Tutbury	Robert Brun	Sept.56-Apr.57		SC6/1094/11 m.12;E368/36 m.12
:Uttoweter	John Guttay	Sept.56-Apr.57		SC6/1094/11 m.9
:Fors custody	Geoffrey Russell	?Oct.60-Jan.62	summoned to account Jan.1262	E368/36 m.4d.
:Skipton	Talbot/Bolton	November 1262		CR 61-4,pp.185-6
Freemantle	Rob.de Esmundethorp	c.1254-1258		CR 53-4,p.60, 56-9,pp.71,
	Henry de Es'thorp	until July 62		CPR 58-66,p.219
	Reginald FitzPeter	from July 62	?while sheriff S'hants	CPR 58-66,p.219
Hadley	Walter Giffard,	Jun.70-Nov.72	during E's absence	E371/34 m.2:CPR 66-72,pp.711,714
	Archbishop of York Thedise de Camilla	+ Nov.72-74 Nov.1272	appointed but never held office	CPR 66-72,pp.711,714
Hereford	Richard del Oke	Sept.69-Apr.70	deputy sheriff to E	E372/114 m.3d:EL59/45 mm.17,22d.

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Lands Hugh de Hersy	Bart. de Sully	June 1270-74	sheriff during absence E	E371/34 m.1: CFR,p.34
	Simon de Hedon/ Walter de Ludham Oliver de Sutton/ Robert de Ludham	May 1268-pre Oct.1272 19 Oct.1272	appointed by E's lieutenants on deaths previous keepers on same terms	CPR 72-81,p.110; C66/94 m.4;964; " " "
Jewry :justices	Beraud brothers, Turri, Weston & Pivelesden	June 1263-65 Aug.1262-early 1263	farmers only 2 out 3 probably appointed by E	CPR 58-66,pp.263,283 CPR 58-66,p.235:E368/36 m.16d. 37 m.21d.
	Hauteyn & Haselbech Rob. de Crepping & Adam de Winchester (Will.de Haselbech)	Oct.63-Jan.65 May 1265	appointed by E with king's assent; Adam removed from office by Montfort	Select Pleas Jews,p.55:CR 64-8,p.11 CR 64-8,pp.52,62
:clerk	Will. de Middleton	May 1265 Dec.1265-1274	replaced Adam de Winchester E's rep. at Ex.Jewry, collecting arrears	CR 64-8,p.62 CPR 58-66,p.554, 72-81,p.87:
Kent	Steph.de Penchester	Jun.70-Jan.71	sheriff before grant to E; also C:Dover	E371/34 m.1
	Henry Malemayns	Jan.71-Sept.73	sheriff during absence E	E371/35 m.6,37 m.23:CPR 72-81,p.7
	William Hever	Sept.73-Oct.74		E371/37 m.23:CPR 72-81,p.7:CFR,p.31
Lacy custody	John FitzJohn	pre Jun.62	uncle to heir, Nicholas de Verdon	E368/36 m.14d.
Levinton custody	Henry de Lee Eustace de Balliol	Sept.1256-1257 pre Jan.1262	accounted for Levinton and Skelton later married Levinton heiress	SC6/1094/11 m.12d:EL59/36 m.4d. CR 59-61,pp.202-3;E368/36 m.6d: KB26/162 m.3d.
Lincoln	Thomas de Bolton	Jun.70-Oct.73	during absence E	E371/34 m.2:CPR 66-72,p.470:CFR,p.12
	William Esturmy	Oct.-Dec.1273	may not have taken up office	CFR,pp.12,15
City & Tower of London	Hugh FitzOtto Philip Basset Walter Giffard	Feb.69-Jun.70 Jun.70-d.No.71 Nov.71-Dec.73	E's deputy as keeper city and C: Tower C: Tower, K:Thames and Jewry in absence E	E371/33 m.2,34 m.2:dALL,p.108:CLR 67-72,p.78 E371/34 m.1,2:CLR 67-72,pp.175,197 CLR 67-72,p.197,216,239:
Longvilers custody :Farnley	Alex. de Hampden Edmund de Lacy Adam de Montalt	Feb.-June 1257 pre d.1258 pre Dec.1259	at farm, then in lieu fee	SC6/1094/11 m.7,8d. E368/36 m.6d. 756;C61/4 m.4:E368/36 m.6
Ludgershall	John de Muscogros John FitzGeoffrey John de Bikenour	Aug.1265 pre Aug.1270 by Aug.70-73	presumably appointed by E another person of this name ceded to Eleanor of Provence as dower	E371/29 m.9 E372/120 m.22 E372/120 m.22
Luton	Bart. le Jovene	c.1270-72		E372/125 m.3:C62/51 m.7

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Mannoers custody	Ralph Bugg	1257	farmer manor of Holm	SC6/1094/11 m.1d.
Meriet custody	William de Cheny	c.Aug.1261	presumably by commission E	CPR 58-66,p.187: KB26/160 m.23
Montalt custody	Thomas Bacon	by June 1262		E368/36 m.14d.
New Aid :collectors	John le Moyne/ Stephen de Jarum Gregory de Rokesle Robert Bernard/ Henry de Suthwald Lumbardus	c.Oct./Nov.1266 ?pre 1270 ?pre 1270 c.1272	collectors on North-East coast collector in London collectors for Durwich collector in port Boston	CPR 66-72,p.2 CPR 72-81,p.239-40 CPR 72-81,p.240 CR 68-72,p.517
:farmers	D. Gwillelmi & co. Beraud co. Guillelmi & co.	May-Aug.1270 Aug 1270-71 Dec.1271-72	appointed by E's lieutenants	CPR 66-72,p.442,463:dALL,p.110 " ":CPR 72-81,p.286 CPR 66-72,p.617
New Forest	Robert Walerand/ Alan Plogonet John de Butsthorne	1254-1270 1257-76	forester in fee; rights bought out 1270 in favour Eleanor of Castile, steward forest, under Walerand	CPR 47-58,p.322:C62/52 m.5,7: E368/36 m.6d:CChR 57-1300,p.149 C.Docs NewForest, passim
:Godeshulle	John de Godeshulle	1255-67	farmer	C62/52 m.5
:Prethorn	John de Badesle	1255-67	farmer	C62/52 m.5
:Burlegh	Richard de Burlegh	1255-67	farmer	C62/52 m.5
Norf'k,Suff'k	William Giffard	June 1270-74	sheriff & C:Norwich during absence E	E371/34 m.2;CFR,p.33
Northampton	William de Boyvill M. Roger de Seton	June 70-Nov.72 Nov.72-Oct.74	sheriff during absence E	E371/34 m.2:CFR,p.1 E372/117 m.1:CFR,pp.1,30
Nottingham :castle :county	Roger de Leyburn Archbishop Giffard Hugh de Stapleford	pre June 1270 June 70-Oct.74 June 70-Oct.74	continued in office after grant to E sheriff & C:castle during absence E deputy to Giffard	C60/67 m.9 E371/34 m.1:CFR,p.30:E372/117 m.9 E372/115 m.9:
Odiham	John de Verdon Robert de Lisle Adam de Vaux	by 16 Aug.1265 c.1270-1275 unknown;?1270	presumably appointed by E	CR 64-8,pp.68-9 E372/125 m.3:C62/51 m.6,53 m.4:CFR,p.51 C62/51 m.6

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Orford	Hugh de Dynninton	by May 72-75		C47/3/21/44 m.2:CPR 72-81,p.89:E372/ E372/117 m.7d:CCR 79-88,p.330
Oxon. & Berks.	William de Lisle Robert de Lisle Bishop Longespée Gilbert de Kirkby	c.May 70-71 pre May 1271 May 71-Oct.74 by Oct.72-74	sheriff & C:Oxford during absence E	CPR 66-72,p.423 CPR 66-72,p.536 CPR 66-72,p.536:E371/35 m.6 CPR 66-72,p.685:E372/116 m.14:CFR,p.33
Peak	Richard de Vernon Ivo de Elinton Gervase de Bernak Will. de Horsendon Ralph Bugg Thomas de Furnivall (Robert de Ferrers) (Henry de Montfort) (Richard de Vernon/ Gilbert le Franceys) Roger Lestrangle Thos Folejamb,Will Hally, Ric.le Ragged (Walter de Kancia) (Ivo de Elinton) Roger Lestrangle	Feb.-May 1254 May 1254 Nov.56-May 57 May 1257-58 May 1260-62 by Apr.1264 c.Jun.-Dec.64 Dec.64-Aug.65 Dec.64-Aug.64 Oct.65-Apr.72 Oct.66-75 April 1272 June 1272 ?Apr.72-Nov.75	bailiff before grant to E farmer keeper farmer seized from Edward deputy Simon de Montfort deputies Henry de Montfort deputies Lestrangle	E372/99 m.15:EL59/29 m.8:CPR 47-58,p.272 8,9;C61/lm.4:E372/103 m.21d:EL59/36 m.4d. SC6/1094/11 m.15 SC6/1094/11 m.15,15d. 783,809;C61/4 mm.2,3 VCH Derby I,p.405 CPR 58-66,p.397 CChR 57-1300,p.54 C47/2/1/8: CR 64-8,p.233:CIM 645 E372/120 m.22:Shirley II 346-7 RH I,p.60, II,pp.289-90 CPR 66-72,pp.642,660 CPR 66-72,p.660 E372/120 m.22:CFR p.56:C47/35/8/32-3: C62/49 m.3, 52 mm.5,4,2,1 C60/68 m.15:E372/115 m.15d. C60/68 m.15: CPR 66-72,p.496 CPR 66-72,p.626, 72-81,p.27
Porchester	Isabel FitzAlan William Belet Thomas de Clare	by Nov.70-71 Nov.1270 c.Feb.72-73	held pre grant to E:accounted Mich.1271 probably did not get seisin took possession from Isabel	CPR 66-72,pp.642,660 CPR 66-72,p.660 E372/120 m.22:CFR p.56:C47/35/8/32-3: C62/49 m.3, 52 mm.5,4,2,1 C60/68 m.15:E372/115 m.15d. C60/68 m.15: CPR 66-72,p.496 CPR 66-72,p.626, 72-81,p.27
Hon.Richmond in E.Anglia	Pons de Mora	?1268-May 73	?from death Peter of Savoy	CFR,p.4
FitzRobert custody	Robert de Ludham	preJune 1258		E368/36 m.6d.
Rochester	Nicholas de Crioll Simon de Creye	Jun.70-d.72 ?Feb.72-74	during absence E from April 1272 included custody town	E371/34 m.1:CPR 66-72,p.624 CPR 66-72,p.642:CCR 72-9,p.16: E371/36 m.18:CFR,p.31
St.Briavels	Will.de Beauchamp,	pre 1270-72	farm fixed January 1272	Bazeley,pp.178,183:E372/125 m.3:

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
& Forest Dene St.Briavels	earl Warwick Osbert de Berford William le Blund	& on pre 1270 c.1270-72	deputy to earl Warwick deputy to earl Warwick	C47/35/10/48 Bazeley,p.178 C47/35/10/48;E372/125 m.3
Scarborough	Geoffrey de Neville William de Percy	Jun.70-Jan.72 Jan.72-Nov.74	during absence E quarrelled with burgesses	E371/34 m.1, 36 m.18 E371/36 m.18: CPR 66-72,p.616:CFR,p.5
Segrave custody	Alex. de Hampden	Dec.55-Apr.58		CR 54-6,p.255:SC6/1094/11
:Coldoverton :Kington	William de Fossato Robert le Eyr	1254-Apr.58 Sept.56-Apr.57	subordinate to Hampden subordinate to Hampden	SC6/1094/11:Just1/1187 m.3:KB26/158 m.18d. SC6/1094/11 nm.7,8
Salop & Staff	Will.de Cavershull Walter de Hopton Elias de Berkwey Urian de St.Pierre	Dec.1269 pre May 1270 by May 1270 1270	deputy sheriff to E deputy sheriff to E receiver or under-sheriff to E described as sheiff:?deputy Audley	E372/113 mm.19d,20d: C60/67 m.9:EI59/44 m.1 CLR 67-72,p.126; CChr 57-1300,p.248:EI59/48 m.14 KB26/198 m.3d, 194 m.28d.
	James de Audley Hamo Lestrangle Hugh de Mortimer	Jun.1270 Jan.1271 1271-72	in absence E:unlikely acted, while J.Hib. also C:Bridgnorth from Nov.1271	C60/67 m.9 EI59/45 m.7d. E372/117 mm.16d,17d:CR 68-72,p.440
Somerset & Dorset	Alan Plogonet John de St.Valery	Jun-postOct.70 ?Apr.71-Nov.74	during absence E: +Corfe >Oct.70 appointment repeated by Lieuts E Apr.72	E371/34 m.2 E372/116 m.7d:CFR,pp.5,35
Stamford & Grantham	Nicholas de Marnham Nich.le Walecot Roger de Stok (Thomas de Kinros)	May 54-post 57 c.1258-60 Nov.59-post July 1260 Aug.61-June 63	also keeper Tickhill ?deputy July also keeper Tickhill & Cantilupe land bailiff for the king;"ejected by barons"	24;C61/1m.4:E368/36 m.14d. Select Cases Ex Pleas,p.22 726,766,820;C61/4 mm2,4,5: E368/36 m.6d. CPR 58-66,p.170:CLR 60-67,pp.104-6: E372/105 m.21, 116 m.2 E368/36 m.3
	William de London	by Sept.61	keeper manor of Grantham, ?deputy	
Thelamach custody	?Alex.de Hampden	c.1257		SC6/1094/11 nm.7,8d.
Warwick & Leicester	William de Mortain William Bagot	Jun.70-Jul.71 July 71-Dec.73	during absence E	E371/34 m.2,35 m.11:E372/116 m.7,117 m.2 E371/35 m.11:CFR,p.16
Wiltshire	Stephen de Edworth Walter de Stirchsle	May 70-?May 72 May 72-Dec.74	during absence E +castle Sarum	C60/69 m.6;E371/34 m.10:E372/114 m.4d. 116 m.18d:EI59/46 mm.10,15:CFR,p.12 E371/36 m.9;E372/117 m.15:CFR,pp.12,38

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Winterbourne Gurnor	Gilbert de Wautham	Nov.65-?Oct.67	appointed to take seisin and administer	C.St.Mark 259-60,264
Yorkshire	Roger Lestrangle	June 70-Oct.74	during absence E +castle York	E371/34 m.1, 37 m.13:E372/117 m.4: CFR pp.8,31
Welsh Estates Abergavenny	William Trussell John le Breton	?pre Sept.56 Sept.56-Nov.57	with the Three Castles	SC6/1094/11 m.4;E101/684/64/1 SC6/1094/11 mm.2d,5: CPR 47-58,p.586 RegIC,pp.35,172-4;C62/52 m.5
	Peter de Montfort	by Mar.1259- early 1263	farmer	818;C61/4 m.2:CPR 58-66,p.14:SC1/4/86, 11/71;Shirley II,pp.219-21,230-1
Audley custody	Adam de Chetwynd	7 Jul-Aug.72 & 30 Sept.72-73	as escheator Cheshire	E372/119m.21d: C62/51 m.4
Builth	Richard de Tunderle Roger de Mortimer Simon de Ribeford	Sept.56-Sept.57 by July 1260 ?pre 1260	when castle fell to the Welsh perhaps deputy to Mortimer	SC6/1094/11 mm.4,5 CPR 58-66,p.85 E368/36 m.6d.
Cardigan	Stephen Bauzan Nich. FitzMartin/ William apGurwaret William apGurwaret Hugh de Turberville Roger de Mortimer Maurice de Berkeley	March 1254 October 1258- Easter 1259 May 1262-3 16 Aug.1263 by Sept.64- post Mar.65 ?pre Jan 1262	took seisin,?stayed keeper +Carmarthen appointed on advice council to Kilgaran & Cardigan:Gurwaret probably based at C 1 year contract appointed by council during pleasure Montfort tried to replace him with Guy de Brion bailiff Cardigan and Carmarthen	CPR 47-58,p.365 CR 56-9,p.330 IW 39 CPR 58-66,p.275:C66/79 m.3 CPR 58-66,pp.348,401,414 E368/36 m.6d
Carmarthen	Stephen Bauzan Nich. FitzMartin Patrick de Chaworth Guy de Brion Nicholas FitzMartin Mich. de St.Edmund Nich.FitzMartin Hugh de Turberville Richard de Tunderle Maurice de Berkeley	May 54-Jun.57 by Sept.1257 Apr-Sept.1258 by Oct. 1258 c.Aug 1259, & Oct.1259-1260 c.Oct.1260-61 May 1262-63 August 1263 Sept.64-Mar.65 ?pre Jan.1262	took seisin, remained keeper;Killed 1257 killed in battle appointed by E on advice council one year contract with Cardigan Montfort attempted to replace with Brion bailiff Cardigan and Carmarthen	CPR 47-58,p.365:AC,pp.92-3 SC6/1094/11 m.5d Paris CM V,p.717:AM I,p.166:CR 56-9,p.322 CPR 47-58,p.654 RegIC,p.174;C62/52 m.4: CR 1256-9,p.423 RegIC,p.174;E372/120 m.22 IW 39 CPR 58-66,p.275 CPR 58-66,p.348,404,414 E368/36 m.6d.

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Chester :Justices	Roger de Tunderle	unknown	c.1270-74 paid 100m. arrears as C:	E101/350/5 m.4;E372/125 m.3
	Alan la Zuche	1250-Mich.55	farmer, in office before grant to E	CPR 47-58,p.272:6;C61/1 m.4:A.Ces,p.70: CR 54-6,pp.134,264-5
	Gilbert Talbot Roger de Montalt	Sept.55-Mar.57 Mar.57-Aug.59		A.Ces,pp.70-4:E368/36 m.6d:E159/30 m.2 A.Ces,pp.74-6:SC6/1094/11 m.2:622,709 711-2;C61/4 m.5;CChr 57-1300,p.24
	Fulk de Orreby	Mich.59-Aug.61		A.Ces,pp.76-8:S-B,PleaR,pp.1,30-2:710-2, 753,857;C61/4 m.5,I:THLSC,103,p.52
	Thomas de Orreby	Aug.61-Dec.62	appointed by king, E abroad:Dec.62 made	A.Ces,pp.78-82:CPR 58-66,pp.174,238:
	William la Zuche	Dec.1262 Feb.63-Dec.64	to give up castles in W.crisis removed and imprisoned by Montfort	S-B,PleaR, pp.33-4:Shirley II,p.218 A.Ces,pp.82,86-90: C145/16/12;994: CR 64-8,p.99:CLR 60-67,p.167
	(Luke de Tany)	Jan.-Aug.1265	Montfortian:E made appointment under duress:surrendered to E after Evesham	A.Ces,pp.90-4: S-B,PleaR,pp.59-60:CIM 643:
	James de Audley Thomas de Boulton	c.Aug.1265-67 1267-July 70		A.Ces,pp.94-8:CCR 79-88,p.29:CPR 72-81,p.5 A.Ces,pp.98,100:CIM 975:993: CChr 57-1300,p.418;
	Reginald de Grey	Jul.70-Sept.74	farmer, complaints about his admin.	A.Ces,pp.100-2:E372/120 m.22, 125 m.3 C60/50 m.3:CPR 72-81,p.6 C62/50 m.3
	Thomas de Ipegrave	unknown		7;C61/1 m.4:CPR 47-58,pp.40,70
:escheator/ forester	Fulk de Orreby	Apr.49-Nov.59	appointed by H.III; office unpopular,	858-9;C61/4m.3:S-B,PleaR,pp.2,7,14
	Thomas de Orreby	Nov.59-60	local opposition to his authority	E372/120 m.22:C62/51 m.4
:constable	Adam de Chetwynd	Apr.72-Sept.75		C.B. Whalley Abbey II,p.347: Abbr.Plac,p.142
	Nicholas de Vaux	c.1250-Mich.55	constable & deputy La Zuche	S-B,PleaR,p.18 CPR 58-66,p.238
:chamberlain	Peter the huntsman	31 March 1260	constable	C.St.Werburgh II,p. xxxii
	Eudo la Zuche	Dec.1262	appointed by king, E abroad in W.crisis	C.St.Werburgh II 759
	Robert de Pulford	c.1263-4		C.St.Werburgh II 564,570,728,741,782,777-8
	Robert de Stockport	c.1266-7		C47/11/2/3
	Robert de Huxley	1269-74		CB Whalley Abbey II,p.347
	Hugh le Sauvage	?pre 1274		SC6/1094/11 m.12: CB Whalley Abbey I,p.268
	Ranulf de Exon.	c.1250-55	at the time of La Zuche and Vaux	703,845,850-1;C61/4 m.1,3:S-B PleaR, pp.18,33-4:C.St.Werburgh II,p. xxxii
	W. de Shelfhanger	c.1256-7	?wrongly transcribed as "oementarius"	C.St.Werburgh II 782
	Richard de Orreby	Oct.1259-1263		CPR 1279-88,p.224: C47/11/2/3
	Will. de Brickhill	1270-71		
Deganwy	Adam de Chetwynd	pre-1270	account audited c.1270-74	RegIC,p.174;E372/120 m.22: 854;C61/4 m.1
	Henry de la Bone Robert de Pulford	pre Sept.1260 from Sept.1260	under justice Chester " "	

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Ellesmere	W. de Bassingbourn	c.1256-8		EL59/36 m.4d.
	Peter de Montfort	May 1258	lease ?in lieu of fee	CPR 47-58,p.628
	Hamo Lestrangle	December 1263	" "	CPR 58-66,p.302
Haworden	Urian de St.Pierre	from Sept.1260	?Montalt custody: Welsh captured castle	853;C61/4 m.1;E368/36m.14d
Kilgarran	Nich. FitzMartin	Oct.1258- Easter 1259	swore oath to barons and to surrender on appointed day	CR 56-9,p.330
	Nich. FitzMartin	1265 >73	?second term; barons try to oust him	CPR 58-66,p.414, 72-81,p.9: CIM 986
Mormouth	William FitzWarin	?Sept.1256-57		SC6/1094/11 m.4
	Robert le Waleys	Jul.57-Mar.58	possibly deputy to Peter de Montfort with the Three Castles	SC6/1094/11 mm.16,16d:E368/36 m.6d
	Gilbert Talbot	by July 1262		CPR 66-72,p.726:CR 61-4,p.191
	Geoffrey de Cauz	pre 1262		E368/36 m.6d:Just1/1188 m.1
Montgomery	Bartholomew Pech	March 1254	taking seisin for Edward	CPR 47-58,p.365
	Imbert de	May 1254 &		CR 53-4,p.63, 54-6,p.370
	Montferrand	October1256		27,28;C61/1m.4
	Hamo Lestrangle	by Aug.1257 & pre May 1260		CR 56-9,p.147: 796;C61/4 m.3
	John Lestrangle, jr	May 60-Nov.61	appointed by king and council	CR 59-61,pp.42,177:795-6;C61/4 m.3
	John le Breton	November 1261	replaced almost immediately as too busy	CPR 58-66,p.191:
	Hamo Lestrangle	from Nov.1261		CPR 58-66,p.191
John Lestrangle, jr	Easter 1263- April 1264	from Nov.1263 king tried to replace with Hamo, repeat orders suggests J refused	Brut,p.350:E371/28 mm.1,3	
Hamo Lestrangle	?by April 64	with Shrewsbury & Bridgnorth,	CPR 58-66,p.300: E371/28 mm.1,3	
Adam FitzPhilip	by Mar.1265 & April 1265	barons want to replace him by John Lestrangle; refused without mandate E	CPR 58-66,pp.411,417:Foedera I i, p.454:E371/29 m.9	
Three Castles	William de St.Omer	March 1254	taking seisin for Edward	CPR 47-58,p.365
	Gilbert Talbot	May 1254	only Grosmont and White Castle	CR 53-4,p.86:1-4,26;C61/1 m.4
	Walerand le Tyes	May 1254-1257	former constable; life-grant	5;C61/1 m.4; CR 56-9,p.62
	John FitzGeoffrey	Mich.1256	farm of Grosmont	SC6/1094/11 m.4:
	John le Breton	Sept.56-Nov.57	with Abergavenny	SC6/1094/11 m.5:CPR 47-58,p.586:CR 56-9,p.62:RegTC,pp.172-4
	Roger de Clifford	until May 1260	replaced on order king and council	CR 59-61,p.42:EL59/36 m.4d.
	Gilbert Talbot	from May 1260	appointed on order king and council	792-3:C61/4 m.3
Gilbert Talbot	June 1262-Dec. 62/early 63	also C:Mormouth;actually in residence & able to assist threatened Abergavenny	CPR 58-66,p.233,66-72,p.726:CR 61-4 p.270:SC1/4/86, 11/71;Shirley II,p.230	
John FitzJohn	pre 1262;	?succeeded to father's farm Grosmont	E368/36 m.14d.	
Will. de Montacute	?pre 1262	farmer Grosmont and White Castle	E368/36 m.6d.: C62/49 m.1	

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Ireland :justiciar	John FitzGeoffrey	Feb.54-Apr.56	in office 1245<;absent mid-1254< with E	CPR 32-47,p.465:C61/1-3;Studd passim;
	Richard de la Rochelle	c.1251-1256	deputy to FitzG; 1254< "bailiff" E or lieutenant FitzG	C47/35/10;85-6,12,135,149,290,387 C61/2;CPR 47-58,passim:CR 47-51,p.533 Cole,p.93; CDI III,p.294
	William de Dene	c.1254-6	another deputy to FitzGeoffrey,	CPR 47-58,pp.512,633,639:CR 54-6, p.424:C47/35/14/12:A.Ces,p.70
	Alan la Zuche	Apr/June 1256 -Oct.1258		CPR 47-58,p.653:C61/4 m.5;723-5: C47/35/14/11:CR 59-61,pp.61,155; C.St.Mary,Dublin II, pp.289,316 C47/35/14/15:Berry,PRIA,24/C,p.39
	Stephen Longespée	21 Oct.1258-d.June 1260	probably arrived mid/late 1259	CR 59-61,p.211:CPR 58-66,p.159;H.Marl. p.88:D.Affairs I 5:EL59/34 m.9
	Geoff. de Forestel	c.May 1259	deputy Longespee	CPR 58-66, pp.180,406,422,CIM p.97 C145/11/26;883 (misdate):35 RepDKI, p.47:L.Niger,p.117:A.Inisfallen,p.362: SCL/4/154, 7/185:Henry Marlboro,p.87 SCL/7/184, 18/7,8:H.Marlboro,p.87
	William de Dene	by Oct.1260-d.Oct.1261	treasurer wrote to king on death to ask urgent replacement	CPR 58-66,pp.406-7:CR 64-8,p.107
	Richard de la	Aug/Oct 1261-Mich.1266	Dec 64-April 1265 in Geraldine prison 1265 Montfort tried to replace	
	Geoff de Geneville	Dec.64-Apr.65	acted during Rochelle's captivity	
	Fulk de Sanford, Archbishop Dublin	c.Feb/Mar.1265	Montfort attempted to appoint him:	
	Roger Waspail	c.May 1265	nominated by Montfort	CPR 58-66,p.422
	Hugh of Taghmon,	c.June 1265	" "	CPR 58-66,p.432
	David de Barry	Aug.1266-Jan.68		35 RepDKI,p.48:SCL/12/5, 18/150; R&S I.Parl.pp.298-9: A.Conn, pp.152-3; C.St.Mary II, p.290 2 RepRCI,pl.1
	Robert de Ufford	Sept.1268-1270	in office Nov 68<: intended "to order and settle the country"	
Richard de Exeter	6 March 1270-Nov.1276	deputy/justiciar: 2apptd. when Ufford returned to England 614,	36 RepDKI,p.54:AMFern.p.15:BoDMS Laud p.88,318:EL01/230/2 m.3 EL01/230/2;CDI 889-891;A.Conn. p.159:C.St.Mary II,p.317:EL59/44 m.12 C47/10/13/4,13; CPR 66-72,p.674, 72-81, pp.2,7:CDI 950,1139:C62/55 m.5:Henry Marlboro,p.88:D.Affairs I.7	
James de Audley	Aug.70-d. June 1272	arrived Nov. Killed accidentally on campaign against O'Briens		
Maurice F.Maurice FitzGerald	by Aug.72- & April 73<	acting;confirmed by lieuts E		
:sheriffs and constables town & castle Athlone	Richard FitzJohn	c.1253-5	with Randown and Meihonet	C47/35/14/54:Gerrard trans, p.255
	Maurice FitzMaurice FitzGerald	Nov.1259	appointed by E; with shrievalty Connaught during pleasure	725;C61/4 m.5
	Richard de la Rochelle	Jan.1262-Sept.1266	while justiciar	35 RepDKI,p.48
	Milo le Bret	Sept.66-Aug.68	appointed by justiciar, David de Barry	35 RepDKI,p.49

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Athlone	Maurice FitzMaurice John de Verdon	from Aug.1268 c.1272-3	reappointed by E speculative id. Provisioned castle	35 RepDKI, pp.49 36 RepDKI, p.24
Cantilupe custody	William de Dene	by Oct.1261 46	H.III, in arrears issues	Curtis, p.6
Clare custody castle & co. Coleraine	Walter de Burgh Henry de Mandeville	pre Sept.1264 Sept.1259- April 1263	ordered by king to surrender to Gilbert with castles Drumtarsy and Lochhel; then granted for life	CDI 750; CPR 58-66, p.350 Curtis, pp.10-11; 889
Co. Connaught	Walter Wyard Jordan de Exeter Maurice FitzMaurice Meiler de Rupe Andrew le Poher Jordan de Exeter, jr.	Oct.1253-1254 c.1258 from Nov.1259 Feb.61-Sept.62 Oct.1268-69 from Mich.1269	killed by Hebridean pirates with castle Athlone during pleasure presumably son of earlier sheriff	38 RepDKI, p.89 A.Conn, p.126; ALCe, pp.427-9 725; C61/4 m.5; CDI 631 35 RepDKI, p.44 35 RepDKI, p.49 36 RepDKI, p.28
Castle Connell	Geoffrey le Bret Theobald Butler	Oct.1261-1262 from July 1272	farmer for £81/5/1 p.a.	35 RepDKI, p.43 C.Om.Deeds, p.76:36 RepDKI, p.31
Co. Cork	W. de la Rochelle William de Dene (John FitzThomas David de Barry Robert de Stapleton Milo le Bret	1254-5 Apr.59-Mar.60 1260-d.July 61 1261 1262 Sept.1263-70	granted in fee during minority heirs FitzT	JRSAI 1905, p.44; C.Carew Ms.p.432 35 RepDKI, p.37 35 RepDKI, p.37:Table 2 36 RepDKI, p.43 36 RepDKI, pp.43,50 35 RepDKI, p.49: 44 RepDKI
Desmond	Richard de Carew	pre d.1272	seneschal; during minority heir FitzT	A.Inisfallen, pp.370-1
Archbishopric Dublin	Thomas de Cheddeworth Walter de la Haye	from July 1271 July 1271-72	keeper; granted to E during vacancy to help crusade expenses receiver issues under Thomas	CDI 1136-7: Harris C, p.301: CPR 66-72, p.540: C62/52 m.3, 55 m.5 C62/55 m.5: 36 RepDKI, p.23
Castle of Dublin	William Picot/ Ralph de Evere Ralph of Norwich	c.Dec.1264- -April 1265 Oct.1265-66	defended castle during captivity Richard de la Rochelle constable	35 RepDKI, p.47
County of Dublin	Ralph de Evere Robert de Clahull Robert de Thurlby Henry de Gorham	Jan.1258 Oct.1260-62 Oct.70-May 72 May 1272-73	sheriff	2 RepRCI, p.52 Lydon, p.25: 678 35 RepDKI, pp.39,43 36 RepDKI, p.25; CDI 889,1053 36 RepDKI, pp.27,45: CDI 1053

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Honour, castle & county of Dungarven	John le Poher	Jan-Apr.1258	keeper	Lydon, p.25:691
	John FitzThomas	c.Oct.58-d.61	apparently keeper before grant	Curtis,p.5
	Will. le Erodeacone	July-Nov.1261	on death John FitzThomas	Curtis,p.8;35 RepDKI,39
	Robert FitzWarin	Nov.1261-Apr.62	" "	" "
	W. de la Rochelle	April 1262-3	with county Waterford	Curtis,pp.2-4
	John de Baskerville	c.1270-1272	sheriff/keeper castle under Audley	El01/230/2 m.4
	William de London	c.1270-1272	appointed constable by Audley	CDI 1242: OCR 72-9,p.303
	Walter de la Haye	by Nov.1272-82	with county of Waterford	36 RepDKI,pp.24,27,38,65
Greencastle	?Robert Gelus	c.Jan.1260	organised repairs to castle	35 RepDKI,p.41:2 RepRCI,p.II,3
Co. Kerry	Walter de Brickell	Oct.1253-5	sheriff	Gerrard transcripts,p.252
	Maurice FitzMaurice	Sept.57-Apr.59	sheriff	43 RepDKI,p.50
	John FitzThomas	Nov.59-July 61	hereditary shrievalty	see Table 2
	Walter Uncle	pre Oct.65-66		36 RepDKI,p.58
	Maurice FitzMaurice	Apr.1267-69	sheriff, perhaps from 1265	36 RepDKI,pp.43,58
	Milo de Curcy	Apr.69-May 72	sheriff	36 RepDKI,p.58
	Maurice FitzMaurice	from May 1272	sheriff	36 Rep.DKI,p.58
Co.Kildare	Roger de Penbroc	Oct.1260-61	seneschal, account suggests held earlier	35 RepDKI,p.38
	Rob. de Hardsacris	Oct.1261-62	seneschal	35 RepDKI,p.42
	John de Athy	c.Oct.70-73	deputy seneschal	36 RepDKI,p.23
Co. Kilkenny	William de Dene	?Oct.1260-61	seneschal	35 RepDKI,pp.38,44
	John de Cogan	Oct.1261-62	seneschal	35 RepDKI,p.44
	John de Clare	Oct.1265-67	seneschal, deputy, Robert de Callan	35 RepDKI,p.47
Knockfergus	?Robert Gelus	c.Jan.1260	?constable with Dundrum and Greencastle	35 RepDKI,p.41;2 RepRCI,p.II,3
county of Limerick	John FitzThomas	Sept.57-Feb.59	did not account for profits justice	38 RepDKI,p.74
	John de Musgrove	Oct.1260-62, 1266-67,72-3	arrears suggest held in 1259: perhaps held continuously 1259-73,deputy R.Bagod	35 RepDKI,pp40,41,47: 36 RepDKI,pp.25,51
Honour of O'Connor	John de Hynterburg	Oct.1260-62	sheriff Tipperary;waste by war 1260-1	35 RepDKI,p.43
	Robert FitzWarin/ Will. le Waraner	Oct.1262-64	keepers	35 RepDKI,p.48
Randown	James de Bermingham	c.1270	fined 400 marks for negligence when castle sacked by Felim O'Connor c.1270	36 RepDKI,p.50
Roscommon	?Richard de Exeter	c.1270	munitioned, ?only as deputy justiciar	El01/230/2 m.3; CDI 891

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
Co. Tipperary	John de Hynterburg	Oct.1260-62	deputy: Thomas Fythend for him	35 RepDKI, p.40,43, cf. Curtis, p.5
	Theobald Butler	Oct.1264-Apr.66		35 RepDKI, p.48
	Nich. de Stafford	Apr-Sept.1266		35 RepDKI, p.48
	Otto de Grandson	Oct.1266-1273	deputy: W. de Waleye, J. de Coventry	35 RepDKI, pp.48,50; 36 Rep, p.25
Twescard	Henry de Mandeville	Nov.1259-61	custos/bailiff; unpopular	35 RepDKI, p.40: Facs II 73: Curtis, p.10: CPR 72-81, p.8
Ulster	Hubert de Ruyly	Apr.1253-54	seneschal?	Gerrard, p.221:39 RepDKI, p.51; CDI 1037
	Peter de Repenteny	Apr.1254-55	seneschal	"": CDI 412:83; C61/2 m.11
	unknown	Oct.1257-58	led expedition in Ulster with justiciar	Gilbert, <u>Viceroy</u> , p.519,
	Nich. de Dunheved	Oct.1259-61	seneschal, farmed at 300 m.	Facs II, 73:35 RepDKI, p.40
	Henry de Mandeville	Aug.1271-72	keeper after death Earl of Ulster	36 Rep. DK1, pp.32-3
William FitzWarin	from Aug.1272		"": C62/59 m.7: SCL/12/192: CDI 1032	
Uryel	William Talun	Oct.1260-62	sheriff; under seneschal Ulster?	35 Rep. DK1, p.39,42
	William de Bagepuz	Oct.65-Apr.67	sheriff; deputy: Roger de Crambe	35 RepDKI, p.46
	John de Fishide	Apr-Oct.1267	" "	35 RepDKI, p.46
	John de ?	Oct.67-Apr.70	?Fishide or Pychford; deputy: Crambe	35 Rep. DK1, p.50
	John de Pychford	c.1270-72		CDI 889; E101/230/2 m.2
William Talun	Nov.1272-76		36 Rep. DK1, pp.24,26	
County of Waterford	W. de la Rochelle	Oct.61-Apr.63	with Dungarven and Twescard,	Curtis, pp.2-4:36 RepDKI, p.28
	John FitzThomas	Nov.59-d.61	hereditary shrievalty	35 RepDKI, p.38: PRIA/39/C, p.5,7
	Robert FitzWarin	1262-1263	in minority heir FitzThomas	Curtis, p.8
	John de Baskerville	c.1270-72	with honour Dungarven	CDI 889: E101/230/2 m.2,4
	William de London	c.1270-72	" "	"": CDI 1242: OCR 72-9, p.303
Walter de la Haye	from Nov.1272	" " "	36 RepDKI, pp.24,27,30,38,65	
County of Wexford	Henry FitzHenry	Oct.1260-61	seneschal	35 RepDKI, p.38
	Richard Danyel	Oct.1261-62	" "	35 RepDKI, p.45, 36 RepDKI, p.24
	Walter de Redesham	Sept.1263-75	seneschal for William de Valence	36 RepDKI, pp.24,26
Channel Islands				
:bailiffs	Richard de Grey	1252-Sept.55	at farm: son, John as deputy	Studd 116,360; C61/3 m.2,2: E372/98 m.1d: E368/31 m.5: C. Iles Normandes 15: CPR 47-58, p.272
	Payn de la More	by Apr.56, Jun.57		CPR 47-58, p.469: SCR, p.28: E368/36 m.6,37 m.16
	Drew de Barentin	by 5 Jul.58, & Nov.59	"custos insule Gemesere": by May 1259 combined with seneschalcy Gascony	SJ Ext.1274, pp.16,20-3: CPR 47-58, p.640, 72-81, p.435: C. Iles N, 28-30: Studd 713; C61/4 m.5: E159/36 m.4d

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
	William de Barentin Hugh de Turberville	by Nov.67-69 by 21 June 69 & 26 Sept.70	"ballivus insularum" compensated for loss farm when transferred to Gascony	Studd 957:C.IlesN 73,98,342 C.IlesN 73-4,99-100,111,134: C62/50 m.8: Devon, p.85
	Arnold-John de Contis	June 71-Nov.75	farmer:inquiry reveals corruption	CPR 72-81, pp.82,90,292: SJ Ext1274passim: RG II 386,993: CFR, p.62: C62/56 m.9
<b>Gascony</b> :seneschal	Richard de Grey	from Oct.1253	appointed by king	CPR 47-58,p.244
	Stephen Bauzan	c.Aug.1254-Aug. 1255	initially named seneschal for Bordeaux & Bazas regions, by Oct.54 addressed as Seneschal Gascony	48,50,246,290;C61/1 m.2, 2 m.8, 3 m.2: CR 53-4,pp.282,310:RG II 1634:RecFeod.401:AHG II p.251:
	Peter de Bordeaux	by 28 Sept.55, & Oct.1255	deputy or lieutenant to seneschal	437,439,452-3,488,546,581;RG I ii 4557,4669;C61/2 mm.3,4, 3 m.1;
	Stephen Longespée	30 Sept.1255 after Oct.57	July 1255 king sent him to Gascony, & nominated as seneschal	CPR 47-58,p.416: 440,615;C61/2 m.1 3 m.1:RecFeod.197,396,398 CR 1254-6,p.219
	Geoff. de Lusignan	c.June 1258, revoked July	unlikely to have acted; anti-Poitevin factions quash appointment	CPR 47-58,p.664; C66/72 m.6d.: Foed I i p.374:
	Drew de Barentin	acting May 59 Nov.1259-60	1 year fee of 4,000 L.Bord. Had to keep 10 knights and serjeants out of fee	CR 56-9,pp.478-9: 720-1;C61/4 m.5; RecFeod.408
	Guy de Lusignan	end.Jan/Feb. 1261	"tenens locum carissimi nepoti nostri domini Edwardi in Vasconia";	Cuttino GR A 99/7:831-3;C61/4 m.1: AHG I 188
	Henry de Cusances	6 Dec.1261 > after Mar.64		RecFeod. 424,379-93,483:L.Etab.B 15 L.Hamm3,505: L.N.Dax 23:
	Queen Eleanor of Provence	c.June 1264- July 1265	clearly acting for E during captivity: issued orders to his officers:contracted loans: issued charters in name E	RecFeod.503: L.N.Dax 23:T-Cadmin, pp.292:Cuttino GR A 166,169:Gouron 1425,1478:AHG VI 1
	Arnold-William Eymeric	June 1264	"vices gerens senescalli", acting with Albret and Montgauger under Q.Eleanor	L.N.Dax 23
	Peter de Bordeaux	June-Sept.64	June, "tenens locum in senescalcia Vasc: Aug. seneschal: under Q.Eleanor;	L.N.Dax 23 RecFeod.503;
	Amanieu d'Albret John de Grailly	23 Feb.1266 by Oct.1266- after May 68	described by king as seneschal Gascony ?acting Feb.1266; 1268 joint with Ippegrave	CR 64-8,p.173 926-7;E36/274f.225?:C47/25/1/2:CPR 58-66,p.679,66-72,p.24:RecFeod.484; RG II 1184,1750: Martène, Thes, 1123 Marca, p.616:RecFeod.397,404,414-5: AHG V 4:RG II 453,1750:E372/121 m.22 KB26/194 m.9
	Thomas de Ippegrave	by 14 Nov.68- -after March, ?August 1269	originally jointly +Grailly;alone by Nov	Marca, p.616:RecFeod.397,404,414-5: AHG V 4:RG II 453,1750:E372/121 m.22 KB26/194 m.9
	Fortaner de Casenova	by 30 Oct-Dec 69:May 70	seneschal; ?demoted to deputy by appointment Leyburn	T-C admin p.38: RG II 769, 1032: RecFeod.417,473,477

Place	Person	Date	Comments	References
	Roger de Leyburn	24 Nov.1269, >after Oct.70 ? 1271	"vices gerens dominin E in Vasconia"; ?intended to cover E's absence in East during E's absence on crusade:	Dubuisson I,pp.233-54: CPR 66-72,pp.297,396,479:L.N.Dax 18: Gouron 54,863,1200,1844:RecFeod.70, 365,416,473:RG II 157,409,479,1042 CPR 66-72,pp.542,652,661:L.Hamm 27 " "
	Hugh de Turberville	Jun.71-May 72	seneschal	
	Bruno de Saye	7 April 1272	deputy to Turberville	
	Thomas de Clare	18 May/Jun.72	"gerentes vices domini E":sent on return from crusade "quando credebatur quod Rex Francie impugnasset Vasconiam"	CPR 66-72,p.652: E372/125 m.3; RecFeod.505-6,508: T-C admin,p.220
	Luke de Tany	18 May 1272- July 1278	sent to join Clare; attested jointly, Clare as lieutenant, Tany as seneschal: replaced after complaints	CPR 66-72,pp.652,661:Feod I i 494: RecFeod.452,470, 505-6: T-C admin p.57
	Arnold de Bogio & Bertrand de Ladils	by May 1270 & July 1270	deputy: he and Bertrand Ladils acted for Leyburn in 1270	RG II 375: Gouron 1352: RecFeod. 416
constable of Bordeaux	Roger de Frampton	by Oct.1254- Oct.1255	included custody Exchequer Bordeaux	CR 53-4,p.281:221,223,477, 604;C61/2 m.1,9, 3 m.1:
	Bernard Ayzon	by 25 Oct.1255 -?Aprill257	arrears wages from 3 Jan.1255, ?payment for other services to E	RG I ii 4660:CPR 47-58,p.549: 573(?interp),589;C61/2 m.1,3 m.1 717;C61/4 m.5; RG II 888 " " "
	Raymond Macayn	by Nov,Dec.59	?acting with William de Salines	
	William de Salines	?Nov.1259	with Macayn "tunc constabulariis Burd"	
	William Gauger/ Montgauger	by 26 Dec.1261 -after Oct.69	1261 described as receiver with Rama: later referred to as constable	RG II 172,453,769,1516: L.N.Dax 23: RecFeod.417,477:874;C61/7I m.10: CPR 72-81, pp.90,102 RecFeod. 6: RG II 1516;874; C61/7I m.10:
	William de Rama	c.1261<	co-receiver:cf. charter dated "tempore quo M. W. de Rama erat castellanus"	E372/125 m.3;SCL/8/13:RG II 1534:CPR 72-81,pp.90,102
	Laurence de Lovershal	by 8 Aug.1272		

Officials of the central Irish administration, and bailiffs, prevots and minor officials in the Gascon administration have been omitted, since these are listed by Richardson and Sayles, Administration of Ireland, pp.92-140, and Trabut-Cussac, L'administration anglaise en Gascogne, pp.341-70. Justiciars Ireland, Seneschals of Gascony, and constables of Bordeaux are adapted from R&S, pp. 78-81, and T-C, pp.371-8, with some modifications. See Le Patourel, Adminstration of the Channel islands for further information on bailiffs.

BIBLIOGRAPHYPrimary sources:a) Manuscript:

Bodleian Library, Oxford: Ms Top.Glouc. c.9  
Ms. Laud Mis.614

## Hereford:

Hereford Cathedral Dean and Chapter, Charters 2932,2947,1402  
Hereford Diocesan Record Office: Register of Bishop Thomas Cantilupe

## London:

## British Library:

Additional Charters 19829, 26515,46918  
Additional Manuscripts 6041, 28024, 35179  
Cottonian Charters XXIX 65  
Cottonian Manuscripts Nero C III  
Egerton Charters 255, 2125  
Harleian Charters 43 C 42, 43 C 48, 43 C 49, 44 E 22  
Harleian Manuscripts 1071, 1965, 2072, 3759

Corporation of London Record Office: Letter-book C

## Public Record Office:

## Chancery:

Miscellanea (C47) 2/1/5,6,8,12;  
3/5/34,42; 3/7/1,34,49; 3/21/44; 3/43/6,7;  
9/1; 9/52/8,11;  
10/13/4,6,8,11-6,20; 10/14/1,13; 10/17/1,13; 10/18/5; 10/32/1;  
11/2/3,4; 13/1/5; 14/6/2,4-6; 25/1.2;  
35/1/9,131,141,185,193-4; 35/4/8; 35/5/2,13,14,17; 35/6/45,49; 35/8/33,  
35/10/48; 35/12/1,2; 35/14/1,6-41,54; 35/17/5; 35/18/9;  
Charter Rolls (C53) 47-61, 65, 69, 93, 117  
Close Rolls (C54) 73, 74, 97, 100  
Fine Rolls (C60) 66-70  
Gascon Rolls (C61) 1-4, 69, 91  
Liberate Rolls (C62) 49-61  
Miscellaneous Inquisitions (C145) 3, 7, 11, 14, 16, 17, 25, 33  
Patent Rolls (C66) 64-92, 95, 97, 100, 119, 210

## Exchequer:

Exchequer Plea Rolls (E13) 1 c,d,e,f, 2  
E32/30  
Treasury of Receipt, Books (E36) 274, 275  
Kings Remembrancer, Various Accounts (E101)  
126/1; 230/2,7; 308/1,2; 349/8, 12,14-15, 18-24, 26-30; 350/1-16,24  
547/25; 601/1,22-24; 619/1; 684/54/1;  
Kings Remembrancer, Memoranda Rolls (E159) 27-48  
E163/1/9; E175/1/1  
Chancellors Roll (E352) 43,46  
Lord Treasurers Remembrancer, Memoranda Rolls (E368) 29-47

Originalia Rolls (E371) 20-37  
Pipe Rolls (E372) 95-121, 125

Records of the Palatinate of Chester:  
Plea Rolls Chester (Ches29) 1  
Miscellanea (Ches 38) 47/1

Special Collections:

Ancient Correspondence (SC1) 1/2/32,106,127; 2/168; 3/34,44, 71,75,76;  
4/106,154-5,174; 5/26-7,53; 7/78,100,167,180,185; 8/9-33,49,86; 10/5;  
11/24-26,161; 12/1-16; 14/10, 121-124; 16/32,171; 17/69,189; 18/7,8; 20/46;  
22/36,50,69,77,80,190; 24/68;  
Ministers Accounts (SC6) 1078/78, 1087/6, 1094/11

Legal Records:

(KB26) 158-169, 172-178,180-182,184-201,210  
(KB27) 70,71  
(Just1) 42, 83, 59, 237, 456, 569, 873, 911, 954, 955, 1167, 1187, 1188, 1189,  
1193, 1202, 1207, 1211

b) Published

'An abstract of Feet of Fines referring to the county of Sussex, from 34 Henry III to 35 Edward I', ed. IF Salzman, Sussex Record Society 7 (1907).

Accounts of the Constables of Bristol castle in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, ed. M. Sharp (Bristol record Society 34, 1982).

Archives historiques du département de la Gironde, 58 vols. (1859-1932) especially I,II,III, V,VIII, XXXVII, XLIII.

Archivo generale de Navarre, vol. 1, 842-1331, ed. JR Castro (1952).

The Beauchamp Cartulary Charters, 1100-1268 ed. E Mason (Pipe Roll Society, NS 47 1971-3/1980).

The Black Book of Limerick, ed. J MacCaffrey (Dublin, 1907).

Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-5. Presented to John Goronwy Edwards, ed. EB Fryde (Oxford, 1962).

Bristol Charters, 1155-1373 ed. N Dermot, 1378-1499, ed. HA Cronne, (Bristol Record Society, vol.1, 1930, vol.11, 1946).

Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales, ed. JG Edwards (Cardiff, 1935).

Calendar of Archbishop Alen's Register, c.1172-1534, ed. C McNeill (RSAL, 1950).

Calendar of Carew Mss, ed. Brewer and Bullen (Rolls Series, 1871).

Calendar of County Court, City Court and Eyre Rolls of Chester, 1259-97, ed. R Stewart-Brown, (Chetham Society, New series 84, 1925).

Calendar of Documents relating to Ireland, preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record office, London, ed. HS Sweetman and GF Handcock, 5 vols. (PRO 1875-86).

Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland, preserved in the Public Records Office, ed. J Bain, GG Simpson, JD Galbraith, 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1881-8, 1986).

Calendar of entries in the papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, vol.1 ed. WH Bliss (PRO 1893).

Calendar of inquisitions miscellaneous (chancery) preserved in the Public Records Office. 3 vols (PRO 1916-37).

Calendar of inquisitions post mortem and other analagous documents preserved in the Public Records Office, 14 vols (PRO 1914-54).

Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of London, 1275-98, A-L, ed. RR Sharpe, 11 vols. (1899-1912).

A Calendar of New Forest Documents, 1244-1324, ed. DJ Stagg (Hampshire Record Society, Winchester 1979).

Calendar of Ormond Deeds, ed. E Curtis, 6 vols. (Irish MSS Commission, 1932-43).

Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Records Office, 1226-1516, 6 vols (PRO 1903-27).

Calendar of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward I, II, III (PRO 1892-1913).

Calendar of the Fine Rolls preserved in the Public Records Office, Edward I, II (PRO 1911-).

Calendar of the Gormanston Register, ed. J Mills and MJ McEnery, (RSAI, 1916).

Calendar of the Justiciary rolls or proceedings in the court of the justiciar of Ireland, preserved in the Public Record of Ireland, ed. J Mills, 2 vols (Irish Record Office, 1905-14).

Calendar of the Liberate Rolls preserved in the Public Records Office, Henry III, 6 vols. (PRO 1917-64).

Calendar of the Liber Niger and Liber Albus of Christ Church, Dublin, (PRIA, 27/C, 1908).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Records Office, Henry III, Edward I, II, III (PRO 1891-).

Calendar of the plea rolls of the exchequer of the Jews preserved in the Public Record Office, ed. JM Rigg and H Jenkinson, 3 vols (Jewish Historical society of England, 3, 1905-29).

Calendar of various Chancery rolls (supplementary close rolls, Welsh rolls, scutage rolls) preserved in the Public Records Office, 1277-1326 (PRO, 1912)

Calendar of Wills proved and enrolled in the Court of Hustings, London, 1259-1358, ed. RR Sharpe, 2 vols. (London, 1889).

Cartulaire des fies Normandes; recueil des documents concernant l'histoire de ces fies conservés aux archives du département de la Manche et du Calvados, de la Bibliothèque Nationale, du Bureau des Rôles, du chateau de Warwick, etc. (Societe Jersiasse, 36, 1924).

Cartulaire générale de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jerusalem; 1100-1310, ed. JMA Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols. (Paris 1899-1902).

The Cartulary of Blyth Priory, ed. RT Timson (Thoroton society Record Series, 27-8 /HMSO, 1973).

The Cartulary of Oseney Abbey, ed. HE Salter, 6 vols (Oxford Historical Society, 1929-36).

The Cartulary of St. Mark's Hospital, Bristol ed. CD Ross (Bristol Record Society, 21, 1959).

Catalogue des chartes de franchises de la France: Volume 2, Les chartes de franchises de Guienne et Gascogne, ed. M Gouron, (1935).

Chartae, privilegia et immunitates; being transcripts of charters and privileges to cities, towns, abbeys and other bodies corporate [in Ireland], 1171-1395 (Irish Record Commission, 1899).

Chartularies of St. Mary's Abbey, Dublin; with the register of its house at Dunbrody ed. JT Gilbert, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 80, 1884).

The Chartulary or Register of the Abbey of St. Werburgh, Chester, ed. J Tait (Chetham Society, new series, LXXIX, LXXXII, 1920-3).

Chester in the Pipe Rolls, 1158-1301 transcribed from 1237 by MH Mills, ed. R Stewart-Brown. (Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society 92, 1938).

Close Rolls of the reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Records Office, 14 vols (PRO 1902-38).

Close Rolls (supplementary) of the reign of Henry III, 1244-1266, ed. A Morton (PRO, 1975).

'Copy of a roll of purchases made for the tournament of Windsor Park in the Sixth year of King Edward I, preserved in the record office of the Tower', ed. S. Lysons, Archaeologia 17 (1814), pp.217-310.

Correspondance administrative d'Alfonse de Poitiers, ed. A Molinier, 3 vols (Paris 1894-1900).

Coucher book of Whalley Abbey, ed. WA Hulton, 4 vols. (Chetham Society, Old series, 10, 11, 16, 20, 1847-9).

The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290, ed. JC Parsons, (Toronto, 1977).

Coutumier d'Oléron, ed. C. Bémont (Extrait du Bulletin philologique et historique, 117: Paris, 1919).

Crede Mihi: the most ancient register book of the archbishops of Dublin before the reformation, ed. JT Gilbert (Dublin, 1897).

Crown pleas of the Wiltshire Eyre, 1249, ed. CAF Meekings (Wiltshire Record Society, 16, 1961).

Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, 31st. Annual Report.

Deputy Keeper of the Public Records of Ireland, 35-39, 43, 44th. Annual Reports (1903-1912).

A descriptive catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Records Office, 6 vols. (London, 1890-1915)

Descriptive Catalogue of the Charters and Muniments in the possession of the Rt.Hon. Lord FitzHardinge at Berkeley castle, compiled etc. IH Jeayes (Bristol, 1892).

Diplomatic Documents in the Public Records Office, Volume 1, 1101-1272, ed. P. Chaplais, (HMSO, 1964)

Documents on the affairs of Ireland before the King's Council, ed. GO Sayles (Irish MSS Commission, 1979).

Documents illustrative of English history in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, selected from the records of the queen's remembrancer of the exchequer, edited by Henry Cole. (Record Commissions, 1844).

Documents of the baronial movement of reform and rebellion, selected RF Treharne, ed. IJ Sanders (Oxford, 1973).

Documents relating to the medieval province of Armagh, ed. A Gwynn, (Archivium Hibernicum 13, 1947), pp.1-29.

Excerpta e Rotulis Finium in Turri Londinensi asservatis, Henrico tertio rege, AD 1216-1272, 2 vols. (Record Commissions, 1835-6)

Extente des îles de Jersey, Guernsey, Aurigny et Sark; suivie des inquisitions dans les îles de Jersey et Guernsey, 1274, Edouard I (Societe Jersiaise, 3 1877).

Facsimiles of the National Mss of Ireland, ed. JT Gilbert, part II (Ordnance Survey Office, 1878).

Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cuiuscunque generis acta publica, inter reges Angliae et alios imperatores, reges, pontifices, principes, vel communitates... Accurante Thoma Rymer, 4 vols. (Record Commission ed. 1816-69).

- The Gascon Calendar of 1322, ed. GP Cuttino (Camden Society, Third Series, 70, 1949).
- Gascon Register A (Series of 1318-9) ed. GP Cuttino and J-P Trabut-Cussac, 3 vols. (London 1975-7).
- Harris Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis, ed. C McNeill (A.Hib VI, 1934), pp.248-449.
- Historic and municipal documents of Ireland, AD 1172-1320, ed. JT Gilbert (Rolls Series, 53, 1870).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, 12: Calendar of the manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells; Tenth Report, Appendix C, 1885; 2 vols, 1907-14, 69: Middleton Mss, 77: De Lisle and Dudley Mss.
- Historical papers and letters from the northern registers, ed. J Raine (Rolls Series, 61, 1873).
- The Irish Cartularies of Llantonny Prima et Secunda, ed. ESTJ Brooks (Irish Mss Commission, 1953).
- The Kniveton Leiger, ed. a Satman (HMSO 24, 1977).
- The Langley Cartulary ed. PR Coss (Dugdale Society, 32, 1980).
- Layettes du Trésor des Chartes. Inventaire et documents publiés par la direction des archives, ed. A Teulet et al, 5 vols. (Paris 1863-1909)
- The Ledger Book of Vale Royal Abbey, ed. J Brownbill (Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 68, 1914).
- Lettres de rois, reines et autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre depuis Louis VII jusqu'au Henri IV, tirées des archives de Londres par Bréquigny, ed. Champollion-Figeac (1839).
- Liber Feodorum. The book of fees commonly called Testa de Nevill, 2 vols. in 3 (Public Records Office, 1920-31).
- Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobe anno regni regis Edwardi primi vicesimo octavo (1299-1300), ed. J Topham (London, 1787).
- Littere Wallie preserved in the Liber A in the public record office, ed. JG Edwards (Cardiff, 1940).
- Le Livre d'Agenais, ed. GP Cuttino (1956).
- Le Livre des Coutumes de Bordeaux.
- Livre des Etablissements de Bayonne (Archives municipales de Bayonne, 1892).
- Le Livre des Hommages d'Aquitaine: restitution du second livre noir de la connetablie de Bordeaux, ed. J-P Trabut-Cussac (Bordeaux, 1959).

Le Livre Noir de Dax, ed. F. Abbadie (AHG XXXVII, 1902).

The London Eyre of 1276, ed. M Weinbaum (London Record Society 12, 1976).

Lord Chancellor Gerrard's Transcripts from Irish Records (Bodleian Rawlinson MS D 657), ed. C McNeill (A. Hib II, 1931, pp.93-291).

'Mandements inédits d'Alfonse de Poitiers, comte de Toulouse', ed. Molinier, Annales du Midi XII (1900), pp.289-323.

Manners and Household Expenses of England in the Thirteenth Century (Roxburghe Club 57, 1841).

Monasticon Anglicanum, William Dugdale, 6 vols. (1817-30).

Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, Edw.I-EdwI, ed. F Palgrave, 2 vols. in 4 (London, 1827-34).

Placita de Quo Warranto, ed. W Illingworth, 2 vols. (Record commission, 1818).

Placitorum in domo capitulari Westmonasteriensi asservatorum abbreviatio, temporibus regum Ric.I, Johann., Henr III, Edw. I, Edw. II, ed. w. Illingworth (Record Commissions, 1811).

'Plea Rolls temp. Henry III. Suits affecting Staffordshire tenants', abstracted G. Wrottesley. William Salt Archaeological Society, IV i (1883) VII, (1885).

The Political songs of England from the reign of John to that of Edward II, ed. T Wright (Camden Society, Old Series 6, 1839).

Receuil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, ed. M Bouquet et al, 24 vols. (Paris 1737-1904).

Recogniciones Feodorum. Recueil d'Actes relatifs à l'administration d'Angleterre en Guyenne en XIII siecle, ed. C Bémont (Paris 1914).

Records of the Wardrobe and Household, I, 1285-6, II, 1286-9, ed. BF Byerly and CR Byerly (1977, 1986).

Regesta Anglo-Normannorum, III, ed. Cronne and Davies.

Register of Bishop Godfrey Giffard, 1268-1301, ed. JW Willis-Bund, 2 vols. (Worcestershire Historical Society, 1898-1902)

Register of the Hospital of St. John the Baptist without the New Gate, Dublin, ed. ESTJ Brooks (1936).

The Register of Walter Giffard, Lord Archbishop of York, 1266-79, ed. J Raine (Surtees Society 56, 1872).

The Registers of Walter Bronescombe and Peter Quivil, Bishops of Exeter, ed. FC Hingeston-Randolph (London 1889).

The Registers of Walter Giffard, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1265-6, and of Henry Bowett, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1401-7, ed. TS Holmes (Somerset Record Society, 13, 1899).

Les Régistres de Gregoire X, ed. J Guiraud, 4 vols. (1892-1906).

Les Régistres d'Innocent IV, ed. E Berger 3 vols. (1884-1921).

Les Régistres d'Urbain IV, ed. L Dorez and J Guiraud (1899-1958).

Registrum Epistolarum Johannis Peckham, ed. CT Martin, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1882-4).

Registrum Thome de Cantilupo, episcopi Herefordensis, AD MCCLXXV-MCCLXXXII, transcribed RG Griffiths, introduced WW Capes (Canterbury and York Society, 2. 1907).

Report touching the Dignity of a Peer, (Journal of the House of Lords, 61, 1829).

Reports of the Commissioners respecting the Public Records of Ireland. 2nd. Annual Report (March 1812).

'Un rôle de lettres patentes emanées du prince Edouard pendant son séjour en Gascogne (Mai-Octobre 1254)' ed. J-P Trabut-Cussac, Recueil des travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel (Paris, 1955).

'Un rôle Gascon de Lettres Cluses expediees par la chancellerie du Prince Edouard fils aîné du roi d'Angleterre, Henri III, 1254-5', ed. C Bemont, Bulletin Philologique et Historique, (1915), pp.92-139.

Rôles Gascons, v. I ed. F Michel; v.I supplement, II, III, ed.C Bemont (Paris, 1185-1906).

Rotuli Hundredorum temp. Hen.III et Edw. I in turr' Lond' et in curiae receptae scaccarii West. asservati ed. W. Illingworth, 2 vols. (Record Commission, 1812-18).

Rotuli Ricardi Gravesend, diocesis Lincolnensis, 1258-79, ed. FN Davis et al. (Lincoln Record Society, 20, 1925).

Rotuli selecti ad res Anglicas et Hibernicas spectantes, ex archivis in domo capitulari West-monasteriensi deprompti. Cura Joseph Hunter (Record Commission, 1834).

Rotulorum Originalium in curia scaccarii abbrevatio, 2 vols. (Record Commissions, 1805-10).

Royal charters and historical documents relating to Carmarthen, ed. Evans and Daniel-Tyssen (1878).

Royal and other historical letters illustrative of the reign of Henry III, from the originals in the Public Records Office, ed. WW Shirley, 2 vols (Rolls series 27, 1862-8).

Select cases before the king's council, 1243-1482, ed. IS Leadam and J Baldwin (Selden Society 35, 1918).

Select cases concerning the law merchant, ed. C Gross and H Hall (Selden Society 23,46,48 1908, 1930, 1932).

Select cases from the ecclesiastical courts of the province of Canterbury, c.1200-1301 ed. N Adams and C Donahue jr. (Selden Society 95, 1978-9).

Select cases in the court of king's bench under Edward I, ed. GO Sayles (Selden society 55,57,58, 1936, 1938, 1939).

Select cases in the exchequer of pleas, ed. H Jenkinson and BER Formoy (Selden Society 48, 1932).

Select cases of procedure without writ under Henry III, ed. GO Sayles and HG Richardson (Selden Society 60, 1941).

Select pleas of the forest, ed. GJ Turner (Selden Society, 13, 1901).

Select pleas, starrs and other records from the rolls of the exchequer of the Jews, 1220-1284, ed JM Rigg (Selden Society 15, 1902).

'Sheriff's accounts of the Honor of Dungarven, of Twescard in Ulster, and of County Waterford', ed. E Curtis, PRIA, 39/C (1929), pp.1-17.

Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals, ed. LC Lloyd and DM Stenton (Oxford, 1950).

Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, ed. E Martène and U Durand 5 vols. (Paris 1717).

'Three Exchequer Documents from the Reign of Henry III', JF Lydon, PRIA 65/C (1966) pp.1-27.

'Three Yorkshire Assize Rolls from the reigns of King John and King Henry III', ed. CT Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, (Record Series 44 1910), pp.88-139 (Assize Roll 1049).

Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum dogmaticorum moralium. Amplissimus Collectio, ed. E Martène and U Durand (Paris 1724).

The Wardrobe book of William de Norwell, ed. M Lyon, B Lyon, HS Lucas, with J de Sturler (1983).

#### Narrative Sources

Academia Tertia Anglicana: antiquarian annals of Stamford ed. Peck (1727).

Annales Cambriae, ed. J Williams ab Ithel (Rolls Series, 20, 1860).

Annales Cestriensis: or Chronicle of the Abbey of St.Werburgh, Chester, ed. RC Christie (Lancashire and Cheshire Record society, XIV, 1886).

- 'Annales Londonienses 1195-1330', in Volume One, Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II, ed. W Stubbs (Rolls series, 76, 1882)
- Annales Monastici, ed HR Luard, 4 vols (Rolls Series, 36, 1864-9).
- The Annals of Connacht, ed. A Martin Freeman (Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1944).
- The Annals of Innisfallen, ed. S Mac Airt (Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1951).
- Annals of Loch Cé, ed. WM Hennessy, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 54, 1871).
- Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters 7 vols. (Dublin, 1848-71).
- Annals of Ulster, ed. WM Hennessy and B MacCarthy, 4 vols (Irish Record Commission, 1887-1901).
- Brut y Tywysogion, Peniarth Ms20 (Board of Celtic Studies History and Law series, 11, 1952).
- Brut y Tywysogion; or the chronicle of the princes, ed. J Williams ab Ithel (Rolls Series 17, 1860).
- Chronica Buriensis. The chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301, ed. A Gransden (1964)
- Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes, ed. H. Ellis (Rolls Series, 1859).
- Chronica monasterii de Melsa, a fundatione usque ad annum 1396, ed. EA Bond, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 43, 1866-8).
- Chronica Rogeri de Hovedene ed. W Stubbs, 4 vols. (Rolls Series, 1868-71).
- The Chronicle of Henry of Marlborough, in Bodleian Ms. Laud Misc.614
- The Chronicle of Melrose, AO, and MD Anderson, and WC Dickinson (1936)
- The Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the barons' wars ed. JO Halliwell, Camden Society, Old series 15, 1840).
- Chronicon Abbatiae Ramseiensis, ed. WD Macray (Rolls series, 83, 1886).
- Chroniques de London, depuis l'an 44 Hen.III jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw.III, ed. GW Aungier (Camden Society, Old Series, 28, 1844).
- Durham Annals and Documents of the Thirteenth Century (Surtees Society 155, 1945).
- L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la conquete de la terre d'Outremer, Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens Occidentaux II.

Flores historiarum, ed. HR Luard (Rolls series, 1890).

Les Gestes des Chiprois. Recueil des historiens des croisades. Documents Armeniens, II (Paris, 1960).

Henry of Huntingdon, Henrici archidiaconi Huntendunensis historia Anglorum ed. Thomas Arnold (Rolls Series, 1879).

Jacobi Grace Kilkenniensis, Annales Hiberniae, ed. R Butler (Irish Archaeological Society 2, 1842).

The historical works of Gervase of Canterbury, ed. W Stubbs, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 73, 1879-80).

The Kilkenny Chronicle in Cotton Ms. Vespasian B X I, ed. R Flower, (A.Hib II 1931 pp.330-340).

Liber de Antiquis Legibus; Chronica maiorum et vicecomitum Londoniarum, ed. T Stapleton (Camden Society, old series, vol.34, 1846).

The metrical chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, ed. WA Wright, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 86, 1887).

Matthew Paris, Chronica Maiora, ed. HR Luard, 7 vols (Rolls Series, 57, 1872-83).

Matthew Paris, Historia Anglorum sive historia minor, ed. F Madden, 3 vols (Rolls Series, 44, 1866-9).

Willelmi Rishanger, quondam monachi Sancti Albaniet quorundam anonymorum, chronica et annales, regnantibus Henrico tertio et Edwardo primo, 1259-1307, ed. HT Riley (Rolls Series, 28b 1865)

Nicholai Triveti Annales ed. T Hog (English historical Society, 1845).

Walter de Whitlesey, 'Historia Coenobii Burgensis', Historia Anglicanae Scriptorum Varii, ed. J Sparke (1724).

#### Secondary Works:

Altschul, M: A Baronial Family in Medieval England: the Clares, 1217-1314.

Baldwin, JF: 'The household administration of Henry de Lacy and Thomas of Lancaster', EHR, 42 (1927), pp.180-200.

Baldwin, JF: The King's Council (1913).

Ballard, A and Tait, J: British borough charters, 1042-1307, 2 vols. (London, 1913-23).

Barker, JRV: The Tournament in England, 1100-1400 (Woodbridge, 1986).

- Barraclough, G: 'The earldom and county palatine of Chester', THLSC, 103 (1951), pp.23-57.
- Bazeley, ML: 'The forest of Dean in its relations with the crown during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries', Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, 33 (1910), pp.153-186.
- Bean, JMW: The Decline of English Feudalism, 1215-1540 (Manchester, 1968).
- Beauséjour, G de: Pesmes et ses seigneurs du XII au XVII siècle. Première partie: du XII au XIV siècle. Maison de Pesmes et branches cadettes de la Resie, Rupt, Bougie et Valay (1896).
- Beebe, B: 'The English baronage and the crusade of 1270', BIHR 48 (1975), pp.127-148.
- Bémont, C: 'Les institutions municipales de Bordeaux au moyen âge', Revue Historique, CXXII (1916).
- Bémont, C, trans.Jacob EF: Simon de Montfort (Oxford, 1930).
- Berry, HF: 'Notes on an unpublished Ms. Inquisition AD 1258 relating to the Dublin city watercourse from the muniments of the earl of Meath' PRIA, 24/C.
- Blaauw, WH: 'On the early history of Lewes priory and its seals, with extracts from a MS chronicle', Sussex Archaeological Collections II (1849), pp.23-30.
- Blaauw, WH: The Barons' war, including the battles of Lewes and Evesham (2nd.ed.1871).
- Blomefield, F and Parkin, C: An essay towards a topographical history of the County of Norfolk, 11 vols. (London, 1805-10).
- Brown, RA: English Castles (1976).
- Brown, RA, Colvin, HM, Taylor AJ: The History of the King's Works. The Middle Ages, 2 vols (HMSO, 1963).
- Cam, H: The Hundred and the Hundred rolls (London, 1930).
- Cam, H: Studies in the Hundred Rolls: some aspects of thirteenth-century administration (Oxford, 1921).
- Carpenter, DA: 'The gold treasure of Henry III', pp. 61-88, Thirteenth Century England I, Proceedings of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Conference, ed. PR Coss and SD Lloyd (1985).
- Carpenter, DA: 'The Lord Edward's Oath to aid and counsel Simon de Montfort, 15 October 1259', BIHR, 58 (1985), pp.226-237.
- Carpenter, DA: 'Simon de Montfort and the Mise of Lewes', BIHR, 58 (1985), pp.106-119.

Carpenter, DA: 'What happened in 1258', pp. 106-118, War and Government in the Middle Ages, ed. JB Gillingham and JC Holt (Woodbridge, 1984).

Carus-Wilson, E: Medieval Merchant Venturers (Methuen, 3rd.ed. 1967).

Chaplais, P: 'The making of the Treaty of Paris and the royal style', EHR, 67 (1952), pp.235-254.

Chaplais, P: 'Le sceau du cour de Gascogne ou sceau de l'office de sénéchal de Guyenne', Annales du Midi, 67 (1955), pp.19-29.

Chaplais, P: 'Le traité de Paris de 1259 et l'inféodation de la Gascogne allodiale', Le Moyen Age, LVI (1955), pp.121-137

Clanchy, MT: 'The franchise of return of writs', TRHS, 5th.Series, 17 (1967), pp.59-79.

Clifford, E: A knight of great renown (1961).

Cockayne GE: Complete peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, ed. V. Gibbs et al 12 vols. (1912-59).

Coss PR: 'The Langley family and its cartulary: a study in late medieval gentry', Dugdale Society Occasional Papers, 22 (1974), pp.3-24.

Coss PR: 'Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the crisis of the knightly class in Thirteenth Century England', Past and Present 68 (1975), pp.3-37.

Cox, JC: The royal forests of England (Methuen, 1905).

Curtis, E: 'Feudal charters of the de Burgo Lordship of Connacht, 1237-1325, from the BM Add. Mss. 6041', pp. 286-295, Feil-sgríbhinn Eoin MhicNeill, ed. J Ryan (Dublin, 1940).

Cuttino, GP: 'A chancellor of the Lord Edward ', BIHR 50 (1977), pp.229-232.

Davies, JC: 'The Memoranda Rolls of the Exchequer to 1307', Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, pp.97-154 (1957).

Davies RR: Conquest, Co-existence and Change. Wales 1063-1415 (Oxford, 1987).

Delaborde, H-F: 'Un frère de Joinville au service de l'Angleterre: Geoffroy, Sire de Vaucouleurs', Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes, 54 (1893), pp.334-343.

Delaville le Roulx, JMA: Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre, 1100-1310 (1904).

Dendy, FW: 'An account of Jesmond', Archaeologia Aeliana, Third Series, I (1904), especially pp.30-52.

Denholm-Young, N: 'Documents of the Barons' wars', EHR 48 (1933), pp.558-575.

Denholm-Young, N: 'The "Paper Constitution" attributed to 1244', EHR, 58 (1943), pp.401-23.

Denholm-Young, N: Richard of Cornwall (New York 1947).

Denholm-Young, N: Seignorial administration in England (Oxford, 1937).

Denholm-Young, N: 'The tournament in the Thirteenth century', Studies in Medieval history presented to FM Powicke, ed. RW Hunt, WA Pantin, RW Southern (Oxford 1948), pp.240-268.

Denholm-Young, N: 'The Yorkshire estates of Isabel de Fortibus'. Yorkshire Archaeological Journal XXXI (1934), pp.389-420.

Dornon, A de Behault: 'La nobless hennuyère autournoi de Compiègne de 1238', Annales du Cercle Archéologique de Mons, 22 (1890), pp.87-103.

Du Buisson, PD: Historiae monasterii Sancti Severi in Vasconie, Libri X, 2 vols. (1876)

Durrieu, P: Les archives Angevines de Naples: etude sur les registres du roi Charles Ier (1265-85), 2 vols. (1885-6. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 46,51)

Earwaker, JP: East Cheshire (1880).

Emden, AB: A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to AD 1500, 3 vols. (1957-9).

English, Barbara: The Lordship of Holderness (OUP, 1979).

Farrer, W: Honours and Knights Fees, 3 vols. (London/Manchester, 1923-5).

Beauclet-Filleau, H and P: Dictionnaire Historique et Genealogique des Familles du Poitou, 3 vols (2nd. ed. 1891-1905).

Foss: The Judges of England (1851).

Frame, R: Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369 (Dublin, 1981).

Frame, R: 'Ireland and the Barons' wars', pp.158-167, Thirteenth Century England I, ed. PR Coss and SD Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1986).

Fraser, CM: A History of Antony Bek, Bishop of Durham, 1283-1311, (Oxford, 1957).

Ganshof, FL: Feudalism, (tr.1964).

Gauban, O: Histoire de La Réole (La Réole, 1873).

Gavrilovitch, Michel: Etudes sur le traité de Paris de 1259 entre Louis roi de France et Henri III roi d'Angleterre (Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes, Etudes 125, 1899)

- Giffin, ME: 'Cadwalader, Arthur and Brutus in the Wigmore manuscript', Speculum, 16 (1941), pp.109-120.
- Gilbert, JT: History of the Viceroy's of Ireland (Dublin, 1865).
- Given-Wilson, C: The Royal Household and the King's Affinity (Yale, 1986).
- Gransden, Antonia: Historical Writings in England, c.550-c.1307 (London, 1974).
- Gras, NSB: The early English customs system (Harvard, 1918).
- Griffiths, RA ed.: Boroughs of Medieval Wales (University of Wales Press, 1978).
- Griffiths RA, with Thomas RS: The Principality of Wales in the later Middle Ages. The structure and Personnel of Government (University of Wales, 1972).
- Gualtaruzzi, C: Libro di novelle et di bel parlar gentile (Florence, edition of 1572).
- Guibours (P de, alias Père Anselme): Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la Maison royale de France, des pairs, grands officiers et des anciens barons, par le Père Anselme, continued by M Fournay, P de Courcy, 9 vols (Paris, 1726-33) and supplement (1873-90).
- Hardiman: A history of the town and county of Galway (Dublin, 1820).
- Harris, GL: King, Parliament and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369, (Oxford, 1975).
- Hewitt, HJ: Medieval Cheshire (Chetham Society, n.s.88, 1929).
- Higounet, C: Paysages et villages neufs du moyen âge (Bordeaux, 1975).
- Hodgson, J: History of Northumberland, especially Part III, Volume III (1835).
- Holmes, GA: The estates of the higher nobility in fourteenth century England (Cambridge, 1957).
- Hoyt, RS: 'The Coronation Oath of 1308', Traditio 11 (1955), pp.235-257.
- Hoyt, RS: The royal demesne in English Constitutional History, 1066-1272 (Ithaca, NY, 1950).
- Jacob, EF: 'The complaints of Henry III against the baronial council in 1261', EHR 41 (1926), pp.559-571.
- Jacob, EF: Studies in the period of baronial reform and rebellion, 1258-67, (Oxford, 1925).

- James, MK: Studies in the Medieval Wine trade, ed. EM Veale (1971).
- Jenkinson, H: 'Records of Exchequer receipts from the English Jewry', THJSE VIII (1918) pp.19-54.
- Jolliffe, JEA: Angevin Kingship (1955).
- Johnstone, H: Edward of Caernarvon, 1284-1307 (Manchester, 1946).
- Johnstone, H: 'Poor relief in the royal household of thirteenth century England', Speculum 4 (1929), pp.149-167.
- Johnstone, H: The Wardrobe and Household of Henry, son of Edward I, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, VII (1922-3), pp.383-420.
- Jubainville, H d'Arbois de: Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne, 8 vols (1859-69).
- Kaeuper, RW: Bankers to the Crown: the Riccardi of Lucca and Edward I (Princeton, 1973).
- Kanterowicz, E: 'Inalienability: a note on canonical practice and the English coronation oath in the thirteenth century', Speculum, 29 (1954), pp.488-502.
- Keen, MH: 'Brotherhood in Arms', History 47 (1962), pp.1-17.
- Kingsford, CL: 'Sir Othon de Grandison, 1238?-1328', TRHS Third Series, III (1909), pp.125-195.
- Labarge, MW: Gascony, England's first colony, 1204-1453 (1978).
- Labarge: A Baronial Household of the thirteenth century (1965).
- Larking, LB: 'On the heart-shrine in Leybourne church', Archaeologia Cantiana, V (1863), pp.133-193.
- Le Patourel, J: The medieval administration of the Channel Islands, 1199-1399 (Oxford, 1937).
- Le Patourel, J: 'The Plantagenet Dominions', History, 50 (1965), pp.289-308.
- Lestrangle: Lestrangle Records (1916).
- Lewis, A: 'Roger Leyburn and the pacification of England', EHR 54 (1939), pp.193-214.
- Lloyd, JE: A History of Wales from the earliest times to the Edwardian conquest, 2 vols (3rd ed.1939).
- Lloyd, JE: The History of Carmarthenshire. Volume One: Prehistoric times to the Act of Union (1536) (Cardiff, 1935-9).

Lloyd, JE: The Story of Ceredigion (400-1277) (University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1937).

Lloyd, SD: 'The Lord Edward's Crusade, 1270-72: its setting and significance', War and Government in the Middle Ages, ed. JB Gillingham and JC Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp.120-129.

Lloyd, TH: Alien Merchants in England in the Higher Middle Ages (1982).

Lloyd, TH: The English wool trade in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1977).

Loomis, RS: 'Edward I, Arthurian enthusiast', Speculum 28 (1953), pp.114-127.

Lunt, WE: Financial relations of the Papacy with England to 1327 (Medieval academy of America, 1939).

A New History of Ireland:

Volume Two: Medieval Ireland, ed. A Cosgrave, especially chapters 6 and 8 by JF Lydon

Volumes Eight, ed. TW Moody, FX Martin, FJ Byrne: A Chronology of Irish History.

Volume Nine, ed. Moody et al. Maps, Genealogies, Lists.

Lydon, JF: 'The hobelar: an Irish contribution to medieval warfare', The Irish Sword. The Journal of the Military History Society of Ireland, 2 (1954-6), pp.12-16.

McFarlane, KB: 'Had Edward I a policy towards the earls?', History L (1935), pp.145-159.

Maddicott, JR: 'Edward I and the lessons of baronial reform: local government, 1258-80', pp.1-30, Thirteenth Century England I, Proceedings of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Conference, ed. PR Coss and SD Lloyd (1986).

Maddicott, JR: 'Law and Lordship: royal justices as retainers in thirteenth and fourteenth-century England', Past and Present Supplement 4 (1978), pp.1-88.

Maddicott, JR: 'The Mise of Lewes, 1264', EHR 108 (1983), pp.599-603.

Maddicott, JR: Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1323. A study in the reign of Edward II (Oxford, 1970).

Madox, T: Firma Burgi: or an historical essay concerning the cities, towns and boroughs of England (1726).

Madox, T: The History and Antiquities of the Exchequer (1769).

Marca, P de: Histoire de Bearn (Paris, 1649).

Mas-Latrie, L de: Histoire de l'île de Chypre, 3 vols. (1852-61).

Meekings, CAF: Studies in Thirteenth Century Justice and Administration (Hambleton, 1981).

Meriet, L: 'Procès pour la possession du Comté de Bigorre', Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes, IVième série, t.III (1857), pp.305-324.

Mitchell, SK: Taxation in medieval England (Yale, 1951).

Moor, C: Knights of Edward I, 5 vols. (Harleian society, 1929-1932).

Moore, EW: The Fairs of Medieval England (Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Universa, 1985).

Moorman, J: 'Edward I at Lanercost Priory, 1306-7', EHR 67 (1952), pp.161-174.

Morris, JE: The Welsh wars of Edward I (Oxford, 1901).

Morris, WA: The Medieval English sheriff to 1300 (Manchester, 1927).

Mugnier, F: 'Les Savoyards en Angleterre, et Pierre d'Aigueblanche, Evêque d'Hereford', Societe Savoisienne, 29, (1890), pp.155-408.

Murray, KME: The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports (Manchester 1935).

O'Brien AF: 'Episcopal elections in Ireland c.1254-72', PRIA 73/C (1973), pp.129-176.

O'Gilvy and Bourousse de Lafforre, MJ de: Nobiliaire de Guienne et de Gascogne, 3 vols. (1856-1860).

Orme, N: From Childhood to Chivalry (1984).

Orpen, GH: Ireland under the Normans, 1169-1333, 4 vols (Oxford, 1922-20).

Otway-Ruthven, AJ: A History of Medieval Ireland (London, 2nd.ed.1979).

Otway-Ruthven, AJ: 'Anglo-Irish shire government in the thirteenth century', IHS, V (1946), pp.1-28

Otway-Ruthven, AJ: 'Knight service in Ireland', JRSAI 89 (1961), pp.1-15.

Otway-Ruthven, AJ: 'The partition of the de Verdon lands in 1332', PRIA 66/C (1968), p.401-445.

Painter, S: Studies in the history of the English feudal barony (Johns Hopkins, 1943).

Pègues, F: 'The clericus in the legal administration in Thirteenth Century England', EHR, 71 (1956), pp.529-559.

Platt, C: The castle in Medieval England and Wales (Secker & Warburg, 1982).

- Plucknett, TFT: The Legislation of Edward I (Oxford, 1949).
- Powicke, FM: Henry III and the Lord Edward: the Community of the Realm in the thirteenth century, 2 vols. (Oxford 1947).
- Powicke, FM: The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307 (2nd. ed. Oxford, 1962)
- Powicke, FM and Fryde, EB: Handbook of Chronology (Royal Historical Society Guide 2).
- Prestwich, JO: 'The military household of the Norman kings', EHR XCVI (1981), pp.1-35.
- Prestwich, Michael: Edward I, (Methuen, 1988).
- Prestwich, M: 'The piety of Edward I', pp.120-128, England in the Thirteenth Century, ed. W Ormrod.
- Prestwich, M: The Three Edwards: war and state in England, 1272-1377 (1980).
- Prestwich, MC: War, politics and Finance under Edward I (London, 1972).
- Prynne, W: The History of King John, King Henry III, and the most illustrious King Edward I (1670).
- Public Record Office: Lists and Indexes, IX, List of Sheriffs for England and Wales from earliest times to 1831 (HMSO, 1898).
- Public Record Office Handbook: Records of the Wardrobe and Household, ed. Barnes (HMSO, 1964).
- Public Records Office Handbook: Records of the General Eyre (HMSO, 1982)
- Raistrick, A and Jennings, B: A history of Lead Mining in the Pennines.
- Rashdall, H: The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, ed. FM Powicke and B Emden, 3 vols. (1936).
- Renouard, Y: Histoire de Bordeaux. Tome III: Bordeaux sous les rois d'Angleterre (1965).
- Rhodes, WE: 'Edmund, Earl of Lancaster', EHR X, (1895), pp.19-40, 209-237.
- Richardson, HG: 'The Coronation of Edward I', BIHR 15 (1937-8), pp.94-99.
- Richardson, HG: 'The English coronation oath', Speculum 24 (1949), pp.44-75.
- Richardson, HG: 'The coronation in Medieval England: the evolution of the office and the oath', Traditio 16 (1960), pp.111-202.
- Richardson, HG: The Jewry under Angevin kings (1960).

Richardson HG and Sayles GO: The Administration of Ireland, 1172-1377 (Irish MSS Commission, 1963).

Richardson HG and Sayles GO: The Irish parliament in the Middle Ages (Philadelphia, 1952).

Richardson HG and Sayles GO: 'Irish revenue, 1278-1384', PRIA, 62/C (1962), pp.87-100).

Ridgeway, HW: 'King Henry III's Grievances against the council in 1261: a New Version and a letter describing political events', BIHR, 61 (1988), pp.227-242.

Ridgeway, HW: 'The Lord Edward and the Provisions of Oxford (1258): a study in faction', pp.89-99, Thirteenth Century England I: Proceedings of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Conference, ed. PR Coss and SD Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1986).

Riley-Smith, J: What were the crusades? (London, 1977).

Roderick, AJ: 'The Four Cantreds: a study in administration', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, 10 (1940), pp.246-256.

Rogers, A: The Making of Stamford (Leicester University Press, 1965).

Rohricht, R: 'Etudes sur les derniers temps du royaume de Jerusalem. A. La croisade de Prince Edouard d'Angleterre', AOI I (1881), pp.617-32, II (1884) pp.407-9.

Roncière, C de la: Histoire de la Marine Francaise. I. Les Origines (Paris, 1899).

Roth, C: A history of the Jews in England, (Oxford, 3rd.ed. 1964).

Ruding, R: 'A memoir on the office of cuneator', Archaeologia 17 (1874), pp.207-213.

Salzmann, L: 'The family of Aquillon', Sussex Archaeological Society, 79 (1938), pp.45-60).

Sanders, IJ: English baronies; a study of their origin and descent (Oxford, 1960).

Sayles GO: 'Medieval judges as legal consultants', Law Quarterly Review, LVI (1940).

Servois, G: 'Emprunts de Saint Louis en Palestine et en Afrique', Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes, t. IV, IVième serie, 19 (1858), pp.113-131, 283-293.

Simonnet, J: Essai sur l'Histoire et la généalogie des sires de Joinville, 1008-1386 (Langres, 1875).

Simpson, GG: 'The familia of Roger de Quincy, earl of Winchester and constable of Scotland', pp.102-129, Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland, ed. KJ Stringer (Edinburgh, 1985).

Smith, LB: 'The Gravamina of the Community of Gwynedd against Llywelyn ap Gruffydd', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, 31 (1984), pp.158-176.

Smith, RAL: Canterbury Cathedral Priory: a study in monastic administration (Cambridge, reissue 1969).

Snellgrove, HS: The Lusignans in England (1950).

Somerville, Robert: History of the Duchy of Lancaster, vol.I 1265-1603 (1953).

Soulsby, I: The towns of medieval Wales: a study of their history, archaeology and early topography (1983).

Spufford: 'Coinage and currency', Cambridge Economic History, III, pp.576-602. ed. MM Postan, EE Rich, E Millar (1963).

Stein, H: 'Henry de Courances, maréchal de France (1255-68)', Annales de la Société historique et archéologique du Gatinais, IX (Fontainebleau, 1891), pp.203-219.

Stewart-Brown, R: 'The end of the Norman earldom of Chester', EHR XXV (1920), pp.26-54

Stewart-Brown, R: 'The Exchequer of Chester', EHR, LVII (1942) pp.289-297.

Stewart-Brown, R: 'The Domesday roll of Chester', EHR XXXVII (1922), pp.481-500.

Studd, JR: 'Chancellors of the Lord Edward, a supplementary note', BIHR, 51 (1978), pp.181-3.

Studd, JR: 'The Lord Edward and King Henry III', BIHR 50 (1977), pp.4-19.

Studd, JR: 'The Lord Edward's Lordship of Chester', THSLC, 128 (1978), pp.1-26

Studd, JR: 'The Seals of the Lord Edward', The Antiquaries Journal: Journal of the Society of Antiquaries of London 58 (1978), pp.310-319.

Talbot, CH: Medicine in Medieval England (Oldbourne History of Science Library, 1967).

Talbot, CH and Hammond, EA: The medical practitioners in medieval England: a biographical register (Wellcome historical medical library, 1965).

- Taylor, AJ: 'Royal alms and oblations in the later thirteenth century. An analysis of the alms roll of 12 E.I', pp. 93-125, Tribute to an Antiquary: Essays presented to Marc Fitch, ed. F Emmison and R Stephens (1976).
- Taylor, AJ: 'White Castle in the thirteenth century, a reconsideration', Medieval Archaeology, V (1961), pp.169-75.
- Tomkinson, A: 'Retinues at the tournament of Dunstable of 1309', EHR, 74 (1959), pp.70-89.
- Tout, TF: Chapters in the administrative history of Medieval England, 7 vols. (Manchester, 1920-37).
- Tout, TF: The place of Edward II in English history (2nd ed. 1936).
- Tout, TF: 'Wales and the March during the barons' wars', and 'The *communitas bachelariae angliae*' in Collected papers, II, pp.47-100, and pp.277-283, ed. J Tait (Manchester 1934).
- Trabut-Cussac, J-P: L'administration anglaise en Gascogne sous Henri III et Edouard I de 1254 à 1307 (Paris, 1972).
- Trabut-Cussac, J-P: 'Bastides ou forteresses? Les bastides de l'Aquitaine anglaise et les intentions de leurs fondateurs', Le Moyen Age, LX (1954), pp.81-135.
- Trabut-Cussac, J-P: 'Le financement de la croisade Anglaise de 1270', Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes 119 (1961), pp.113-40.
- Trabut-Cussac, J-P: 'Le prince Edouard et les rivalités municipales à Bordeaux (1248-1261)', RHB, New Series 1-2, (1952-3), pp.185-99.
- Trehearne, RF: The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-63 (Manchester, 1932).
- Trehearne, RF: Simon de Montfort and Baronial Reform. Thirteenth Century Essays. ed. EB Fryde (1986).
- Vale, J: Edward III and Chivalry: Chivalric society and its context, 1270-1350.
- Vale, M: War and Chivalry (1981).
- Veale, M: The English fur trade in the later middle ages (1966).
- Vernon-Harcourt, LW: His Grace the Steward and Trial of Peers (Longmans 1907).
- Victoria County History, for Derbyshire, Oxfordshire, Shropshire.
- Warren, WL: Henry II (Methuen, 1973).
- Waters, WH: The Edwardian settlement of North Wales in its administrative and legal aspects (especially Chapter 2, Cardiff, 1935).
- Watson, GW: 'The families of Lacy, Geneva, Joinville and La Marche', The Genealogist, new series XXI, 1904, pp.1-16.

Watson, J: Memoirs of the ancient earls of Warren and Surrey, and their descendants to the present time, vol. I (1782).

Willard, J, Morris, WA, Strayer, JR, Dunham, WH: The English government at work, 1327-1336.

Volume One: Central and Prerogative Administration (1940).

Volume Two: Fiscal Administration (1947).

Volume Three: Local Administration and Justice (1950).

Williams, Gwyn A: Medieval London. From Commune to Capital, (University of London, Athlone Press, 1963).

Wolffe, BP: The Royal Demesne in English History: the Crown estate from the conquest to 1509 (Athens, Ohio, 1971).

Wood, Charles: The French apanages and the Capetian monarchy, 1224-1328 (Harvard 1966).

Wood, H: 'The muniments of Edmund de Mortimer, 3rd Earl of March, concerning his liberty of Trim', PRIA 40/C (1932), pp.312-55.

Wurstemberger, JL: Peter der Zweite. Graf von Savoyen, Markgraf in Italien, sein Haus und seine Lande, 4 vols. (Bern, 1856-8).

Yates, WN: 'Bishop Peter de Aquablanca, 1240-68, a reconsideration', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 22 (1971), pp.303-317.

#### Unpublished Work

Knowles, CH: The Disinherited, (University of Wales, Ph.D. thesis, 1959).

Lloyd, SD: English Society and the Crusades, 1261-1307 (Oxford D.Phil.thesis, 1983; forthcoming publication, Oxford, 1988).

Lydon, JF: Ireland's participation in the military activities of English kings in the Thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, (University of London, Ph.D. 1955).

Studd, JR: A catalogue of the acts of the Lord Edward, 1254-72, (Leeds University Ph.D. thesis, 1971).

Walker, RF: The Anglo-Welsh Wars, 1217-67, (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1954).

Ridgeway, HW: The Politics of the English Royal Court, 1247-65, with special reference to the rôle of the aliens (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1984).