



# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The Household knights of Edward I.*

Ingamells, Ruth Louise

### How to cite:

---

Ingamells, Ruth Louise (1992) *The Household knights of Edward I.*, Durham theses, Durham University.  
Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1509/>

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

## The Household Knights of Edward I.

Abstract.

The royal household lay at the heart of the king's army in the late thirteenth century. The military importance of the knights attached to Edward's household has been examined by M.C Prestwich. Although Prestwich acknowledged that the knights did serve in other areas of royal government no systematic study of their role has been attempted.

Based on an examination of the surviving wardrobe accounts and other documents the role of the household knights in many areas of royal government in England and Edward's other dominions has been assessed. The part they played in newly or partially conquered territories of Wales and Scotland has also been considered. The knights attached to Edward's *familia* were employed as sheriffs, justices, constables of castles and diplomats and councillors. However the proportion of knights who served in these areas remained small. The knights were appointed with any regularity only to posts which demanded a combination of military and administrative skills. A large number held royal offices in Scotland and Wales.

However, there were a small number of knights whose skills as diplomats and councillors were clearly of more importance to the king than military prowess. This inner circle of knights were probably the forerunners of the chamber knights of the fourteenth century.

The rewards received by the knights in return for their services have also been considered in great detail. The knights were rewarded in accordance with their status and length of service within the household. The major grants of lands, wardships and offices went to a fairly small group of men. The others received more minor gifts of grants of timber and animals. Edward was not a king who was renowned for his generosity. However, the loyalty of the knights to their master suggests that the rewards they received were adequate.

---

The Household Knights of Edward I

Volume 1 of 2

Ruth Louise Ingamells

Ph. D. (University of Durham)

Department of History, 1992.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



- 5 MAY 1993

## Contents

### Volume 1

List of Illustrations	2
Acknowledgements.	3
Abbreviated references.	5
Introduction.	8
Chapter 1. Recruitment	32
Chapter 2. The Military Role of the Household	69
Chapter 3. Inside the Household	115
Chapter 4. Local Government and Justice	162
Chapter 5. Local Government II-Knights and Castles	199

### Volume 2

Chapter 6. Gascony and Ireland	3
Chapter 7. Scotland and Wales	41
Chapter 8. Diplomacy and Council	88
Chapter 9. Rewards	123
Conclusion.	169
Appendix I. Knights in receipt of Fees and Robes	178
Appendix II Genealogical tables	184
fig i	184
fig ii	185
Appendix III Number of knights attached to the Household	186
Appendix IV Expenditure on Fees and Robes	188
Appendix V The Retinues of Household Knights in 1300 and 1301	189
Appendix VI Grants of Wardship 1272-1307	190
Bibliography.	191



## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

### Tables of Figures

#### Volume 2

Appendix I.	Knights in receipt of Fees and Robes	178
Appendix III	Number of knights attached to the Household	186
Appendix IV	Expenditure on Fees and Robes	188
Appendix V	The Retinues of Household Knights in 1300 and 1301	189

.

### Diagrams.

#### Volume 2

Appendix II	Genealogical tables	fig i	184
		fig ii	185
Appendix VI	Grants of Wardship 1272-1307		190

I would like to thank Michael Prestwich for his all his help and guidance in my work; my Father for his encouragement; and Chris and Lucy for all their help and support.

No part of this work has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without her prior written consent and information from it should be acknowledged.

At the discretion of the Librarian of the University of Durham this thesis may

- (i) be made available for consultation by bona fide scholars
- (ii) be photocopied wholly or in part for consultation outside Durham

## ABBREVIATED REFERENCES

- Ann. London* 'Annales Londonienses', *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, i, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1882).
- BIHR* *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*
- BL* British Library
- Cal. Anc. Corr. Wales* *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales*, ed. J.G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1935).
- Cal. Anc. Pet. Wales* *Calendar of Ancient Petitions relating to Wales*, ed. W. Rees (Cardiff, 1975).
- Cal. Chanc. Warrants* *Calendar of Chancery Warrants, 1244-1326* (1927).
- CChR* *Calendar of Charter Rolls* (1903-).
- CCR* *Calendar of Close Rolls* (1892-).
- CDI* *Calendar of Documents relating to Ireland*, ed. H.S. Sweetman, 5 vols (1877-86).
- CDS* *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, i-iv, ed. J. Bain (1881-8); v, ed. G.G. Simpson and J.D. Galbraith (Edinburgh, 1986).
- CFR* *Calendar of Fine Rolls* (1911-).
- CIMP* *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem* (1904-).
- CJR* *Calendar of Justiciary Rolls Ireland*, ed. J. Mills et al. 3 vols (Dublin, 1905).

<i>CLR</i>	<i>Calendar of Liberate Rolls</i> (1916-).
<i>CPR</i>	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls</i> (1891-).
<i>CWR</i>	'Calendar of Welsh Rolls', <i>Calendar of Chancery Rolls Various, 1277-1326</i> (1912).
<i>Chron.</i> <i>Lanercost</i>	<i>Chronicon de Lanercost</i> , ed. J. Stevenson (Maitland Club, 1839).
<i>Dict. Nat.</i> <i>Biog.</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i> , ed. L. Stephen (1885-1900).
<i>Documents</i> , ed. Stevenson	<i>Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland</i> , ed. J. Stevenson 2 vols (1870).
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>Flores</i>	<i>Flores Historiarum</i> , ed. H.R. Luard, 3 vols (Rolls Series, 1890).
<i>Foedera</i>	<i>Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et Acta Publica</i> , ed. T. Rymer (Record Commission ed., 4 vols, 1816).
<i>Gascon Reg.</i>	<i>Gascon Register A</i> ed. G.P. Cuttino, 3 vols (1975-6).
<i>G.E.C</i>	G.E. Cokayne, <i>Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom</i> , ed. V. Gibbs and others, 12 vols (1912-59).
<i>Guisborough</i>	<i>The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough</i> , ed. H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 3rd series, lxxxix, 1957)

<i>KW</i>	<i>The History of the King's Works</i> , i, <i>The Middle Ages</i> , ed. R.A. Brown, H.M. Colvin, A.J. Taylor (1963)
<i>Liber Quot.</i>	<i>Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobiae, 1299-1300</i> , ed. J. Topham <i>et al.</i> (1787).
<i>Littere Wallie</i>	<i>Littere Wallie</i> , ed. J.G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1940).
<i>Parl. Writs</i>	<i>Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons</i> , ed. F. Palgrave, 2 vols in 4 (Record Commission, 1827-34).
<i>Records 1285-6</i>	<i>Records of the Wardrobe and Household 1285-6</i> , ed. B.F and C.F Byerly (1977).
<i>Records 1286-9</i>	<i>Records of the Wardrobe and Household 1286-9</i> ed. B.F and C.F Byerly (1986).
<i>RG</i>	<i>Rôles Gascon</i> , ed. F. Michel and C. Bémont, 3 vols (Paris, 1885-1906).
<i>RH</i>	<i>Rotuli Hundredorum</i> , 2 vols (Record Commission, 1812-18).
<i>Rishanger</i>	<i>Willelmi Rishanger, Chronica et Annales</i> , ed. H.T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1865).
<i>Treaty Rolls</i>	<i>Treaty Rolls</i> , i, 1234-1325, ed. P. Chaplais (1955).
<i>TRHS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>

## INTRODUCTION

Edward I was described as the 'truest man of all things, and in war wary and wise....., of Christendom he bare the prize'.<sup>1</sup> As a prince he served in the Holy Land and fought to preserve royal power and honour in the civil turmoils of the 1260s. As king of England he marshalled his forces to conquer Wales and crush its resistance to English rule. He attempted a similar task in Scotland but dwindling finances, ill health and other difficulties blighted the royal plan.

At the core of the royal army was the battalion led by Edward. This consisted of the knights who were attached to his household. These knights, men such as Walter de Beauchamp and Elias Hauville, filled important offices within the royal household. With regular access to the king they became royal advisers and gained favours for their followers and others. Those who achieved pre-eminence within the royal *familia*, as did the Grandsons, the Genevilles and the Cliffords, became members of the royal council.

The duties of the household knights stretched far beyond the royal court or the king's battalion. Knights such as John Botetourt, William Inge and John St John served as royal justices, diplomats, sheriffs, constables and wardens of the march. A number were also selected as the king's representatives in Gascony and Ireland. The knights were woven into the fabric of royal administration there, as well as in England. Tied closely to the royal court they exerted the power and executed the commands of Edward I.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Political Songs of England*, ed. T. Wright (Camden Society, 1839), 242

The households of Edward's predecessors have been studied by a number of historians. J.O. Prestwich and M. Chibnall have examined the *familia* of the early Norman kings. J.O. Prestwich demonstrated that the reality of a royal military household dated back to the eleventh century. According to Orderic Vitalis, William the Conqueror used it to contain the resistance movement in Maine between 1084 and 1086. By the reign of Henry I members of the household received bonus payments, regular wages and compensation for losses incurred upon the king's service. The household also attracted men from outside Henry's dominions who were retained by annual fees.<sup>2</sup>

The *familia* of King John has been examined by Stephen Church. R.F. Walker and M.C. Prestwich have considered the part played by the household in the campaigns of Henry III and Edward I respectively.<sup>3</sup> Prestwich stated that the 'main reason why Edward retained so many was because of their military function.'<sup>4</sup> He also noted that the 'knights were much more than soldiers', they were used as diplomats, councillors and administrators. However, no systematic study of their non-military role has been conducted.

A detailed study of the exact balance of the knights' military and administrative duties at the end of the thirteenth century would be useful in considering the changes which seem to have taken place during the fourteenth century, the origins of

---

<sup>2</sup> J.O. Prestwich, 'The Military Household of the Norman Kings', *EHR* xcvi (1981), 8-9; M. Chibnall, 'Mercenaries and the *Familia Regis* under Henry I', *History*, Lxii (1977), 15-23

<sup>3</sup> S. Church, 'The Household Knights of King John', (London University Ph.D. thesis, 1992); M.C. Prestwich, *Edward I* (1988), 154; R.F. Walker 'The Anglo-Welsh Wars 1217-1267 with special references to English Military Development', (Oxford University Ph.D. thesis, 1954), 66-7

<sup>4</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 154



which probably lay in Edward I's reign. C. Given-Wilson in his important study of the king's affinity revealed that by 1364-5 the term household knight was disappearing from the wardrobe account books. It was being replaced by the phrase 'knight of the chamber'. These knights of the chamber were much fewer than the household knights of Edward I. There were twelve in 1364-5. The revival of the chamber began under Edward I<sup>5</sup> but the crucial period of change occurred between 1350 and 1365. The 'system of retaining a large body of household knights, for primarily military purposes was finally abandoned' between 1360 and 1385 because the king rarely campaigned in person.<sup>6</sup>

As a result the 'service which the king expected from his chamber knights was different from that which he had formerly expected from his household knights.' The knights of the chamber did accompany the king on campaign but their numbers were not expanded. Their primary role was as councillors, diplomats and administrators. They were 'an inner group of high-ranking and trusted royal servants valued by the king for their domestic service and for their brains as much as for their strong right arms'.<sup>7</sup>

In addition there was a nucleus of fighting men within the king's knights. After 1377 the term 'the king's knight' began to be used increasingly in the patent rolls. In Richard II's reign there were 149 such knights. They were men of considerable standing within their local community. The knights were not members of the

---

<sup>5</sup> Peter de Chauvent and John de Sulleye were chamberlains of Edward I. John Botetourt may also have held that office because he was in charge of the men of the chamber during the campaign of 1301. See chapters 2 & 3

<sup>6</sup> C. Given-Wilson, *Royal Household and the King's Affinity* (1986) 206-211

<sup>7</sup> Given-Wilson, *Royal Household and the King's Affinity*, 210, 211

royal household; they were attached to the person of the king. They received annuities from the exchequer and robes when they were at court. Some were selected because of their military capabilities but their influence in the localities was more important to the king.<sup>8</sup>

The terms under which the household knights served during Edward I's reign are not contained in any form of indenture, although this form of written agreement was becoming increasingly common in the late thirteenth century.<sup>9</sup> The terms of service in the household were probably too well known to necessitate a formal agreement.<sup>10</sup> In the absence of indentures it is necessary to rely upon the lists recording the payment of fees and robes. Fees had been paid through the exchequer during previous reigns but from Edward I's reign they were issued by the wardrobe.<sup>11</sup>

At least 282 different men are named as being in receipt of fees and robes during Edward I's reign. Unfortunately, the lists are not comprehensive. The first household list which has survived from Edward I's reign is for 1277-8. This is a list of those knights receiving daily wages in court during that year. After that date the lists for 1278-9, 1283-4, 1285-6, 1288-9, 1289-90, 1296-7, 1299-1300, 1300-1, 1303-4 and 1305-6 have survived. In addition, the prest accounts of 1301-2 and 1304-5 give some indication of who

---

<sup>8</sup> Given-Wilson, *Royal Household and the King's Affinity*, 211-12, 221, 254

<sup>9</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 148

<sup>10</sup> The only indentures involving household knights were either those stating the terms under which they would serve as a constable of a royal castle or as a warden of the Scottish march. See below, p 357

<sup>11</sup> The obligations and arrears to those who had been promised fees in Henry III's reign were being paid by the exchequer in the first years of Edward I's reign; C62/10 m 9

was attached to the household in those years.<sup>12</sup> The intervals between the lists are so great that it is impossible to make an accurate calculation of the total number of knights who were members to the household during the reign.

The household wage accounts and horse valuation lists survive from some of the military campaigns. However, the accounts of war wages have survived for the same years as the lists of fees and robes. In any case, the household was greatly expanded during most military campaigns. It is therefore difficult to distinguish between those knights who were recruited for the duration of the campaign and those who were permanent members of the household.<sup>13</sup>

In addition, there were those men who were referred to as household knights in other official documents, such as the Close and Patent Rolls. Imbert de Monréal was spoken of as a 'knight of the household' in a Patent roll of 1275. In December 1276 John Geyton and William FitzWarin were described as part of the king's household which was travelling to Wales. Geyton and Monréal also appear in the household wage account for 1277. William FitzWarin became a household knight in 1289. He had been a squire in 1277.<sup>14</sup>

In 1280 two merchants of Lucca gave a loan to Otto de Grandson, who was referred to as one of the king's household. Further references confirm his position. In 1281 he was granted land in Ireland because of his service to the king from his youth. Grandson had arrived in England in 1247 to join Henry III's household. During Edward I's reign Otto admitted other knights to the household. At Easter 1287 he admitted Oger Mote the younger into the household on behalf of the king. Grandson received many

---

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix III

<sup>13</sup> See chapter 2

<sup>14</sup> *CPR 1272-81*, 105, 187

lucrative rewards from the king which could explain why he did not receive any fees or robes.<sup>15</sup>

Other such knights are by their nature difficult to trace. Hugh de Vere was also involved in admitting knights to the household in 1289-90. Amanieu d'Albret, a Gascon, appears in the household wardrobe accounts of those serving in Scotland in the early fourteenth century. His regular appearance suggests that he was in England because he had become attached to Edward's household.<sup>16</sup>

These knights, often men of considerable social standing, formed an inner circle around the king. Otto de Grandson was the lord of Grandson in Savoy and Hugh de Vere was the second son of Robert, earl of Oxford. It is difficult to assess how they were attached to the household. There does not appear to have been any formal system of replacing fees with grants of wardships or land. In fact Edward seems to have moved away from such a policy as the reign progressed. The household ordinance of 1279 stated that Hugh FitzOtto, the steward of the household, should not receive any fees or wages because he had been granted £50 a year in wardships.<sup>17</sup> His successors were not rewarded in this manner. In fact subsequent stewards and other knights received wardships in addition to their fees. In 1275, Stephen de Monteferrand received £50 a year from the lands of John de Mandeville during the minority of his heirs. The grant stated that this was to sustain him in the king's service. Stephen still received daily wages in 1277-8 and robes in 1278-9.<sup>18</sup>

One knight did receive the custody of a castle in lieu of his

---

<sup>15</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 1393; *CDI*, ii, no. 1847

<sup>16</sup> C47/4/5, f 34

<sup>17</sup> T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, ii (Manchester, 1920), 158

<sup>18</sup> E101/3/21; C47/4/1; *CPR 1272-81*, 133

fees and robes. In 1290 Alexander de la Pébrée was granted a castle in Gascony in place of the money owed to him by the king.<sup>19</sup> However, there is no evidence that such grants were common-place. Many knights became wardens of castles while they were in receipt of fees and robes and Edward was reluctant to alienate royal demense.<sup>20</sup>

There were men whose careers suggest that they were household knights even though their names do not appear in the accounts which have survived. The backgrounds of such figures who held important administrative or military positions are discussed in the relevant part of the thesis.

The knights attached to the household were divided into two different ranks. The superior rank was that of a banneret, the remainder were simple knights. The former received sixteen marks and the latter eight marks a year for their robes. Fees for service in the household amounted to 10 marks a year for the knights and 20 marks for the bannerets. The bannerets naturally formed a smaller group than the knights.<sup>21</sup>

Some men were admitted as bannerets. Others joined the *familia* as simple knights and were later promoted. The household accounts reveal twenty such cases during Edward's reign.<sup>22</sup> Walter de Beauchamp first appeared as a banneret in 1297. He probably achieved this elevation because he was the sole steward of the household after 1292. The holding of an important office did not necessarily guarantee that a knight would be made a banneret. John Botetourt was an admiral of the navy in 1295 but he still received

---

<sup>19</sup> C47/4/5, f 34

<sup>20</sup> See chapters 5 & 9

<sup>21</sup> See Appendix III

<sup>22</sup> See Appendix I

his fee as a knight in 1297. He became a banneret only in 1300. Bogo de Knoville was the justice of west Wales from January 1280 to November 1281. He was not raised to the rank of banneret until 1289-90.<sup>23</sup>

For many, the promotion was probably a reward for long service in the household. John Botetourt and John de Sulleye were receiving fees and robes as knights of the household in 1284-5. They became bannerets in 1300.<sup>24</sup> William de Cantilupe, a member of the king's *familia* in 1285-6, was also promoted in 1300. Eustace Hatch and Bogo de Knoville were attached to the household in 1277. They achieved the rank of banneret in 1299 and 1289 respectively.<sup>25</sup>

Eight knights were raised to the rank of a banneret between 1297 and 1300. These promotions may have been linked to their service in Flanders in 1297 or to the political situation and the king's need for support in the 1300 parliament. Some of the knights who were promoted, such as John Kingston, had been admitted to the household only in 1297.<sup>26</sup>

The rank of banneret seems to have been accorded to those who came from an important family or those who had substantial estates. Alexander de la Pébrée was lord of Bergerac, Vital de Caupenne was lord of Caupenne and his two nephews Elie and Arnald were also members of the household. Thomas de Clare was the younger son of Richard, earl of Gloucester. Raymond Bouglon was lord of La Tresne, Peter de Chauvent was a member of an important Savoyard family; he

---

<sup>23</sup> Bl Add Ms 7965, f 60-1; C47/4/5, f 32

<sup>24</sup> Some knights who served in the household for a considerable proportion of the reign never became bannerets. Gilbert de Bridesdale was receiving wages in 1277-8. The wardrobe account books reveal that he was still a simple knight in 1300.

<sup>25</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1677-80; E101/351/17; *Liber Quot*, 188-195; E101/352/24; C47/2/6; E101/3/31

<sup>26</sup> See chapter 8

was the son and heir of Henry, lord of Chauvent. John de Bohun was the younger son of Humphrey, earl of Hertford and Essex who died in September 1275, Philip Daubeney was the son and heir of Ralph Daubeney, lord of Landal in Brittany. Henry de Beaumont, admitted as a banneret in 1297, was the grandson of the Emperor of Constantinople and related to Eleanor of Castile.<sup>27</sup>

However, such family connections did not necessarily mean that a man would be admitted to the household as a banneret. Pons de Castillon, the son of Gaucelm, lord of Castillon was a simple knight in 1288-9. Walter de Beauchamp who first appeared as a banneret in 1297 was the younger son of William de Beauchamp of Elmly in Worcestershire by Isabel Mauduit. Walter's elder brother had inherited the earldom of Warwick when his uncle died in 1267-8. William de Cantilupe, who achieved the rank of banneret in 1300, was the nephew of Thomas de Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford and the great nephew of Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester. William de Geneville became a banneret in 1289-90. He was the younger son of Geoffrey de Geneville, lord of Meath.<sup>28</sup>

The possession of a substantial amount of land was another attribute of a banneret.<sup>29</sup> Some held important lands in either the Welsh or the Scottish marches. Robert Clifford was the holder of half of the hereditary sheriffdom of Westmorland, Roger Mortimer was granted the lands of Llywelyn Fychan which became known as the barony of Chirk, William de Braose was lord of Gower, John Tregoz was lord of Ewias Harold. John Lestrangle was the master of Knockin in Shropshire. A number were the holders of baronies. Norman Darcy

---

<sup>27</sup> *RG*, iii, 370; *G.E.C.* iv, 93-5

<sup>28</sup> *GEC*, xii, part ii, 368; See above vol. i, p 65

<sup>29</sup> Tenants in chief were not necessarily bannerets. Peter de Champagne who held the honour of Albemarle in chief remained a knight. *CCR 1296-1301*, 49

held the barony of Nocton.<sup>30</sup> John Botetourt became a banneret in 1300. He had married Maud, one of the daughters and heirs of Simon de Beauchamp, baron of Bedford, in 1295. He acquired one third of the barony after Simon's death in 1296.<sup>31</sup> However, not all bannerets conformed to this pattern. John Dovedale, admitted as a banneret in 1303-4, did not belong to an important family or hold extensive lands.

The responsibilities and duties of a banneret are no easier to define than is his status. The banneret had to provide larger retinues during a military campaign.<sup>32</sup> The Song of Caerlaverock shows that all bannerets carried their own banner. Robert Clifford's banner was 'chequered with gold azure, with a vermillion fess', Walter de Beauchamp had 'six martels of gold in a red field with a fess instead of a dancette'.<sup>33</sup> It is possible that the extra burden of providing more men during a campaign made some simple knights reluctant to become bannerets. Perhaps they even requested that the 'honour' should not be bestowed upon them.

Two historians have suggested that there may have been other formal ranks within the household. Denholm-Young claimed that the *commilitones* who appear on some accounts of fees and robes were an élite corps. This is clearly incorrect: as Prestwich pointed out these *commilitones* were companions. In the 1284-5 robe account the names of eight men appear with the *commilitones*. At the end of that section the scribe recorded sixteen payments of eight marks.<sup>34</sup> The

---

<sup>30</sup> RG, iii, 370; GEC, iv, 93-5

<sup>31</sup> John Botetourt's origins are obscure but the rumours about him being the illegitimate son of Edward I can be discounted. See above vol. i, p 43

<sup>32</sup> See chapter 2

<sup>33</sup> *The Siege of Carlaverock*, ed N.H. Nicolas (1828), 29, 31; the author mentions the bannerets of the household by name but not the knights, which gives some indication of their status.

<sup>34</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 148; N. Denholm-Young, *History and Heraldry*



point can be further clarified by an examination of an entry for John St John in the accounts of 1288-9. He received 4s a day when he was in court by himself and 6s per day 'quando habet commilitonem'.<sup>35</sup>

The *commilitones* were probably 'brothers in arms', men who were serving together sharing the costs and rewards of service within the king's household.<sup>36</sup> By the fifteenth century brothers in arms tended to be men who were of relatively low military rank who had very little land and very obscure family connections. However, the bannerets of Edward I who had companions were men from important family connections had considerable estates. In 1284-5 they included Peter de Chauvent, son and heir of Henry lord of Chauvent in Savoy and John de Bohun the son of the earl of Hereford.<sup>37</sup>

After 1284-5 the *commilitones* rarely appear on the lists of those entitled to receive fees and robes. However, they still occur on the accounts which record the actual payment of fees and robes in the forms of prests. The prest accounts of 1289-90 reveal that of the 22 bannerets in receipt of fees that winter, sixteen

---

(Oxford, 1965), 31-2; E101/351/17

<sup>35</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 2999

<sup>36</sup> The terms of the agreement under which these *commilitones* agreed to serve the bannerets have not survived. However, indentures which have survived from the fifteenth century suggest that the brother in arms agreed to raise the necessary ransom money if one of them was taken prisoner and to pool any profits or spoils. An indenture between Nicholas Kingston, the nephew of John Kingston, the household knight and William Mansell survives from 1298. However, this does not discuss the terms for the divisions of profits or loss terms but as McFarlane points out these may already have been well established. Similar indentures may have been made between the bannerets and their companions. K.B. McFarlane, 'A Business-Partnership and Administration 1441-1445', *EHR*, lxxviii (1963), 290-1; K.B. McFarlane, 'An Indenture of Agreement between two English Knights for Mutual Aid and Counsel in Peace and War, 5 December 1298', *BIHR*, xxxviii (1965), 200-10

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 202; E101/351/17

received payment for themselves and another.<sup>38</sup> These were the *commilitones* of the 1284-5 account. The men accompanying John de la Mare and Guncelin de Badlesmere in 1289-90 were bannerets; others were again just referred to as *commilitones*.<sup>39</sup>

All the bannerets in receipt of fees and robes in 1297 were accompanied by a knight. At the top of the list of winter fees is an entry for John de Engayne. It states that he and another were in receipt of fees for that period. Below this are the names of nine other bannerets who were to receive payment 'pro eodem'. One could argue that Engayne was the only banneret to have a companion but this seems unlikely. The first entry on the list of summer robes is for Robert Clifford. The payment he received was for himself and another knight. The other nine entries below his name were again 'pro eodem'.<sup>40</sup>

In 1299-1300 the situation was more complicated. The list of winter fees for that year begins with an entry for Eustace Hatch who was to receive payment for himself alone. The subsequent 23 entries were 'pro eodem'. These are followed by an account of the fees paid to Henry de Beaumont and John de Chauvent. Both men had a companion. The remaining five bannerets received payments 'pro eodem'. It is unclear whether these five were also accompanied by a knight. Of the 23 bannerets in receipt of summer fees, eleven appear after the entries for Henry de Beaumont and John de Chauvent. This would suggest a considerable increase in the number of bannerets who were serving with a partner. This could have been

---

<sup>38</sup> It seems unlikely that "altero" was ever used to denote a squire rather than a companion. In the controller's account of 1285-6 the entry for John Nesle states that he was in court alone during the winter but he was to receive winter robes for himself and his squire. Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1035, 1156, 1202

<sup>39</sup> C47/4/5, f 31v-32

<sup>40</sup> B1 Add Ms 7965, f 60v-61v

intended to strengthen the household prior to an important campaign in Scotland.<sup>41</sup>

A number of entries in the 1285-6 account book state that a banneret was serving alone. This suggests that some bannerets were usually accompanied by a partner. An entry which calculated Philip Daubeny's wages stated that he was in service alone.<sup>42</sup> Prestwich argued that such partnerships had disappeared by the later years of the reign.<sup>43</sup> There was clearly a change between 1300 and 1305-6. In 1301 only one banneret, John de Chauvent, had a companion. None of the bannerets attached to the household in 1303-4 and 1305-6 had a partner. Their potential companions may have been fully employed in Scotland serving at the king's wages.<sup>44</sup>

The idea that an élite corps existed within the household has recently been revived by Bean. He has concluded that a 'bachelor' of the king was a household knight of superior status. Bean suggested that the term bachelor had two meanings in the thirteenth century. As a general term it might denote a young, unmarried member of the knightly class. It could also be used to describe a large group. The Burton annalist describes the group making demands of Edward, the earl of Gloucester and others in 1259 as the *Communitas bachelerie Anglie*.<sup>45</sup>

However, when the term was applied to a king's knight, Bean claimed that it meant a member of his household. In 1216 a 'bachelor' received a payment from King John's chamber. Edward I

---

<sup>41</sup> *Liber Quot*, 195-7

<sup>42</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1132

<sup>43</sup> M.C. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (1972), 47

<sup>44</sup> E101/369/11, f 106; B1 Add Ms 8835, f 52

<sup>45</sup> J.M.W Bean, 'Bachelor and Retainer', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, iii, 122; 'Annales Monasterii de Burton' *Annales Monastici*, i, ed. H.R. Luard (Rolls Series 1864), 147

was petitioned by one of his bachelors who claimed that Alexander I had granted him a yearly fee out of his chamber but he had received no payment.<sup>46</sup> From his study of fourteenth century indentures, Bean claimed that the bachelor was a person of superior knightly status within the king's entourage. The bachelor knight was in regular attendance in the household while the non-bachelor knight was summoned only in a crisis.<sup>47</sup>

Given-Wilson's work on the household of Edward III in the late fourteenth century supports Bean's conclusions. However, it is uncertain whether it is equally applicable to the reign of Edward I.<sup>48</sup> In the late thirteenth century the term king's bachelor did not necessarily mean that the man was a household knight. A number of household knights were referred to as bachelors during the reign. In April 1301 there was an entry in the Irish accounts for Henry Cantok, a knight bachelor, to be paid the arrears of his wages from the wardrobe account. Henry was part of Edward's *familia* between 1300 and 1306. In 1290, John Fulburn, a knight bachelor, made a complaint to the king and his council. He was in receipt of fees and robes in 1284-5, 1285-6, 1300 and 1301. In 1306, Edward I sent a writ to John Wogan, the Justiciar of Ireland, asking him to reward his 'dear bachelor John Louth for his services in Gascony and Scotland'. John Louth was a member of the household between 1297 and 1306.<sup>49</sup> In 1306, William Leyburn was described as the

---

<sup>46</sup> Bean, 'Bachelor and Retainer', 122

<sup>47</sup> J.M.W. Bean, *From Lord to Patron* (Manchester 1989), 24-5, 28-30

<sup>48</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity*, 203

<sup>49</sup> The above references all concern Irish knights or Irish affairs. It may have been that the term bachelor was used to denote Irish knights who were members of the king's *familia* to distinguish them from the knights attached to the household of the Justiciar of Ireland. These were also referred to as knights of Edward's household. See below, vol. i, p 59-60

prince's bachelor.<sup>50</sup>

However, the term king's bachelor was not always applied to men who were household knights. In September 1281 two merchants were asked to deliver a loan to Robert Bruce, earl of Carrick, the king's bachelor. No earl was ever a household knight. The knight bachelor whom Bean cites as petitioning Edward I in 1303-4 about the payment of his fee was Reginald le Chein. He never appears in the wardrobe accounts as being in receipt of fees and robes.<sup>51</sup>

It is also impossible to accept that those household knights who were termed bachelors occupied a superior knightly position within the household of Edward I. If there had been a special group of men with important privileges they would surely have been distinguished in the lists of fees and robes. In fact an entry in the account book of 1289-90 suggests that the word 'bachelor' was interchangeable with the term simple knight. This entry records a change in the status of Bogo de Knoville within the household. In the previous wardrobe accounts Bogo had been listed as a simple knight but in 1289-90 he became a banneret. The entry records him receiving his last payment as a 'bachelor'. It was as a banneret that he received his fees and robes for the winter.<sup>52</sup>

This suggests that during Edward I's reign a bachelor of the household ranked lower than a banneret. It is therefore impossible to see the bachelors of Edward I as men 'of superior knightly status who occupied a position of special trust within the immediate entourage of his lord'.<sup>53</sup> Bannerets such as Robert Clifford, John St John, Peter de Chauvent, Walter de Beauchamp and

---

<sup>50</sup> *CDI*, iii, no. 998; iv, no. 79; *CJR*, 1305-7, 103; *CDS* v, p. 193

<sup>51</sup> Bean, 'Bachelor and Retainer', 122; *CDS*, ii, no. 1737

<sup>52</sup> C47/4/5, f 32; E101/351/17; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1722

<sup>53</sup> Bean, *From Lord to Patron*, 28-30

John Botetourt were important in royal service. If there was an 'inner ring' of knights in Edward's household it was more likely to have been formed by men like Otto de Grandson than by a knight such as Henry Cantok. His recruitment from Ireland was primarily related to the Scottish wars. There is no indication that he was a close confidant of the king.

The number of knights and bannerets attached to the household varied each year.<sup>54</sup> These figures are slightly different from those given by Prestwich. The number of men in receipt of fees and robes every winter and summer has been calculated. These accounts were not identical. In 1303-4, the names of one banneret and three knights who were receiving fees are not on the robe account. Conversely, one banneret and two knights who are on the robe list do not seem to have received fees. In addition, the figures for the size of the household in 1289-90 and 1305-6 have been supplemented by the information available in the prest accounts. This suggests that more men were receiving payments than the lists of fees and robes indicate.

The size of the household in 1277-8, 1283-4, the summer of 1286 and 1286-7 has been calculated from the accounts of those receiving daily wages for being attendant at court upon the king. The figures for 1301-2 and 1304-5 are derived from the surviving prest accounts. These are incomplete and clearly underestimated the number of men attached to the household in those years. The accounts of 1301-2 do give the names of other knights who were receiving war wages as part of the household. However, it is difficult to determine which of these men had been adopted into the household for the duration of the campaign. The payments made in

---

<sup>54</sup> See Appendix III

these accounts are for odd amounts of money. Under these circumstances it has been impossible to establish whether men such as Bernard de Bignoles were knights or bannerets.<sup>55</sup>

The size of the household varied with the political circumstances. Most of the fluctuations have been analysed by Prestwich.<sup>56</sup> The size of the household in 1283-4, 24 bannerets, eleven companions and 49 knights is usually attributed to the aftermath of the second Welsh war. The household was larger during the second Welsh war than in 1277-8. Only nine bannerets with nine companions and 49 knights appear on the court wage account for 1277-8. The household seems to have expanded in the 1280s. In the winter of 1285, 22 bannerets with four companions and 57 knights were attached to the household. In 1289-90 the king's *familia* included 22 bannerets, sixteen companions and 39 knights.<sup>57</sup>

There was a sharp fall in the size of the household during Edward's visit to Gascony between 1286 and 1289. Prior to Edward I's departure, 21 bannerets and 41 knights were in receipt of summer robes. The names of eleven bannerets and 28 knights appear on the wages account between June and October 1286. The size of the household remained at this level until the king returned to England.<sup>58</sup>

There was an influx of knights into the household in 1297 in preparation for the expedition to Flanders. Edward I needed to expand his household because of the growing opposition to his proposed campaign.<sup>59</sup> In spite of the influx of knights, the

---

<sup>55</sup> E101/364/13; E101/367/16; E101/368/6; E101/368/27; E101/369/16; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 1099, 1396

<sup>56</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 22

<sup>57</sup> E101/351/17; E101/352/24; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1677-80

<sup>58</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1726-1818

<sup>59</sup> See chapter 2

household was still relatively small in size.<sup>60</sup> Sixty-eight knights and bannerets were receiving fees and robes. That was smaller than the household of 1284-5 or even that of 1288-9.<sup>61</sup>

This suggests that there may have been a sharp decline in the size of the household between 1290 and 1297. This could have been due to the fact that Edward I was already facing financial problems after the failure of the Riccardi. The intensity of the financial pressure upon Edward in 1297 may explain why the expansion of the household was not greater.

The household was much larger in 1300 than in 1297. This expansion was mainly the result of a rise in the number of bannerets attached to the household. Fourteen bannerets were in receipt of fees and robes in 1297; by 1300 this figure had risen to thirty. Prestwich has attributed this increase to the summer campaign in Scotland. It may also have been due to the problems Edward I anticipated in the parliament of 1300.<sup>62</sup>

In spite of the continuing campaigns in Scotland the size of the household decreased between 1300 and 1305. There were eighteen bannerets and 36 knights in receipt of fees and robes in 1301 and 22 bannerets and 30 knights in 1303-4. This was the result of financial pressures. In addition there had been calls for the abolition of prise due to the strain imposed by purveyance during the Scottish wars.<sup>63</sup> The total amount expended on fees in 1300 was £590: this fell to £350 in 1301, and £260 in 1303-4.<sup>64</sup>

Prestwich argued that it was possible to identify an increase

---

<sup>60</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 148

<sup>61</sup> Bl Add Ms 7965, f 60-61

<sup>62</sup> See chapter 8

<sup>63</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 47

<sup>64</sup> See Appendix IV



in the ratio of bannerets to simple knights during the reign.<sup>65</sup> The main expansion seems to have occurred in the 1280s. The bannerets and their companions formed 16% of those receiving wages from the household in 1277-8. In 1284-5 this figure had risen to 40% This ratio seems to have been maintained in later years. The bannerets constituted 34% of the household in 1285, 39% in 1286, 34% in 1301, 42% in 1303-4 and 36% in 1305-6.

The fluctuating size of the household meant that its personnel could change quite rapidly. Five bannerets and ten knights who were attached to the household in 1301 do not appear in the accounts relating to 1303-4. Conversely, ten bannerets and twelve knights who were members of the household in 1304 had not been in receipt of fees and robes in 1301.<sup>66</sup>

The expeditions to Flanders in 1297 and to Gascony in 1286 provoked a dramatic change in the membership of the household. Many knights did not accompany Edward to Gascony.<sup>67</sup> They were replaced by a considerable number of Gascon knights.<sup>68</sup> Most of the Gascons did not travel with the court to England in 1289. Those who did returned to Gascony the following year.<sup>69</sup>

Many of the English knights who did not accompany Edward to Gascony rejoined the household in 1289. Twelve bannerets who were receiving robes from the king in 1286 remained in England. Nine of these men returned to the king's *familia* in 1289-90. Eustace Hatch became attached to the household of the king's children. He

---

<sup>65</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 47

<sup>66</sup> Bl Add Ms 7966A, f 135-136; Bl Add Ms 8835, f 52-55

<sup>67</sup> See above, vol. i, p 24

<sup>68</sup> Byerly *Records*, 1285-6, nos 1677-1680; Byerly, *Records* 1286-9, nos 1098-1396, 2942-3009

<sup>69</sup> See below, vol. i, p 60-2

reappeared as part of Edward's household in 1299. Twenty-eight simple knights did not venture abroad in 1286. Eleven were once again members of the household in 1289-90.

The absence of a complete set of wardrobe accounts for every year of the reign prevents the drawing of any firm conclusions about the average length of service in the household. However, the surviving evidence suggests that few knights served for more than twenty years. Of those knights who appear on the wage account of 1277, sixteen received robes in 1284-5. The same number were still attached to the household in 1289-90. The names of only five appear on the accounts which survive from the later years of the reign.<sup>70</sup>

Of the 177 household knights who appear in receipt of fees and robes in and prior to 1289-90, 150 are not on any of the later lists. Twenty-four were dead and twenty-six were Gascons who had been attached to the household during the second Welsh war or between 1286 and 1289. Four knights had left the household to go on the expedition to Gascony in 1294, seven had joined other royal households and a number, including Roger Lestrangle, had retired.<sup>71</sup>

A few knights did remain in royal service throughout the reign. Peter de Chauvent was a member of the household in 1278-9. He was still in receipt of fees and robes in 1301. Guncelin de Badlesmere and John de la Mare were part of Edward's *familia* in 1284-5. They were still attached to the household in 1300. John Botetourt, John Lestrangle and John de Sulley were household knights in 1284-5 and they remained with the household until 1305-6. Eustace Hatch, William Latimer the elder and Bogo de Knoville fought as part of the household in 1277, and were

---

<sup>70</sup> E101/351/17; E101/3/21; C47/2/5

<sup>71</sup> CFR 1272-1307, 233, 257, 284-5, 336, 354, 368; CPR 1281-92, 423; CPR 1292-1301, 67; RG, iii, 2743, 2745, 2827; E101/360/17

receiving fees from the king in the first years of the fourteenth century.<sup>72</sup>

John Botetourt became a knight in 1284-5, and appeared on every subsequent list except for the prest accounts of 1304-5 which are incomplete. Peter de Chauvent was a member of the household in 1278-9. He received fees in every year for which the accounts survive until 1301. However, the careers of most knights and bannerets were disjointed. John de la Mare, a member of the *familia* in 1284-5 and 1303-4, was absent from the household lists of 1286-8, 1297 and 1301.

Sometimes the absence of a knight in a particular year is easily explained. The visit to Gascony in 1286 and the expedition to Flanders in 1297 are obvious reasons. Bogo de Knoville was in receipt of fees and robes in 1277-8 and 1305-6. Apart from the prest accounts of 1301-2 and 1304-5 he was absent only from the accounts which record Edward's visit to Gascony. However, the possibility that a scribe occasionally omitted a member of the household from the accounts cannot be discounted.

The existence of a royal household in which the knights received a monetary fee and robes<sup>73</sup> must have important implications for any debate on the origins of the so-called 'bastard feudalism'. Many elements which are traditionally associated with the term bastard feudalism, such as the use of an annual money fee and the payment of wages, the retaining of men from outside the direct

---

<sup>72</sup> E101/351/17; E101/369/11, f106; *Liber Quot*, 188-195; Bl Add Ms 8835 ff 52-54; Bl Add Ms 7966A, ff 78-9

<sup>73</sup> The household knights received actual robes from the king in addition to the monetary payment. However, this had not evolved into a distinct uniform or livery by the end of the thirteenth century. I am indebted to the help of Dr Frédérique Lachaud on this subject.

tenurial connections and even the use of an indenture were already present in the royal household of the twelfth century.

This corresponds with the recent work of David Crouch who has demonstrated that William Marshal, earl of Pembroke, was recruiting knights from outside his own lands.<sup>74</sup> This suggests that these elements of bastard feudalism had been developing within the king's household and the households of the magnates from the twelfth century. Carpenter's argument that the 'first and greatest bastard feudal lord was the king' is understandable.<sup>75</sup> However, under these circumstances Crouch is surely correct to dispute the continued use of the term 'bastard feudalism'. Some features of it were present from the time when 'feudalism' itself was established. A royal household formed in this manner was clearly one of the instruments of a 'feudal king.'

It is possible that the development and growth of the royal household during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did encourage the magnates to recruit men from outside their own lands. During a military campaign the knights and bannerets served with their own retinues of knights and squires. These men also had feudal obligations to the king. These factors may have encouraged the household knights to recruit men beyond their normal tenurial connections. For instance no tenurial connection can be found between Robert Clifford and a number of his retinue in 1300.<sup>76</sup>

The expansion of the household in this manner was not of course new in Edward I's reign. There exists as early as 1101 an agreement in which Count Robert of Flanders arranged to provide

---

<sup>74</sup> D. Crouch, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised' *Past and Present*, cxxx (1991), 172-3; D. Crouch, *William Marshal, Court, Career and Chivalry in the Angevin Empire 1147-1219* (1990), 161

<sup>75</sup> D.A. Carpenter, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present*, cxxx (1991), 186

<sup>76</sup> See chapter 2

Henry I with 1,000 knights a year in return for £500. Henry I promised to maintain these men as part of his own military household during the campaigns in Maine.<sup>77</sup>

However, Coss has argued that although certain elements of bastard feudalism can be traced back to the twelfth century the crucial stimulus came between 1180 and 1230. During that period the development of royal government encouraged magnates to retain justices and other men involved in local administration.<sup>78</sup> Crouch has disputed this idea on the grounds that Coss places too much emphasis on the decline of the honour as the motivation behind the magnates' actions. He also states that as early as 1130 lords were offering mediation at court in order to secure favours for their men.<sup>79</sup> Carpenter confirmed that magnates could be found to be retaining justices and sheriffs before 1154. However, he claimed that the scale of such activities was transformed by the Angevin legal reforms. He also argued that the increasing use of local men as opposed to *curiales* in the thirteenth century gave the magnates the opportunity they needed to increase their power.<sup>80</sup>

There is clearly a strong case for supposing that the growth in royal government stimulated the magnates' attempts to retain officials. Carpenter based his conclusion upon his own work on the decline of the curial sheriff. However, the role of the household knight was not necessarily declining in all areas of local administration and justice. By attempting to have members of their household in such positions the magnates were mirroring the actions of the king. This would suggest that to a certain degree the

---

<sup>77</sup> Prestwich, 'The Military Household of the Norman Kings', 8-9

<sup>78</sup> P.R. Coss, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present*, cxxii (1989), 32, 44

<sup>79</sup> D. Crouch, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', 172-3

<sup>80</sup> Carpenter, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', 180, 181

growing employment of both household knights and knights attached to particular magnates was a simultaneous response to the growth of royal government.

In essence the household knights of Edward I were a body of men attached to the household whose membership and size fluctuated with the political and military circumstances. These men were bound to the king by a monetary fee and the provision of robes. The household of Edward I had many similarities to that of the early Norman kings and their successors although the household in the late thirteenth century was numerically larger than its predecessors. Walker claimed that the average size of the household during Henry III's reign was 32 knights. The largest number of knights receiving fees in any one year was 70.<sup>81</sup> In addition, there was increasingly a distinction in the household between simple knights and bannerets. Such a differentiation had probably been present in previous reigns as the knights had received fees of varying amounts. However, the ranks became clearer, more formalised and more distinct under Edward I. This thesis will examine the role of the household within different areas of royal government. It will attempt to evaluate the importance of the knights' non-military role. The origins and evolution of the knights of the chamber will be assessed.

---

<sup>81</sup> Walker, 'The Anglo-Welsh Wars', 70

## CHAPTER 1

### RECRUITMENT

The fluid nature of the royal household meant that new men were retained each year. In 1286-7 only two knights were admitted but in 1297, a year of political and military upheaval, a third of the household knights were new members. The problem of recruiting men was greater than that faced by Edward's predecessors because the royal household of the late thirteenth century was proportionately larger.

This chapter will examine the recruitment of the 282 knights who were in receipt of fees and robes during the reign. A number of factors need to be considered, including the importance of a knight's family background and the geographical location of his lands. The influence of political events on the composition of the household will also be examined.

At the beginning of the reign the core of Edward's household knights consisted of men who had been in his or his father's service before 1272. The exact composition of the household in the first decade of the reign is difficult to determine. One list of robes for 1273-4 has survived. Of the nine bannerets and forty-two knights who were receiving robes that year, twelve had been in royal service before 1272.

Of the bannerets, John de Mohaut, Peter de Chauvent, Adam de Mohaut, Hugh FitzOtto and Roger de Trumpington went on crusade with Edward to the Holy Land in 1270. Peter de Chauvent had been fairly prominent in the Lord Edward's household, appearing on a number of charter witness lists in 1270 and before. Adam de Mohaut had been

attached to Henry III's household. He received a yearly fee of 20 marks in 1261. Hugh FitzOtto, the household steward, had probably joined Edward's household prior to 1266. That was the first year in which he appeared as a witness to one of the Prince's charters. He witnessed a grant at Bayonne in 1270 as part of the household.<sup>1</sup>

A similar but less extensive record of service can be attributed to the following knights: Richard de Boys, Philip Darcy, Gerard de St Laurent, Giles de Fiennes, Ralph de Woodborough and Imbert de Ivyre. They had all gone on crusade as part of Edward's contingent. William Montravel was a yeoman of Prince Edward in 1269 and Constable of Bordeaux in 1271.<sup>2</sup>

From the witness lists it seems likely that such men as Roger Clifford the elder, Geoffrey de Geneville,<sup>3</sup> John de Grailly, William de Braose, Luke de Tany, Robert de Tibetot, James d'Audley, Hamo Lestrangle, Roger Leyburn the elder, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, and Robert de Ufford were also members of the household in the 1270s. Otto de Grandson appears on the witness lists and there is a reference in 1280 to two merchants giving a loan to Otto de Grandson, a member of the king's household.<sup>4</sup>

All these men had been in royal service prior to 1272. William de Braose was attached to Henry III's household in the 1260s. The others appeared regularly as witnesses to Edward's charters. A charter of Edward's dated 1270, which granted Robert de Tibetot a manor in Suffolk, was witnessed by Roger Leyburn, James Audley,

---

<sup>1</sup> S.D. Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade 1216-1307* (Oxford, 1988), appendix iv; Walker, 'Anglo-Welsh Wars', 75; RG, ii, 479; C53/56

<sup>2</sup> C. Moor, *The Knights of Edward I* (Harleian Society, Leeds, 1929), iii, 197

<sup>3</sup> The admittance of Geneville and Grailly into the household is discussed below, vol. i, pp 64-65

<sup>4</sup> CPR 1272-81, 389; C53/68



Roger Clifford, Hamo Lestrangle and John de Grailly. Tibetot, Ufford, Clifford, Leyburn, Tany and John de Grailly all went on crusade with Edward. Roger Mortimer the elder acted as Edward's representative in England and was a member of the regency council which controlled the country until his return.<sup>5</sup> Robert de Ufford, James Audley and Geoffrey de Geneville had held important positions in the lands which had been assigned to the Prince in 1254 and had all been justiciar of Ireland.<sup>6</sup>

Leyburn, Clifford, Lestrangle, Tibetot, Vaux and Ufford had entered the household in 1257 when Edward had expanded it to deal with the threat from Wales. As Ridgeway demonstrated, these knights became increasingly prominent in 1259 as Edward attempted to establish the independence of his household from the king, and from the barons who were attempting to uphold the Provisions of Oxford.<sup>7</sup>

When Henry III departed for France to negotiate peace with the French, Edward appointed Leyburn and Clifford as custodians of Bristol Castle and the Three Castles in Wales respectively. Hamo Lestrangle received custody of Montgomery. These appointments were annulled upon Henry III's return but the importance of this circle around Edward did not diminish. Roger Leyburn was steward of his household, replacing the man who had been appointed by Henry III.

Ridgeway showed that the financial concerns of the Prince led him to become reconciled with his father after May 1260. This led to a decline in Edward's authority over his household and some of these knights, Clifford, Lestrangle, Vaux and Leyburn, appear to

---

<sup>5</sup> Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade 1216-1307*, Appendix 4; *CChR 1257-1300*, 147; SC1/8/28; *CLR 1260-7*, 35

<sup>6</sup> See below, vol. ii, 14; R.J. Sutton, *Robert de Ufford: tige des seigneurs de Poswick à la croix engrêlée* (Olne 1968), 23-43

<sup>7</sup> H.W. Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court 1247-65, with special reference to the role of aliens (Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1984), 272-3, 345

have been replaced in Edward's household by royal servants of Henry III's choosing.<sup>8</sup> Removed from the Prince's household, they allied themselves with Simon de Montfort. In many ways the rebellion of the mid-1260s was a movement of those who had been displaced from Edward's household.<sup>9</sup>

By the summer of 1263 Clifford the elder, Leyburn the elder, Vaux and Lestrangle had rejoined the Prince.<sup>10</sup> This may have been the result of Simon de Montfort's overtures to Llywelyn ap Gruffydd. Both Clifford and Lestrangle were marcher lords. From that point onwards these men loyally served with the royal forces and remained attached to Edward's household. Roger Clifford fought with the royal forces at Northampton in 1264 and was one of those who helped to arrange Edward's escape from captivity in 1265. Leyburn was with Warenne holding Rochester for the king in 1264. He fought at Evesham and then treated with London on the king's behalf.<sup>11</sup>

Roger Clifford and Roger Leyburn the elder were appointed to subdue the sheriffdom of Westmorland, which had been held by the rebel, Robert Vipont II. In 1265 they were granted the marriage of his heirs, Isabella and Idonia: the former married Clifford's son,

---

<sup>8</sup> In February 1262 Leyburn was accused of misappropriating the Prince's finances and his lands were confiscated, including Eltham in Kent which Edward, to Henry III's annoyance, had given to him. It is unclear who brought Leyburn down. It may have been the result of the king's displeasure at his giving away such lands as Eltham or it may have been due to the influence of Edward's mother: Prestwich, *Edward I*, 37

<sup>9</sup> Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court 1247-65,' 396-8; A. Lewis 'Roger Leyburn and the Pacification of England', *EHR*, 1939, 194-5

<sup>10</sup> *Rishanger*, 13; *Flores*, iii, 257; 'Annales Prioratus de Dunstaplia, A.D. 1-1297', *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864-9), 223

<sup>11</sup> *Guisborough*, 189, 197; *Rishanger*, 21, 25, 34; *Chron. Lanercost*, 79; *Ann. London*, 70; *Receuil des lettres Anglo-Francaises*, 1265-1399, ed. F. Tanqueray (Paris, 1916), 1; Lewis, 'Roger Leyburn and the Pacification of England', 194-5

and the latter Leyburn's.<sup>12</sup>

Roger Mortimer had supported the barons in 1259. He was one of the council of twelve left in charge in England during Henry III's absence in 1259. Mortimer joined the king at the same time as Clifford and the others in 1263, having been promised three of de Montfort's manors. He was the prime mover behind Edward's escape in 1265. Roger met the Prince and conveyed him to Wigmore. He led one of the royal contingents at Evesham and his appearance on charter witness lists suggests that he remained in Edward's household in the 1260s.<sup>13</sup>

In the 1280s a significant core of the household continued to be provided by those who had served the Prince or Henry III in the 1280s. Of the 24 bannerets in receipt of wages in 1283-4 eleven had directly served either Henry III or Edward when he was a young prince. Of the 50 knights at least nine had also been in the king's service during the previous reign.

Among the bannerets<sup>14</sup> William Latimer, Nicholas de Segrave, Thomas de Clare, and Richard de Braose had been on crusade in 1270. Clare had been fairly prominent in the Lord Edward's household, appearing on a number of charter witness lists in 1270 and before. Roger Lestrangle, William Leyburn, Alexander de la Pébrée and Hugh Turberville did not go on crusade but they had witnessed Edward I's charters before 1270. Hugh Turberville had also been appointed as senschal of Gascony and warden of the Channel Islands. Roger Mortimer of Chirk was described as a royal yeoman in 1270.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> CLR 1267-72, 78; See chapter 9

<sup>13</sup> 'Annales Monasterii de Burton, 1004-1263', i, 510; *Guisborough*, 200; *Rishanger*, 46; *CChR 1257-1300*, 246

<sup>14</sup> The careers of John de Mohaut, Peter de Chauvent and Roger de Trumpington who were also in receipt of robes in 1277-8 are discussed above, vol. i, p 32

<sup>15</sup> *G.E.C.* ix, 277-81; *CChR 1257-1300*, 149-151, 348, 418; C53/56;

Of the simple knights, Bartholomew de Briançon, Guy Ferre the elder, Ingram de Ivyre, William de Geneville and John de Weston had journeyed to the east as part of Edward's contingent. Guillaume Arnald had appeared as a witness on Prince Edward's charter lists.<sup>16</sup>

The recruitment of household knights was often based on a family tradition of service. Edward I recruited men from those families who had already provided him or his father with knights. Of the 232 household knights who were in receipt of fees and robes from 1272 to 1307, at least 53 had relatives who had been in royal service before 1272.

The sons of the knights who had formed the core of Edward I's household from the late 1260s onwards followed their fathers into royal service. The eldest son of Roger Leyburn, William, had been a member of the Prince's household prior to 1272 and remained with the household throughout the reign. He was joined by his own son Thomas Leyburn in 1306. The son and the grandson of Roger Clifford the elder followed him into royal service. Roger Clifford the younger served Edward I until his death during the second Welsh war and his son Robert Clifford received fees and robes as a household knight in 1297. Roger Mortimer of Chirk, a younger son of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, was in receipt of fees as a banneret in 1282-3. William de Braose the younger was a member of the household in 1297. William de Geneville, son of Geoffrey de Geneville, and Peter de Grailly, son of John de Grailly, were household knights in the 1270s. Hugh d'Audley, son of James d'Audley who died in 1273, was a knight of the household in 1285-6.<sup>17</sup>

The three Lestrangle brothers, Hamo, Roger and John Lestrangle

---

E101/4/8

<sup>16</sup> C53/60 m 8

<sup>17</sup> G.W. Watson, 'The Families of Lacy, Geneva, Joinville, and La Marche', *Genealogist*, N.S., xxi, 73; *G.E.C.* i, 27

IV, had been prominent in royal service prior to 1272. Hamo and Roger were connected to Prince Edward's household. John Lestrangle III had been in receipt of fees as a knight of Henry III's household from 1226 to 1233.<sup>18</sup> John Lestrangle V received fees and robes in the 1280s. He was joined in the household by his son John in 1306.

Other household families had an equally strong tradition of service. Ralph Basset of Drayton was in receipt of fees and robes in 1289-90. His grandfather had been attached to Henry III's household in 1227-30. Edward Charles, a member of Edward I's household from 1297, was the son of William Charles, steward of the king's household in 1270. Hugh de Brok was the son of Laurence de Brok who was receiving a £20 fee from Henry III in 1262. John de la Mare, in receipt of fees and robes from 1282-3, was the grandson of Matthew de la Mare. The latter had been a valet of Queen Eleanor's household in 1254-9 and a knight of Henry III's household in the 1260s. Philip Daubeney was the brother of William Daubeney, who was a knight of Queen Eleanor in 1252-8.<sup>19</sup>

Baldwin Freville's mother was Maud Giffard, daughter of Hugh Giffard of Boyton by Sybil, the daughter of Walter de Cormeilles. She was the governess of Henry III's children and a close friend of the king and queen. Ralph Gorges' father served with Edward in the Holy Land and had been a household knight of Henry III.<sup>20</sup>

A number of Turbervilles were in Henry III's service. It seems likely that they were related to the Hugh and Thomas Turberville who were in Edward I's household. William Turberville received fees

---

<sup>18</sup> Walker, 'The Anglo-Welsh Wars 1217-1267', 75

<sup>19</sup> Walker, 'Anglo-Welsh Wars', 76; Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court', 412; *CLR* 1267-72, 1227, 1288; *CLR* 1260-7, 106, 2299b, 2328; *CFR* 1272-1307, 519

<sup>20</sup> P. Montague-Smith, 'The Frevilles of Tamworth Castle, Stafford', *Genealogist Magazine*, xxi, 185-9; *CLR* 1267-72, 346

from the king between 1241 and 1249. Henry Turberville was seneschal of Gascony in 1240 and there was a John Turberville who acted as the king's steward in 1266. The Achard family also had a tradition of royal service. In 1268 there was a Walter Achard and a John Pychard serving as sergeants at arms at Windsor. These men were probably related to Robert Achard and Miles Pychard. Miles Pychard owed a John Pychard some money in 1292 and both men held land in Herefordshire.<sup>21</sup>

Clearly many of the household knights who served Edward I belonged to families who had served his father. This tradition of service continued during Edward I's reign. Out of the ~~232~~ household knights who received fees and robes between 1272 and 1307, 47 have been identified as having 'direct' family ties.<sup>22</sup>

Twenty-six of the knights were linked by a father and son relationship. Walter de Beauchamp, who was in receipt of fees and robes from 1284 to 1301, was joined in royal service by his two sons. Walter de Beauchamp the younger joined the household in 1297 and his brother William was in receipt of fees and robes in 1300. Guncelin de Badlesmere was also joined by his two sons. Giles received the fee of a knight simple in 1285-6 and in 1299-1300 Bartholomew, his son and heir, joined the household.

It was more usual for a household knight to be followed into royal service by only one of his sons. Into this category fall John St John, John de Bavent, William de Braose and William Latimer the elder, who were all receiving fees in 1285-6. William de Braose the younger, Roger St John and Robert de Bavent were admitted to the household in 1297. William Latimer the younger was in receipt

---

<sup>21</sup> *CLR* 1240-5, 7, 43, 84, 1222; *CLR* 1260-7, 250; *CLR* 1267-72, 393, 624; *CCR* 1288-96, 254

<sup>22</sup> This term embraces the following relationships; father, son, brothers, uncle, nephew, cousin

of fees and robes in 1299-1300. Robert Hausted was joined by his son Robert in 1299-1300. William le Brun and his son Maurice were both household knights in 1299-1300 and Norman and Philip Darcy were attached to the king in the 1280s.<sup>23</sup>

There were at least three pairs of brothers in Edward I's service. Baldwin and Alexander Freville were one pair. Robert de Felton and his elder brother William were both admitted in 1297. Thomas Morham was also admitted in that year and his brother Herbert was a household knight in 1299-1300. A number of household knights were joined in royal service by their nephews. Alexander de la Pébrée and his nephew Guy were both in receipt of fees and robes in 1285-6. Hugh Pecche also featured in that list. In 1299-1300 his nephew Gilbert was a member of the household.

In addition to these examples there was probably a direct family relationship between at least 24 other knights. There must surely have been a connection between Thomas and John Bicknor, William and Robert de Cantilupe, Thomas and Elias Hauville, Bogo and Gilbert de Knoville, John and William Russel, Richard and Nicholas de Boys, and Hugh and Thomas de Turberville. When Elias Hauville went to Gascony in 1294 his custodianship of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford was given to Thomas Hauville. Both Hugh and Thomas Turberville held lands in Herefordshire. Thomas and John Bicknor both held lands in Kent and were associated with the mews at Bicknor.<sup>24</sup>

This tradition in certain families of providing a pool of recruits for the household was probably strengthened by the more indirect links of intermarriage between these families. At least

---

<sup>23</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1250, 1677, 1678. 1679, 1680; B1 Add Ms 7965, f 60-3; *Liber Quot*, 160-185

<sup>24</sup> *CFR 1272-1300*, 343; *CCR 1288-96*, 48, 54; *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, I, ii (Record Commission, 1783), 25

forty-one household knights were linked through such ties. A number of knights married the daughters of other household knights. John Dovedale and Gilbert de Briddlesdale married Mary and Isabel, the daughters and heirs of Peter de Champagne. John de la Mare married Eleanor, the daughter of Walter de Beauchamp. Robert de Felton married Hawise, the daughter of John Lestrangle and John Lestrangle married Maud, a daughter of Elbe des Montz, possibly by an heiress of Roger Deyvill.

It is possible to trace a series of different connections over a number of generations which created a large family network. Walter de Beauchamp was the son of William de Beauchamp of Elmley. His sister Sarah married Gilbert Talbot, a member of the household from 1297. His uncle William, Earl of Warwick, married Alice the sister of Nicholas de Segrave, another household knight. Walter's nephew Guy who became Earl of Warwick married twice. His second wife was Alice the widow of Thomas, the son of William Leyburn.<sup>25</sup>

This type of network was quite common among the knights. John Tregoz became a household knight in 1290. His family was related by marriage to a number of other household families such as the Cantilupes, the Lestranges, the Grandsons, the Creukers, the Knovilles, the Feltons and the des Montz.<sup>26</sup>

It is difficult to determine the importance of these connections in the recruitment of new knights to the household. For instance John Cromwell had already been admitted to the household when he married Idonia, the widow of Roger Leyburn in 1302. John de la Mare married Eleanor after, not before, his admittance to the household. However, such marriages strengthened the bonds between household knights and helped to perpetuate the tradition of royal

---

<sup>25</sup> See Appendix II fig i

<sup>26</sup> See Appendix II, fig ii,



service among these families.<sup>27</sup>

The tradition of service in the royal household was shared by the wives and daughters of the knights. These ladies were sometimes connected to the household of the queen or one of her daughters. John Ingham's wife Margerie was a lady in waiting in the household of the king's daughter Joanna. Agnes, the daughter of Matthew de Mont Martin, was a damsel of the Queen. James de la Plaunche married Matilda who was a lady of the household of one of the royal daughters. Andrew de Sackville's wife Ermentrude was one of Eleanor's attendants. John de Weston's wife Christina was a lady of the chamber after 1286. These marriages were sometimes promoted by the queen as reward for the loyal service of a knight or of a kinsman such as James de la Plaunche.<sup>28</sup>

A number of household knights were the younger, landless sons of prominent families. These men needed a career in royal service to improve their fortunes. An excellent example of this is provided by Walter de Beauchamp. He was the younger son of William de Beauchamp of Elmley. When his father died in 1268 his younger brother William received his father's land. Walter bought the moiety of Alchester. At least fifteen other household knights fall into this category including John Cromwell, Geoffrey de Pitchford, William de Geneville, John de Mohaut, Robert de Mohaut, Edmund Mauley, John de Sulleye the younger and Hugh Pecche. Roger Lestrangle was the younger son of John Lestrangle III. John de Bohun's elder brother Humphrey received the land and the earldom of Hereford after their father's death in 1275. Thomas de Clare was

---

<sup>27</sup> *CFR 1272-1307*, 373; *G.E.C.* ii, 289, viii, 463-4, xii part i, 253-4; I.J. Sanders, *English Baronies* (Oxford, 1960), 75; See Appendix II, fig ii

<sup>28</sup> *The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290*, ed. J.C. Parsons (Toronto, 1977), 14-5, 50, 155-6, 275-6; *CFR 1272-1307*, 532

the younger son of Richard, earl of Gloucester. Roger Mortimer of Chirk was the third son of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore. His brother Ralph predeceased his father in 1274, and Edmund, who had been destined for the church, inherited Wigmore. It was only through his own service to the king that Roger acquired landed wealth. Henry de Beaumont was the younger son of Louis de Brienne D'Acre, Viscount of Beaumont in Maine by Agnes daughter and sole heir of Raoul, Viscount of Beaumont.<sup>29</sup>

However, the household was not simply the province of younger sons. The heirs of earldoms did not become household knights but many eldest sons, even those who were due to inherit a great deal of land, did join the household. Into this category fall Robert Clifford, John Lestrangle, William de Cantilupe, Amaury St Amand, William Leyburn and John Tregoz.

Edward I recruited the relatives of men who were prominent in other areas of royal service into his household. William Touchet was the nephew of the treasurer William Louth. John Lovetot the younger was a son of the prominent royal justice. Giles de Fiennes was the nephew of Michael de Fiennes who had been Prince Edward's chancellor.<sup>30</sup>

Such distant relatives of the king and his wife as Henry de Beaumont were recruited into the household.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, Giles and

---

<sup>29</sup> *G.E.C.*, iii, 551-3; v, 630-4; vi, 459; viii, 559; ix, 277-81; x, 334-7; xii part i, 415-6; xii part ii, 386; Moor, *Knights*, i, 74; iii, 207; *CIPM*, i, no. 286; *CPR 1292-1301*, 423

<sup>30</sup> *Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, ed. Parsons, 42; *CPR 1292-1301*, 540; G.P. Cuttino, 'A Chancellor of the Lord Edward', *BIHR*, xlx (1977), 229

<sup>31</sup> The claims that John Botetourt was an illegitimate son of Edward I, possibly by a lady that the Queen sent to help to help him escape from Dover castle in 1265 are untrue. It is based on an entry in the Hailes Abbey Chronicle. As Prestwich pointed out, the entry is written over an erasure and is therefore suspect. Denholm-Young, *History and Heraldry*, 38-9; Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 58; Bl Cottonian Ms Cleop. D. III, f 51

William de Fiennes and James de la Plaunche could claim kinship with Eleanor of Castile. Eleanor was the great-granddaughter of Alberic II of Dammartin. His daughter Agnes had married a member of the Fiennes family. Their eldest son Enguerran de Fiennes II was the father of William and Giles. The family of James de la Plaunche was a cadet line of the Fiennes but the exact genealogical link is unknown. Henry de Beaumont was also related to the queen: his father and Eleanor were full cousins.<sup>32</sup>

Another recruiting ground for household knights was the lesser ranks of the household such as squires, falconers and hound keepers. Forty-seven household knights had already served in the household in a different capacity before they were promoted. Of those in receipt of fees and robes in 1285-6 John Botetourt, William de Geneville, Eustace Hatch and Andrew de Sackville had previously been squires of the royal household. Eustace Hatch served as a squire during the first Welsh war. John Botetourt, William de Geneville and Andrew de Sackville were receiving wages as royal squires during the second Welsh war.<sup>33</sup>

Of the ~~fourteen~~ bannerets and 48 knights in receipt of fees and robes in 1297, sixteen knights excluding John Botetourt had previously served as royal squires. John Louth was the sumpterman of the robes in 1285-6. William de Felton had served as a squire in the first Welsh war and had remained attached to the household as a valet of the chamber in the 1280s. He went to Gascony with the king in 1286. Household records from that period show him to have been active in arranging for work to be done at the places where Edward stayed on his journey, Bonnegrade, Peyranere, Condom and Mauléon.

---

<sup>32</sup> *Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, ed. Parsons, 42, 46, 49 53; Sanders, *Baronies*, 61-2

<sup>33</sup> E101/3/15; E101/351/9; E101/4/1

He went to each of these places in advance of the king and arranged for carpenters, plasterers and other workmen to do what was necessary.<sup>34</sup>

Robert Hausted the elder, Thomas Bicknor, Alexander Freville and Robert de Bures had served as squires during the second Welsh war. Except for Bures they were still receiving wages in this capacity in 1290. In addition William le Brun, James de la Plaunche, Robert de Bavent, John de Chauvent, Guy de Warwick and Robert Hausted the younger were also receiving wages as squires in 1290. By 1294-5 their ranks had been joined by Robert Clifford, Walter de Beauchamp the younger, Thomas Morham and Roger St John.<sup>35</sup>

Of the seventeen bannerets and fifty knights in receipt of fees and robes in 1306, fourteen had served as royal squires. Five of these have already been mentioned. Of the remainder Walter de Teye, John Thorpe and John de Rivers held this position in 1290. William de Beauchamp, the brother of Walter de Beauchamp the younger and William Montague were squires in 1294-5. Edmund Cornwall and Edmund Willington were valets of the chamber in 1297.<sup>36</sup>

Many of these knights had also been falconers or keepers of the hawks and hounds.<sup>37</sup> Thomas Hauville, William FitzWarin and John Bicknor feature in the hunting accounts from 1277-8 onwards. Thomas Bicknor was named as the king's ostringer in the household ordinance of 1279. Robert de Bavent appears as one of the king's falconers after 1284-5. Eble des Montz was briefly employed to care

---

<sup>34</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 959; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 301, 322, 367, 410, 435, 533, 1446, 1588, 1676, 1779

<sup>35</sup> C47/4/4, ff 11, 18v, 20, 20v, 21v, 28; *Book of Prests*, ed. Fryde, 24-25, 35; BL Add Ms 7965, f 60-4; E101/3/15; E101/351/9 ff 6, 8, 9; E101/4/1; E101/352/24

<sup>36</sup> C47/4/4, ff 19, 20v, 30v; BL Add Ms 7965, f 129v; E101/370/28 m 11

<sup>37</sup> For a detailed discussion of these men and their careers see chapter 3

for the king's hounds at Somerton in December 1285. Robert de Cantilupe was engaged in caring for Edward I's falcons in 1283-4.<sup>38</sup>

Some of Edward I's knights came from the households of other members of his family. Walter Fraxino was described as a yeoman of the Prince of Wales in 1297. Robert Hausted the elder had been a groom of Eleanor of Castile in 1270. He was part of the household of the queen when she was in Gascony from 1286 to 1289. Robert Hausted the younger, his son, was a valet of Prince Edward in 1289-90; he was admitted as a knight in 1297.<sup>39</sup>

Household knights were also recruited from the households of magnates or from the *familia* of household knights themselves. John Bokland was a squire of William Louth, the keeper of the wardrobe in the late 1280s. He accompanied William Louth and Guncelin de Badlesmere on a mission to the King of France in 1286. Hugh Denegre was a knight of Otto de Grandson. He went to the Holy Land with Otto in 1289-90. John Dovedale and Thomas Paynel were squires of Elias Hauville and John St John respectively. William and Robert Felton or their ancestors appear to have come from Felton in Shropshire which was held by John Lestrangle. Robert married John Lestrangle's daughter, which suggests that the brothers might have been in the service of the Lestrangle family before they joined the royal household.<sup>40</sup>

John Usflete was a squire of John d'Eyville in 1282-3. Richard de Welles was a squire of Luke de Tany while William FitzClay seems to have had strong connections with the household of Otto de Grandson. Grimbald de Pauncefoot was a knight of Roger Mortimer. John Cromwell was closely associated with Robert Clifford: he had

---

<sup>38</sup> E101/350/29; E101/351/12

<sup>39</sup> *Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, ed. Parsons, 36-7; *CCR* 1296-1301, 60; C47/4/5, f 46

<sup>40</sup> *CPR* 1281-92, 129; Byerly, *Records* 1286-9, no. 103

served in Clifford's retinue at Falkirk.<sup>41</sup>

Some household knights were attached to *familia* of the king's great magnates. John d'Oyley, who was admitted to the household in 1297, may have been in the service of Amadeus, Count of Savoy, for in 1304 the death of a John d'Oyley who was the steward of the said count is recorded. William Pouton was a squire of William Plunkett before he became a household knight.<sup>42</sup> Bogo de Knoville was probably a descendent of the Bewes de Knoville who was the steward of William, earl marshal in 1224. Peter Tadington was a knight of the household of Roger Bigod, earl of Norfolk. Guncelin de Badlesmere had been attached to the household of William de Valence, earl of Pembroke.<sup>43</sup>

It is difficult to assess whether the bond between such knights and their magnates remained intact once they entered the king's household. It seems probable that this was case with the bond between Thomas Paynel and John St John. Paynel went to Gascony with John St John in 1294 and it was he who made the necessary arrangements for the raising of John's ransom in 1297. It was to Paynel that John's wages were paid for staying in the Scottish March in 1300. After John St John's death in 1302, Paynel moved into the service of his eldest son.<sup>44</sup>

The attendance at court required by a knight suggests that admittance into the royal household would lead to the knight being effectively removed from active service with a lord outside the king's *familia*. However, this was not necessarily the case. Peter

---

<sup>41</sup> C47/2/7; C62/51; E101/6/40

<sup>42</sup> CPR 1301-7, 277; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 2226

<sup>43</sup> *Documents Illustrating the Crisis of 1297-8*, ed. M.C. Prestwich (Camden Society, 4th series, xxiv 1980), 157; Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court 1247-65', 439

<sup>44</sup> CDS, ii, no. 1218; CDS, v, no. 292; *Liber Quot*, 139; *Documents 1297-8*, ed. Prestwich, 35

Tadington seems to have been a member of Edward's *familia* and retained his membership of the earl of Norfolk's household in 1297.<sup>45</sup> John d'Oyley also appears to have maintained his links with Amadeus Count of Savoy. Robert FitzPayn seems to have retained a strong link with Aymer de Valence during his tenure in the household.<sup>46</sup>

The recruitment of household knights did not take place in a vacuum. Political events and crises influenced the composition of Edward I's *familia*. The king used the household as an instrument to promote reconciliation: he recruited former rebels into his household in the hope of binding them more closely to the crown.

Edward did this on two major occasions. A number of household knights in the early years of the reign had been adherents of Simon de Montfort in the 1260s. Of the bannerets receiving wages as part of the household in 1285-6, three had been rebels. John d'Eyville had been in the king's service in the 1250s, receiving a £20 fee in 1255. He was sheriff of York in the early 1260s but he refused to surrender the castle to the king in 1263. After the death of Simon de Montfort John fulfilled a more prominent role among the rebels. Guisborough described him as a man of great military strength and a leader of the disinherited barons. After the Dictum of Kenilworth in 1266 John was one of those who occupied the Isle of Ely and plundered the surrounding areas of Norwich and Cambridge. In April 1267 he was still in rebellion and he joined the popular uprising in London led by the earl of Gloucester. Once again Edward arrived and negotiations took place; by June John was finally admitted to the king's peace.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> See chapter 8

<sup>46</sup> See chapter 2

<sup>47</sup> *G.E.C.* iv, 131; Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 55, 58-9; *Ann. London*, 73, 77; *Guisborough*, 202; *CLR 1251-60*, 249

Nicholas de Segrave had been an even more prominent supporter of the Provisions of Oxford. In 1260 he had sworn an oath to support Henry III but in May 1262 he was at the London parliament which was hostile to the king. He served with the rebellious earl of Gloucester at the siege of Rochester in April 1264. At the battle of Lewes he was with the section of Simon's army that contained the Londoners. The contingent was almost immediately routed. He was captured at the battle of Evesham. After his release he joined the earl of Gloucester in London.<sup>48</sup> He went on crusade with Edward I in 1270.<sup>49</sup>

Norman Darcy and his brother Roger were arrested at Hull for their part in the rebellion. They were brought before the king on 4 June 1264. Norman was pardoned for homicide in 1265 and was admitted to the king's peace in 1267.<sup>50</sup>

Of the knights who were attached to the household in 1285-6 Hugh Pecche,<sup>51</sup> John Neville, John Russel, William St Clare, Thomas de Sandwich and Grimbald de Pauncefoot all appear to have been adherents of Simon de Montfort. William St Clare received a safe conduct to come to the king's peace in November 1266. His lands had been confiscated and given to Baldwin de Akeny. He stood trial in

---

<sup>48</sup> *G.E.C.* xi, 601-5; *Guisborough*, 187, 194; *Rishanger*, 27; *Ann. London*, 69, 77

<sup>49</sup> It is unclear whether either Nicholas de Segrave or John d' Eyville actually sailed for the Holy Land. Recent scholarship has suggested that relatively few former rebels went on crusade with Edward I in 1270. B. Beebe 'The English Baronage and the Crusade of 1270' *BIHR*, xlviii (1975); Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade 1216-1307*, 127-131; This is clearly born out by the experiences of household knights. Apart from Segrave and Eyville only one former rebel, Thomas de Sandwich, went on crusade.

<sup>50</sup> *CPR 1258-66*, 462; *CPR 1266-72*, 73

<sup>51</sup> Hugh Pecche and his brother received a pardon for coming to the king's peace in 1266, and he swore fidelity in 1267. But as Lloyd pointed out such pardons did not necessarily mean that a man had been a rebel. Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade*, 127-131



February 1267 and then his lands were restored. John Neville and his brother who were supporters of Montfort joined the king in 1266.<sup>52</sup>

Grimbald de Pauncefoot had been one of those who had besieged Edward in Gloucester castle in the early stages of the civil war. After Edward had escaped from Kenilworth the position was reversed and Edward besieged Grimbald at Gloucester. The garrison surrendered and was favourably treated. Grimbald was knighted by Edward I and joined his forces.<sup>53</sup>

Edward I also recruited the children of former rebels. William de Cantilupe was a banneret in receipt of fees and robes in 1285-6. His great uncle was Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester and his uncle was Thomas de Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford, both of whom were very important supporters of Simon de Montfort. Walter de Cantilupe had been one of the barons' representatives on the committee of twenty-four who went to Oxford to draw up the reforms. After the publication of the Provisions of Oxford he was elected to the council of fifteen, formed to guide and control the king. In the 1260s he was used by de Montfort as a negotiator. It was he who was sent to Bristol castle to rescue Edward from the townsmen who were besieging him. Later on he went to France as a representative of the barons at the arbitration of the French king.

Thomas de Cantilupe, whose early career had been guided by Walter, also adhered to Simon de Montfort. He acted as chancellor during the months when de Montfort was controlling England in 1265. It seems possible that William de Cantilupe's father was also a

---

<sup>52</sup> *CPR 1266-72*, 21, 609

<sup>53</sup> *Prestwich, Edward 1*, 49; *Guisborough*, 191

rebel.<sup>54</sup>

Thomas Multon's father, who had died in 1271, had been on the side of the barons. In June 1266 he had received a protection for going to the king's court providing he behaved faithfully towards the king and his heirs. Ralph Basset of Drayton was the son of the Ralph Basset who had been killed fighting for the rebels at Evesham. He remained in the battle even though he had been warned to take flight by the earl of Leicester.<sup>55</sup>

It is difficult to assess whether these men were actually recruited into the household because they were sons of rebels. Ralph Basset does not appear to have been in receipt of fees and robes until 1290 and the Cantilupes had a long tradition of royal service. In addition, only one of the household knights who appears on the list of robes for 1278-9 and the wage account of the previous year had been a rebel. John Neville was captured at the siege of Kenilworth. The absence of a large number of rebels from the household in the 1270s must cast doubt on the extent to which Edward deliberately recruited former rebels into his household.<sup>56</sup>

The policy of recruiting rebels into his household was adopted in the late 1290s. Important Scotsmen captured at Dunbar in 1296 were imprisoned for a time in England. The price of their freedom was a promise that they would serve with Edward I in Flanders and they had to deliver up members of their families as security for their good behaviour. Some of these men became household knights.

Reginald Crawford fought at Dunbar. He did fealty and homage

---

<sup>54</sup> R.F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform 1258-63* (Manchester 1932), 68, 84, 310, 320; D.A. Carpenter, 'St Thomas Cantilupe; his political career', *St Thomas Cantilupe Bishop of Hereford*, ed. M. Jaucey (Hereford 1982), 57, 58, 62

<sup>55</sup> *Ann. London*, 69; *Flores*, iii, 6, 262; *Rishanger*, 37; *CPR 1258-66*, 607

<sup>56</sup> C47/4/1

for his lands on 28 May 1296 and he is listed as a household knight in 1297. Simon Fraser of Peeblesshire came to the king's peace in October 1296 and the sheriff of Stirling was ordered to restore his lands which had been confiscated. These were granted back to him in hereditary right in March 1299. In May 1297 he took an oath to serve the king and swore that he had taken no part in the uprisings of that year led by Robert Bruce and William Wallace. He was admitted as a household knight on 15 August 1297 and served the king in Flanders.

Richard Marshal was one of those taken at Dunbar in 1296 and imprisoned at Montgomery. His lands were restored on 21 October 1297. His recruitment to the household was not immediate; he was admitted on 6 August 1300 during the Caerlaverock campaign. Adam Swinburn held lands in Scotland and at Simondburn in the liberty of Tyndale in Northumberland. He fought with the Scots in 1296 and was captured and imprisoned at Berwick. He, like Richard Marshal, was in receipt of fees and robes in 1300. Simon Lindsay was probably related to the powerful Scottish Lindsay family who were supporters of Robert Bruce. He was admitted to the household on 14 December 1299 at Berwick on Tweed.<sup>57</sup>

Richard Siward was probably in the king's service as early as 1294-5. However, he rebelled against the king and was captured at Dunbar in 1296 and imprisoned in the Tower of London. His lands in Northumberland had been seized. Some of the lands were returned to his wife in September 1296 while the rest were restored on 31 July 1297. He had been released from prison the previous day, mainperned by other household knights including John Tregoz, John Botetourt, Bogo de Knoville and Guncelin de Badlesmere. Siward promised to

---

<sup>57</sup> B1 Add Ms 7965, ff 61, 64; *CDS*, ii, nos 549, 808, 929, 952, 1060, p 172-5; *Documents*, ed. Stevenson, ii, 43, 46, 48, 175; *CChR* 1300-27, 84; *Rot. Scot.*, i, 26, 40, 49; *Liber Quot*, 185, 188

serve the king overseas but was forced to deliver his son John to the king as security for his good behaviour. He served the king well in Flanders and in return for this the king ordered the removal of the irons which were holding his son.<sup>58</sup>

Herbert and Thomas Morham were also in the king's service in 1294-5. Both were captured at Dunbar. Thomas was imprisoned in the Tower of London and Herbert was taken to Nottingham and then to Rockingham. They did homage to the king and were released from prison. Thomas was immediately admitted as a household knight and he fought for the king at Falkirk. Herbert Morham promised to fight for the king in Flanders. He was a member of the household in December 1299.<sup>59</sup>

Edward I's policy of recruiting rebel Scotsmen as household knights after 1296 was neither significant in numerical terms nor successful. Not all of the men who joined remained loyal. Reginald Crawford did not appear in receipt of fees and robes after 1297. He was one of those concerned in the murder of John Comyn by Robert Bruce and the subsequent uprising. He was captured by Douglas Macdowell in 1306-7 and he was executed at Carlisle.<sup>60</sup>

There were rumours about Simon Fraser's loyalty as early as August 1299. A letter from John Kingston, a household knight and constable of Edinburgh, to Walter Langton, the treasurer revealed that the men of the earl of Buchan had entered the forest of Selkirk, which was held by Simon Fraser. Fraser had been given eight days warning but he had failed to inform the garrison.

---

<sup>58</sup> *CFR 1272-1307*, 389; *CDS*, ii, nos 742, 839, 930, 936, 940, 950; *Rot Scot.*, i, 43; *Documents*, ed. Stevenson, ii, 27, 46, 92; *Chron. Lanercost*, 175; *Rishanger*, 161; E101/6/37

<sup>59</sup> *CDS*, ii, nos 911, 925, 940, 949, 1949; *Guisborough*, 327; *CCR 1296-1302*, 126; *CPR 1292-1301*, 466; Bl Add Ms 7965, f 61; *Liber Quot*, 188-95

<sup>60</sup> *CDS*, ii, no. 1915; *Chron. Lanercost*, 205; *Flores*, iii, 136, 327

Indeed, there were rumours that Fraser had made an alliance with the Scots. Kingston warned the king not to trust him. Stevenson in his edition of the documents dated the letter as 9 August 1298 but this is incorrect. The true date was August 1299. This is confirmed by a letter from Robert Hastang to the king dated 20 August 1299 which speaks of the inroads which had been recently made by the Bishop of St Andrews, the earl of Buchan and others in Selkirk.

The king appears to have heeded Kingston's advice. The entry for Fraser in the list of fees and robes in 1299-1300 says that he was in prison in Scotland. In 1301 Fraser was in open rebellion; he and Herbert Morham were besieging Lochmaben. They placed so much pressure upon the castle that the keeper had to ask for reinforcements. Fraser was with Comyn's force which defeated John Segrave at Roslin on 23 February 1303. A decree of banishment was published 15 September 1305 and he was ordered to prepare to leave the realm for four years. At the same time Aymer de Valence burnt his lands in the forest of Selkirk. He was finally captured in 1306, possibly at Linlithgow. According to one chronicler he saved Robert Bruce.<sup>61</sup> Walter Reginald escorted him to Newburgh in Tyndale and then Robert Barker took him to London.<sup>62</sup>

According to the song composed about his execution, Fraser's legs were fettered under the horse's belly and he was taken to Newgate. There he was tried by Thomas Multon, Ralph Sandwich and John Abel. The author claimed that <sup>he</sup> 'knew himself to be so foul' that he could not deny his treason. On 7 September 1306 with 'feteres ant with gyves' he was drawn to the Tower of London where he was hanged, beheaded and disembowelled. His entrails were burnt

---

<sup>61</sup> *Flores*, iii, 133; *Ann. London*, 148

<sup>62</sup> *Documents*, ed. Stevenson, ii, 301, 431; *CDS*, ii, nos 1619, 1782, 1978; *CDS*, v, p 197-8, no. 201

and his head was stuck upon London Bridge. The viciousness of his execution was probably a measure of the fury that Edward I felt at being betrayed by a household knight.<sup>63</sup>

A Herbert Morham besieged Stirling castle in 1299. This was probably not the same Herbert Morham who was a household knight for he had been captured and imprisoned at Edinburgh for the abduction of Joan de Clare on 22 April 1299. It was only later in the year that the garrison at Stirling was forced to make a truce with a Herbert Morham, the leader of the Scottish force.<sup>64</sup> The Herbert Morham who was a member of the household in 1300 probably remained loyal to the king. In spite of his loyalty and that of Siward the recruitment of Scottish rebels can hardly be classed as an unqualified success.

It is interesting to note that Edward I did not attempt to recruit Welsh rebels into the household. Only one Welshman, Owen de la Pole, became a member of the household and his father Gruffydd ap Gwenwynwyn had been a loyal supporter of the king.<sup>65</sup> Prestwich suggested this may have been due to the social structure of Wales which meant that there were few men of knightly status for Edward to recruit.<sup>66</sup>

Political problems could effect household recruitment in other ways. Given-Wilson in his study of the king's household in the late fourteenth century showed that as the tyranny of Richard II grew in the 1390s he recruited his knights from the North West and Cheshire

---

<sup>63</sup> *The Political Songs of England*, ed Wright, 212-223

<sup>64</sup> It was this Herbert Morham who, according to the author of the Song about the treason of Fraser, was executed because he had staked his head that the English would never capture Fraser. When he was proved wrong he was beheaded. *The Political Songs of England*, ed. Wright, 212-223; G.W.S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm* (1965), 149

<sup>65</sup> See chapter 7

<sup>66</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 152

to build up a power base. Similarly in the reign of Henry IV, twenty-five Yorkshire knights were the key to his success in suppressing the Percy rebellions.<sup>67</sup>

There is some evidence of Edward I recruiting men from particular areas but it was not as dramatic or as concentrated as in the later fourteenth century. During the conquest and settlement of Wales only a small number of household knights came from the Welsh marches. Of the 24 bannerets in receipt of fees and robes in 1283-4, seven bannerets,<sup>68</sup> Roger Lestrangle, Roger Mortimer of Chirk, Hugh Turberville, John de Bohun, John de Mohaut and Thomas de Clare held lands or had strong family connections in the Welsh Marches. Owen de la Pole was the only Welshman to be recruited to the household. Of the 50 simple knights Bogo de Knoville, Thomas Turberville, John de Sulleye the elder, William de Geneville and Grimbald de Pauncefoot came from the Welsh borders.<sup>69</sup>

With the exception of Owen de la Pole few of these men were recruited because of the second Welsh war. The Lestranges, the Mohauts, the Mortimers, the Genevilles, the Clares and the Turbervilles had all served Edward in the 1260s. However, the fact that they held land in the Welsh marches may have been the original reason why these men were admitted to the household. Edward had been granted custody of Chester in the 1250s and supporters who could defend the marches from increasing encroachment by the Welsh would have been useful to him.

Even fewer household knights were recruited from the northern

---

<sup>67</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity*, 220-232

<sup>68</sup> These figures underestimate the number of knights who held land in the Welsh marches during the second Welsh war. For instance Roger Clifford the younger and Roger Mortimer of Wigmore were killed during the second Welsh war.

<sup>69</sup> For the lands of these men and their role in the defence of the Welsh March see chapter 7

borders during the war with Scotland. Of the knights who were in receipt of fees and robes in 1299-1300, four, Robert de Bures, John Cromwell, William Felton and Robert Clifford, held lands in the Scottish borders. However, it is unlikely that they were recruited because of the situation in Scotland. Clifford came from a family which had strong connections with the household and Felton had been in the household since he was a squire in the 1270s.<sup>70</sup>

Throughout the reign the largest single geographical area from which household knights were recruited was the south east. Given-Wilson found a similar pattern among the knights attached to Richard II's household prior to the political crisis of the 1390s.<sup>71</sup> In 1285-6 five bannerets, William Leyburn, Guncelin de Badlesmere, Peter de Champagne, John de la Mare, John St John, came from the south east. Of the simple knights, sixteen came from the same area including Hugh de Brok, Giles de Badlesmere, Robert de Creuker, William St Clare, Giles de Fiennes, Guy Ferre, Robert Fitz John, Ralph Gorges, Elias Hauville, John Lovel, John de Merk, Geoffrey de Pitchford, Hugh Pecche, John Russel and Andrew Sackville. Two others, Robert Giffard and Richard de Boys, came from the south west.<sup>72</sup>

The situation was exactly the same at the end of the reign. In 1300 four knights held lands in the Scottish borders; three other knights, William Latimer and his son and William Rithre, came from the north; William de Cantilupe, Walter de Teye, Robert Hausted his son Robert and Robert de Bavent came from the midlands, but over thirty held lands in the south east and south west.

---

<sup>70</sup> See above, vol. i, p 44

<sup>71</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity*, 220

<sup>72</sup> *CChR* 1257-1300, 76, 148, 184, 203, 248, 339, 345, 389, 427; *CChR* 1300-26, 25, 236; Sanders, *Baronies*, 31; *CCR* 1296-1302, 49; *CFR* 1272-1307, 277; *CIPM*, iii, nos 30, 566; iv, no. 96; vi, no. 587; *CWR*, 367



It is not surprising that a significant proportion of the household knights came from the south east. With the exception of the years that Edward I conducted campaigns in Scotland or Wales his itinerary reveals that he spent most of his time in the south. From 20 November 1285 until Edward I's departure for Gascony in May 1286 he spent most of his time in the south east or the south west. The court was in Hampshire between 23 and 25 November. It moved from there to Dorset. The king remained there, except for a brief visit to Somerset until he journeyed to Devon on 19 December. He stayed in Devon until 10 January; from there he moved on to Wiltshire which he reached on 18 January. The remainder of the month was spent in Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire. He arrived at Westminster on 7 February where he remained until 28 February. He left Middlesex on 2 March, travelling first to Buckinghamshire and then to Oxfordshire. He continued his progress westward reaching Gloucestershire on 19 March. His stay in the south west was of short duration: by 25 March he was in Wiltshire and on the penultimate day of the month he was in Hampshire. The beginning of April was spent in Sussex and Middlesex. He visited Hertfordshire between 10 and 21 April, ending the month in Middlesex. May was spent in Kent prior to Edward I's departure for Gascony.<sup>73</sup>

It was therefore in the south east that Edward I met potential recruits as his court journeyed through the home counties. Secondly, household knights who lived in these areas would find it easiest to fulfill their dual responsibilities of attendance upon the king and caring for their lands.

---

<sup>73</sup> *Itinerary of Edward I, part i: 1272-1290* (List and Index Society, ciii, 1974)

Household knights were also recruited from other parts of Edward I's dominions. Twenty-six household knights held land in different regions of Ireland during his reign. The presence of these knights in the household should not be seen as the result of a royal policy of recruiting knights from Ireland. Most of these men had considerable estates in England. It was a direct consequence of the practice of Henry III and his predecessors of granting lands in Ireland to important royal servants.<sup>74</sup> Although the appearance in the household of knights such as Henry Cantok, the brother of Thomas Cantok, chancellor of Ireland and John FitzSimon, in the last years of the reign was probably due to the expansion of the household during the war with Scotland.<sup>75</sup>

In addition to these knights there were a further ten knights who were described in the justiciar of Ireland's accounts of the 1270s as receiving fees as part of the household of Edward I in Ireland. In 1275-6 nine men were receiving robes as part of the king's household. Walter l'Enfaunt, Nicholas Dunhevet, William Cauntenton and Richard FitzJohn received seven marks for their robes. William Cadel received a £12 fee and 40s for his robes. A number of other men of a lower status received three and half marks for their robes. Into this category fall Ralph de Curteys, Milo Dywe, Robert Nugent and Simon de Monteny. In 1276-7 David Barry received the arrears of his fee worth 20 marks for 1275-6.<sup>76</sup>

However, although the wording in the accounts implies that they were knights of Edward I's own household they were really knights of the justiciar's household. Firstly, these knights did not

---

<sup>74</sup> See chapter 6

<sup>75</sup> For the importance of Irish troops in the Scottish wars see chapter 2

<sup>76</sup> *CDI*, ii, p 235

receive the same payments as the household knights who appear on the English wardrobe accounts. In England simple knights received eight marks a year for their robes, and squires four marks. Also, knights from Ireland who were named in English accounts such as John Fulburn did not usually receive payment for their fees through the Irish exchequer. Henry Cantok was paid the arrears of his wages by the Irish exchequer in 1301 but this was unusual, particularly as Cantok continued to serve in the household to the end of the reign.

The knights who received their robes in 1275-6 appear to have spent most of their time in Ireland. Of the ten mentioned in the 1275-6 account, William Cauntenton and Richard FitzJohn were the only ones who served in Wales in 1277. This again argues against their being part of Edward I's own household.<sup>77</sup> It will be shown in chapter six that these knights were occupied with internal Irish affairs and administration, all of which suggests they were attached to the justiciar's household.<sup>78</sup>

Considerably more household knights were recruited from Gascony than Ireland. Thirty-seven of the household knights between 1272 and 1307 were Gascons. The vast majority of these men's interests were in Gascony rather than England. A contingent of about 40 knights were brought over to Wales in 1282-3. A number of these men, including Roger Mauleón, Arnald Gavaston, Elie de Caupenne and William Rions served in the household in later years.<sup>79</sup>

However, few Gascons were recruited into the household as a

---

<sup>77</sup> *CPR 1272-81*, 221-22; *CDI* iv, no. 797

<sup>78</sup> The knights of the justiciar's household do not feature in the Irish accounts later in the reign. Subsequent stewards such as Robert de Ufford received £500 a year to maintain himself and a retinue of 20 men. The knights must have received their fees out of this sum of money *CDI*, ii, no. 1237

<sup>79</sup> E101/3/27

direct result of the expedition to Wales. Most returned home after the conquest. Five Gascons appear in the 1283-4 wage list for the household. Of these Arnald de Guillaume had been part of the 1282-3 expedition. Three of the others, Guy Ferre the elder, William Montravel and Alexander de la Pébrée had all been in royal service prior to 1272. In August 1270 Alexander de la Pébrée had witnessed a charter of the Prince granting John Arden lands in Ireland for his service. These men had probably joined the Prince or Henry III on one of their visits to Gascony.<sup>80</sup>

The biggest influx of Gascons into the household was during Edward I's visit of 1286-9. In 1288-9 there were 22 Gascons in the household. Many of these had clearly had contact with Edward I before his visit. Some had served in the the second Welsh war while others had met Edward I on his previous visits to Gascony. For example Arnald Gavaston and Arsinus de Noaillan had acted as pledges for the good conduct of Gaston de Béarn in 1273. However, these men joined the household as Edward I visited their region. Arnald Gavaston held lands in Béarn. He was admitted to the household on 27 October 1287 while the court was visiting St Sever. Bertram of Podensak joined the household in 1286-7 while the court was at Bordeaux.<sup>81</sup>

It is possible that many Gascons were eager to join Edward's household because of the financial difficulties facing their families. In Béarn, Labourd, Soule and Chalosse a lord's lands passed undivided to his eldest son. The younger sons were forced to seek their fortune elsewhere. The situation in Landes, Bazadais and Marsan was different. A lord's lands were divided among his heirs.

---

<sup>80</sup> *Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, ed. Parsons, 32-4; CCHR 1257-1300, 149; CLR 1262-72, 1278

<sup>81</sup> RG, ii, 235, 280, 629; RG, iii, xii; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, 1320 1378

There was often not enough land or revenue to support his sons adequately. These difficulties were intensified at the end of the thirteenth century by the twin problems of declining yields from agricultural rents and rising costs. In a war the Gascon nobility were obliged to serve as part of the heavy cavalry. Vale has calculated that by the early fourteenth century a war horse for a banneret cost approximately two and half months wages. He claimed that the lesser nobility needed to belong to the household of a great magnate or a king because they were dependant upon the pensions, annuities and compensation that such service provided.<sup>82</sup>

This would have encouraged a number of Gascons to seek the opportunity to join Edward's household. A number of the younger sons of the Gascon nobles of Béarn joined the household. The Caupenne family had lands in Dax; Arnald, a younger brother of Elie de Caupenne, was a member of the household. Miles de Noaillan was a probably a younger brother of Bertrand, lord of Noaillan.<sup>83</sup>

Few of the Gascon knights who were recruited during Edward I's visit to Gascony returned to England with the household. Otto Doazit, Roger Mauléon and Alexander de la Pébree who did go to England in 1289 returned to Gascony in 1290.<sup>84</sup> The next influx of Gascons was in 1297. Barrau de Sescas, admiral of the Fleet in Bayonne and Raymond de Champagne joined the household in that year. This influx was due to the expedition to Flanders and the war with France. Edward I was recruiting important local men into his household in an attempt to secure their support.

---

<sup>82</sup> M.G.A. Vale, 'The Gascon Nobility and the Anglo-French War, 1294-8', *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. J.B. Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), 141, 143; Vale 'Warfare and the Life of the French and Burgundian nobility in the late Middle Ages' *Adelige Sachkultur des Spätmittelalters* (Vienna, 1982), 169-179

<sup>83</sup> J.P. Trabut-Cussac, *L'Administration Anglaise en Gascogne sous Henry III et Edouard I de 1254-1307*, (Paris, 1972), 172

<sup>84</sup> C47/4/5, ff 45, 48-9

In addition to the men recruited from Gascony two knights, Hugh Famechon and John de Nesle, lord of Falvy came from the county of Ponthieu which was acquired by Edward in the right of his wife in 1279. John de Nesle had been the second husband of Eleanor of Castile's mother. He received fees and robes as a banneret of Edward's household between 1283 and 1287. After his wife's death John had lost the title of count of Ponthieu. He had also been in considerable financial difficulties. In 1279 Edward had agreed to pay John's debts as well as those of his wife. John's financial situation remained uncertain and he must have been encouraged to join Edward's household.<sup>85</sup>

Between 1272 and 1307 Edward I's household also retained knights from regions outside the king's dominions, such as Savoy, Burgundy, Lombardy and Aragon. At the beginning of the reign there were a significant number of knights from Savoy. Between 1284 and 1286 there were eleven household knights in receipt of fees and robes who were of Savoyard descent. In addition there were other men such as Otto de Grandson who were also attached to the household and who came from Savoy. The main reason for the presence of these men in the household was that Edward had inherited them from his father. Henry III's marriage to Eleanor of Provence in 1236 provided a link with the House of Savoy. Over the next thirty years 200 Savoyards came to settle in England, sixty percent of whom were clerics.<sup>86</sup>

Otto de Grandson was the eldest son of Pierre de Grandson of Lake Neuchâtel by Agnes, the daughter of Ulric Count of Neuchâtel.

---

<sup>85</sup> For a detailed discussion concerning Ponthieu and John Nesle see J.C. Parsons, 'The Beginnings of English Administration in Ponthieu: An Unnoticed Document of 1280,' *Medieval Studies*, 1 (1988), 374, 388, 392-4

<sup>86</sup> Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court 1247-65,' 35, 171

He and his brother William came to England with Peter of Savoy in 1247. He quickly became attached to the young Prince's household. In 1265 he received a grant of property forfeited by rebels. He went on crusade with Edward in 1270 and legend has it that he sucked the poison from the wound of the Prince at Acre.<sup>87</sup>

Otto de Grandson introduced other members of his family into the king's household. John de Bevillard, a member of the household in the 1280s, came from the village of Bonvillars not far from the castle of Grandson. He is thought to have married one of Grandson's sisters. William de Grandson's son Peter joined the household in 1299-1300. Otto's nephews, Peter de Staney, Peter Stradlington and Peter de Vuippens were members of Edward I's household in 1284-5, 1297 and 1288-9 respectively.<sup>88</sup>

Otto de Grandson also introduced his feudal tenants into the household. William Cicon appears in his entourage in England in 1276. William came from Pontarlier which is very close to Neuchâtel. William became a member of Edward's household in the 1280s and played an important role in the conquest of Wales.<sup>89</sup>

Peter de Chauvent, the son of Henry de Chauvent, Lord of Champvent arrived in England with Otto de Grandson (his cousin) in 1247. He was the keeper of the king's weapons in 1252-9. Peter received 60 marks for his yearly fee in 1255 and 1256. He was part of the Prince's household in 1262 when he witnessed a charter concerning a grant to John de Grailly. Chauvent remained an important member of Edward's *familia* until his death. His son John de Chauvent was attached to the royal household from 1297

---

<sup>87</sup> E.R. Clifford, *A Knight of Great Renown* (Chicago, 1961), 12-14, 30

<sup>88</sup> *Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, 110; A.J. Taylor 'Who was John Pennard, Leader of the Men of Gwynedd?' *Studies in Castles and Castle Building*, (1985), 209-27

<sup>89</sup> *KW*, i, 342; C62/52

onwards.<sup>90</sup>

John de Grailly came from a family in Gex in Savoy. In March 1262 he received a grant of land for good service to the Prince. He went on crusade with the Prince in 1270. His son Peter de Grailly was a member of the king's household in the 1280s.<sup>91</sup>

Eble des Montz's father, with whom he shared the same name, had served the queen in the 1240s before joining the Prince's household in the 1250s. He left the household briefly in 1259 but remained prominent in royal service in the 1260s. He was steward of the king's household in 1268.

Imbert de Monréal, who was in receipt of fees and robes in 1284-5, was attached to the *familia* of Peter of Savoy in the 1260s. He defended the castle of Pevensey held by Peter in 1264. Giles and William de Fiennes who were members of the royal household in the 1280s were related to Michael de Fiennes who had been the Savoyard chancellor of Edward in the 1250s.<sup>92</sup>

A knight who is usually classed as part of the Savoyard faction is Geoffrey de Geneville.<sup>93</sup> In fact he came from Burgundy, a close neighbour of Savoy. Geoffrey was a younger son of Simon de Geneville, or Joinville, the seneschal of Champagne. He came to England in the 1240s and made a very advantageous marriage to Maud, the daughter of Walter de Lacy. Geneville received half the lordship of Meath including the castle of Trim in Ireland and he became lord of Eways Lacy and Ludlow in Wales. He became attached to the Prince's household in the mid 1250s. According to Ridgeway

---

<sup>90</sup> *CLR* 1251-60, 222, 310; C53/52

<sup>91</sup> C53/52

<sup>92</sup> *Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, ed. Parsons, 49; *CLR* 1260-7, 33, 78; Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court' 423

<sup>93</sup> Philippe, Count-Palatine of Burgundy, became the Count of Savoy in 1268. E.L. Cox, *The Eagles of Savoy* (Princeton, 1974), 373



he left Edward's *familia* in 1259 when Edward was trying to assert the independence of his household from his father and from the Savoyard faction. Geoffrey moved momentarily back to Henry III's household before rejoining the Prince after Edward's reconciliation with his father in 1260. In 1260 he received 60 marks for his Easter fee. He remained in the Prince's household and as part of his council during the 1260s and 1270s. His sons John and William de Geneville became members of Edward I's household in the 1280s.<sup>94</sup>

The appearance of knights from countries other than Savoy is more difficult to explain. In 1285-6 two German knights, Eustace de Jardin and Rainald de Macere and one Lombard knight, Bonvassal of Genoa were members of the household. The presence of the Lombard knight could be attributed to a number of reasons. It may have been the result of a contact Edward I had made when he journeyed through Lombardy on his return from the east in the 1270s. However, there is no evidence to suggest that Bonvassal de Genoa was in the household in the 1270s. Another possibility is that he was recruited by a household knight who was on a diplomatic mission to Rome. For instance Elias Hauville, the marshal of the household, went to Rome in 1284.

The two German knights may have been recruited through the German connections of Edmund, earl of Cornwall, whose father Richard had been elected King of the Romans in 1257. Alternatively it could have been the result of a contact made on a diplomatic mission. Hugh Turberville, a banneret of the household, went on a mission to the King of Germany in October 1283.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> *G.E.C.* v, 630-4; Ridgeway, 'The Politics of the English Royal Court 1247-65,' 35, 171, 330, 356, 392; *CLR* 1251-60, 327; *CDI*, ii, nos 268, 307; Watson, 'The Families of Lacy, Geneva, Joinville and La Marche', 73

<sup>95</sup> *CPR* 1281-92, 79, 83; *Calendar of Papal Registers, Papal Letters*, i, 1198-1304 (1893), 473-4

Two knights of Aragon were members of the household in the later years of the reign. Jaime Señor de Gérica was in receipt of fees and robes in 1297 and Pascual of Valencia was admitted to the household in 1303-4. The appearance of these two men in the household was probably the result of the war with France. It is likely that the English forces recruited Spaniards for support. For instance in 1300 Pascual de Valencia was owed £1,637 21d, as testified by Henry Lacy, earl of Lincoln, for wages and compensation for bearing arms in Aquitaine. It may have been through his contact with the earl of Lincoln that Valencia joined the household. Alternatively the king or the knights he left as hostages may have made contacts with these Spaniards during the 1286-9 negotiations over the release of Charles of Salerno.<sup>96</sup>

J.O. Prestwich demonstrated that the early Norman kings recruited foreign knights into their households.<sup>97</sup> The composition of Edward's household between 1272 and 1307 was equally diverse as were the avenues through which a knight might gain admission. At the beginning of the reign the core of the household was clearly provided by those knights, English, Gascon and Savoyard, who had served the Prince or his father before 1272. As the reign progressed it was the descendants of these men who came to fill the ranks of Edward's *familia*. Some joined the household as squires and were promoted, others gained admittance as knights. From the genealogical tables it is quite clear that there was a network of families, strengthened by intermarriage, who generation after generation sent their members into the royal household.

It is often impossible to assess why a particular knight

---

<sup>96</sup> CPR 1292-1301, 489

<sup>97</sup> Prestwich, 'The Military Household of the Norman Kings', 8-9

joined the household. However, the key factor common to all recruits was that they had had personal contact with the king or with members of his household before they were recruited. Either they had married into a 'household' family, or they were in the service of a household knight, or they met the king as he journeyed around the country either in England, Gascony or Scotland. The household did not of course operate in a vacuum and after the problems of the 1260s and during the conquest of Scotland and Wales this was reflected to a certain extent in the composition of the household. However, these factors have clearly been shown to have been of lesser importance than the network of personal and family contacts.

For the members of the higher nobility and their ancestors who were in contact with Edward's household or that of his predecessors the existence of a household recruited from such diverse sources was unremarkable. In organizing their own households in a similar fashion the nobles were merely following a royal lead. By the late thirteenth century it is doubtful whether the nobles considered the retaining of men from outside their own lands as anything but commonplace.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE MILITARY ROLE OF THE HOUSEHOLD

The last thirty years of the thirteenth century were dominated by a succession of military campaigns. Between 1277 and 1295 there were four major military operations to conquer and secure Wales. During the 1290s the dispute and war with France dominated the political agenda. Following the death of Alexander III, king of Scotland, Edward was asked to arbitrate between the numerous claimants to the throne. The attempt to establish English overlordship and the subsequent conquest of Scotland led to a series of military campaigns in the north between 1296 and 1307.

The military forces of Edward's household stood at the heart of the royal army. As Prestwich pointed out it was for this purpose that most knights were retained.<sup>1</sup> This chapter will examine the contribution of the household to the conquest of Wales and the wars in Scotland. The role of the knights both as military commanders and in the preparations for a campaign will also be investigated.

A household knight who took part in a major campaign received two forms of remuneration for his services. A banneret received 4s a day in wages and a knight 2s a day. When his service began his horse was valued. If it was killed or injured the appropriate amount was paid.<sup>2</sup> The time had not yet arrived when household knights were tied to the king through a military contract or indenture. Only one contract of this type between a household knight and the king has survived. In January 1300 Robert Clifford

---

<sup>1</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 154; See above, vol. 1 p 9

<sup>2</sup> See chapters 3 & 9

was paid 500 marks to remain at Lochmaben until 24 June. In addition the household knights who were constables of castles sometimes agreed to keep the castle for a set period of time in return for a specified sum of money.<sup>3</sup>

The household knights and their retinues formed a major part of the paid cavalry in Edward I's military campaigns. Nearly all the paid troops employed by the king in any campaign received their wages from the household. As Prestwich stated, the paid army was often the household in arms.<sup>4</sup> However, not all of the men who received wages through the household were permanent members of the king's *familia*. There also were the retinues of the true household knights, bannerets and squires, and those who had been co-opted into the household for the duration of the military operation.

It is in the wage accounts and the horse valuation lists that the most valuable information about the participation of the household knights in a campaign can be found. Unfortunately, only limited evidence has survived from the two Welsh wars. The exact size of the household contingent in 1277 is therefore unknown. Morris calculated that the household and 'other details' provided approximately 150 men. Prestwich, following Morris, claimed that the paid cavalry, including the household, was equal to at least 300 men and possibly more.<sup>5</sup>

In fact the permanent members of the household probably amounted to considerably more than 150 men. Morris based his calculations upon a wage account for the household knights and two

---

<sup>3</sup> *Documents*, ed. Stevenson, ii, 407

<sup>4</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 50

<sup>5</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 127; Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 127

accounts relating to the lesser ranks of the household.<sup>6</sup> However, the document relating to the knights was not an account of war wages. The manuscript records the number of days which the household knights spent at court with the king from November 1276 to November 1277. It does not include the retinues which accompanied them.<sup>7</sup>

On a military campaign a household knight was accompanied by a retinue of knights and squires. The campaign of 1277 was no exception. A number of the knights who received wages for being attendant upon the king also feature in the accounts of the garrisons on the Welsh borders. From these documents it is clear that the knights were accompanied by retinues of varying sizes.

The retinues of the household bannerets were larger than those provided by simple knights. John de Bohun was at Montgomery during the spring of 1277. His retinue consisted of one knight and four squires. John de Mohaut was part of the garrison at Carmarthen between January and March 1277. He was accompanied by four knights and six squires. The retinues of the simple knights were much smaller. Twelve simple knights served at Carmarthen. With the exception of Elias Hauville they all had one squire. Hauville was accompanied by four squires. Peter de Brompton and Richard de Boys who were at Montgomery both had a squire as a companion.<sup>8</sup>

No evidence survives relating to the retinues of the remaining twenty-two knights and nine bannerets who appear on the court wage account. However, it is inconceivable that these men served without retinues in the war. The twenty-two knights must

---

<sup>6</sup> E101/3/17; E101/3/18; E101/3/21

<sup>7</sup> E101/3/21

<sup>8</sup> E101/3/12; E101/3/13

each have been accompanied by at least one squire. The size of the retinues of Bohun and Mohaut and records from later campaigns suggest that the nine bannerets served with a following of at least one knight and a group of two or three squires. That means that the permanent household knights and bannerets were providing a force of at least 138 men.

In fact the household contingent was probably a lot larger. Some of the simple knights and bannerets would have had larger retinues than those which have been estimated. Therefore the paid cavalry, including the lesser ranks of the household and other men who were receiving wages, was probably 400 men or more.

The size of the household contingent in 1282 was probably similar to that of 1277. Unfortunately there is no distinction between the household and non-household troops in the cavalry rolls. However, a horse list shows that 116 knights responded to the muster at Devizes in April 1282. Another valuation list from later in the campaign indicates that thirty-six knights and bannerets were serving with 137 men. The sizes of the knights' retinues in this campaign were probably the same as in 1277. Knights such as Peter de Brompton and Jordan Lubeck had horses valued for themselves and one companion.<sup>9</sup>

There were approximately 850 men in the paid cavalry in this campaign. Therefore the knights and bannerets provided approximately one quarter. To this figure must be added the contribution of the 72 household squires. This means that the permanent members of the household were contributing approximately one third of the forces in royal pay.

---

<sup>9</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 50-1; C47/2/5; C47/2/6; E101/4/1

The scale of the military forces that went on campaign increased in the later years of the reign. The contingent provided by the permanent members of Edward's *familia* expanded and a larger number of men were co-opted into the household for the duration of the campaign.

The household accounts of war wages and the horse valuation lists survive for most of the campaigns in Scotland. However, the information provided by the two sources is rarely identical. In 1300 six knights and their retinues appear on the horse valuation list but not on the wage account. It seems certain that these knights, Guy Ferre the elder, Robert Hausted the younger, Guy de la Pébrée, Thomas Hauville, William Touchet and John de Engayne did serve with the king.<sup>10</sup> The author of the Song of Caerlaverock mentions that William Touchet was a banneret in the king's squadron.

'Touches, a knight of good fame, bore  
red with yellow martels',<sup>11</sup>

In addition there were thirteen household knights who were on the wage account but not on the horse valuation list. It is difficult to find a logical explanation for these discrepancies. It seems unlikely that these knights and their retinues would have neglected to have their horses valued. Secondly, the entries for these men in the wage accounts state that their horses were valued upon the day on which their wages began. This may have been a standard phrase used by the wardrobe clerk. The only credible explanations of the discrepancies are either that the clerk recording the horses was very careless or that the king paid

---

<sup>10</sup> *Liber Quot*, 195-210; E101/8/23

<sup>11</sup> *Siege of Carlaverock*, ed. Nicolas, 35



compensation even if there had been no original valuation. This would explain why the thirteen knights failed to have their horses valued.

There is also a difference between the sizes of the retinues recorded in the wage account and on the horse lists. For instance John de la Mare received wages for two knights and eight squires from 13 July to 5 September. When his horse was valued on 21 July, he was accompanied by two knights and only seven squires.<sup>12</sup>

Throughout the campaign of 1300 the permanent members of the household constituted the largest part of the paid cavalry. The first household knights began to receive wages as part of the army on 25 June at Carlisle.<sup>13</sup> Between then and 15 July sixteen bannerets and 23 knights were receiving wages as part of the army. By 15 July the army had arrived at Caerlaverock. The joint retinues of these men amounted to 42 knights and 210 squires. The horse valuation list records a further six knights who had horses before 15 July.

In addition six knights and eighteen squires accompanied the wardrobe clerk, John Droxford. A further three knights and eleven squires formed the retinues of men such as William de Grandson and Amanieu d'Albret. These knights were never in receipt of fees and robes but they were clearly part of the king's *familia*. In total 344 men were provided by the knights and bannerets who were permanent members of the household.<sup>14</sup>

The rest of the paid cavalry between these dates amounted to a further 301 men. 217 received wages through the wardrobe: the other 84 appear on the horse valuation list. At least 38 of these

---

<sup>12</sup> *Liber Quot*, 195-210; E101/8/23

<sup>13</sup> All the following figures relating to the household knights and their retinues were taken from the *Liber Quot*, 195-210

<sup>14</sup> E101/8/23

were household squires: the others were co-opted into the household for the duration of the campaign. Some were squires drafted in from the garrisons of Berwick, Roxburgh and Jedburgh. Others were knights and bannerets such as Hugh Neville, William Mortimer and Richard Ashton. Eight knights who had been appointed to raise and conduct foot soldiers from various counties appear among the knights and bannerets who were receiving wages. However, these men were not household knights; they were prominent local men who had been recruited for the task. By 15 July there were 645 men at the king's disposal in the paid cavalry. Over half were provided by members of the king's *familia*.

The permanent members of the household continued to dominate the paid cavalry throughout July and August. After the successful completion of the siege at Caerlaverock the army moved westwards through Dumfries, Kirkcudbright, Twynholm and Wigton, returning to Caerlaverock on 27 August. The king remained there until 31 August.<sup>15</sup> During this period other members of the household, such as Roger Mortimer, joined the king and the retinues of those knights who were already with the army expanded. William Leyburn was accompanied by five knights and thirteen squires between 8 July and 6 August. On 7 August another knight and two squires joined his following. John St John's retinue consisted of two bannerets, eleven knights and 51 squires on 13 July. This rose to two bannerets, twelve knights and 64 squires between 20 July and 30 August.

The contingent provided by the household knights reached its zenith on 22 August. On that day seventeen bannerets and 25 knights

---

<sup>15</sup> *Itinerary of Edward I, part ii 1291-1307* (List and Index Society, cxxxii 1976), 158-64

with a joint retinue of two bannerets, 62 knights and 281 squires were receiving royal wages. The retinues of other permanent members of the household such as John Droxford, William de Grandson and Amanieu d'Albret also increased. In addition a further thirteen knights had had their horses valued before this date. By 22 August the total number of men provided by the knights, bannerets and clerks of the household had risen to 451: forty-five household squires were also part of the army. The rest of the paid cavalry amounted to 359 men. Therefore the king's *familia* constituted more than half of the men who were in royal pay.

Following the army's return to Cumberland on 31 August there was a sharp decline in the number of household knights in the army. By 8 September there were only twelve bannerets and thirteen household knights still with the king. Their joint retinues amounted to only thirteen knights and 91 squires. In addition there were two knights and ten squires provided by John Droxford.

The sharpest fall occurred between 29 and 31 August. This fall is easily explained. The wage accounts reveal that the men who left the army between 29 and 30 August joined the garrisons of the king's castles in Galloway. When Edward returned to Dumfries and Caerlaverock in late October some household knights, including Robert Clifford and Elie de Caupenne, rejoined the army. All but three of the knights ceased to receive wages on 3 November, signifying that the campaign was officially over.

The ratio between the true household troops and the 'forinsec' element was maintained throughout the final months of the campaign. On 8 September 146 of the men who had been co-opted into the household were still with the army. The real household knights and bannerets provided 141 men or 176 when the household squires are

included. On 13 October the paid cavalry amounted to 210 men. Just over half were provided by the permanent members of the king's *familia*.

The household knights were of similar importance during the campaigns of 1297, 1298, 1301 and 1303-4. In 1298 the regular household forces formed a slightly smaller proportion of the troops than in 1300. The two horse valuation lists for 1298 reveal that the paid cavalry amounted to 1,300 men. The household horse list records 760 men of whom 428 were provided by the permanent household knights and bannerets. The Falkirk Roll and the horse list show that there were 27 bannerets with a retinue of 370 men. The 32 simple knights provided a further five knights and 93 squires. Therefore the real household knights and bannerets were providing over a third of the paid cavalry.<sup>16</sup>

In 1301 the knights began to receive war wages on 15 July. Out of the 392 knights and bannerets who were receiving wages on 20 July, six bannerets and eleven knights with a joint retinue of 28 knights and 44 squires had been co-opted into the household. More knights and bannerets continued to join the army. Eble des Montz left the garrison of Edinburgh to join the army on 3 August. John Fulburn and Miles de Noaillan arrived on 1 August from the castle of Lochmaben. Of the 568 knights and bannerets receiving wages on 29 August, 18 bannerets and 20 knights with a joint retinue of 44 knights and 289 squires were real members of the household. There were another twelve household knights and bannerets with a following of four knights and 30 squires on the horse valuation list between 13 and 27 July.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> E101/6/40

<sup>17</sup> Bl Add Ms 7966A, f 81-87; E101/9/24

The paid cavalry in 1301 including the lesser ranks of the household and the contingent from Ireland of eight bannerets, fourteen knights and 242 squires amounted to 1,000 men. The permanent members of Edward's *familia* were therefore providing between one third and one half of the cavalry in royal pay.<sup>18</sup>

Unfortunately the Wardrobe account books for 1302-3 have not survived so an exact calculation of the household's contribution to the summer campaign of 1303 is impossible. However, recent work by Michael Haskell based on a book of prests, a draft wardrobe book and horse valuation lists suggests that the paid cavalry amounted to 900-950 men. The total could have been considerably larger as Haskell claims that horse valuation lists are incomplete.<sup>19</sup>

During the summer campaign of 1303, 32 bannerets and 28 household knights were included on the horse list. They had a joint retinue of 158 men. A further eleven bannerets and 26 knights were entered in the book of prests. This means that as usual almost a third of the paid cavalry was provided by the real household knights and bannerets.<sup>20</sup>

This proportion was maintained in 1304. Six hundred men were in royal pay on 20 November.<sup>21</sup> 31 knights and bannerets were permanent members of the household. They had with them a contingent of 26 knights and 181 squires. Most of these troops remained with the

---

<sup>18</sup> For further discussion on the Irish contingent in 1301 see J.F. Lydon 'Irish Levies in the Scottish Wars 1296-1302', *The Irish Sword*, v (1962)

<sup>19</sup> M.A. Haskell, 'The Scottish Campaign of Edward I, 1303-4' (Durham University M.A. thesis, 1991), 51-90

<sup>20</sup> E101/364/13; E101/612/7; E101/612/11

<sup>21</sup> Bl Add Ms 8835, ff 55-59; Bl Add Ms 35293, ff 52-56; In addition there were seven bannerets, eighteen knights and 149 troops from Ireland with the king. J.F. Lydon, 'Edward I and the war in Scotland 1303-4', *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. J.F. Lydon (Dublin, 1981), 43-61

king until after the siege of Stirling.

The household knights and bannerets provided their largest contingent for the military campaigns of 1297-1304. During these years nearly all the household knights and bannerets who were in receipt of fees and robes were mobilised against the Scots or the French in 1297. Of the 64 household knights receiving fees in the summer of 1300, 44 appear on either the wage account or the horse list. Two others were also serving with the king. Amaury St Amand was described by the author of the Song of Caerlaverock as a knight who was 'displaying his prowess'. The author also describes the banner of John de Rivers, which was of gold and vermillion.<sup>22</sup>

Of the remaining seventeen, Robert FitzPayn was serving with John de Warenne. Henry Cantok, Roger de Lees, John Louth and Gerald Frensay were part of the English garrison at Edinburgh castle. Some of the others may have been serving in the retinues of other household knights. Thomas Paynel usually served with John St John. John Cromwell had been part of the contingent of Robert Clifford on many occasions. William Latimer the younger was probably serving with his father and Peter de Grandson with his uncle William de Grandson. Hugh Denegre was a knight of Otto de Grandson so it is probable that he was also serving with William de Grandson.<sup>23</sup>

The absence of Bogo de Knoville is easily explained. As the constable of Montgomery, he had probably been ordered to look after the king's affairs on the Welsh border. Edward I must always have been a little wary of a possible revolt. No trace has been found of the activities of Alexander Freville, John Thorpe, Edward Charles,

---

<sup>22</sup> *Siege of Carlaverock*, ed. Nicolas, 26, 31

<sup>23</sup> *Liber Quot*, 200

Gilbert Pecche, John de Sulleye and William Dean in 1300.<sup>24</sup>

The number of men provided by the household was clearly larger in the Scottish campaigns than during the Welsh wars. This was not due to the massive increase in the number of bannerets and knights who were in receipt of fees and robes. It was the result of an increase in the size of their retinues. In July at the start of the 1300 summer campaign the retinues of the household bannerets ranged from between one and six knights. The vast majority of bannerets were accompanied by two or three knights. The only exception was John St John. By the middle of August he had 2 bannerets and 11 knights in his following. The size of his retinue was probably a consequence of his position as warden of the Scottish march. It cannot have been due to the extent of his lands; other men of greater wealth had smaller retinues. Robert Clifford, holder of half the hereditary sheriffdom of Westmorland, was accompanied by no more than four knights on this campaign.

The number of squires serving with the bannerets ranged from the four provided by Hugh Mortimer to the 28 serving with John St John in July 1300. John St John's retinue of squires increased to 64 in August. Again the size of John St John's retinue was exceptional: most bannerets were accompanied by between six and thirteen squires.

Of the 27 household knights who served in 1300, four had knights in their retinues. The largest number was provided by John Chauvent who was accompanied by two knights. The groups of squires serving with the knights were larger than in 1277. Guy Ferre the younger had seven squires in his following. Only six of the knights

---

<sup>24</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, 301

were accompanied by only one squire.<sup>25</sup>

It is difficult to assess what factors determined the size of a knight's retinue. However, as the retinues were larger in 1300 than in 1277 and 1282 it is probable that the king indicated his expectations to his *familia*. A comparison of the retinues provided by household knights in 1300 and 1301 shows that the knights continued to provide retinues of a similar size.<sup>26</sup> Of the 22 household knights who served in 1300 and 1301, four provided identical retinues for both campaigns. Robert de Scales served with one knight and six squires in 1300 and 1301. William FitzClay, Robert de Bavent and Thomas Bicknor were accompanied by the same number of squires in each campaign. In total seventeen knights served with a similar number of followers in 1301. The retinues tended to be rather smaller than in 1300.<sup>27</sup>

The retinues provided by the household knights and bannerets were composed of men from a variety of sources. Some were family members. In 1300 Robert Felton's retinue included a Nicholas Felton and a Henry Felton. Walter and William Beauchamp were in the retinue of their father, the steward of the household. William Leyburn's retinue included Henry Leyburn and Simon Leyburn.<sup>28</sup>

Another pool of men for a knight's retinue was his own tenants. Of the thirteen knights who accompanied Clifford in 1300, three held land from him. Hugh Louther held Louther, Thomas Holbeck

---

<sup>25</sup> *Liber Quot*, 195-210

<sup>26</sup> The knight who was accompanied by a retinue of a totally different size in 1301 was William Latimer the elder. In 1300 it consisted of six knights and thirteen squires. In 1301 he served with only three valets. However, the only record of his contribution in 1301 is the horse list so this may be incorrect.

<sup>27</sup> *Liber Quot* 195-200; E101/8/23; E101/9/24; Bl Add Ms 7966A, ff 81-7; See Appendix V

<sup>28</sup> E101/8/23



was the holder of Ellebeck and Asam. John de Montenby held the manor of Burg. Three of the others, Roger Coupland, Nicholas de Vipont and Simon Sourby had names which corresponded to local lordships and manors. Nicholas de Vipont was possibly a descendant of the Vipont family which had held the sheriffdom of Westmorland prior to the Cliffords and Leyburns. Nicholas may even have been related to Clifford's wife.<sup>29</sup>

The remaining knights were probably recruited into Clifford's retinue for the duration of the campaign. These seven may have come from outside his lands. This clearly has important implications for the development of bastard feudalism.<sup>30</sup> This would support the recent work of David Crouch who has shown that the higher nobility were retaining men with whom they had no tenurial connection during the thirteenth century. The need to provide a retinue of men during a campaign may have encouraged the knights to recruit men beyond their tenurial connections.<sup>31</sup>

The household knights and bannerets clearly formed a major part of the paid cavalry for some of Edward's campaigns but their importance must not be exaggerated. The household was only mobilised if the king was on campaign. The king's illness in 1306-7 could explain why the household knights do not feature as prominently in the military operations in Scotland at that time. The contribution of the household to the campaigns of 1306-7 was negligible in both size and importance. From the fragmentary evidence there appear to have been 666 men divided among various commanders in 1306. Of the 72 household knights in receipt of fees

---

<sup>29</sup> E101/8/23; *CIPM*, v, no. 533

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of this issue see above, vol. i, pp 28-30

<sup>31</sup> Crouch, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', 172-3

and robes that year there are references to only ten serving in these forces. They had a joint retinue of eight knights and 57 squires. Adam de Swinburn was serving at Dumfries with four squires. The household provided less than a sixth of the recorded cavalry forces. In addition there were a number of knights who had been attached to the household at some point in their career. When these men are included, the figure for the 'household' force in 1306 can be increased to 185 men. This was still less than one third of the total paid cavalry in the field.

The king was ill when he journeyed north so it is possible that other household knights remained at his side. The household squires certainly accompanied him on his journey northwards. Of the 88 men who were listed as being with Edward I as he set off on campaign, 21 were receiving fees as household squires. However, it is interesting that no protections were issued to household knights for going to Scotland in that year.<sup>32</sup>

The household contingent was similarly sparse in 1307. Divided among the various commanders in Scotland were sixteen household knights with a joint retinue of 66 men. Due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence it is impossible to assess what proportion of the paid cavalry this contingent represented.<sup>33</sup>

If it was necessary to send a army abroad without the king or if a rebellion had to be crushed in Edward I's absence then forces other than the household knights had to be relied upon. However, even in these circumstances any available household knights would participate in the campaign. William Leyburn, William de Braose, Roger Mortimer, Hugh Turberville, Roger Lestrangle and John

---

<sup>32</sup> CDS, ii, nos 1780, 1786; v, no. 420; E101/13/7; E101/360/17; E101/369/10; E101/369/11, f 89; E101/371/837; E101/612/19

<sup>33</sup> CDS, ii, no. 1923; E101/612/20; E101/612/21

Lestrangle took part in the military operation to crush the revolt of Rhys ap Iaredudd in 1287. Most of the household was in Gascony with Edward in that year. All these men except William Leyburn held land in the Welsh marches. Edward I may have deliberately left them in England because he feared a revolt. Other household knights who did not go to Gascony also took part in the campaign. Norman Darcy, Ralph Gorges, John Lovel and Ralph Basset of Drayton all received protections to go to Wales. In addition the household steward, John de Mohaut, left Gascony for Wales in 1287. His departure from the king's court indicates the importance of the household and its expertise in military campaigns.<sup>34</sup>

The contribution of the household knights to the expedition to France in 1294 was even larger. At least seventeen former household knights went to Gascony in 1294. Their joint retinues, calculated from the protections they and their men received, amounted to 108 men.<sup>35</sup>

The household formed a large proportion of those receiving royal wages when the king was on campaign but the paid cavalry was only one of the military resources at the king's disposal. Both in Wales and in Scotland the paid cavalry was always overshadowed by other forces. In 1277 Morris calculated that the total cavalry with the king at his headquarters was 800 men. There were a further 200 men in other parts of Wales. Therefore the household knights were providing less than a third of the known cavalry forces.<sup>36</sup>

In 1300 the household knights provided over half the paid

---

<sup>34</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 3919, 4135, 4180-3; *CPR 1281-92*, 271-3

<sup>35</sup> *RG*, iii, 1926, 2224, 2230, 2286, 2303, 2304, 2324, 2343, 2346, 2363, 2378, 2379, 2593, 2692, 2743, 2761, 2790, 2891, 2908-9, 2916-19, 3019, 3449, 3958, 4227

<sup>36</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 127; Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 52

cavalry of 850 men. However, Prestwich has calculated that 40 knights and 366 squires were provided by the feudal muster. An additional 60 bannerets are mentioned in the Song of Caerlaverock. These men were serving voluntarily at their own cost. The size of their retinues is unknown. There was also an extensive unpaid contingent at Falkirk. Sixty-two bannerets appear on the Falkirk roll of arms who did not receive any wages. Morris estimates that these men could have provided another 1,000 cavalrymen.<sup>37</sup>

There was only one campaign in which the household was not overshadowed by other military forces. The household knights and their retinues were the most important element in the expedition to Flanders in 1297. In 1297 one of the major disputes between Edward I and his opponents was the provision of men for the war with France. No earls accompanied Edward when he set sail from Winchelsea on 22 August 1297. Lewis in his study of the Flanders campaign stressed that the household was the largest and most stable element of the expeditionary force. He calculated that Edward I was accompanied by 670 men when he left England in August: 475 of these men were household troops. By November the contingent had increased to 870 men. He estimated that 550 of these men were attached to the household.<sup>38</sup>

The permanent knights and bannerets provided a large part of the household contingent. Of the 475 household troops with Edward I in August, 257 were provided by the household knights and

---

<sup>37</sup> M.C. Prestwich, 'Cavalry Service in 14th Century England', *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. J.C. Holt and J.B. Gillingham, (Woodbridge, 1984), 148; Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 70-1; Prestwich, *Edward I*, 479; H. Gough, *Scotland in 1298*, 141-151; E101/6/40

<sup>38</sup> N.B. Lewis, 'The English Forces in Flanders, August-November 1297', *Studies in Medieval History presented to F.M. Powicke*, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, R.W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), 312, 314

bannerets. Nine bannerets and 21 knights were serving with a joint retinue of 26 knights and 201 squires. This included the retinues of the wardrobe clerks, John Droxford and John Benstead. In November 1298, thirteen bannerets, 30 knights and two clerks were accompanied by 43 knights and 201 squires.<sup>39</sup>

Therefore in November 1297 the household knights and their retinues were providing just less than one third of the total army in Flanders. This situation was exceptional but it clearly demonstrates the loyalty of Edward's *familia*. The household was the most reliable source of the troops at the king's disposal.

In a major campaign the contingent of household knights sometimes fought together as a unit. This was the case in 1300. The author of the *Song of Caerlaverock* stated that the army was 'arranged in four squadrons'. Unfortunately the poem does not name all those in each squadron. However, the evidence suggests that the household knights served in the third squadron which was commanded by the king. Seventeen bannerets were in receipt of fees and receiving wages for serving in the army in 1300. The author recorded that thirteen of these men were in the king's squadron. William de Grandson and Amanieu d'Albret were also part of the same battalion. There is no concrete evidence but it is probable that most of the simple knights and their retinues were also in the third squadron.<sup>40</sup>

However, it would be unwise to assume that all the simple knights were with the king. Of the bannerets who were receiving war wages in early July, five served in other squadrons. John St John, William Latimer the elder, William Leyburn and Roger Mortimer

---

<sup>39</sup> Bl Add Ms 7965, ff 64-67v

<sup>40</sup> *Siege of Carlaverock*, ed. Nicolas, 5, 23, 24-43

were in the fourth squadron which was led by the king's son. The poem states they were 'appointed to conduct and guard the king's son' because this was his first active campaign.<sup>41</sup>

The attachment of these particular men to the Prince in 1300 was not unusual. John St John, William Leyburn and Roger Mortimer are mentioned as part of the Prince's household in 1301 and they served with him on that campaign. They were a core of experienced men, loyal to the king, who could support and advise the Prince.<sup>42</sup> All four of these men had considerable military experience.<sup>43</sup>

Roger la Ware, who had been co-opted into the household for the duration of the campaign, was a member of the second squadron which was commanded by John, Earl of Surrey. In the same squadron was Robert FitzPayn. He was in receipt of fees that year, but he was not receiving war wages. His presence in the second squadron can probably be explained by his connection to Aymer de Valence. Valence was also serving with Warenne. An indenture between Valence and Robert FitzPayn, dated November 1303, shows that the latter had agreed to remain with Valence for a tournament. The link between the two men may already have been formed in 1300.<sup>44</sup>

The 1300 campaign was not the only campaign in which the household knights fought as a single unit. The Falkirk Roll of Arms clearly demonstrates that the army was divided into four battalions in 1298. The household knights fought as a single battalion under the command of the king. Forty-six bannerets were listed as members of Edward's squadron; eight of these men were not on the horse

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 43-46

<sup>42</sup> E101/9/23; E101/360/17

<sup>43</sup> For the military careers of John St John and Roger Mortimer see chapter 7

<sup>44</sup> *Liber Quot*, 199; *Siege of Carlaverock*, ed. Nicolas, 17; *CDS*, ii, no. 1407

lists. Nine others were listed in the roll which did not contain household members. The remainder were household bannerets. The simple knights were probably serving in the same squadron.<sup>45</sup>

The household knights did not always form a single unit. In 1301 the army was divided into two contingents. The king advanced from Berwick to Roxburgh, Bothwell and Linlithgow. A second army under the Prince of Wales advanced from Carlisle through Caerlaverock, Dumfries, Ayr and Turnberry.<sup>46</sup>

The knights and bannerets were divided between the two armies. Thirteen bannerets and eighteen knights with a joint retinue of 39 knights and 210 squires accompanied the king. The other 288 knights and bannerets mentioned in the wage accounts and the Irish contingent were with the Prince of Wales. A further twelve household knights and their joint retinue of 34 men are on the horse valuation list. These men were with the king. None of the names of the knights or bannerets who appear in the Prince's section of the wage account appear on the horse roll for the household.

An analysis of the wage account shows that only three of the bannerets accompanying the king were not in receipt of fees and robes that year. John Latimer, Hugh Bardolf and Gilbert de Umfraville and their contingent of eighteen knights and 35 squires had clearly been co-opted into the household for the campaign. In contrast the vast majority of the bannerets with the Prince of Wales were part of the household only for the duration of the war. John Cromwell was the only banneret that year in receipt of fees and robes from the king. William Leyburn, Roger Mortimer, John St

---

<sup>45</sup> Gough, *Scotland in 1298*, 141-151; Prestwich, *Edward I*, 479; E101/6/40

<sup>46</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 489

John and Reginald de Grey, the justice of Chester, were members of the Prince's household. Others such as Maurice de Berkeley and Thomas la Rouche were probably part of the 'forensic' element of the household troops.

The division of the simple knights of the household between the two contingents was very different. Almost half of the simple knights in the king's battalion were not permanent members of the household.<sup>47</sup> Leaving aside the contingent of Irish, only three knights had been co-opted into the Prince's army for the campaign. The division of regular members of the king's *familia* between Edward and the Prince was designed to give each section of the army a core of experienced household knights.<sup>48</sup>

Within the section of the army commanded by the king there were further divisions. An undated document shows how a contingent of household knights was divided into groups. Prestwich has claimed that this manuscript was written in 1301. He pointed out that Ralph Manton first appeared as part of the household in 1301. Manton was killed in 1303. A comparison of the document with the wage account and horse list for 1301 reveals that all those listed on the undated document were on campaign in Scotland that year. Secondly, the size of the retinues of the men on the undated document compares favourably with those recorded in the wage account. In the undated manuscript William de Cantilupe was recorded as having a retinue of fourteen horses; in the wage account he received payment for three knights and eleven squires.<sup>49</sup>

The document clearly related to the king's section of the

---

<sup>47</sup> Eight knights and 38 squires

<sup>48</sup> Bl Add Ms 7966A, ff 81-87; E101/360/17

<sup>49</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 56; E101/13/35; Bl Add Ms 7966A, ff 81, 85



army. None of the bannerets and knights who were with the Prince appear on the list. It was not necessarily drawn up at the start of the campaign. The wage accounts show that Cantilupe's retinue rose to fourteen only after 23 August.

The document describes how the household knights were divided into *constabularia*.<sup>50</sup> Most of these *constabularia* had approximately ten men. Walter de Teye had ten horses in his retinue so it was classed as one *constabularia*. However, the retinues were not divided if they had more than ten men. Some knights with smaller retinues had to be grouped together into *constabularia*. In these cases there might be just over or under ten men. John de Merk, Robert de Bures and Thomas Bicknor each had three men in their retinue. They joined together to form one *constabularia*.

Four bannerets and all of the knights on the wage account except for Robert de Bures and Henry Cantok do not appear on the undated document. The absence of John Botetourt is easily explained. He appears at the top of the manuscript as the leader of 60 men of the king's chamber. These men were not knights but valets of the king's chamber. Among them was the king's physician, John Kenly.<sup>51</sup>

It is unlikely that the missing knights and bannerets were absent from the army when the document was drawn up. William de Cantilupe, who was included in the undated document, served with the king from 19 July to 23 October. Robert de Scales, who was not on the document, served from 11 July to 31 October. It is possible that another document showing the organisation of the rest of the

---

<sup>50</sup> This is the only document which has survived from Edward I's reign showing the household knights divided into *constabularia*. An account from the second Welsh war shows that the household squires of 1282-3 were divided into *constabularia*. C47/2/6

<sup>51</sup> E101/13/35 m 11; E101/370/28 m 11

king's army has not survived.<sup>52</sup>

In the Welsh wars of 1277 and 1282-3, the knights served under a number of different commanders. The account of court wages of 1277 shows that a number of the knights who were current members of the household were at the king's side during the summer of 1277. Twenty-six household knights and bannerets received wages for being with Edward from 20 June through to October or November. However, Richard de Boys, the marshal of the household, was at Oswestry for part of August. William Cicon and Elias Hauville were at Carmarthen. A number of knights received wages for being in court only for a few days between July and November: these men were serving in other parts of Wales. Bogo de Knoville was in court for only seventeen days during this period. As sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire he was busy organising the foot soldiers from that county. Stephen Montferrand spent only 27 days at court in July and August. Henry St Lambert was also absent from the court. John Geyton, who was receiving wages for being in court in December 1276, was issued with a protection to go to Wales. He must have served under a different commander.

Other knights who were associated with the household but who do not appear on the 1277-8 or 1278-9 accounts were in different regions of Wales. Roger Mortimer of Wigmore commanded a group of knights and foot at Montgomery. John d'Eyville became attached to Reginald Grey's command at Flint. William de Braose and John de la Mare were in south Wales.<sup>53</sup>

There was a concentration of household forces at Chester in June 1282. However, some household knights were serving in other

---

<sup>52</sup> B1 Add Ms 7966A, ff 81-85

<sup>53</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 124, 127, 133; E101/3/11; E101/3/16; E101/3/21; *CPR 1272-81*, 187

areas. Roger Mortimer of Wigmore was captain of the march. He and his men were at Montgomery from 24 May 1282 until his death in October 1282. His successor was another household knight, Roger Lestrangle. He had been serving in the same area near Builth. Roger continued to harass the Welsh in that area throughout the winter of 1282-3. He received £948 10 9 for the wages of the garrison of Montgomery in March 1283.<sup>54</sup>

There were also some household knights with William of Valence in South Wales. Philip Daubeney and his retinue appear to have been at Cardigan from 11 June 1282 to March 1283. Roger Mortimer the younger was probably with his father at Montgomery prior to his death. From 1 November 1282 he joined William of Valence. He served with six companions from then until 25 December. In January 1283 he was made custodian of the pele of Lampeter.<sup>55</sup>

Edward I sent small contingents of household knights to other areas as the war progressed. The well-known and ill-fated expedition to Anglesey in October 1282 contained a number of household knights.<sup>56</sup> In 1283 a group of knights including John de la Mare, Michael Upsale, Andrew le Rat and Robert Whitfield were sent to Conwy. Some journeyed on to Bangor to join Otto de Grandson.<sup>57</sup>

The household knights were divided between a number of commanders during the campaigns in Scotland of 1306-7. In 1306 the household forces were scattered between the king, his son, Aymer de Valence and Robert Clifford. In June 1306 Aymer de Valence's contingent consisted of eight bannerets, and 291 knights and squires. Of these men, two bannerets and four knights had been

---

<sup>54</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 159; E101/4/1; C47/2/4

<sup>55</sup> C47/2/4

<sup>56</sup> See below, vol. i, p 105-6

<sup>57</sup> E101/4/1

members of Edward's *familia*. Gilbert Pecche and Matthew de Mont Martin were in receipt of fees and robes that year. William Latimer, Henry de Beaumont, William Francis and William Felton had been part of the household in previous years. Robert Clifford was leading a force of 40 men. He was accompanied by Robert Felton and Thomas Paynel. All three men were members of the royal household although they did not receive a fee in 1306.<sup>58</sup>

Unfortunately, the wage accounts of <sup>the</sup> contingent of the Prince of Wales have not survived. However, there is a horse valuation list and an indenture for victuals at Perth and Aberdeen. These two documents reveal that the Prince had a squadron of at least 167 men. William Leyburn, Guy Ferre and Robert Hausted were among those who were accompanying the Prince. In addition, an order to the sheriffs of different counties in October 1306 names 20 knights and bannerets who had left the Prince's army during that summer without permission. Those guilty of this offense included William and Walter de Beauchamp, the sons of the late steward of the household and Roger Mortimer. William Pouton and William Montague had been with the Prince at the siege of Dunaverty in October 1306. Adam de Welles may also have been with the Prince. He was in Scotland with two knights and eleven squires from 23 July to 12 October.<sup>59</sup>

The Beauchamps and William Leyburn were current members of the king's household. Robert de Scales, Guy Ferre and Robert Hausted had been members of Edward I's *familia* but they had become part of the Prince's household. Robert Hausted the younger was his steward.

The army which Edward I led into Scotland that summer

---

<sup>58</sup> E101/369/11, f 89; *CDS*, ii, nos 1780, 1786; v, no. 420

<sup>59</sup> E101/13/7; E101/360/17; E101/369/10; E101/371/837; *CDS*, v, no. 457; *CFR 1272-1307*, 543-44

contained only few household knights. Eighty-eight men are known to have accompanied the king. Six of these men were household knights. They had a joint retinue of three knights and 26 squires.<sup>60</sup>

In addition, a small number of household knights were serving as constables of Scottish castles in 1306. John Botetourt was the warden of Scottish march. He joined the siege at Dunaverty in October 1306. Richard Siward was the constable of Dumfries. Adam de Swinburn was part of its garrison. Eble des Montz was the custodian of Jedburgh and John Kingston was the constable of Edinburgh.<sup>61</sup>

In 1307 the household forces were again divided between different commanders. Between 12 February and 4 March John Botetourt led a number of forays in Galloway. His own retinue consisted of three knights and eleven squires. He was accompanied by eleven other knights. Eight of these men were household knights. Walter de Beauchamp, Thomas Leyburn, Walter Hakelute the younger, Richard de Welles, Gerald Frensay, John de Sulleye, his brother, William and John de Chauvent served with a joint contingent of fifteen men. These knights remained with Botetourt from 5 March to 23 April. Upon that date they were joined by Thomas Bicknor, Edmund Willington and John Lestrangle who were members of the household.<sup>62</sup>

Robert Clifford conducted a raiding force from Carlisle to Glentrool in April 1307. Sixty-six horses were valued for this expedition. Most of them belonged to men from the sheriffdom of Westmorland but four were owned by Edmund Cornwall, Eble des Montz, John Bicknor and William Felton, who were household knights.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> E101/369/11, f 90; E101/612/19

<sup>61</sup> CDS, v, no. 465; E101/13/16 f 13; E101/369/11 f 89

<sup>62</sup> E101/612/20; CDS, ii, no. 1923

<sup>63</sup> CDS, ii, no. 1923; E101/612/21

The household knights were a military force which could be quickly mobilized in any military emergency. They could advance against the enemy, months before the full army was assembled. In 1277 the official muster took place on 1 July. The wage account which recorded attendance at court revealed that by December 1276 the king and his knights were already moving westward. Knights such as John Geyton left Edward's side and journeyed into Wales. From the middle of January 1277 a group of household knights were serving in the garrisons on the Welsh border. William Leyburn, John de Bohun, Peter de Brompton and Richard de Boys were at Montgomery. Elias Hauville, William Cicon, Jordan Lubeck and Andrew le Rat served at Carmarthen from 25 January to 14 April.<sup>64</sup>

In 1282 the household knights were again mobilised in advance of the main force. The army was officially summoned to meet at Rhuddlan on 2 August. However, following the council at Devizes in April 1282, 116 household knights had their horses valued for immediate service. Thirteen knights and 23 squires accompanied Amadeus, Count of Savoy to Chester. Among them was the chief steward of the household, Robert FitzJohn and the two marshals, Elias Hauville and Richard de Boys. John de la Mare served at Oswestry which was under the command of Roger Mortimer. These men were joined by other household troops during the succeeding months. Walter de Beauchamp, Philip Darcy, Hugh Turberville, Guncelin de Badlesmere and Thomas Multon arrived at Montgomery on 7 May.<sup>65</sup>

However, the household was not always mobilized in an emergency. There was widespread rebellion in Scotland in 1297. Edward did not despatch his household forces to deal with the

---

<sup>64</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 116; Prestwich, *Edward I*, 176; E101/3/12; E101/3/13; E101/3/15

<sup>65</sup> E101/4/1; C47/2/5

revolt. Instead he relied upon the resources of Robert Clifford and Henry Percy. Their swift advance into the borders forced the Scottish nobles to surrender. Robert Bruce was probably among those who submitted to the king's will although Wallace and other rebels remained at large. The capitulation of the Scots culminated in the treaty of Irvine which was negotiated by Clifford and Percy.

Clifford was a member of the household in 1297 but that was not the main reason he was chosen. He and Percy were selected to lead a force into Scotland because they were both major northern landowners. They commanded an army of men which they had raised from their own lands and from the lands of other local men. A letter from Edward to Clifford and Percy promised that the summons would not set a precedent. Upon Clifford's request the king instructed other men in the marches to send men to join Robert. Five hundred foot soldiers were required from Coupland.<sup>66</sup>

The household was not mobilised to deal with the revolt in Scotland in 1297 because Edward I was planning an expedition to Flanders. He was also facing internal opposition in England from certain sections of the nobility. Therefore he was unlikely to send his loyal household troops and bodyguard to Scotland when he was not planning to conduct a major campaign in that region. Edward's *familia* was needed in other areas.

There seems to have been a continuing reluctance to send household knights to deal with rebellions in Scotland. The household was not mobilised to counter the revolt which followed the murder of John Comyn in 1306. It was Aymer de Valence, Robert Clifford, and Henry Percy who made the initial strike in Scotland

---

<sup>66</sup> *Documents*, ed. Stevenson, ii, 179, 186

after the uprising. All three of the commanders and their men were in Scotland by April 1306. Only a small number of household knights served as part of their contingents.<sup>67</sup>

Household knights were used as a quick attack force to deal with emergencies in Wales but not in Scotland. The main reason for this was the relative distance of the two countries from Westminster and the south east. The king spent the vast majority of his time in the south east of the country. The estates of most of his *familia* also lay in that region. Household knights could be quickly despatched from there to the Welsh borders. A crisis in Scotland could be more quickly dealt with by the northern marcher lords.

A number of preparations were necessary before a major campaign. This included the collection and distribution of victuals and the raising of foot soldiers. Supplies were needed for the large royal armies under Edward's command and for the castles held by the English in Wales and Scotland.

Household knights were used quite frequently as purveyors during the Welsh wars. In March 1283 Hugh Turberville and Grimbald de Pauncefoot were sent to Hereford and Richard de Boys was sent to Shropshire and Somerset to purvey a large quantity of victuals. Two months later Grimbald de Pauncefoot was paid 33s 4d for the transportation of supplies from the forest of Dean into various parts of Wales. In August 1283 Philip Darcy was sent to Warwick and

---

<sup>67</sup> CDS, ii, nos 1754, 1762; v, no. 420



Leicestershire to collect 100 quarters of wheat.

The knights were also used to distribute the victuals from the supply base at Chester to different command posts. In July 1283 Philip Darcy was paid for transporting some supplies from Chester to Rhuddlan. In August 1283 Gilbert de Briddleshale received a payment for a similar service.<sup>70</sup>

Household knights had a smaller part to play in organizing the victualling for the Scottish campaigns. The steward of the household, Walter de Beauchamp, was responsible for arranging the victuals to be supplied to the king's household when it was on campaign. Prior to the proposed winter campaign of 1299, Beauchamp left the king at Darlington and journeyed to Berwick to prepare for Edward's arrival. He was accompanied by another household knight, Thomas Bicknor. Before the summer campaign of 1300 Beauchamp was sent to make preparations for the household's arrival at Carlisle. In 1301 Walter spent the period between 7 and 28 June at Berwick making the necessary arrangements.<sup>71</sup>

Beauchamp also helped to organize the supplies for the whole of the Scottish march. Walter remained at Berwick after the king's departure in December 1299. In January 1300 he and the clerks of the wardrobe released an estimate of the supplies needed for the castles. Other household knights were sometimes involved in such meetings. In July 1299, William Latimer, the king's captain in Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire, went to a meeting at York concerning the garrisons of the Scottish castles.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> E101/351/9

<sup>71</sup> *Liber Quot*, 55, 72; *CCR 1296-1302*, 259

<sup>72</sup> *Liber Quot*, 55, 72; M.C. Prestwich, 'Victualling estimates for English garrisons in Scotland during the early fourteenth century', *EHR*, lxxxii (1967), 536-40

Only a few household knights were involved in the actual purveyance of the victuals during the Scottish wars. None were appointed in 1300. Of the 22 men appointed in 1301 two were household knights. One knight was a member of the commissions of 1303 and 1306. Those knights who were selected held land in the county to which they were appointed. John Thorpe and John Botetourt collected produce from Norfolk and Suffolk and they both held land in those counties. William de Cantilupe, a purveyor in Yorkshire, had estates in that region.<sup>73</sup>

The only household knight who was regularly involved in the purveyance of victuals was William Russel. He was the keeper of the Isle of Wight. Among the victuals he purveyed from the island in 1300 were over 365 quarters of wheat and 35 quarters of oats.<sup>74</sup> In 1304 he had to inform the king that the 400 quarters of wheat and five bushels of corn had been sunk in a ship just off the island. However, he still managed to supply Richard Bromsgrove with over 591 quarters of wheat and 147 quarters of oats.<sup>75</sup>

Fewer household knights were appointed to purvey victuals during the Scottish campaigns than during the Welsh wars. The organisation for the collection of produce had not been formalised in the 1280s. Household knights were used because they were available. The purveyance of victuals was on a much larger scale during the campaigns in Scotland and more sophisticated arrangements were made.

Household knights were frequently employed to raise foot soldiers during the Welsh wars. The names of John de Mohaut, Bogo

---

<sup>73</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, 578; *CPR 1301-2*, 99, 159, 417, 419; *CChR 1300-26*, 21, 192

<sup>74</sup> *Liber Quot* 106, 133; *CPR 1292-1301*, 487

<sup>75</sup> *CPR 1301-7*, 276; E101/369/11, ff 27v, 84v

de Knoville, Imbert de Monréal, Richard de Boys, Peter de Brompton and Thomas Turberville all appear on the 1277 infantry roll. Each of these men was responsible for a different section of the foot soldiers. Bogo de Knoville as sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire was responsible for the men from those counties. John de Mohaut was in charge of the infantry from Chester and Lancaster. Thomas Turberville was in command of the men from Roger Clifford's lands.

In 1282 Hugh Turberville was instructed to raise over 1,400 foot soldiers from Ghent, Hereford and the forest of Dean. Richard de Boys, the marshal of the household, was in charge of 1,000 men from Shropshire and Staffordshire.<sup>76</sup>

The household knights who were Welsh marcher lords were responsible for raising foot soldiers from their own lands. In 1287 writs were issued for soldiers to be raised in the Welsh marches to crush the rebellion. Among those who received a writ was Roger Mortimer of Chirk. He had to find 400 foot soldiers from his own lands. Robert de Bures, the bailiff of Queen Eleanor, raised 100 foot from the queen's lands in Maelor Saesneg.<sup>77</sup>

The system for arraying foot soldiers had also changed by the 1290s. During the war with Scotland Robert Clifford raised men from his lands in Westmorland but few other household knights were involved in organising the infantry. No household knights served on the commissions which raised footsoldiers in 1298 or 1300. In 1301 two of the fifteen commissioners of array were household knights. One member of the king's *familia* was appointed as a commissioner in 1303. All the knights, Robert FitzPayn, William

---

<sup>76</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 174; E101/3/11; *CWR*, 259

<sup>77</sup> *CWR*, 313; C47/2/4

Hauterive and John Savage served upon commissions in their home counties.<sup>78</sup>

In contrast fifteen of the 50 commissioners appointed to raise men with more than £40 of land in 1300 were household knights. As usual these men served in the counties where they held land. Primarily these knights were appointed to this commission because they were men who were trusted by the king. He would be able to rely upon their loyalty should there be a protest against this new form of military summons. By employing commissioners who were local landowners and prominent in royal service, Edward hoped that more men would be encouraged to obey the summons.<sup>79</sup>

Household knights were also involved in such other preparations for a campaign as the purchase of war materials. In 1300 John d'Oyley, a household knight and constable of Dumfries, arranged for a movable siege engine to be built at Caerlaverock. Thomas Bicknor received 5s 6d for horse leather which he had sent to the king's engineer. This was used to make slings for the siege engines. William Felton received 10s for the five lances he bought to carry the king's standards. This task must have been regularly assigned to him. In October 1301 he purchased another five lances for the same purpose. Two household knights, Francis Villars and John de Chauvent, were involved in the purchasing of horses and mules for the king's army. It was not unusual for household knights to make such purchases. In 1302-3 Guy Ferre was sent to London to buy some horses for the Prince's use in Scotland.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> CPR 1292-1301, 151, 438, 593; CPR 1301-7, 132-4

<sup>79</sup> CCR 1296-1301, 381; CIPM, vi, no. 454; Moor, *Knights* i, 122; v, 42

<sup>80</sup> *Liber Quot*, 64, 65, 79; CDS, ii, no. 365; v, no. 226; Bl Add Ms 7966A, f 46



The household formed a major part of the cavalry but no household knight was ever made commander in chief of a battalion in a major campaign. The large battalions at Caerlaverock were led by the king, his son and John de Warenne, the earl of Surrey. In 1298 the first squadron was commanded by the earl of Hereford, the earl of Lincoln and the earl of Norfolk; the second was led by Anthony Bek, the third by the king and the fourth by the earls of Gloucester, Arundel, Oxford and Pembroke.<sup>81</sup>

Household knights were not appointed because it would have provoked a storm of opposition from members of the higher nobility. The protests which occurred in 1282 and 1294-5, when the king appointed household men as marshals of the army, have been examined by Prestwich and Morris. In 1282 Robert Tibetot was chosen to be the marshal of the army in south Wales. Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford and Constable of England objected to the plan. His protest was very effective and Tibetot was replaced at the council of Devizes by the earl of Gloucester.

In 1294 Roger de Molis was appointed as marshal of the army in south Wales. The earl of Norfolk, the Marshal of England and the commander in South Wales objected. At the military council at Worcester he protested that his rights had been infringed. Edward promised that the appointment would not diminish the earl Marshal's privileges.<sup>82</sup>

Neither Roger de Molis nor Robert Tibetot appear on any of the surviving lists of fees and robes during Edward I's reign. However, they were definitely members of the household. Tibetot went on crusade with the king and he was a member of the royal council. He

---

<sup>81</sup> Gough, *Scotland in 1298*, 139-57; *Siege of Carlaverock*, ed. Nicolas, 12

<sup>82</sup> Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 250; Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 72

appears on the witness lists for 1279-80 as part of the circle of men who were attendant upon the king at court. Robert was given tasks and offices which were usually assigned to household knights. He was appointed as a commissioner of oyer and terminer in 1275 and 1278, he was constable of Nottingham and the justice of west Wales.<sup>83</sup>

Roger de Molis was probably a member of the household during the 1290s. He served as part of the paid cavalry in 1282. In 1294, Roger was appointed to investigate forest offences in the company of Richard de Boys and Hugh de Brok.<sup>84</sup>

The magnates did not object to the appointment of these men because they lacked military expertise. Tibetot had been to the Holy Land, he had fought for Henry III during the civil war and he had defended Bristol against De Montfort. Roger de Molis served in both Welsh wars. He was also part of the forces which crushed the rebellion of Rhys ap Maredudd in 1287.<sup>85</sup>

The earls would not tolerate the appointment of these men as commanders because they were socially inferior. The magnates refused to serve for pay in 1282. They considered that those such as the household knights who received wages were inferior. They were unwilling to take orders from such men.<sup>86</sup>

Two household knights were successfully appointed as marshal of the army. Ralph Gorges, who had served in Wales in 1277, 1282 and 1287, was named as the marshal of the army which was sent to Gascony in 1294. The Marshal of England, the earl of Norfolk, did not go on the campaign. None of the earls protested about this

---

<sup>83</sup> *G.E.C.*, xii part ii, 89; *CCR 1272-81*, 123, 287, 443; C53/68

<sup>84</sup> E101/4/1

<sup>85</sup> *G.E.C.*, ix, 4; *CPR 1281-96*, 79, 272, 397

<sup>86</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 72, 249;

appointment because none of them went on the expedition.<sup>87</sup>

Geoffrey de Geneville was named as the marshal of the army which went to Flanders in 1297. Bigod and Bohun, the Marshal and Constable of England, refused to draw up the necessary lists for the muster at London in July 1297 and so Edward I replaced them. As no earls sailed with the army, Geoffrey's appointment was not disputed.<sup>88</sup>

The experience of Ralph Gorges in Gascony suggests that the earls' fears about the social inferiority of such men may have been justified. The magnates may have believed that such a man did not have enough status to command respect from the men beneath him. This was not an idle fear. Ralph Gorges was left in command of the army in the Rioms area in 1295. John Giffard, the commander at Podensac, surrendered to the French. Ralph set up a judicial tribunal of knights to try Giffard. This provoked a riot among the English garrison. This may have reflected the weakness of his personal authority.<sup>89</sup>

The higher ranks of the nobility did not object to household knights being appointed as the untitled assistants of inexperienced commanders. John St John, Roger Mortimer and William Leyburn fulfilled this role when they served with the Prince of Wales in 1300 and 1301.<sup>90</sup>

The expedition to Gascony in 1294 was officially commanded by the earl of Richmond, the king's inexperienced nephew. On that campaign John St John and Robert Tibetot were chosen to assist him.

---

<sup>87</sup> *CPR 1281-92*, 272; *RG*, iii, cxlvi

<sup>88</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 420; *Rishanger*, 173

<sup>89</sup> Moor, *Knights*, ii, 127; *CPR 1281-92*, 272; *RG*, iii, cxlvi; *Guisborough*, 246-7

<sup>90</sup> See above, vol. i, p. 86

St John was selected because he was the seneschal of Gascony. In the words of Pierre de Langtoft, he 'knew the countries'.<sup>91</sup>

The career of John St John is discussed in detail by Bémont. His appointment as the earl of Richmond's assistant gave St John the opportunity to lead a major section of the army. This task would normally have been given to an earl. John St John left John of Brittany at Rioms in late 1294. He led the other half of the army to defend Bayonne and other areas of southern Gascony.<sup>92</sup>

The household knights often held offices below the rank of commander-in-chief. The knights were frequently appointed as the captain or warden of a section of the Scottish or Welsh marches. In Wales, two household knights, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore and Roger Lestrangle served as captain of the garrisons of Montgomery, Oswestry and Whitchurch. Four household bannerets, Robert Clifford, John St John, John Botetourt and Richard Siward held the office of warden of the Scottish march between 1296 and 1307.<sup>93</sup>

Following the conquest of 1282 a new administrative structure was established in north Wales. The knights who were appointed as justice or deputy justice of north Wales were responsible for the forces from their region during a rebellion. During the revolt of 1287, John de Bevillard, the deputy justice of North Wales and Robert Tibetot, justice of west Wales were responsible for the men from their areas at the siege of Dryslwyn.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> *Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, ed. T. Wright, ii (Rolls series, 1868), 214

<sup>92</sup> *RG*, iii, lxi-lxii, cxlvi

<sup>93</sup> The roles of these knights as wardens of the march and the reason for their appointment is discussed in chapter 7.

<sup>94</sup> See below, 286; *CWR*, 244; Taylor 'Who was John Pennard, Leader of the men of Gwynedd', 210, 219; For a detailed account of Tibetot's activities in 1287 see R. Griffiths, 'The Rebellion of Rhys ap Imereduc', *Welsh History Review*, iii (1966-7)



Household knights were regularly chosen to lead a small group of men on forays against the enemy. Expeditions to capture the Welsh supply base of Anglesey were generally led by a household knight. The most famous was the expedition of 1282. This ended in a disaster which saw the death of Roger Clifford the younger, a prominent household knight.<sup>95</sup> This operation was conducted by a group of household knights including Otto de Grandson, William Latimer, Luke de Tany and Clifford. Langtoft described Roger Clifford the younger as 'the foremost of the party' but Tany was almost certainly the leader.<sup>96</sup>

Philip Daubeney led a foray in south west Wales. Robert Tibetot sent a letter to the Chancellor between August and September 1282. This missive announced that Philip and the garrison of Cardigan had conducted some successful raids in that area. They had taken a large amount of booty and eighteen prisoners.<sup>97</sup>

During the war with Scotland between 1296 and 1307 household knights were responsible for leading at least twelve raids and forays against the enemy. Many of these were led by the wardens of the march or by the knights who were constables of Scottish castles.<sup>98</sup> Robert Clifford was regularly appointed to conduct raids even after his term as warden was over. For instance in 1303 he, William Latimer and John Segrave led a chevauchée from Dunfermline. In 1306 and 1307, Robert Clifford again led major raids against the

---

<sup>95</sup> For a discussion of the disaster which arose when the contingent on Anglesey lead an unauthorized raid against the Welsh on the mainland, see Morris, *Welsh Wars*, 180; *Guisborough*, 219-20; *Rishanger*, 101-2

<sup>96</sup> *Langtoft*, ed. Wright, 179

<sup>97</sup> *Cal Anc Corr Wales*, 131-2

<sup>98</sup> See chapter 7

enemy.<sup>99</sup> In 1301, Hugh d'Audley led an expedition to attack the king's enemies on the moor of Alkirk.<sup>100</sup>

Household knights were given important positions of authority within the navy. Three knights were appointed as admirals of Edward I's navy. Two knights served as under-captains of the fleet. In 1294 William Leyburn was described as the captain of the king's fleet while John Botetourt was named as the under-captain.<sup>101</sup> By 12 December 1295 the position of both men had changed. A writ issued upon that date describes both men as the admirals of the king's fleet. Following Botetourt's elevation John Savage, another household knight, became the under-captain. The exact date of the latter's appointment is unknown but he is referred to by that title in the wardrobe account book of 1297. Savage had special responsibility for the Cinque Ports. In 1298 he was described as the lieutenant and captain of the mariners of the Cinque Ports.<sup>102</sup>

Leyburn and Botetourt were replaced in 1300 by Gervase Alard of Winchelsea who was not a member of the household. He was reappointed in June 1306 in joint command with the household knight, Edward Charles. Under these two men the command of the fleet was divided into two sections. Alard had jurisdiction over the area which lay between Dover and Cornwall. Edward Charles was in charge of the region which stretched from the mouth of the Thames to Berwick.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> See above, vol. i, p 93

<sup>100</sup> CDS, ii, no. 1226; v, no. 357

<sup>101</sup> CPR 1292-1301, 126

<sup>102</sup> *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. E.B. Fryde, D.E. Greenway, S. Porter, I. Roy (1986), 135; Bl Add Ms 7965, f 25

<sup>103</sup> CPR 1301-7, 438

The *Handbook of British Chronology* states that the division of the coastline between two admirals happened after 1328. However, the foundations were probably laid in Edward I's reign. The division seems to have ' existed, albeit unofficially, during the period of joint command by Leyburn and Botetourt. In 1297 writs were issued dealing with the need to ensure the safety of various ports from attacks by the French. John Botetourt was responsible for Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex while William Leyburn was in charge of the western ports of Surrey and Sussex. Occasionally the responsibility for another smaller subdivision of the fleet would be given to a captain. In February 1307, John Louth, a household knight, was appointed as the captain and governor of the fleet from the Cumbria area.<sup>104</sup>

The admiral frequently sailed with the fleet. In 1294 William Leyburn received a respite of debts because he was going to Gascony with the fleet. John Botetourt sailed with the fleet which was taking reinforcements and money to the English army in Gascony in 1295. Both Botetourt and Leyburn went to Flanders in 1297. In 1306, Edward Charles was ordered to sail the fleet from the Thames up to Berwick.<sup>105</sup>

However, the duties of the household knights who were admirals and under-captains of the fleet were mainly administrative. The admiral of the fleet had to ensure that the correct number of ships were assembled at a designated port prior to an overseas expedition. On 7 June 1294 William Leyburn and the barons of the Cinque Ports were ordered to ensure that all the ships required by the king were assembled at Portsmouth in September. This was in

---

<sup>104</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, 291; *CPR 1301-7*, 490

<sup>105</sup> *RG*, iii, cxlix, 3423; *BL Add Ms 7965*, ff 64-66; *Foedera I*, ii, 990; *CCR 1302-7*, 400

preparation for the king's brother's departure for France. In 1297 William Leyburn visited a variety of ports to ensure that the sailors took their boats to Winchelsea by the middle of the summer.<sup>106</sup>

The fleet was often used to convey men and supplies to an army that was already in field. The admiral was clearly involved in the purchasing and collection of those supplies. Edward Charles received a number of payments in 1305-6 for victuals and other necessities which he had transported to Scotland.<sup>107</sup>

The admirals were also responsible for ensuring that there were sufficient victuals for the sailors during a voyage. In 1294 Leyburn, Botetourt and their men were given permission to hunt in the forests of Sussex and Hampshire for supplies.<sup>108</sup>

It was the duty of the admirals to ensure that the ports and coasts were adequately protected against attacks from the French. In 1294 William Leyburn and the constable of Dover were responsible for organizing a system to defend the coast. The sheriffs had to assemble knights to guard the coast. In 1297 writs were sent to Botetourt and Leyburn instructing them to ensure the safety of the ports in different counties. Each county had to provide six ships paid for by the inhabitants.<sup>109</sup>

The admirals were frequently ordered to ensure the safety of a particular person or merchant crossing the sea. In 1294 Leyburn was instructed to protect the king's officials who were travelling to Gascony to prepare for the forthcoming campaign.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> *RG*, iii, 3006, 3285; *CCR 1296-1302*, 99

<sup>107</sup> *E101/369/11*, f 68

<sup>108</sup> *RG*, iii, 3285

<sup>109</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, 291; *E159/68 m 79*

<sup>110</sup> *RG*, iii, 2942, 3035

Occasionally the admiral was required to arbitrate in judicial disputes. In May 1297 William Leyburn was ordered to restore the goods of a group of men who had been arrested by the king's officials at Winchelsea. Two months earlier John Botetourt had been instructed to release the ships from Flanders which had been taken prior to the war with France.<sup>111</sup>

The under-captains of the fleet had similar duties to those of the admirals. In September 1297 John Savage was ordered to accelerate the passage of the ships carrying victuals to the army in Flanders. The fleet finally set sail in November 1297 and Savage went with it. He received 31s in the wardrobe accounts of that year for the voyage to Flanders. In 1298 Savage attended a council at Westminster to arrange the assembling of ships at the end of the truce with the king of France.<sup>112</sup>

As the bulk of an admiral's duties were administrative the holder of the office did not need extensive sailing experience. The only admiral with such expertise was Gervase Alard. He was a leading citizen of the Cinque Ports; he was not a household knight. Botetourt, Leyburn and Edward Charles were appointed because they had administrative not sea-faring skills. Botetourt frequently served as a justice of oyer and terminer and Leyburn had been constable of a number of castles. As household knights they had served in a number of campaigns and their loyalty was assured.

In addition, the admirals and under-captains often held land in a county which had important ports. Prior to Botetourt's elevation to the rank of admiral he had been an under-captain with special responsibility for the fleet in Yarmouth and Norfolk.

---

<sup>111</sup> CCR 1296-1301, 33-4; CPR 1292-1301, 245

<sup>112</sup> CCR 1292-1301, 100, 245; CCR 1296-1301, 61, 192; RG, iii, 3407; C47/2/11; Bl Add Ms 7965, f 25

Botetourt came from a Norfolk family. John Savage, under-captain and then lieutenant of the fleet of the Cinque Ports had lands in Kent. Leyburn, who had special responsibility for the western fleet, also had lands in Kent.<sup>113</sup>

While the fleet was in Gascony the two English admirals shared their responsibilities with a Gascon admiral. Barrau de Sescas was the captain of the royal fleet of Bayonne. He was admitted into the household in 1297. In 1294 and again in December 1295 Sescas, Leyburn and Botetourt were ordered to oversee the fleet while it was in Gascony.<sup>114</sup>

Barrau de Sescas had his own responsibilities with regard to the Gascon fleet. In 1301-2 he and the mayor of Bayonne instructed the people not to sell ships to the king's enemies. After the conclusion of the peace in 1303 Sescas was responsible for settling the disputes and grievances concerning the coast of Gascony as had been agreed under the treaty with the French.<sup>115</sup>

In 1295 keepers of the seas were deployed as part of a scheme to defend the English coast from attacks by the French. Southern England was divided into areas of responsibility and special custodians were appointed. Three household knights were nominated to these posts. William Hauterive and Henry Cobham became the custodians of Surrey and Sussex. They replaced the original custodian John de Warenne, earl of Surrey. Cobham was also chosen as the keeper in Kent. These knights were selected because they were local men. William Hauterive held the manor of Egden in Sussex. Henry Cobham had held the barony of Rundale in Kent. Osbert

---

<sup>113</sup> *CChR 1257-1300*, 461

<sup>114</sup> *RG*, iii, 3883, 4131, 4134; *Bl Add Ms 7965*, f 60

<sup>115</sup> *CPR 1301-7*, 152; *Cal Chanc Warrants*, 129, 133

de Spaldington was chosen as the keeper of the sea between Berwick and Scarborough in 1296. He was probably selected because he was the constable of Berwick at the time.<sup>116</sup>

It was the duty of the keepers of the seas to assemble the ships from the ports in that area. In 1296 Osbert de Spaldington had to raise 100 ships from the region between King's Lynn and Berwick. They were also responsible for protecting the coastline from attack. In 1296 William Hauteville was ordered to reduce the coast line guard in Sussex. In an emergency they had the authority to call out the full manpower of the county, if it was necessary.<sup>117</sup>

The men attached to the royal household were an important military resource at the disposal of the Norman and Angevin kings throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The household forces used by Edward I were greater than those of his predecessors. Their numbers became progressively larger towards the end of the reign. The household provided their largest contingent for the campaign of 1300.

The household troops consisted of two main elements. There were the permanent members of the household and the 'forinsec' element. Nearly all the knights who were in receipt of fees and robes in the year of a major expedition were mobilised against the enemy. During the Welsh and Scottish wars the true household knights provided between one third and one half of the paid cavalry. In 1298 and 1300 the household fought as a single squadron under the command of the king. In 1301 their expertise was divided between the Prince of Wales and his father. During the two Welsh

---

<sup>116</sup> A.Z. Freeman, 'A Moat Defensive, The Coastal Defense Scheme of 1295', *Speculum*, xlii (1967) 446, 451; *CChR* 1257-1300, 219

<sup>117</sup> Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 140

wars and the campaigns of 1306-7 the knights were divided between a number of commanders.

The household could be quickly mobilised in any emergency. In 1277 and again in 1282 the knights were the first forces to arrive in Wales, months in advance of the formal muster. However, the knights were not despatched to provide the initial response to uprisings in Scotland; rather Edward relied upon local northern landowners. This demonstrates the extent to which the king and his household were based in southern England. When England was at peace Edward spent most of the year in the south and it was from that region most of his knights were recruited.<sup>118</sup>

During a campaign a group of household knights could be detached from the main body and sent on a special raid or foray into enemy territory. Their social status prevented the knights from being appointed as commander-in-chief in a campaign, but such raids were frequently led by a household knight. The knights, usually bannerets, also served as the wardens and captains of the Welsh and Scottish marches and as the admiral of the king's fleet. These positions did not infringe upon the authority of the earls.

In all the campaigns except the expedition to Flanders in 1297 the household was numerically overshadowed by the other forces at the king's disposal. In the crisis of 1297 the earls refused to serve overseas and the permanent household forces provided over a third of the army which accompanied Edward to Flanders. This proved that the household knights and their retinues were the most reliable and loyal of the king's military forces.

The household knights were only absent from the royal army if the king was not personally accompanying the expedition. Hence

---

<sup>118</sup> See above, vol. i, 57-8



their absence from Wales in 1287, Gascony in 1294 and Scotland in 1306-7. It is therefore not surprising that the large body of knights attached to the royal household declined in the late fourteenth century when the king campaigned in person only infrequently.

## CHAPTER 3

### INSIDE THE HOUSEHOLD

The household knights remained at the king's side during a military campaign. However, they were not necessarily in constant attendance upon the king at other times. When they were at court the knights were entitled, until 1300, to dine in the king's hall.<sup>1</sup> The household was responsible for catering for the king and his entourage as they toured the country. There were a number of key officers who ensured the smooth running of its administration. Some of the positions were held by the king's clerks but others were invariably the province of household knights. This chapter will study the role of those knights who were appointed to such offices and the amount of time they devoted to their duties. It will also attempt to determine the attendance and role of those knights who were not given a formal post.

Eight household knights held the office of steward of the household during Edward I's reign. Hugh FitzOtto was steward from 1272 until his death in 1283. In 1278 a deputy was appointed, described as the 'other steward' in the household ordinance of 1279. Robert FitzJohn became chief steward in 1283 following the death of Hugh FitzOtto. John de Mohaut emerged as the new deputy steward. He in turn was promoted to the rank of chief steward after the demise of Robert FitzJohn in 1286. His subordinate was Peter de Chauvent. Unlike his predecessors, Mohaut did not hold the office until his death. In the summer of 1287 he was in south Wales. He and Vincent Hulton were the joint paymasters of the infantry commanded by Reginald Grey and Roger Lestrangle. He remained in

---

<sup>1</sup> See below, vol. 1, p 129

Wales throughout the summer. It seems probable that his departure from the king's court in Gascony heralded the end of his tenure of office as steward. Mohaut was a member of a prominent Welsh marcher family and he may have been anxious to join the effort to crush the 1287 rebellion.<sup>2</sup>

The departure of Mohaut left a vacancy. Peter de Chauvent was promoted to the post of chief steward. Walter de Beauchamp may have assumed the responsibility of the office of deputy steward in 1287. Beauchamp had accompanied the king to Gascony in May 1286. The records show that he received wages for being attendant upon the king from that date until 6 August. Sometime after that date he left Gascony for England. Walter returned to the duchy in April 1287; he may have assisted Chauvent after Mohaut's departure.<sup>3</sup>

Walter de Beauchamp became the sole steward of the household in 1292 after the appointment of Peter de Chauvent as chamberlain. Beauchamp's successors, Robert de la Warde and John Thorpe, also operated alone. The former was appointed after Walter's death in 1303. He remained in the office until his demise in 1307.<sup>4</sup> For the final six weeks of Edward I's reign the position was held by John Thorpe.<sup>5</sup>

Tout argued that this change from a dual to a sole stewardship after 1292 demonstrated that there was a clear process of

---

<sup>2</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 3467, 3623-5

<sup>3</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1200, 1203

<sup>4</sup> Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 146; Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 25-6

<sup>5</sup> The *Handbook of British Chronology* includes three other men as stewards of the household during Edward I's reign; Roger Waltham, Richard de Boys and Thomas de la Hide. Roger Waltham was the household steward of Henry III. Thomas de la Hide was actually the steward of crown estates in Cornwall and Richard de Boys was marshal of the household. *Handbook of British Chronology*, 76; *CPR 1266-1272*, 625, 642; Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 146; *CCR 1302-7*, 368, 372, 374

consolidation at work during the reign. This was begun in the ordinance of 1279 which subordinated the 'other steward' to the chief steward.<sup>6</sup>

However, this interpretation is too vague. There seems to have been a system of dual stewardship in Henry III's reign<sup>7</sup> but the household had only one steward, Hugh FitzOtto, for the first six years of Edward's reign. There was a reversion to the practice of having two stewards in 1278 when Robert FitzJohn was appointed. The appointment of a second steward in 1278 may have been due to the experience of the Welsh war in 1277 and a desire to improve efficiency within the household. During the period 1278-1279 there was an attempt to improve the efficiency of the domestic establishment. As Prestwich demonstrated, the drawing up of the household ordinance of 1279 suggests that Edward I believed that there was a need for a reorganization. The ordinance dealt with the domestic offices, those concerned with accounting and lists the names of those allowed to sleep in wardrobe. It goes to great lengths to define the role of such offices as that of the steward. It was clearly an attempt to streamline and improve the administration.

It is possible that the war of 1277 and the need to organize the supply of the household during that crucial period may have placed an increasing strain upon the household steward. It may also have highlighted a number of inefficiencies in the way that the household was run. The appointment of a second steward prior to the promulgation of the ordinance may have been another measure to improve efficiency.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 32

<sup>7</sup> CLR 1260-7, 72

<sup>8</sup> Tout, *Chapters* ii, 49; Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 135, 168

The return to the single stewardship in 1292 was possibly because the chief steward, Peter de Chauvent, had been elevated to the rank of chamberlain. This meant that there remained an experienced 'deputy' who could be called upon in Beauchamp's absence. For example Peter de Chauvent acted as 'locum teneus senscalli' between 6 December 1295 and 23 September 1299. There was therefore no real need to appoint another steward in 1292.<sup>9</sup>

The decision not to appoint a deputy steward after Peter de Chauvent's death, particularly during a period of increasing pressure placed on the household by the war with Scotland, may have been due to Edward I's financial problems. The king had attempted to reduce the scale of household expenditure in 1300 by the promulgation of Statute of St Albans. Thus the failure to appoint a deputy steward may have been the result of a desire to keep household expenditure to a minimum.<sup>10</sup>

Those knights who were appointed as steward were not men who possessed extensive lands. A knight with major territorial interests would not have been prepared to devote the amount of time to affairs at court that was required of a steward. In addition, the steward's estates tended to be in the south of England. This was the area of the country which was covered most frequently by Edward I's itinerary. By employing stewards who held land in that region the amount of time they spent travelling between the court and their own lands could be kept to a minimum.<sup>11</sup>

Hugh FitzOtto held the manor of Mendlesham in Suffolk, and the manors of Chignal and Steeple in Essex. John de Mohaut had a messuage in Oakley in Buckinghamshire, the manor of Sulgrave in

---

<sup>9</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 26

<sup>10</sup> Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 159, 427

<sup>11</sup> See above, vol. i, p 57-58

Northamptonshire and lands at Great Lillingstone in Oxfordshire. Peter de Chauvent's estates were in Essex and Sussex. He held the manor of Rawreth in Essex and Offham in Sussex. Walter de Beauchamp, younger son of William de Beauchamp of Emley, bought the moiety of Alchester manor in Warwickshire. Through his wife, Alice, he acquired the manor of Pirton in Worcestershire. He also had lands in Wiltshire. Robert de la Warde, the penultimate steward of the reign, was the only one whose estates lay in the Midlands. At his death in 1307 he was the holder of a messuage in Derbyshire, a manor at Upton in Leicestershire and another at Shapland in Essex. He also had lands at Barton on Humber and Melton Mowbray.<sup>12</sup>

Prestwich claimed that while the men who were chosen as steward were not of the highest baronial rank they were bannerets. This was not invariably the case. John de Mohaut, Peter de Chauvent, Walter de Beauchamp and Robert de la Warde all received fees and robes as bannerets of Edward's household. Walter de Beauchamp was not a banneret when he was first appointed as steward in 1289 but he had been elevated to that rank by 1297. It may be that his promotion to chief and sole steward in 1292 was partly responsible for the change in his status. However, such promotion was not automatic. Robert FitzJohn became chief steward in 1283 but he still had the rank only of a knight in 1285-6, in spite of the fact that his subordinate John de Mohaut was a banneret.<sup>13</sup>

The knights who were raised to the rank of steward were men who been members of the household for a considerable number of

---

<sup>12</sup> Moor, *Knights*, iv, 5, 155; *CIMP*, ii, no. 464; iii, no. 175; no. iv, 152

<sup>13</sup> Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 146; Byerly, *Records, 1285-6*, nos 1677, 1678, 1679, 1680; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 2903-5; E101/352/24, ff 31v, 36v; B1 Add Ms 7965 f 60v; B1 Add Ms 8835, f 52; *Liber Quot*, 188-195

years prior to their appointment. Hugh FitzOtto, John de Mohaut and Peter de Chauvent were probably attached to Edward I's household prior to 1272.<sup>14</sup> Walter de Beauchamp was a household knight in 1283-4. John Thorpe was a household squire in 1289-90; he was raised to the rank of knight during the 1290s. The only exception to this rule appears to be Robert de la Warde. He does not appear to have been in receipt of fees and robes prior to 1303-4. This may be the result of the dearth of household records for the period from 1290 to 1297. He was certainly in the king's service in 1301 when he was sent as an envoy to the king of France.<sup>15</sup>

During these years of service the king must have gained detailed knowledge of the personality, trustworthiness and competence of these men. It is probable that they had already been involved in household administration in a minor way. For instance, John Thorpe was one of the men who was employed to make payments to various officers of the household on the king's behalf in 1301-2. It is likely that the personal relationship which developed between the king and an individual knight was the crucial factor that led to a knight's appointment as steward.<sup>16</sup>

The other main officer of the household was the marshal. It is very difficult to identify the knights who were chosen as marshals of the household during Edward I's reign because the lists of bannerets and knights fail to distinguish the marshal in any way.

According to the household ordinance of 1279 there were two marshals of the household. In 1279 these were Richard de Boys and

---

<sup>14</sup> See above, vol. i, p 32-33

<sup>15</sup> E101/4/8; C47/4/4 f 15; *CCR 1296-1302*, 416

<sup>16</sup> E101/364/13 f 5

his deputy Elias Hauville. They were still acting as marshals of household during Edward I's visit to Gascony. The entries for Boys in the account books of 1286-9 record the payments he made to men who helped to prepare the places where the king stayed. There are also entries in those accounts for Elias Hauville which refer to him acting in place of the marshal.<sup>17</sup>

Like the stewards, Richard de Boys and Elias Hauville held only a small amount of land which was in the south of England. Richard had estates in Dorset, including the manors of Whitfield, Winterborne Steepleton and Woodsford. Elias Hauville held one manor in Northamptonshire, Chaldswell manor in Oxfordshire and the manor of Braithwell in Yorkshire.<sup>18</sup>

The duration of Boys' and Hauville's royal service prior to their appointment as marshal is uncertain. Richard de Boys went on crusade with Edward I in 1270, which suggests that he was already part of the household. Elias Hauville was in royal service in Gascony in the 1270s as custodian of Bayonne. In 1276 he was arrested 'for things that he did not receive for the king's use' and he had to stand before king and answer for things that pertained to the king. He must have been cleared of the charges because he was serving in Wales as part of the household contingent in 1277. Interestingly, Richard de Boys was one of those who acted as a mainpernor for Elias Hauville after he had been arrested. Thus it is possible that Richard and Elias were associates. This could explain the appointment of Hauville as deputy marshal.<sup>19</sup>

The exact duration of the tenure of these two men as marshal is unknown. Elias Hauville died in 1297 but he probably vacated the

---

<sup>17</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 569, 970, 1003

<sup>18</sup> Moor, *Knights* i, 114; ii, 205; *CChR 1257-1300*, 339

<sup>19</sup> *CPR 1271-82*, 194; *CCR 1272-9*, 304; *CPR 1266-1272*, 440; E101/3/21



office of marshal before that date. He went to Gascony in 1294 and at that juncture he surrendered other posts which he had held in England, such as the custodianship of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford. Richard de Boys died in 1302, but he does not appear in the lists of those knights receiving fees and robes in 1297 or 1300. This indicates that he had severed his connection with the household before those dates.<sup>20</sup>

The office of marshal of the household had descended from the office of marshal of the realm. Jones has argued that the marshal was appointed by the earl marshal. However, there is no evidence to support this supposition in the case of Boys and Hauville. The earl marshal did have a representative at court but he was a completely separate entity from the two household marshals who were described in the Ordinance of 1279. During Edward I's visit to Gascony in 1286-9 Walter Fancourt was specifically described as holding the place of the earl at court.<sup>21</sup> He also received a number of payments for Bigod as his lieutenant. Fancourt was present in addition to the two working marshals who were household knights.<sup>22</sup>

The steward and marshal were largely responsible for ensuring that the internal administration of the household ran smoothly. According to the ordinance of 1279 a major role for both men was the daily accounting and auditing of the household accounts. One or both of the stewards plus the controller and treasurer and one of

---

<sup>20</sup> Moor, *Knights*, ii, 205; *CPR 1292-1301*, 84; *Liber Quot*, 188-195; B1 Add Ms 7965, ff 60-3

<sup>21</sup> In this chapter the term 'marshal of the household' will not be used to describe the earl's representative.

<sup>22</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 2126, 2132, 2159; W.R. Jones, 'The Court of the Verge; the jurisdiction of the Steward and Marshal of the Household in Later Medieval England', *The Journal of British Studies*, x, (1970), 3

the marshals had to be present at the drawing up of the household accounts each evening. These men would meet the sergeants of each of the household departments such as the kitchen, pantry and buttery and examine the 'messes' of the hall as testified to by the sergeants. These were compared to the expenditure of each of the departments. However, most of <sup>the</sup> food used that day would have been taken from the household stores. From these regular evening sessions a day book was compiled.<sup>23</sup>

Each evening's entry was divided into columns. In the first column was the name of the place where the household was staying and the date. On 4 December 1285 for example the king and queen stayed with Richard de Boys at Woodsford. This was followed by a record of the amount of wine used that day. On that particular occasion it was forty-five sesters. After the wine there were eight columns in which the outlay of each department was entered.

At Woodsford the expenditure pattern was as follows: the dispensary 42s 7d, the buttery 28s 10d, the kitchen £4 7s 10d, the scullery 9s 11d, the saucery 12d, the hall 11s 4d, the chamber 14s 4d, and the stables £4 17s 9d. This was followed by the total wage bill for the day which was £4 9d. The next entry was a record of the alms given, which amounted to 4s. The penultimate column was a list of gifts of meat which had been presented. Total expenditure that day was £18 19s 3d.<sup>24</sup>

If at these accounting sessions the steward and marshal found that the departments had been wasteful or negligent then they would reprimand those responsible. The culprits were punished by having a

---

<sup>23</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 31, 158-60; C. Johnson, 'The System of Accounting in the Wardrobe of Edward I', *TRHS*, 4th series, vi (1923), 61-2

<sup>24</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1325

suitable amount deducted from their wages. In 1298, Beauchamp fined Master Robert of the king's pantry a month's wages for not providing sufficient food for the knights eating in the hall. Due to his miscalculation the knights had taken food in the surrounding area of Ghent to the contempt of the king. On the same day a clerk of the king's poulterer was fined for the poor quality of the food he had bought.<sup>25</sup>

The steward of the household was not usually involved in the final accounting process of the household and wardrobe to the exchequer. This was the responsibility of the keeper of the wardrobe and his clerks. However, in 1300 Walter de Beauchamp did participate. The previous keeper of the wardrobe, Walter Langton, was the new treasurer of the exchequer and in 1300 the accounts for the period when he was keeper were presented to the exchequer. The year 1300 was a politically sensitive time and Edward I felt that if Langton were allowed to audit his own accounts this could provide ammunition for his enemies. At the Lenten Parliament of 1300 Edward I therefore appointed a special commission to do the auditing. This consisted of John Langton, the Chancellor, Walter de Beauchamp, steward and Ralph Manton the cofferer, who represented the current keeper, Droxford. The accounts were duly heard and the steward and the chancellor reported to Edward I and his council on 13 June at York. The accounts were accepted.<sup>26</sup>

According to the ordinance of 1279 the amount of wine used daily was calculated so that the accounts of the tuns of wine could be audited two or three times a year. The department in charge of the administration of wine was the butlery. Matthew Columbers was

---

<sup>25</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 32n, 159-60; Johnson, 'The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward I', 62

<sup>26</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 91

in charge of this department from the late 1270s. Byerly argued that Columbers originally accounted to the exchequer but after the office was regranted to him for life in 1280 he was responsible to the treasurer and the steward.<sup>27</sup>

However, from other sources it is clear that Hugh FitzOtto was very much involved in the accounting and administration of the butlery in the 1270s. It was by his testimony and orders that payments were made for wine which had been bought for the household. In 1275 Roger de Greschurch was paid £10 for two tuns of wine bought for the king by FitzOtto's orders. Hugh was also involved in arranging for the storage of the king's wine. In June 1275 he directed the sheriff of London to receive 100 tuns of wine from the king's chamberlain and deliver it to the Tower of London. It was upon his instructions that wine was sent from London to Geoffrey de Geneville in 1282-3.<sup>28</sup>

The stewards of the household were responsible for arranging for victuals to be supplied to the household and in preparing for the household's arrival at a new place.<sup>29</sup> Hugh FitzOtto was involved in arranging for supplies for the king and his household during the war with Wales. The steward was often involved in overseeing the arrival of even relatively small items that the king desired for his table. It was by the order of Hugh FitzOtto that Guncelin de Badlesmere was paid for livestock captured in the forest of the

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 160; Byerly, *Records*, 1285-6, p. xxxi

<sup>28</sup> CCR 1272-9, 188, 204; SC1/30/68

<sup>29</sup> The steward bore the responsibility for ensuring that a place was prepared to receive the king, but much of the practical work was done by officials of a lower status. When king was in Gascony in 1286 William Felton, valet of the chamber travelled in advance of king to Bonnegarde, Peyranere, Condom and Mauleon. At these places he arranged for carpenters and plasterers to do the necessary repairs and then he purchased a great deal of basic equipment such as plaster of Paris; Byerly, *Records* 1286-9, nos 301, 331, 367, 410, 435, 533, 1446, 1588, 1676, 1779, 1783

Wirral and then sent to Westminster.<sup>30</sup>

Another duty of the steward was to oversee the conveyance of the household from place to place. In 1286 John de Mohaut journeyed ahead of the king to Dover to arrange Edward I's crossing to France. The account book of 1305-6 records that Robert de la Warde ordered a payment to be made to Peter, clerk of the pantry, for the conveyance of that office. He also ordered that Richard of Doncaster, a clerk of the Marshalsea, should be paid for carts and horses that were needed for transportation.<sup>31</sup>

The name of the steward appeared regularly on the horse valuation lists. A man going on campaign or on a royal mission had his horse valued on the day that his service commenced. The household steward accompanied by the treasurer was responsible, for example for the valuation of the horses of those serving at Caernarfon on 11 April 1285.<sup>32</sup>

If the horse died or was injured the owner would be provided with compensation determined by the original valuation. The owner had to provide evidence of the horse's demise before he could be paid. The steward played an important part in this procedure. It was possibly to him that the evidence was presented. There are numerous payments of compensation listed in the household account books which were made on the testimony of the steward. In 1289-90, for example, John de Mohaut received a payment for the death of his horse upon the testimony of the steward.<sup>33</sup>

If the horse were injured the owner would usually take it to

---

<sup>30</sup> C62/51, m 3; SC1/37/17

<sup>31</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 525; E101/369/11, f 84; *CPR 1301-7*, 430

<sup>32</sup> C47/2/2, f 19

<sup>33</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, p xxix, 2477-2578; E101/352/21, m 3

the caravan of the household. This was a pool of horses that travelled with the king under the care of the marshalsea department. A roll of the caravan for 1301-2 records what happened to various horses. The knight who returned the horse received compensation but again this was often dependent on the testimony of the steward. In the year 1289-90, the steward testified that Arnald de Caupenne had returned his horse to the caravan.<sup>34</sup>

An injured horse was not always returned to the caravan. In 1289-90, the steward bore witness to the fact that Amaury St Amand had returned his horse to the almoner. Compensation was paid in the usual way but it is unclear what happened to the horses after they had been given to the almoner. It is possible that the man who presented the horse intended it to be given as alms, but there is no evidence in the rolls of alms to support this supposition.<sup>35</sup>

Apart from the marshal's attendance at the daily accounting sessions he had various other important duties. The marshal had to find lodgings for members of the king's household and those present on business at the court including members of the royal family, the chamberlain, the steward and others. For instance in 1286 Richard de Boys received 8s 10d in lieu of money he had spent on arranging hospitality for the household at Mauleón.<sup>36</sup>

Like the steward, the marshal played a part in organizing the travel arrangements of the king. Richard de Boys journeyed ahead of Edward I to Wissant, to arrange the voyage home from Gascony in August 1289.<sup>37</sup> The marshal and the steward also took part in

---

<sup>34</sup> E101/10/12, m 1; E101/352/21, m 1

<sup>35</sup> E101/352/21, m 1

<sup>36</sup> *Fleta*, ed. H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles (Selden Society 1955), ii, 115; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 1003

<sup>37</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 1984

arranging special celebrations that concerned the king and his household. Both the steward and marshal were present at the wedding of Joan of Acre to the earl of Gloucester at Aylesbury in 1290. It is probable that they helped to arrange the banqueting and the care of Edward's guests. From there Elias Hauville journeyed on to the tournament at Winchester; he may also have been involved with its preparations.<sup>38</sup>

The marshals and the two sub marshals had to maintain discipline in the hall.<sup>39</sup> This was the area where most of the king's followers congregated for their meals. The ordinance of 1279 stated that every month the marshals had to check that no unauthorized men ate in the hall or kept their horses in the stables. The marshal fulfilled this task by keeping a check upon who was officially present. He compiled annual rolls detailing which knights, squires and officials were attendant upon the king.<sup>40</sup> The men who were hired on only a temporary basis and those who did not eat in the hall were not included.<sup>41</sup>

The duties of the marshal were altered by the so-called Statute of St Albans in 1300. Unfortunately, this Statute does not

---

<sup>38</sup> C47/4/5, f 7v

<sup>39</sup> On the subject of discipline the *Fleta* instructed the marshal to keep the verge free of common harlots. The first time he found them they were to be fined 4d. The next time they were to be arrested and then banned from all the royal households. After that they were to be shackled and put in prison. A later treatise stated that there were twelve official whores under the marshal's control. One of the duties of the marshal was to supervise the twelve ladies. An absence of evidence in the account books has led Prestwich to assign the latter to the realms of fantasy. *Fleta*, ii, 115; Prestwich, *Edward I*, 147

<sup>40</sup> Johnson, 'System of Account', 62, 64; *Book of Prests*, ed. Fryde, xxi

<sup>41</sup> The accounts recording the wages of the household squires were based upon the marshal's roll. Some entries record that a man was receiving wages but that he was not on the roll of the marshal. *Book of Prests*, ed. Fryde, xxi, 23, 27

survive but contemporary references show that its main aim was to reduce the number of men eating in the household. The financial problems of 1297 and the expense of the war with Scotland made the reduction of household expenditure desirable. The purpose behind the provisions may also have been to reduce the amount of food which needed to be purveyed.<sup>42</sup>

The Statute implemented a system of payment whereby some members of the household who were entitled to eat in the hall surrendered their right in return for a cash payment. Due to the scarcity of information it is impossible to assess whether all the household knights were affected by the Statute.

Walter de Beauchamp, the steward, and John Droxford, the keeper of the wardrobe, gave up their right to eat in the hall for themselves and their followers in return for £200 a year each. The other household knights who received money in lieu of eating in the hall were paid according to the number of days they spent in court. The rates of payment were identical to the daily wage rates; 4s per day for a banneret and 2s per day for a knight. William de Cantilupe received 6s per day for himself and his companion from 27 June to 2 July. William FitzClay was in court for 10 days between 23 June and 2 July and he received 20s.

However there were 77 knights in the household in 1300 but only six of them received any compensation. This suggests either that major accounts relating to these payments are missing or that these six men were exceptional in opting to receive money. The king's squires and nuncio also surrendered their right to eat in hall in return for a monetary payment.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 159; Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 49-50

<sup>43</sup> *Liber Quot*, 200-3; E101/371/8 m 129



An analysis of the wage account for 1283-4 shows that the household knights spent a varying amount of time at court. Under those circumstances, paying the knights money would help to eliminate any miscalculations in the number of men who were likely to dine in the hall. The inclusion of the steward among those receiving cash payments may seem unusual because he spent most of his time at court. It would therefore have been more convenient for both him and his men to eat in the household. However, as it was the steward who organized the food supplies for the household it is probable food still found its way to him and his men. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that the chamberlain was allowed a share of the gifts of food delivered to the king's chamber.<sup>44</sup> It would not have been unusual if the steward had a similar privilege with regard to the household. In addition both Beauchamp and his successor were royal counsellors. Their role as advisers to the king must have meant that they were occasionally invited to eat in the chamber.<sup>45</sup>

The statute must have affected the duties of both the marshal and the steward. To settle any dispute over who had rights to eat in hall after 1300, the marshal had to draw up a roll of those assigned wages in lieu of board. This was then passed or a copy was given to the steward and treasurer. In addition the reduction in the number of men who were eating in the hall must have eased the problem of finding sufficient supplies for the household.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> See below, vol. 1, p 142

<sup>45</sup> See chapter 8; The household steward did not establish a formal claim to dine in the chamber in Edward II reign he was still clearly associated with those who dined in the hall. Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 333

<sup>46</sup> The statute was probably not rigorously enforced after 1300, for by Christmas 1300 king's messengers were eating at the common table again. M.C. Hill, *The King's Messengers 1199-1377* (1961), 33-4

The steward had an important judicial role to play within the household. In addition to the Court of the King's Bench and the Court of Common Pleas, the 'King also has his court in his hall'. This was presided over by the steward who 'occupies the place of the king's chief justicar'.<sup>47</sup> The court was often referred to as the court of the steward and the marshal. The writ of 1293 relating to the parliament of 1290 confirms that the marshal referred to in this context was the earl marshal's representative. The writ relates to an incident in which Bogo de Clare served a writ upon Edmund, earl of Cornwall within the bounds of parliament. The steward and the marshal claimed that only they had the right to issue a writ within parliament's jurisdiction. The name of the marshal was Walter Fancourt, the earl of Norfolk's lieutenant.<sup>48</sup>

In 1293 the king issued a pardon relating to the death of John the Mason. The pardon was stated to be the result of an inquiry held by the steward and marshal of the household. The marshal was named as Fulk Vaux, who was clearly Fancourt's successor. Vaux had been one of the witnesses to the earl of Norfolk's charter granting the king land in Norfolk, Essex and Suffolk in 1291.<sup>49</sup>

The role of the earl marshal's lieutenant is confirmed by the *Fleta*. This treatise is considered a well informed source whose author had access to the court records and may have even have sat as a member of the court. The *Fleta* describes the role of the 'foreign marshal', who was the representative of the earl of Norfolk. It was 'his duty to execute the judgments of the king's

---

<sup>47</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 109-116

<sup>48</sup> *Rot. Parl.* I, 17

<sup>49</sup> *CPR 1291-1301*, 70; *CCR 1279-88*, 201

steward within the verge and to ensure the safe-keeping of prisoners'. However, the author also states that the chamberlain, marshal of the hall and other household knights were also present at the court's sessions. As the *Fleta* discusses the functions of the 'marshal of the hall' in a separate section this was clearly a completely different official to the 'foreign marshal'.<sup>50</sup>

No plea rolls for the court of the steward survive until 1316-17. Sayles originally argued that this court did not exist as a separate entity before 1290. He believed that before that date the steward was simply one of a number of justices of the king's court. Sayles claimed that the crucial period in the development of the household court occurred during the king's visit to Gascony in 1286-9. This visit led to the separation of the household from the court of the King's Bench and created the opportunity for the steward to develop a separate court. This new court was adopted upon a permanent basis when Edward I returned to England.<sup>51</sup>

However, in a later work Sayles revised his opinions and argued that the court of the steward may have been in existence from as early as 1272, if not before. Sayles cites a case heard on 11 May between the abbot of Westminster and the sheriff and mayor of London. The case was heard before the steward and marshal of Henry III, William Wintershill and Philip Buckland. Sayles also believes that the plea rolls date back to at least 1286, as *Fleta* mentions the plea rolls of Peter de Chauvent in that year.<sup>52</sup>

The court of the steward and the marshal normally met every other day. It occasionally convened daily during the travels of the

---

<sup>50</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 109, 114, 127

<sup>51</sup> *Select Cases of the Court of the King's Bench*, iii, ed. G.O. Sayles, (Selden Society, 1939), lxxxvi, lxxxvii

<sup>52</sup> *Select Cases of the Court of the King's Bench*, vii, ed. G.O. Sayles (Selden Society, 1971) xlv, xlv

king through the realm. The court had, according to *Fleta*, jurisdiction 'within the bounds of the household, namely within a circumference of twelve leagues from whence the king maybe in England, an area that is called the king's verge. This jurisdiction of twelve leagues from the household is confirmed by the *Mirror of Justices*.<sup>53</sup>

The jurisdiction of the court continued even when the king was in a foreign land. *Fleta* lists two cases which occurred while Edward was in France in 1286-9. The first happened while the king was in Paris in 1286. Enguerrand of Nogent was arrested because it was alleged that he had stolen some silver plates from the king. The incident occurred at a time when the king of France was also present. *Fleta* states that 'the right of the court of the king of France was claimed by the castellan of Paris' but after much discussion it was 'decided that the king of England should use and enjoy the royal prerogative and privilege of his household'. The case was heard before Robert FitzJohn. Enguerrand of Nogent was found guilty and hanged at St German des Prés.

The second case occurred in 1288-9 when Peter de Chauvent was chief steward. Following the precedent of the earlier case it was decided to prosecute William of Lessness for robbing Edmund Murdock in 1283-4. The robbery, Edmund claimed, was committed within the bounds of the household. William was told that he could not evade appeal just because the felony had been committed in another realm.<sup>54</sup>

*Fleta* stated that the household court superseded all courts which existed within the verge and that when the steward knew that

---

<sup>53</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 109; *The Mirror of Justices*, ed. W.J. Whittaker and F.W. Maitland (Selden Society, 1893), 124

<sup>54</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 112

the king was going to be travelling through a certain district he would send a writ to the sheriff to 'cause all the assizes of his county and all his prisoners with their attachments...to come at a stated day'. The treatise even provides an example of the sort of writ that should be sent.<sup>55</sup>

Using these important sources notable historians, including Jones, have declared that the jurisdiction of the court of the verge was limited to a radius of twelve miles from the king's household. However, an examination of the roll of amercements for 1297 presents a different picture. This is the only surviving roll of amercements from Edward I's reign. It covers the year 1296-7 and there are also a few brief entries for 1295-6. The roll clearly states that these are the amercements made before Walter de Beauchamp in that year. The counties covered by the roll are Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Warwick, Leicestershire, Surrey, Sussex, Gloucestershire, Kent, Southampton, and London and Middlesex.<sup>56</sup>

However, according to the itinerary of Edward I for 1296-7 the king did not visit and was not within a twelve mile radius of Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Warwick, Leicestershire or Gloucestershire. Nor had he visited these counties in the previous year. The roll does not have entries for the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, Somerset and Dorset and Devon where the king spent a large proportion of the year. This of course suggests that the roll is incomplete.<sup>57</sup>

A number of possible conclusions can be drawn from this evidence. Firstly, it could be deduced that the information

---

<sup>55</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 111

<sup>56</sup> Jones, 'The Court of the Verge,' 2; E101/256/3

<sup>57</sup> *Itinerary of Edward I*, part ii, 98-111

provided by the *Fleta* and *Mirror of Justices* is incorrect or that by the term 'twelve leagues' they meant a distance greater than twelve miles. Another possibility is that the amercements were listed under the home county of those men at court. This seems unlikely. The main bulk of the fines from all the counties is for non-attendance at the steward's court. For instance there were at least 414 fines under Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire for non-attendance that year. Even if so many men visited the king from that county it seems improbable that so many should have fallen foul of the household regulations during their visit.

It is interesting to note that Beauchamp visited some of the counties which were featured in the amercement roll but which were not on the king's itinerary. As constable of Gloucester, Beauchamp was in that county between 11 February and 25 March 1297. Beauchamp's main lands were at Alchester in Warwickshire. It therefore seems possible that he visited that county in 1296-7.<sup>58</sup> This suggests that the steward was personally carrying the jurisdiction of the court into areas which were not visited by the king. In doing so he would have been making the functioning of the court independent from the geographical position of the household.

However, it is difficult to prove that Beauchamp attended all the counties on the amercement roll which were not visited by the king. The fines of those attending the court seem to be set out under specific terms; Michaelmas, Hilary, Easter, Trinity and St John. It is therefore more likely that men from these counties were summoned to the household rather than that Beauchamp dealt with the cases in the counties which he independently visited. This strongly suggests that the jurisdiction of the household court was wider

---

<sup>58</sup> B1 Add Ms 7965 f 20v

than twelve miles.<sup>59</sup>

It is possible the jurisdiction of the household court was deliberately extended in 1296-7. As Prestwich noted, the fines from the household court were unusually high in that year. It is difficult to make comparisons with the earlier years of the reign because fines from the steward's court were added to the fines from the market pleas. But the evidence that does exist confirms the supposition that the fines collected in 1296-7 were abnormally high. In 1283-4 fines totalled £107 18s. The amount collected from fines was £64 4s in 1293-4, 73s 4d in 1294-5, £38 10s in 1295-6 but in 1296-7 fines amounted to £232 11s. This fell to 106s 8d in 1297-8.<sup>60</sup>

The year 1297 was one of political and financial crisis. Edward I may have deliberately extended the jurisdiction of his household court either to raise more money from fines or as a means of exerting his political influence over a wide range of counties. However, the amercement roll lists a few fines for 1295-6 under counties which Edward I did not visit in that year. This suggests that the king attempted to expand the volume of business handled by the steward's court in 1296-7 rather than to extend its jurisdiction.

Most of the entries on the amercement roll were for non-attendance at court. Offenders were charged between one and two

---

<sup>59</sup> The court's jurisdiction was not unlimited. The steward was expected to respect the existence of liberty. When the liberty was infringed a dispute developed. In 1296 pleas were held at Bury St Edmunds. The abbot claimed that the steward and marshal ought not to sit within the banlieu of the town. In June 1300 the steward of the Bishop of Ely came into the exchequer to prove to the king that his master had a liberty which prevented the court of the steward and the marshal having jurisdiction in the Isle of Ely. *Select Cases King's Bench* iii, lxxxviii; vii, xlv

<sup>60</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 166-7; E372/130; See enrolled wardrobe account in E372/144

shillings. There does not appear to have been any correlation between the number of fines for absences and whether the king's entourage actually travelled through the county. For example there were 414 such fines listed under the county of Bedford and Buckinghamshire and 526 under the heading of London and Middlesex. Edward I visited the latter county but not the former in 1296-7.<sup>61</sup>

Those who were fined for offences other than a failure to attend were forced to pay varying amounts. In 1300 Walter Rudham and William Attfield were fined 13s 4d for an injury they had done to Robert Oliver, a valet of the king. William Chervill and William Strongbow were fined 40d for a misdemeanour committed against two other household valets. Two men paid 2s for the right to come to a private agreement. Four men were fined 13s 4d for contempt of court. Three brothers, Henry Droys, Philip Droys and Reginald Droys had their goods confiscated for a crime they had committed in Newcastle: from that the court received £30 11s 8d.<sup>62</sup>

Such a large number of fines for non attendance were due to the inherent problems of an itinerant court with a wide jurisdiction. Another problem of such a court was highlighted by the *Articuli Super Cartas* of 1301. One of the complaints against the steward was that legal actions were begun in a local area and then the cases were left uncompleted. The *Articuli Super Cartas* stated that if the action could not be concluded before the household left the verge then the case should be returned to the common law courts.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> E101/256/3

<sup>62</sup> *Liber Quot*, 4-5; Prestwich, *Edward I*, 167

<sup>63</sup> It is unlikely that the provisions of 1301 had much effect. The order was repeated in the Ordinances of 1311. However, the practice was sometimes observed even before the *Articuli Super Cartas* of 1301. In 1300, William Staunford, an escaped prisoner, had originally been impleaded before the steward and marshal in Norfolk. When the king left the area he was handed over to a sergeant of the county and delivered to sheriff of London who dealt with the case.



Those cases which were dealt with by the steward covered a wide range of offences.<sup>64</sup> The most numerous were categorised as trespass; this included breaches of the king's peace, robbery and violence.<sup>65</sup> The malpractices of local officials were also investigated in the household court. In 1276 an inquest was held at Winchelsea before the steward, Hugh FitzOtto, into a complaint by six men against the sheriff, Matthew Hastings of Sussex. They claimed that the sheriff had arrested and imprisoned a youth and forced him to indict them of robbery.<sup>66</sup>

The court also dealt with anyone who interfered with the king's officials. If his officers were prevented from enforcing the king's rights the court could bring the culprit to heel. Numerous examples relating to the obstruction of the king's purveyors can be found in the plea rolls of the court during Edward II's reign.<sup>67</sup>

Jones claimed that cases of murder were never dealt with in the court of the verge, but were always passed on to other courts. This was not necessarily the case. It is clear that some potential

---

William was originally from London and had asked to be put upon an inquisition of his county. Jones, 'The Court of the Verge', 9, 15; *CPR 1292-1301*, 560

<sup>64</sup> The court was not allowed to deal with cases concerning freehold. *Fleta* stated that the steward and marshal could deal with cases of distraint unless it touched freehold. This was emphasized in the *Articuli Super Cartas*, which suggests that the court had contravened this rule. Prestwich, *Edward 1* 167; *Fleta*, ii, 113; Jones, 'The Court of the Verge', 17

<sup>65</sup> Not all cases which fell within the court's jurisdiction were heard in the court of the verge. In 1291 Nicholas de Lovetot struck another man in the king's hall at Westminster but the case was heard before the court of the King's Bench not the household. Two years later, Eustace de Parles and his brother insulted William Beresford, a justice of the king's, in the king's hall. They made serious allegations of corruption. This case was heard in parliament. Prestwich, *Edward I*, 167

<sup>66</sup> *Select Cases of the Court of the King's Bench*, vii, xlv,

<sup>67</sup> Jones, 'The Court of the Verge', 18

murder cases were investigated by the court. In 1297 Richard le Fevre of Stokes by Clare received a pardon for the death of Reginald le Scot because, according to the record of the steward and marshal of the household, he had killed in self defence. There was a similar case in 1299. John Bishop received a pardon for killing in self defence as the result of an inquisition before steward and marshal.<sup>68</sup>

The court of the verge also heard cases of debt between members of the household and outsiders. In 1301 the *Articuli Super Cartas* demanded that the court should look only into cases of debts between members of the household. As this command was repeated in the Statute of Stamford and the Ordinances of 1311 it can be presumed that the steward and marshal continued to hear cases of debts concerning those outside the household after 1301.<sup>69</sup>

During the 1290s the household court became a place where recognizance or acknowledgements of debts could be enrolled. An examination of the records of the Court of King's Bench clearly shows that it was increasingly having to enforce recognizances made before the household court.<sup>70</sup> One of the reasons for the increasing popularity of the court after 1300 was the petitioning by a group of English and foreign merchants for the right to use the court of the marshal and steward concerning the debts owed to them. This was because they were not allowed to plead at common law about contracts made outside the realm during the king's war. Secondly, the common law process was long and expensive. In 1302 they requested that recognizances enrolled before the steward's court

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 18; *CPR 1292-1301*, 229, 399

<sup>69</sup> Jones, 'The Court of the Verge', 17

<sup>70</sup> *Select Cases of the Court of the King's Bench*, iii, lxxxvii

could be recovered in the exchequer.<sup>71</sup>

The *Fleta* mentioned the chamberlain as one of the household officials present in the court of the verge. After he had assumed the rank of chamberlain in 1292, Peter de Chauvent occasionally presided over the court in Beauchamp's absence. His appointment as chamberlain was presumably due to the fact that he had served the king well as steward. Peter de Chauvent died in 1303. It is possible that he left the office before that date. Between 1292 and 1300 he appears to have been in regular attendance upon the king. His name occurs with reasonable frequency upon the charter witness lists and he accompanied the king on all the major military campaigns. Chauvent fought at Dunbar, Falkirk and in Flanders. However, in 1300 he did not appear as a witness of the king's charters later than May. He did not go on campaign with Edward that summer. He received a protection for going abroad in January 1301 and he did not serve with the king in Scotland.<sup>72</sup>

A charter of 1306 names John de Sulleye the elder as chamberlain of the household. His appointment was probably a reward for his long years of loyal service. He had been a member of the household since the early 1280s.<sup>73</sup> By 1300 he had become a banneret. Sulleye may not have been Chauvent's immediate successor. A document relating to the campaign of 1301 names John Botetourt as the man in charge of the valets of the king's chamber. This does not necessarily mean that he was chamberlain. He may have been in charge of the valets only for the duration of the campaign.

---

<sup>71</sup> Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 167; *Select Cases of the Court of the King's Bench*, iii, cxxiv

<sup>72</sup> E101/5/23; E101/6/37; E101/6/40

<sup>73</sup> *CPR 1301-7*, 460

Botetourt had been attached to the king's household since the early 1280s. To reward such a man by promoting him to the rank of chamberlain would not have been unusual. However, the fact that in 1302 he was appointed as a justice of oyer and terminer must cast doubt over whether he actually held the office of chamberlain. Such commissions would have kept him from the king's side. However, if Botetourt was Chauvent's successor he must have surrendered the position in 1303 when he was chosen as warden of the Scottish march.<sup>74</sup>

Unfortunately, little is known about the chamber in this period. No accounts survive and the ordinance of 1279 is silent because the chamber was independent of the wardrobe. It is therefore very difficult to assess the chamberlain's role. Chauvent's appointment as chamberlain was certainly considered a promotion by contemporary sources. The *Fleta* stated that it was the most 'dignified office' of all the offices and implies that the chamberlain was outside jurisdiction of the steward.<sup>75</sup>

The chamber and its members were closer to the king than those who resided in the hall. It is possible that Chauvent and Sulleye were partly responsible for ensuring that the steward provided the chamber with the necessary food for the king. As the steward ate in the hall it was the chamberlain who was present in the chamber when the meals were being served. The chamberlain probably supervised the setting up of the king's personal quarters. This supposition is strengthened by the statement in the *Fleta* that the chamberlain was allowed to have all the old bench coverings and hangings discarded from the chamber. He also received some part of

---

<sup>74</sup> E101/13/35

<sup>75</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 116

the gifts of food which were destined for the chamber.<sup>76</sup>

A great deal of important political business was transacted in the chamber. It was in his chamber at Westminster during the parliament of 1305 that Edward I offered John de Warenne the marriage of Joan, his granddaughter. It was also in the chamber that the seal was surrendered to and received from the king.<sup>77</sup> Consequently, it was in the chamber that the king's most intimate advisers resided. As chamberlain, Chauvent and Sulleye were members of this inner circle of advisers and they were part of the royal council. Peter de Chauvent was named as a member of the king's council in a document of 1299. He was also a witness to many of Edward I's charters. In 1299-1300 he appears on the witness list on 9 January, 12 January, 18 March and 4 May. John de Sulleye is listed as one of the the king's councillors at the council at Lanercost in 1306. He also appears as a witness on the charter which records the king assigning his sons Thomas and Edmund the land he had gained from the earl of Norfolk in 1306.<sup>78</sup>

Chauvent was also present when the important members of the nobility rendered homage. According to *Fleta* the chamberlain was owed a fee by those rendering homage to the king. If the person doing homage did not hold a barony then the chamberlain had to be content with his outer garment. In 1298 William Vescy paid him 100s when he did homage. In 1293 when John Baillol did homage as the king of Scots he paid him £20 which was apparently double the amount owed by an earl.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 116

<sup>77</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 43, 248, 332-3; J.C. Davis, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (1967), 67-69

<sup>78</sup> CPR 1301-7, 460; C53/86; *Parl. Writs.*, I, 180;

<sup>79</sup> *Fleta*, ii, 116; CCR 1288-96, 317; CFR 1272-1307, 399

As a counsellor and chamberlain Chauvent could provide a direct line of communication to the king. He could channel requests to Edward. In 1295 he demanded a protection for men serving in Wales on the king's behalf. Similarly in 1305 John de Sulleye obtained protections for men serving in Scotland.<sup>80</sup>

The duties attached to the office of steward, marshal and chamberlain suggest that the knight who held the post had to spend the vast majority of the year at court. The witness lists certainly confirm that Peter de Chauvent was frequently at court. The steward was almost constantly in attendance. The wage account of 1283-4 records the number of days that each of the household knights were present at court. The two stewards Robert FitzJohn and John de Mohaut both received wages from 21 November 1283 to the end of September 1284. This suggests that the only month in which they were absent was October.<sup>81</sup> The other surviving wage account is for the last months of 1286 after Edward I and his entourage had arrived in Gascony. Once again the household stewards spent most of their time in court. The wage account stretches from 13 May to November 1286. John de Mohaut was receiving wages for being in court throughout that period. Robert FitzJohn received wages for being with the king from 13 May to 15 August. Soon after that date he died.<sup>82</sup>

The situation with regard to the marshals of the household is less conclusive. The wage accounts for 1283-4 suggest that Boys and Hauville did not spend as much time at court as did the stewards. Elias Hauville went on a diplomatic mission to Rome that year.

---

<sup>80</sup> SC1/26/144; *CPR* 1301-7, 392

<sup>81</sup> E101/4/8

<sup>82</sup> Byerly, *Records* 1285-6, nos 1128, 1228; E101/4/8

After his return from Rome he was in court from July to September. According to the wage account Richard de Boys seems to have been in court only between 21 November and 31 December 1283.<sup>83</sup>

In contrast the wage account relating to Gascony demonstrates that Richard de Boys was attendant upon the king between 13 May and 25 October. He was outside the court because of illness from 26 October to 25 November. Boys recovered only slowly between 26 November and 28 February 1287. He received wages for being in court for 100 days from 1 March to 8 June 1287. Unfortunately, there is then a gap in the wage accounts until November 1288. From 1 November 1288 until 12 August 1289 he was with the king for 250 days.<sup>84</sup>

After the king's return to England Richard de Boys' attendance at court declined. He was outside the household for a considerable time between 4 September and 23 December 1289, investigating the misdeeds of forest officials. His absences were equally prolonged between 1 January and 19 November 1290.<sup>85</sup>

Elias Hauville also spent a considerable amount of time in court during Edward's visit to Gascony. Hauville joined Edward I in Gascony on 5 November, possibly because Richard de Boys was ill. He received wages for being in court from that date until 22 October 1287. The wage accounts which survive from 1288 show that he was attendant upon the king for 134 days between 25 April and 12 August 1289. With the return to England Hauville's attendance rate at court, like Boys', declined. He received wages for being outside the court for 15 days in September and October 1290. During that

---

<sup>83</sup> E101/4/8

<sup>84</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1304, 1737, 1750; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 1182, 1266, 2993

<sup>85</sup> C47/4/5 f 3v, f 16; *CPR 1281-92*, 397, 398, 406

time he was inquiring into the affairs of Thomas Weyland in Norfolk. Between 4 February and 19 April 1290 Hauville journeyed to Sicily to deliver a message from Edward to its king.<sup>86</sup>

The study of Boys' and Hauville's activities suggest that the king did not require the marshal to be attendant constantly upon him at court when he was in England. This suggests that much of the work must have fallen onto the shoulders of the sub marshals. Although the attendance of the steward was vital in the household court, the 'marshal of the hall's' presence was not. The regular attendance of the marshals during Edward's visit to Gascony may have been due to the increasing complexity of the travel arrangements. The burden upon the marshal to find suitable lodgings for the king must have been increased: such a task could not be left to the sub marshals.

Even those household knights who did not hold a household office would be given miscellaneous tasks to perform. The preparations for the visit to Gascony in 1286 provide a good illustration. On 31 April 1286 Gilbert de Briddeshale accompanied Matthew Columbers across the sea to make preparations for the king's arrival in Gascony later that summer. When the king was journeying to Monsempron in 1287, Gilbert de Briddeshale arranged for four boats to carry the king and queen across the river. He also arranged for a guide for Edward from Mimizan to Oloron Ste Marie. William Montravel left the court and went to Orleans to prepare the chamber there for the arrival of the king. He also arranged for eight boats to transport the king and the household from Gien to Orléans.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 1215, 1345, 1372, 1999, 2988; C47/4/5, f 7v

<sup>87</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 374, 667; *1286-9*, nos 14, 331, 450



The offices of king's falconer and ostringer placed upon the holder the responsibility for the care of the king's birds both inside and outside the household. Twelve household knights were involved in the care of the king's birds. Six of these men had only a very limited involvement, which was often confined to the period before they became household knights. Guy Ferre the elder was a royal squire in 1283-4. During that year he received wages for caring for the king's birds outside the household for fifty-five days. There are no other references to his undertaking such tasks after he had been raised to the rank of a household knight. Eble des Montz appears fleetingly in the hunting account of 1285. In December he was with the king's hounds in Somerton and later he was responsible for a number of the king's goshawks. He was involved in similar work in January and February 1289. Montz was a royal squire during the 1280s and 1290s. He does not feature in the hunting accounts after 1300 when he was receiving a fee as a knight. Robert Hausted and Robert de Cantilupe were involved in the care of the king's birds in 1283-4. The former bought two gyrfalcons for Edward and the latter was outside court with the king's birds for six days. These are the only two references to these men in the hunting accounts. They became knights of the household in the late 1290s.<sup>88</sup>

John de Bourne was in receipt of fees and robes as a household knight in 1288-9. He appears in the hunting account for that year and the following year. An Oger Mote and his son Oger Mote the younger were in receipt of fees and robes as household knights in 1285-6 and 1288-9. Both these men were Gascons; they

---

<sup>88</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1689, 2055, 2112; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 706, 2792, 2799; Bl Add Ms 7965 ff 60-61v; E101/351/12

were not in the wardrobe accounts after 1290. An Oger Mote is mentioned in the hunting records for 1304-5 and 1305-6. It may be that the 1304-5 and 1305-6 accounts refer to one of these men but it seems likely that it was one of their relations who had recently been admitted into royal service.<sup>89</sup>

The participation of the remaining household knights was more significant. Their involvement in the sport often began when they were royal squires but it continued after they had become household knights. They came from families who seemed to have had a tradition of serving the king as falconers and ostringers. These men were not merely given occasional tasks to perform: their activities dominated the hunting accounts. They were men who were in a position of authority over the king's other falconers.

John and Thomas Bicknor were part of the family which seem to have presided over the king's mews at Bicknor in Kent. In 1277-78 Thomas Bicknor was out of court caring for the king's hawks in January and February. In the household ordinance of 1279, Thomas was named as the king's chief ostringer. He appears continuously in the hunting accounts during the rest of the reign. The records show that caring for the king's hawks took up most of his time. In 1283-4 he spent 108 days outside the court with the king's hawks between November 1283 and March 1284. He continued to supervise the king's hawks in 1285-6 and 1288-9. By 1297 he was no longer a squire of the king: he had become a knight, but his work with the king's falcons continued. A reference to him in the account for 1304-5 stated that he had spent time with the falconers of John of Brabant.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 2867; C47/4/4 f 54; E101/368/27 ff 78, 81v; E101/369/11, f 131v

<sup>90</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, ii, 158; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1688, 2252; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 2871; E101/350/29; E101/351/9

John Bicknor was already a household knight in 1283-4 and he was still a member of the household in the early fourteenth century. John appears in the hunting accounts for 1277-8, 1297, 1300, 1302-3 and 1305-6, first as an ostringer and later as a falconer.<sup>91</sup> Bicknor was clearly <sup>a</sup>man of superior status to his colleagues. As early 1285-6 he was the only one of king's keepers of hawks who had a hound keeper who received robes from the king. An examination of the entries relating to him in the hunting accounts shows that John frequently received the wages of other keepers such as Elias Cockerel, Robert Malore, and Matthew de Cone. John would then distribute the money amongst the others. This suggests that these men were his responsibility. It also seems probable that he was in charge of the mews at Bicknor. He is often referred to as the keeper of the king's hawks in Kent.<sup>92</sup>

Another family which dominated the hunting scene was that of the Bavents. John de Bavent and his assistants appear regularly in the hunting accounts, exercising the king's falcons. His hound keeper even received a robe payment from the king. Robert de Bavent was first mentioned as a household knight in 1297.<sup>93</sup> His role as a falconer of the king began when he was a royal squire. He was referred to in the hunting documents relating to 1284-5, 1285-6, 1286-9, 1289-90, 1302-3, 1304-5 and 1305-6.<sup>94</sup> Bavent clearly held a position of authority. A series of eighteen letters between Edward

---

E101/351/12; E101/369/11, ff 119v, 121, 128;

<sup>91</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1696, 2137, 2854; *Liber Quot*, 304; E101/350/29; E101/351/12; E101/364/13

<sup>92</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1696, 2047

<sup>93</sup> Robert's brother Ralph also featured in the hunting accounts. At the end of the reign there was a Thomas de Bavent who was responsible for caring for Edward I's gyrfalcons. Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1099; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 2289, 2841

<sup>94</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1689; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 829, 2841, 2642; E101/350/29; E101/369/11, ff 119v, 121, 128; C47/4/2/; C47/4/5 f 50; *CCR 1302-7*, 379

I and Robert de Bavent between 1302 and 1305 suggests that his role as a falconer was one of some significance.<sup>95</sup>

The role of the Hauville family in royal hunting and falconry stretched back to the beginning of the thirteenth century. There were eleven Hauvilles involved in falconry during King John's reign. A number of members of the same family appear on the hunting accounts of Edward I's reign. One of these became a household knight. Thomas Hauville,<sup>96</sup> a royal falconer in the 1270s and 1280s, became a knight in 1290. His work as a falconer continued. Thomas was mentioned in the accounts for 1290-1 and 1304-6.<sup>97</sup> Thomas Hauville became involved in falconry because he, like his ancestors, held the manor of Dunton in Norfolk by a sergeant of keeping the king's falcons.<sup>98</sup>

Finally, John de Merk, a knight of the household from the 1280s onward, spent a great deal of time with the king's hawks and hounds during his career. In 1285-6 he was with the hawks and hounds at Frompton from 9 to 24 January 1286. He continued to appear regularly in the hunting accounts of subsequent years, notably in 1290, 1301 and 1303. Merk also gained responsibility for the royal eyries at Windsor which had originally being under the control of

---

<sup>95</sup> 'Lettres du Roi Edouard I à Robert de Bavent, King's Yeoman, sur des questions de venerie' ed. F.J. Tanqueray, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxiii (1939), 490-500

<sup>96</sup> Thomas Hauville's elevation to the position of household knight was probably because another member of the family, Elias, was the marshal of household. The exact relationship between these two men is unknown but when Elias went to Gascony in 1294 he committed the position of keeper of forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford to Thomas Hauville. Elias does not appear in the hunting accounts which survive for Edward I's reign. *CFR 1272-1307*, 343

<sup>97</sup> Other Hauvilles who feature in royal hunting documents 1272-1307 include Geoffrey, Richard and Henry. Their exact relation to Thomas is unknown; A.L. Poole, *Obligations of Society in the xii and xiii Centuries* (Oxford, 1946), 68; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1695; E101/369/11, f 119; C47/4/4, f 49v; *CFR 1272-1307*, 343

<sup>98</sup> J.H. Round, *The King's Sergeants and Officers of State* (London, 1911), 311

Geoffrey de Pitchford, the constable.<sup>99</sup>

As falconers and ostringers the household knights had many tasks to perform. Firstly, they were involved in the buying of new birds.<sup>100</sup> John Bicknor received payments in 1277-8 and 1285-6 for journeying to Bruges in west Flanders to purchase goshawks for the king. These purchases were made only with the approval of the king. In the letter dated 8 July 1304 from Edward I to Robert de Bavent, the king instructed his falconer to buy goshawks and gyrfalcons from Boston only if they are the best and most beautiful.<sup>101</sup>

The knights in charge of the birds were involved in the care of those birds both inside and outside the household. Outside the household young birds were cared for in mews. Thomas and John Bicknor seem to have been in charge of the one at Bicknor in Kent.<sup>102</sup>

At the mews arrangements had to be made for the supplying of fresh meat to the birds. According to Fredrick of Hohenstaufen who produced a guide to the care of such birds in the 1240s, young falcons needed to be fed on birds of the field, pigeons, doves, thrushes, larks and wrens, or possibly on small wild animals such as goats or rabbits. This food, according to Fredrick's instructions, had to be fresh and served raw with all the bones removed. If it was not fresh the meat had to be warmed up until it

---

<sup>99</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, p xxix, nos 2092, 2099, 2117, 2102; C47/4/4, ff 48, 59v; E101/364/13, f 64v; Bl Add Ms 7966A, f 142; CCR 1279-88, 392

<sup>100</sup> Many of the king's falcons were received as gifts. Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 115

<sup>101</sup> 'Letters du roi Edouard', ed. Tanqueray, 491-2, 499; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 2241; E101/350/29

<sup>102</sup> Unfortunately, little is known about the mews at Bicknor. According, to Fredrick II the mews should be covered and protected from the rain. There should have been artificial nests and proper perches upon which the birds could sit. A basin of water was needed so that the birds could bath. *The Art Of Falconry being De Arte Venandi cum Avibus of Fredrick II of Hohenstaufen*, ed. C.A. Wood and F.M. Fyre (Stanford, 1943), 130, 133-6

reached the temperature of a live animal. The adult birds could be fed on less tender food. Doves were certainly an important part of the diet of Edward I's falcons. There are entries in the household accounts for 1285-6 concerning the transportation of doves for the king's falcons from Libourne to Saintes.<sup>103</sup>

There are numerous payments to John Bicknor throughout the reign for his supervision of the 'mewing' of the king's hawks at Bicknor. This was referring to the care which had to be given to the birds during the period when they were moulting. This happened once a year around March and April. According to Fredrick II the birds could be treated in two ways: they could be kept at work but treated with extra care or kept inside on their blocks and fed well until the new feathers appeared. It is not clear which method was favoured by English falconers.<sup>104</sup>

John Bicknor also supervised the process of enseaming the birds. The purpose of this process seems to have been to reduce the weight and fat of the birds, probably through some form of vigorous exercise. This operation seems to have taken up some considerable time: the accounts of 1286 record that he was engaged in this process throughout the months of August and September.<sup>105</sup>

As falconers and ostringers the knights were responsible for training the birds and reporting back to the king on their progress. The letters from Edward I to Robert de Bavent discuss the methods which the king thought Bavent should use to train his birds. Edward I's letter to Robert de Bavent dated 29 November 1304, thanked Robert for his diligence in training and breaking in the gyrfalcons. His letter of 13 August 1305 gave Robert

---

<sup>103</sup> *The Art Of Falconry*, ed. Wood and Fyre, 130, 133-6; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, p xxxix, no. 819

<sup>104</sup> *The Art Of Falconry*, ed. Wood and Fyre, 425-6

<sup>105</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 2025, 2217; E101/369/11, f 118

instructions about training the birds to return to the fist and lure. Robert regularly informed the king about the progress of the birds under his care. Most of Edward I's letters to Robert began by saying that he had read his report on the state of the gyrfalcons in his last letter. In his letter of 12 April 1305 Edward was displeased because Robert had told him that the gyrfalcons were flying badly.<sup>106</sup>

John Bicknor undertook the task of training the hawks to chase waterfowl by the rivers. Between 14 January 1303 and 7 April he went with one hawk to various rivers in Somerset and Dorset for this purpose. During these sessions noise drums were used to raise the waterfowl from the water. An entry in the account for 1285-6 mentions the purchase of eight drums for John Bicknor's work by the river.<sup>107</sup>

Unsurprisingly, the knights tended to train and fly the king's birds in a particular area of the country, often in the county in which they held lands. Thus Thomas Hauville naturally took the king's birds to parts of Norfolk and Suffolk. Robert de Bavent, holder of the family lands at Mareham in Lincolnshire, frequently trained the birds in that county. He was in Lincolnshire with the falcons in 1277-8, 1285-6, 1288-9 and 1289-90. It seems probable that he had facilities on his estates for housing the birds.<sup>108</sup>

The knights were also responsible for conveying their charges to court and for helping to organize hunting expeditions. The letter of Edward I dated 8 February 1304 commanded Robert de Bavent

---

<sup>106</sup> 'Letters du roi Edouard', ed. Tanqueray, 492, 494, 498, 500

<sup>107</sup> *The Art Of Falconry*, ed. Wood and Fyre, 170-2, 205, 219, 228, 230, 243; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, 85; E101/369/11, f 126

<sup>108</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 2842; Moor, *Knights* iii, 207; *CChR 1300-26*, 25; E101/350/29; E101/369/11, f 131; C47/4/4, ff 50, 59v

to take gyrfalcons to Dumfermline. It was often the responsibility of those in charge of the birds to arrange for a guide to lead the king to the hunting ground. This responsibility often fell to Thomas and John Bicknor. In 1285-6 John hired a guide to lead the king to the rivers near Colnbrook. Thomas arranged for the king and his party to be shown across the Thames when they were hunting near Latimer.<sup>109</sup>

The knights would not necessarily have undertaken all the tasks of training the birds in person. When John Bicknor went with a hawk to the rivers of Somerset and Dorset in January 1303 he took a valet with him to carry it. Thomas Hauville was accompanied by an assistant, two valets, two boys to look after the horses and a hound keeper when he went to Norfolk and Suffolk with a falcon in 1289.<sup>110</sup>

Occasionally the birds were injured during such hunting sessions: it was the duty of the falconers to care for them. In his letter to Robert de Bavent dated 12 November 1302 Edward I said that Robert was unable to journey to court because one of the falcons had been damaged while chasing<sup>a</sup> heron.<sup>111</sup>

It is clear that medical remedies were available if the birds fell ill.<sup>112</sup> There is a reference in the account books of 1285-6 to the purchase of 'Saundragon' for the king's gyrfalcons. However, the medical remedies were often not effective and the falconers regularly turned to spiritual cures. In 1285-6 John de Bavent had

---

<sup>109</sup> 'Letters du Roi Edouard I', ed. Tanqueray, 491; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 193, 215, 1696

<sup>110</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 2842, 2847; E101/369/11, ff 126

<sup>111</sup> 'Lettres du roi Edouard I', ed. Tanqueray, 490

<sup>112</sup> For the account of the falconer Calamere who placed a tiny wax image of his falcon on the altar of St Thomas Becket at Canterbury see A.J. Taylor, 'Edward I and the Shrine of St Thomas of Canterbury', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, cxxxii (1979), 26



been in Lincolnshire with a gyrfalcon who had become ill. He resorted to placing a coin over its head. In the same year John Bicknor gave alms to St Richard of Chichester on behalf of eight birds of the king.<sup>113</sup>

The responsibilities of the king's knights who were falconers and ostringers meant that they had to spend most of the year away from the king's court. In 1289-90 John Bicknor was absent from 20 November 1289 to 3 January 1290. He stayed with Edward for the beginning of February. On the thirteenth day of that month he left the court and went to Bicknor. He remained away from the king's side until 31 May. Unfortunately, the next entry in his wage accounts simply states that he received wages from 1 June to 19 November for the days he spent inside and outside the court.

Robert de Bavent spent 335 days away from the household from 31 October 1288 to 15 January 1290. From that day until 31 April he stayed with the king. Between 1 May and 19 November he was out of court for 53 days. Thomas Hauville and John de Merk were out of court from 28 December 1289 to 15 April 1290 with the gyrfalcons. They seem to have spent most of the remainder of the year in court. On 3 November 1290 they finally departed from the king's side, returning to the household on 21 April 1291.<sup>114</sup>

However, during a year of a major campaign the duties of these men as falconers and ostringers seem to have been superseded by their military duties as knights of the royal household. During the Caerlaverock campaign of 1299-1300 Thomas Bicknor, John Bicknor, Robert de Bavent, John de Merk and Thomas Hauville were all in receipt of fees and robes as household knights. All these men except Thomas Hauville received wages for serving in the king's

---

<sup>113</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, p xxxix nos 71, 368, 2195, 2286

<sup>114</sup> C47/4/4, ff 11, 18, 20v, 30, 32v, 48v, 50-52, 55, 59v, 60

army in Scotland. Similarly in 1297 Thomas Bicknor, Robert de Bavent and John de Merk all served in Flanders with the king.<sup>115</sup>

A number of the household knights held positions of responsibility in other royal households. Throughout the reign there was a small group of knights attached to the queen's household and the households of the king's children. In the 1270s John Ferre was attached to Eleanor's household, as in 1283-4 were Robert Giffard, Robert de Creuker, Guillaume Arnald and Giles de Fiennes. In 1290 Creuker and Fiennes were still members of her household but they had been joined by Adam de Creting, John Ingham, William St Clare and Peter de Staney, John de Weston and Eustace Hatch. Other knights including James de la Plaunche,<sup>116</sup> Guy Ferre the elder and Robert Hausted the elder began their careers in the household of Eleanor of Castile.<sup>117</sup>

Some of these knights were simultaneously attached to the households of the king's children. Geoffrey de Pitchford, who was in receipt of fees and robes as a knight of Edward I in 1285-6, was attached to the household of the king's children from 1273 until the late 1290s. Robert de Creuker, Hugh Famechon, Eustace Hatch and John Ingham served as part of the *familia* of the royal children between 1286 and 1289.<sup>118</sup>

Guy Ferre the elder had become part of the household of Edward

---

<sup>115</sup> *Liber Quot*, 166, 188-95, 207, 304; B1 Add Ms 7965, ff 60-1, 66v, 67

<sup>116</sup> Some of these knights could claim kinship with the queen. See above, vol. i, pp 43-44

<sup>117</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, 1677-80; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, 3212, 3220; *The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile*, ed. Parsons, 154-55; B1 Add Ms 7965 f 60; *Liber Quot*, 188-95; E101/371/1; E101/4/8

<sup>118</sup> H. Johnstone, 'The Wardrobe and Household of Henry son of Edward I', *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, vii (1922-3), 386-7; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, 3401, 3412, 3424

of Carnarvon by 1293. By 1300 he had been joined by a number of other well known household knights, including John St John, Gilbert de Briddeshale, Giles de Fiennes, William Leyburn, Robert Clifford, Hugh d'Audley, Robert Hausted the younger, Robert de Scales and John de Weston.<sup>119</sup> Robert Hausted the elder was involved in the household of the king's daughter Margaret in the 1290s and the household of Elizabeth Countess of Holland in 1301.<sup>120</sup>

A number of these household knights held official positions within the queen's and the young prince's household. Guy Ferre the elder was the steward of household of Eleanor of Provence in 1275. John Ferre and John de Weston were stewards of the household of Eleanor of Castile in the 1280s. Guy Ferre the younger seems to have acted as steward during John Ferre's absence in 1290.<sup>121</sup>

Other knights were appointed to an office in the household of the king's children. Geoffrey de Pitchford as constable of Windsor exercised a general supervision over the household of the king's children. In 1273 he was described as 'tunc custos predicti Henrici' and received £30 14s in wages. Henry died in 1274 but Geoffrey held the same position in later years in the household of Edward of Carnarvon. His work mainly involved the possession of the counter rolls of receipts and expenses of the household. A roll of the household of Edward I's son Henry is endorsed as the 'roll of Geoffrey de Pitchford'. Gifts and payments were recorded in his name and the final account presented to the exchequer was by his view and testimony. Johnstone stated that his position corresponded to that of a lay supervisor who kept the counterrolls of the royal

---

<sup>119</sup> E101/260/17; E101/370/29

<sup>120</sup> CPR 1292-1301, 293; E101/360/11; Bl Add Ms 37656

<sup>121</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, nos 1619, 2143, 3220, 3223; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 3239; H. Johnstone, *Edward of Carnarvon 1284-1307* (Manchester, 1946), 15-6

household under Henry III. However, in 1296 he was described as the steward of the household of the Prince of Wales. As such he arranged for example for venison to be delivered to the Prince.<sup>122</sup>

Robert Hausted the elder was steward of the household of Margaret, the king's daughter, in the early 1290s. An entry for 1297 describes him taking six bucks and four fawns from the forest of Essex for her use. He also accompanied her to Brabant in 1297.<sup>123</sup> At the end of the reign John de Weston was appointed as keeper of the king's children by his second wife. In 1306 he was arranging for brushwood to be delivered to the castle of Northampton where the children were staying.<sup>124</sup>

Guy Ferre the elder was the *magister* of Edward of Carnarvon. An order to the constable of Windsor in 1293 links his name with that of William Blyborough, keeper of the Prince of Wales' wardrobe. The men were proffering advice about an appointment. His role was that of a tutor to the Prince. It was through him that the young prince learnt such social skills as chivalry and horsemanship. Guy Ferre was still attached to his household in 1300-1. At that time another knight, Robert Hausted the younger, was the steward of the Prince's household. His name appears in connection with the preparation of the Prince's household for the journey to Scotland.<sup>125</sup>

The knights who did not hold an office in the king's household or in that of his children seem to have spent varying amounts of time at court. In 1283-4 there were 20 bannerets and 40

---

<sup>122</sup> Johnstone, 'The Wardrobe and Household of Henry', 386-88; *CCR* 1296-1302, 60

<sup>123</sup> *CPR* 1292-1301, 293

<sup>124</sup> *CCR* 1302-7, 485

<sup>125</sup> Johnstone, *Edward of Carnarvon*, 14-17; Bl Add Ms 22923, f 11v

knights excluding the stewards and marshals, who were receiving wages.<sup>126</sup> Of the 20 bannerets only eight spent half a year or more at court with the king. Richard de Braose and Philip Daubeney appear in receipt of wages for eleven of the twelve months. Peter de Chauvent was in court for ten months, Hugh Turberville for nine months, Robert and Pons Plessetio for eight months and William Latimer and William Leyburn for approximately six months. Of the remainder Roger Mortimer and Norman Darcy spent four months of the year with the king. John Nesle, Thomas Multon, Thomas de Clare, Nicholas Segrave and Alexander de la Pébrée stayed between three and four months with Edward. The rest including William Butler of Wem, Roger Lestrangle, John d'Eyville, Walter de Huntercombe and William Montravel appear to have been in attendance upon the king for less than two months.

Forty knights were receiving wages as part of the household in 1283-4. Of these approximately half are recorded as being in attendance upon the king for half or more of the year. Eustace Hatch and Gilbert de Briddeshale were at court for the entire year. John de Weston and Thomas Turberville spent 11 months with the king. Seven others spent ten months at court, two spent nine months and four were in court for eight months. The remaining five were attendant upon the king for between six and seven months of the year. Of the twenty-one knights who received wages for less than half the year the majority resided with the household for only one month or less. John de Bevillard had the shortest attendance record. He received wages for being in court for only ten days. On the same wage account there are four knights, Giles de Fiennes, Guillaume Arnald, Robert de Creuker and Robert Giffard who are

---

<sup>126</sup> These figures exclude those knights who were receiving only fees; E101/4/8.

designated as being the queen's knights. These men spent between seven and ten months at court.

In spite of the varying amount of time that the knights spent in court the total number receiving wages at any one time remained fairly constant. There were 36 knights and bannerets in court during November and December, 41 in January, 39 between February and April, 38 in May and June, 40 in July and August, and 31 in September. There were only twelve knights receiving wages in October. This sharp decline may have been due to a change from the paying of wages to the giving of fees.<sup>127</sup> The knights were paid wages only during periods of 'active service'. The year 1283-4 saw the aftermath of Edward I's conquest of Wales. In the following year household knights were paid fees rather than wages. Even in 1283-4 there were nine knights already receiving fees. Their rate of attendance at court is unknown.

From this the following conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, there seems to have been a core of bannerets and knights who stayed with the king for most of the year. In 1283-4, these included bannerets such as Richard de Braose, Philip Daubeney and Peter de Chauvent. Among the knights, Eustace Hatch, Gilbert de Briddeshale, Robert FitzJohn, John de Weston, Thomas Turberville, William Regimund, Geoffrey de Pitchford, Hugh Famechon, Robert Whitfield, Guy de la Pébrée and Arnald Guillaume all spent between ten and twelve months at court.

The knights who held the office of steward seem to have spent most of the year in court. Their vital role of ensuring that the household was well supplied, discipline was maintained and that the

---

<sup>127</sup> See chapter 9

entourage travelled smoothly from county to county made their presence at court essential. The marshal of the household spent considerably less time at court. They must have relied upon the sub-marshals to execute their duties. The importance of the marshal in arranging lodgings for the household and in making travel arrangements seems to have made their presence necessary when the king went abroad.

The chamberlain also spent a considerable amount of time at court. During Edward I's reign only Chauvent, Sulleye and Botetourt can be definitely connected with the chamber. However, other knights including those who served as royal councillors<sup>128</sup> and Beauchamp the steward, who surrendered his right to eat in the hall in 1300, may also have occasionally eaten in the chamber. From such men developed the chamber knights of the fourteenth century.

The duties of those knights who held the positions of falconers and ostringers meant that they had to spend a considerable amount of the year away from the household training the hawks and falcons. However, there were many other knights who ~~were~~ absent from the court for many months. Their presence at the king's side was clearly not essential when the household was not on campaign. This perhaps reflects the real reason many were recruited.

The placing of the king's knights in the households of the queen and the royal children must have helped to create a feeling of unity among the royal households. It is probable that Edward encouraged the attachment of men such as John St John, William Leyburn and Guy Ferre the elder as a method of providing his son and heir with loyal men who could be trusted to guide the young Prince. However, the exploits of the young Prince Edward between

---

<sup>128</sup> See chapter 8

1300 and 1307 cast doubts upon the effectiveness of such a policy.



## CHAPTER 4

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT & JUSTICE

The knights attached to Edward I's household provided a group of men who could be mobilised in a military emergency. However, during the years when there was peace the knights were available for use in other spheres of royal government. A group of knights, including the officers of the household, were constantly attendant upon the king but a substantial number spent only part of the year at court. An obvious area in which these knights could be employed was local administration. In this chapter the role of the knights as sheriffs, constables, wardens of the forests and royal justices will be evaluated. The scale of household involvement in these areas, the importance of the royal connection in their appointment and the degree to which they personally performed the duties assigned to the office will be examined.

Of the 297<sup>1</sup> men who held the office of sheriff between 1272-1307, only twelve were household knights. Roger Lestrangle was sheriff of Yorkshire from 1270 to 1274. In 1274 Thomas de Sandwich, Robert FitzJohn and Bogo de Knoville held office in Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk, and Shropshire and Staffordshire respectively. William St Clare was sheriff of Hertfordshire in 1278. Robert Malet and Geoffrey de Pitchford were appointed in the 1280s: the former was sheriff of Bedford and Buckingham in 1285, and the latter sheriff of Sussex and Surrey in 1282. In the later years of the reign five household knights were sheriffs. They were Miles Pychard who had custody of Herefordshire between 1299 and 1303; Gilbert de Knoville, sheriff of Devon from 1294 to 1299; John de

---

<sup>1</sup> These figures exclude the hereditary sheriffdoms.

Bourne sheriff of Kent in 1293; Henry Cobeham, sheriff of Kent in 1300 and sheriff of Wiltshire in 1304; and Walter Hakelute the younger, sheriff of Hertfordshire in 1307.<sup>2</sup>

Less than 5% of the total number of knights receiving fees and robes in Edward I's reign held the office of sheriff. This provides a complete contrast to the earlier part of the century. In the 1230s a large number of household knights served as sheriffs. Godfrey Crowcombe held Oxford, Engelard de Cigogne, Berkshire and Ralph FitzNicholas the counties of Warwick, Leicester, Nottingham and Derby. Amaury St Amand was sheriff of Hertfordshire, Nicholas de Meulles of Devon, Thomas Hengrave of Norfolk and Suffolk, and William Talbot of Gloucestershire.<sup>3</sup>

Fewer household knights were sheriffs in the second half of the century. This was due to the exchequer's policy of extracting revenue over and above the county farm to meet the king's ever increasing expenditure. The crucial period, according to Carpenter, was 1236-42. In 1236 William of Savoy introduced a new system of accounting. The sheriffs had to account for all profits and in return they received only small allowances. The system became even more stringent in 1241. The exchequer introduced a system of very high increment payments. This made the office of sheriff increasingly unattractive to the curial or household sheriff. Such men were usually absentee sheriffs. A deputy did the work while they enjoyed the profits. After 1241 the profits were so small that they could support only one man. Increasingly, local men and professional administrators replaced household knights and curials. The office of sheriff continued to be dominated by local landowners

---

<sup>2</sup> *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales* (List and Index Society, ix 1963), 1, 17a, 34, 49, 59, 67, 86, 117, 135, 152

<sup>3</sup> D.A. Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff in England 1194-1258' *EHR*, xci (1976), 1-32

and professional administrators in Edward I's reign. This is borne out by a study of Essex and Hertfordshire. Thomas de Sandwich and William St Clare, household knights, were sheriffs in 1274 and 1278 respectively. William Lamburne, who was sheriff in 1285, had three manors in Essex. He continued to serve in the county after his term as sheriff. In 1290 and 1294 he served on oyer and terminer commissions in Essex. Henry Gropinel, sheriff in 1290, possessed a manor and two messuages of 30 and 60 acres in Essex. Ralph Boxsted, sheriff in 1288, owned a manor and a sixty acre messuage in Essex. Similarly, Ralph Ginges and William Gros had land in Essex and they served on oyer and terminer commissions in the counties in later years.<sup>4</sup>

The remaining sheriffs of Essex were professional administrators. William Sutton, sheriff in 1294, held the same office in Cambridgeshire and Huntingdon and Norfolk and Suffolk. He was justice of north Wales in 1303 and he served on numerous oyer and terminer Commissions. In 1300 he made a perambulation of the forest in Essex, Buckingham and Oxfordshire. Simon Bradenham was sheriff of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire. John de Lee served in the same capacity in Somerset and Dorset in 1301 and in Hampshire in 1302.<sup>5</sup>

There was a brief hiatus in this policy during the civil war and while Edward was on crusade between 1270 and 1274. Hence the appointment of Roger Lestrangle. Of those knights appointed later only Thomas de Sandwich and Bogo de Knoville did not hold land in the county of which they were sheriff. Robert Malet held a messuage in Berkshire and a manor in Buckinghamshire. The king granted

---

<sup>4</sup> *List of Sheriffs*, 43; *CIPM*, ii, nos 361, 453, 579; iv, no. 154; *CPR 1272-81*, 473; *CPR 1281-92*, 100, 400; *CPR 1292-1301*, 186, 362, 457, 613, 619; *CCR 1279-88*, 131; *CCR 1288-96*, 394; *CCR 1292-96*, 220;

<sup>5</sup> *CCR 1302-7*, 62; *CPR 1292-1301*, 506, 547; *CPR 1301-7*, 270, 282, 353; *List of Sheriffs*, 54, 122

Gilbert de Knoville the manor of Horington in Devon, in fee simple, in 1293. Robert FitzJohn held the manor of Little Nassingham in Norfolk and an assortment of other lands in Suffolk. Miles Pychard's estates were in Hereford and Worcester, William St Clare had lands in both Essex and Kent and Henry Cobeham held lands in Kent and Wiltshire.<sup>6</sup>

In many cases the local connections of these knights were probably more important in their appointment as sheriff than their curial ties. This is confirmed by the fact that a number of the knights were not members of the household at the time of their appointment. Robert Malet was sheriff of Buckingham and Bedford in 1285 but it was not until 12 February 1286 that he was admitted as a knight of the household.<sup>7</sup>

However, it would be wrong completely to ignore the significance of the household in the appointment of a knight as sheriff. Even if the household knights appointed as sheriffs were local men, their position in the royal household would have enabled them to gain preferment over other local men who may have wanted the position. Miles Pychard, John de Bourne and Walter Hakelute the younger had all been admitted to the household prior to their appointment. Miles Pychard, sheriff of Herefordshire 1299-1303, was in receipt of fees and robes in 1297, 1299 and 1303-4. Walter Hakelute the younger, who served in the same county in 1307, was admitted to the household in 1305. Likewise John de Bourne, sheriff of Kent in 1294, was a member of the household from 1286-7 onwards.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *CIPM*, iv, nos 276, 446; v, no. 278; *CChR 1257-1300*, 184, 219, 272; *CPR 1292-1301*, 58, 459; *CChR 1257-1300*, 275, 289, 407; *CCR 1288-96*, 254, 390; Moor, *Knights*, iv, 171; *G.E.C.*, iii, 351

<sup>7</sup> Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, no. 1211

<sup>8</sup> *Liber Quot*, 190; Bl Add Ms 7965, f 66v; Bl Add Ms 8835, f 52v; Bl Add Ms 7966A, f 78; E101/369/11, f 106; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*,

Of the remainder, Robert FitzJohn, Roger Lestrangle, Bogo de Knoville and Thomas de Sandwich all had strong household ties at the time of their appointment. Robert FitzJohn, sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk in 1274, became steward of the household in 1278. He was a trusted servant of the king in 1276. In that year he went to Gascony to take the lands and chattels of Gaston de Béarn into the king's hands.<sup>9</sup>

Roger Lestrangle, sheriff of Yorkshire between 1270 and 1274 had been a member of Edward's household when he was a young prince.<sup>10</sup> Thomas de Sandwich, sheriff of Essex and Hertford in 1274 was a close associate of Roger Leyburn, another household knight. In 1266 the latter had entrusted him with the port of Sandwich. Thomas had gone on crusade with Edward in 1270. This suggests that Thomas was established in royal service by 1274. Bogo de Knoville received wages as a member of the household in 1277.<sup>11</sup>

As the majority of household knights held land in the shire of which they were sheriff, one might surmise that they were performing their duties in person. As sheriffs the knights had a variety of judicial, administrative and executive tasks to perform.<sup>12</sup> The most important of these was their financial responsibility for the shire. The sheriff appeared twice a year at the exchequer, once for a view of account and then for the final accounting process. For instance in 1274-5 Bogo de Knoville and his

---

1677-1680

<sup>9</sup> *CPR 1272-81*, 135, 261

<sup>10</sup> See chapter 1

<sup>11</sup> *CPR 1272-81*, 302; *CCR 1279-88*, 144; *CLR 1267-72*, 365; E101/3/21

<sup>12</sup> They presided over the county court, made a tourn of the hundred courts twice a year, enforced the decisions of a general eyre, proclaimed the king's mandates and guarded the local castle and its prisoners. For an analysis of the sheriff's responsibilities in the late thirteenth century see W.A. Morris, *The Medieval Sheriff to 1300* (Manchester, 1927); H.M. Jewell, *English Local Administration in the Middle Ages* (Newton Abbot, Devon, 1972)

subordinates were responsible for the collection of the rents, fines and other dues from the counties which made up the farm. In 1274-5 total receipts from Shropshire amounted to £266 14s 1d. This came from a wide range of sources including £9 from the monastery of Wenlock, £20 from the burgesses of Shropshire, 40s from the mill of Wrockwardine and £11 1s from John Lestrangle for Cheswardine. The receipts from Staffordshire were much smaller. Among the money collected was 13s for the sale of pasture and herbage and £12 5s 6d of judicial profits. Out of the issues of the shire Knoville made a number of payments on the king's behalf; 30s in alms, and 100s<sup>13</sup> for expenses incurred in collecting the tax of a 20th.<sup>14</sup>

Robert Malet, John de Bourne, Thomas de Sandwich, William St Clare, Robert FitzJohn, Walter Hakelute the younger and Bogo de Knoville all accounted in person. This suggests that they were not the old style absentee curial sheriffs. However, it would be wrong to suggest that the household knights devoted all their time to their shire even in the years when they accounted in person. The demands of the king meant that they spent some period away from the shire. For instance, Bogo de Knoville was very active in Wales during the first Welsh war. He was with the army at Chester in July 1277 and conveyed the foot soldiers of Shropshire to Flint where he remained from 25 July to 1 September.<sup>15</sup>

Miles Pychard, Gilbert de Knoville and Roger Lestrangle

---

<sup>13</sup> See enrolled accounts for Shropshire and Staffordshire E372/119

<sup>14</sup> Upon Edward I's return to England from his crusade in 1274 there was an inquiry into the misdeeds of sheriffs and royal officials in general. This has become known as the Hundred Roll inquiry. Three household knights, Bartholomew de Briançon, Roger Lestrangle and Robert de Ufford served upon the inquiry. They were all appointed to regions where they held lands. For instance Bartholomew Briançon was appointed in Kent, Surrey, Sussex and Middlesex probably because he held land in Sussex. *CPR 1272-81*, 59; *CChR 1257-1300*, 42, 44, 330; H.M. Cam, *The Hundred and The Hundred Rolls* (London, 1930), 39

<sup>15</sup> E101/3/16; E101/3/21

accounted through their clerks. Geoffrey de Pitchford did not account at all in September 1282 because he was in Wales. Gilbert de Knoville's absence is explained by the expedition to Flanders in 1297. He received wages in the king's army from 19 August to 11 November. Miles Pychard was in Scotland for much of his tenure in office. His clerk Tyrel accounted on his behalf in 1299. He accounted in person in 1300. In 1303 a special command of the king allowed him to account through a deputy because he was in Scotland.<sup>16</sup>

The role of the sheriff was changing in the thirteenth century. Traditionally responsible for the levying of taxation, troops and purveyance the sheriff's role was performed increasingly by special royal commissioners.<sup>17</sup> Relatively few household knights served on the commissions set up to raise foot soldiers or to purvey victuals.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, few were part of the commissions responsible for the levying of taxation. Out of the 38 men appointed in 1302 to collect 40s on every knight's fee only one, Robert Giffard, was a household knight. Of the eighty-two collectors appointed in 1306, only two were household knights. No household knights were appointed to collect the 11th and 17th in 1295.<sup>19</sup>

The largest number of household knights who served on a single commission was five. In total 70 men received orders to serve in 1275. Each county was to have three commissioners, two collectors and one 'superior'. Three of the knights were superiors, the other two were collectors.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Bl Add Ms 7965 f 66v; *CCR 1296-1302*, 123

<sup>17</sup> Morris, *Medieval Sheriff*, 230-2

<sup>18</sup> See chapter 2

<sup>19</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, 104, 170

<sup>20</sup> *CCR 1272-81*, 250

The knights chosen to participate in the commissions to raise taxes tended to serve in their local area. In 1275, William de Braose of Bramber in Sussex was appointed as a 'superior' in Surrey and Sussex. Bartholomew de Briançon of Essex served in the counties of Essex and Hertfordshire. Roger Mortimer of Wigmore was part of the commission in Shropshire and Staffordshire.<sup>21</sup>

Robert Giffard collected taxes in his home county of Cornwall in 1301, 1302<sup>22</sup> and 1306. John Thorpe and Gilbert de Knoville were assessors of taxation in 1306 and 1304, respectively. They both served in the area where they held lands. John Thorpe was part of the commission in Norfolk and Suffolk. Gilbert de Knoville as sheriff of Devon was fulfilling the responsibilities of his office.<sup>23</sup>

In spite of the changes in his role the sheriff remained the key figure in thirteenth century local administration. However, there were areas of England where the structure of royal government was different. This included the five hereditary sheriffdoms. One of these was held by household knights. The Cliffords and the Leyburns,<sup>24</sup> as holders of the hereditary sheriffdom of Westmorland, had extensive rights of jurisdiction. They were responsible for the execution of royal writs, summons and other business. Most of the work was done by a sub sheriff appointed jointly by both families. If there was a dispute the king would take action; Edward intervened in 1280 when Clifford was attempting to conduct tours

---

<sup>21</sup> Moor, *Knights*, i, 144; *CChR*, 1257-1300, 42, 300

<sup>22</sup> J.F. Willard, *Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property*, (Massachusetts 1934), 36-7 This year was different: tax collectors were chosen by local communities not by the king and council. The fact that Giffard was still chosen in 1302 shows that he was seen as a local man and not a household knight first and foremost.

<sup>23</sup> *CPR* 1301-7, 76, 201-2, 456; *CPR* 1292-1301, 611

<sup>24</sup> See chapter 2



too frequently.<sup>25</sup>

Similar but not identical were the other large liberties, the Palatinates of Durham and Chester.<sup>26</sup> The earldom of Chester was assigned to the young Prince Edward in 1254. It remained in his possession until he passed it on to his son and heir in 1301.<sup>27</sup> One household knight was appointed justice of Chester between 1272-1301. Guncelin de Badlesmere held the post from 16 October 1274 to 14 November 1281. In contrast to the sheriffs, Badlesmere did not hold land in Chester: his estates were in Kent.<sup>28</sup> As a household knight he was a man the king could trust to administer this important border county on his behalf. A man of some military ability was needed to guard the area against the Welsh. A local man of no particular standing would have been inappropriate. Subsequent justices of Chester such as Reginald Grey were also important royal servants.<sup>29</sup>

As justice of Chester, Badlesmere was the main official within the county.<sup>30</sup> His responsibilities were similar but more extensive than those of a sheriff. All royal orders and writs were addressed

---

<sup>25</sup> I. Hall, 'Lords and Lordship of the English West March: Cumberland and Westmoreland circa 1250-1350', (Durham University, Ph. D. thesis, 1986) 101, 113, 117, 203, 207, 205, 208, 209, 212, 224, 232

<sup>26</sup> There has been much debate over whether Chester should be classed as a palatinate in the thirteenth century. Recent research suggests that full palatinate status only emerged because Edward I used the county as a base for his conquest of Wales. J.W. Alexander, 'New Evidence concerning the Palatinate of Chester', *EHR*, lxxxv (1970), 725-6; J.W. Alexander, 'The English Palatinates and Edward I' *Journal of British Studies*, xii, (1982-3), 5

<sup>27</sup> G. Barraclough, *The Earldom and County Palatinate of Chester* (Oxford, 1951), 21-22; R. Stewart Brown, 'The End of the Norman Earldom of Chester', *EHR*, xxxv (1920), 53

<sup>28</sup> Moor, *Knights*, 31; *CFR 1272-1307*, 31

<sup>29</sup> For Badlesmere's role in Wales see chapter 7

<sup>30</sup> Stewart Brown, 'The End of the Norman Earldom of Chester', 50; J.R. Studd, 'The Lord Edward's Lordship of Chester', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, cxxviii (1978), 18

to him. He would then pass them onto the officials concerned, the chamberlain, sheriff and keeper of the forest, all of whom were subordinate to him.

If any of the major offices of the county fell vacant Badlesmere would hold them and then deliver them to the new officer who was appointed by the king. For example in January 1278 he was ordered to surrender the office of chamberlain and the issues from the previous Michaelmas to Leo, son of Leo the king's clerk. On 14 September 1275 the office of escheator was committed to him. He therefore received and had to execute orders regarding the seisin of land in the county. For instance in 1276 he took the land of Henry d'Audley tenant in chief, into <sup>the</sup> king's hands until such a time as it had to be given to the rightful heir.<sup>31</sup>

The escheator was bailiff of the royal forest so Badlesmere received numerous orders concerning the royal forest. In September 1275 he was instructed to permit Roger Lestrangle to take two stags from the forest of the Wirral for the king's use. Badlesmere was to salt them and send them to London. He also received orders regarding the land in the forest. In 1275 he was ordered to allow Ranulf de Ovre to have free common in Bradfordwood. Ranulf had enjoyed this privilege prior to the king receiving seisin of the area from Stephen Merton.<sup>32</sup>

As justice of Chester, Guncelin de Badlesmere presided over the county court. This was a much more powerful body than a normal county court. It dealt with both crown pleas and pleas brought by writ. Badlesmere also heard crown pleas in the city court. These

---

<sup>31</sup> *CFR 1272-1307*, 44, 68

<sup>32</sup> Alexander, 'The English Palatinates and Edward I', 7; Stewart Brown, 'The End of the Norman Earldom of Chester', 5; Studd, 'The Lord Edward's Lordship of Chester', 19; *CPR 1272-81*, 105, 252; *CCR 1272-9*, 210, 217, 399, 516; C62/51

hearings and Badlesmere's annual visitation of the hundreds were very important because the normal justices in eyre were excluded from Cheshire. However, it would be incorrect to assume that Badlesmere dominated the county court. He presided but he did not give judgement. This was the responsibility of the *judicatores* and suitors. The former were more powerful than the latter. In the county court Badlesmere heard pleas relating to Chester's royal forest.<sup>33</sup>

Chester sent no representatives to parliament so Cheshire's contribution to taxation had to be sorted out separately. The responsibility for this appears to have lain with Badlesmere. In 1275 the king sent a request to the County of Chester asking them to grant him a 15th on movables as the rest of the country had done. The county was ordered to give credence to Badlesmere in the matter. He must have been successful for in March 1277 he received an order to pay Bartholomew de Sulleye and William Louth £338 and £250 for their custody of Chester Abbey out of the money collected from the 15th.<sup>34</sup>

One of Chester's privileges was that it had its own exchequer. The chamberlain was in charge of it but he was subordinate to the justice. Badlesmere presented the account of Chester's revenues to the exchequer at Westminster. He accounted for £799 15s 10 1/2d in 1274-5<sup>35</sup> and progressively lower sums in subsequent years. Most of

---

<sup>33</sup> Jewell, *Local Administration*, 73; T.F.T. Plunkett, 'New Light on the Old County Court,' *Harvard Law Review*, xlii (1929); Studd, 'The Lord Edward's Lordship of Chester', 19; R.C. Palmer, *The County Courts of Medieval England* (Princeton, 1982), 63

<sup>34</sup> G.T. Lapsley, *Crown, Community and Parliament in the Later Middle Ages* (1957), 383

<sup>35</sup> M.H. Mills and R. Stewart-Brown, 'Cheshire in the Pipe Rolls 1158-1301', *The Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, xcii (1938), 116; E327/119, This comprised: £149 3s 4d from the city of Chester, £130 from the farm of the mill of Dee, £100 from the farm of the town of Middlewich, £34 8s 4d from the town of Northwich, 73s 4d from the hundred of Caldy, £152 14s 8d from the profits of

the revenue was spent on the Welsh war and the construction of Vale Royal Abbey.<sup>36</sup> However, the justice's superiority should not be overstated. In June 1278 Badlesmere was instructed to receive no fines or amercements except in the presence of the chamberlain or his deputy.<sup>37</sup> In addition, Badlesmere presided over the exchequer's court.<sup>38</sup>

Badlesmere appears to have spent most of his tenure in office in Chester or the surrounding area. A number of letters survive from Badlesmere written between 1274 and 1278 which suggest that he was in Chester dealing with problems relating to the county and to the neighbouring Welsh. He played an active part in the first Welsh war and afterwards he was used by the king to enforce the treaty of Aberconwy in the area. An absentee justice would not have been able to ensure the safety of the county effectively.<sup>39</sup>

In 1276 another household knight, Robert de Ufford, the justiciar of Ireland was referred to as justice of Chester. Ufford only assumed responsibility for affairs in Chester which affected Ireland. It is clear that previous justiciars of Ireland such as James d' Audley had also been joint holders of the office of justice of Chester.<sup>40</sup> None of the latter justiciars of Ireland between 1272-1307 were styled 'justice of Chester' although the

---

the court; Badlesmere's expenses amounted to £24 2s 8d. This had been spent on alms to the Prior of the Hospital of St John the Baptist and wages and repairs to Chester castle.

<sup>36</sup> P.H.W. Booth, *The Financial Administration of the Lordship and County of Chester 1272-1377* (Cheetham Society, 3rd series, 1980), 55-6, 134; C62/55, m 2; C62/57, m 6-7

<sup>37</sup> R. Stewart Brown, 'The Exchequer of Chester' *EHR*, lvii (1942), 291; *CCR* 1272-9, 460; Studd, 'The Lord Edward's Lordship of Chester', 18; *CPR* 1272-81, 105

<sup>38</sup> R.A. Stewart Brown, *County Court Rolls*, (Cheetham Society, lxxxiii, 1925), xli

<sup>39</sup> *Cal Anc Corr Wales*, 111-3; *Littere Wallie*, 141; *Welsh Assize Roll*, 51-2, 160; See chapter 7 for Badlesmere's Welsh activities

<sup>40</sup> *CCR* 1272-9, 314, 375; *CDI*, ii, p 149

links between the two areas must have remained close.<sup>41</sup> The change may have been the result of the growing importance of the office of justice of Chester and its increasing responsibilities and links with Wales after 1277.

Another area of England which had an unusual administrative structure was the Isle of Wight. In the thirteenth century it enjoyed the rights of an important liberty. The island was acquired for the crown under rather dubious circumstances in 1293, following the death of Isabella de Fortibus, widow of the last Fortibus, the earl of Aumale. She was also the heiress of the last Redvers, earl of Devon.<sup>42</sup> Royal officials such as John FitzThomas and Simon Winton had always been appointed as custodian of the royal lands on the island and those held by the queen in Southampton.<sup>43</sup> However after 1292 a bailiff was appointed to assume responsibility for the custody of the Countess' lands on the island. The royal custodian in 1297 was Robert de Glamorgan who had held his land from the late Countess but in 1299 a household knight was appointed. William Russel remained as custodian until 1307. His successor was another household knight, Nicholas de Boys.<sup>44</sup>

William Russel and Nicholas de Boys were appointed because of their household ties. They did not hold land on the island. They were chosen to serve as custodians because the military role and

---

<sup>41</sup> See chapter 6

<sup>42</sup> The authenticity of the charter made by Duchess on her deathbed has been questioned. The charter arranged the sale of the island to Edward I for 6,000 marks and it has been suggested that it was a royal forgery. Denholm-Young has questioned this interpretation in 'Edward I and the sale of the Isle of Wight' *EHR*, xliv (1929), 433-8

<sup>43</sup> *CPR 1281-92*, 413; *E372/136*, m 3; *E372/137*, m 43-44

<sup>44</sup> N. Denholm-Young, *Seignorial Administration*, (1937), 101; See *E372/147* for enrolled accounts of these custodians

the position of the island had become important during the war with France. The treacherous letter of Thomas Turberville to the king of France in 1295 revealed that the island was not adequately defended. Following this letter and attacks on the English south coast by the French, a large garrison was established on the island.<sup>45</sup> The garrison was only a temporary measure to ensure the island's safety during the war with France but it is hardly surprising that after 1299 Edward chose a household knight as bailiff of the island. In addition Hugh Courtenay, the heir of the Countess, achieved his majority in 1297 and began to press his claim for his 'rightful inheritance'. In these circumstances Edward I may have felt that the appointment of a household knight would tighten his hold on the lands.

William Russel had considerable military experience. He seems to have been paymaster in Wales in 1287, he took part in the expedition to Flanders in 1297 and he fought at Falkirk in 1298. Neither Russel or Bous held land on the islands so their association with the household and their military experience appears to have been the crucial factor.<sup>46</sup>

As custodian Russel accounted for £599 19s 1d in 1300.<sup>47</sup> This comprised the revenue of the lands of the Countess on the island and in Southampton. Russel collected £26 11d from the profits of royal justice,<sup>48</sup> £24 11s 8d and £7 2s 7d from the burgesses of

---

<sup>45</sup> A.Z. Freeman, 'A Moat Defensive; The Coast Defense Scheme of 1295', *Speculum*, xlii (1923), 442-62

<sup>46</sup> Beryl, *Records 1286-9*, no. 3889; E101/6/40; B1 Add Ms 7965, f 66v

<sup>47</sup> The total revenue had been much lower when Edward I had gained custody of the lands in 1292. Humphrey Dunsterre had accounted for only £270 5s 4d in 1294-5 and £350 2s in 1296. The main reason for this was that the manors of Swanston, Brixton and Whitfield were not included in the account until 1297. E372/147

<sup>48</sup> Total profits of the court actually amounted to £30 19s 7d but £4 13s 10d of this was allocated to Carisbrooke castle to help clear

Newport and Yarmouth, respectively. From the manors he received £87 17s 4d from Bowcombe, £14 10s 1d from Pan, £52 19s 6d from Freshwater, £72 2s 4d from Thorley, £27 15s 11d from Wellow, £47 4s 1d from Wroxall, £59 8s 8d from Brixton, £102 2d from Swanston, £24 14s 5d from Whitfield and £32 13s from Newton.<sup>49</sup>

The accounts rendered by these two men also suggest that there was a change in the administration of the island in 1307. During William Russel's tenure in office the different manors on the island had their own bailiffs. Between 1304 and 1307, William Lupe was keeper of Brixton and Nicholas Paye was keeper of Newton.<sup>50</sup> In contrast after 1307 Nicholas de Boys was named on the ~~ministers'~~ accounts as warden of the island. It is his name which appears on the accounts of the different manors.<sup>51</sup>

It is of course possible that this change was more apparent than real. The writ which announced Boys' appointment stated that he was to keep the island on the same terms as Russel. It is inconceivable that each of the manors during Boys' tenure did not continue to have a separate keeper.<sup>52</sup> The presence of these bailiffs meant that the custodian did not perform all his duties in person. William Russel was absent from the island for considerable periods of time. For instance he was part of the campaign in Scotland in 1300, when he received wages for being part of the king's army from 14 July to 23 August.<sup>53</sup>

---

the deficit in that account.

<sup>49</sup> E372/147

<sup>50</sup> SC6/985/4; SC6/985/3; SC6/984/23

<sup>51</sup> SC6/985/8

<sup>52</sup> SC6/985/4; *CFR* 1307-19, 3

<sup>53</sup> *Liber Quot*, 210

The administration of the royal forest was another area where household knights played an important role. From 1238 the king's forest was divided into two sections. Power was vested in two justices, one governing north and one south of the Trent. During Edward I's reign four household knights were appointed as justice. Roger Clifford the younger was justice of the forest south of the Trent from 1270 to 1281. His successors were Luke de Tany between 1281 and 1282, Roger Lestrangle between 1283 and 1296 and Hugh Despenser who held the office from 1296 to the end of the reign. Robert Clifford became justice of the forest north of the Trent in 1297.<sup>54</sup>

These knights were trusted by the king; they were available and their position at court enabled them to gain preferment over other candidates. In this sense their place in the king's *familia* was crucial to their appointment. However, their attachment to the royal household did not make their selection inevitable.

Turner stated that the posts of justice of the forest north or south of the Trent were held only by men of 'substance.' Robert Clifford and Roger Lestrangle both received fees and robes as bannerets. The Cliffords and the Lestranges had substantial land holdings. Roger Clifford the younger and his son Robert held half the hereditary sheriffdom of Westmorland. Roger Lestrangle was lord of Ellesmere. Both families had a long record of royal service.<sup>55</sup> Roger Lestrangle was an experienced royal servant at the time of his appointment. He had been sheriff of York, he had fought in the Welsh wars and he had been constable of Dinas Bran and Oswestry in

---

<sup>54</sup> M.L. Bazeley, 'The Extent of English Royal Forest in the Thirteenth Century', *TRHS*, 4th series, iv (1921) 140-3; G.J. Turner, 'Justice of the Forest South of the Trent', *EHR*, xviii (1903), 18; Jewell, *Local Administration*, 83; *CPR 1292-1301*, 306

<sup>55</sup> See chapter 1



1277. After the death of Roger Mortimer in 1282 he was appointed captain of the garrison in Oswestry, Montgomery and Whitchurch.<sup>56</sup>

Similarly, Luke de Tany, justice of the forest south of the Trent 1281-2, had a long and distinguished career in the service of the king. He was born of a family who had been established in England after the Conquest. During Henry III's reign he had been constable of Knaresborough. In 1272 he became seneschal of Gascony. He was well rewarded for his services, receiving land in Perigord where he constructed a bastide. After he left Gascony he accompanied Antony Bek on a diplomatic mission to try and reestablish peace between the kings of France and Castile.<sup>57</sup>

Hugh Despenser, Roger Lestrangle's successor, was from an important family. His father was Hugh Despenser of Loughborough. He held land in Leicestershire, Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. Hugh the elder had been one of the twelve elected by the barons at the Oxford Parliament. A baronial supporter in the civil war, he was appointed justice of England and constable of London, Devizes, Oxford and Nottingham by de Montfort. He was slain at Evesham in 1266 and his widow married the earl of Norfolk.<sup>58</sup>

It is safe to assume that in spite of their attachment to the royal household these knights would not have become justices of the forest if they had not been men of substance. For many simple knights of the household such a post would have been out of their reach. This point is confirmed by a study of the another holder of the office who was not a household knight.

William de Vescy was justice of the forest north of the Trent between 1288 and 1297. He was the younger son of William de Vescy,

---

<sup>56</sup> CCR 1272-9, 398; *Cal Anc Corr Wales*, 65; *CWR*, 244

<sup>57</sup> *RG*, iii, xix, xxi; Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 190, 191, 303-4

<sup>58</sup> *G.E.C.* iv, 260, 262; *CPR 1292-1301*, 72

lord of Kildare in Ireland and Agnes, daughter of the fifth earl of Derby. He served as constable of Scarborough from 1289 to 1292. In 1290 he went with the bishop of Durham to treat with Scottish envoys. After the death of his brother, he inherited the family lands in Ireland. He became justiciar of Ireland in 1294.<sup>59</sup>

As justice of the forest the household knights had a wide variety of tasks to perform. They supervised the wardens and their staff of foresters and verderers who were in charge of the individual forests. In November 1301 Robert Clifford, John, bishop of Carlisle, John de Insula and Michael Harclay were appointed to inquire into the extortions of the foresters in Inglewood. On occasion, the justice would take it upon himself to change the forest officials. Such independent action did not always meet with the approval of the king. In 1291 Roger Lestrangle was reprovved for dismissing some of the new officials appointed by Richard de Boys and Roger de Molis after their inquiry into abuses in Bernwood.<sup>60</sup>

Responsibility for the sale of timber and the renting of areas of waste lay with the justice. During the financial crisis of 1297, Lestrangle was encouraged to extract the maximum amount of profit from such transactions. Other burdens which were laid upon the justice included the care of the roads in the forests. In 1286 Lestrangle was instructed to clear and improve the pathways. The king hoped that this would improve the safety of travellers in the forest.<sup>61</sup>

Only the justice or king could admit to bail those who had

---

<sup>59</sup> G.E.C. xii, part ii, 277, 281; CPR 1281-92, 385

<sup>60</sup> M.L. Bazeley, 'The Forest of Dean and its relations with the Crown during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Transactions of Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society*, xxiii (1910), 213; CPR 1281-92, 427; CPR 1292-1301, 632

<sup>61</sup> CFR 1272-1307, 225; CPR 1292-1301, 187

been imprisoned for forest offences. Such orders were always conveyed through the justice. Roger Lestrangle received numerous directives of this kind. In 1285 he was ordered to give bail to Richard Pet, Matthew son of Nicholas and William son of Warin de Dean. They had to be mainperned by twelve men to ensure that they appeared before the justices of the forest.

Orders for gifts of wood and game were frequently sent to the justice of the forest rather than to the individual warden. In 1287 Roger Lestrangle received notification of a number of grants relating to various forests. The Bishop of Lincoln was granted six live bucks and fourteen live does from the forest of Rutland, John de Grey received six oaks from Salcey, Grimbold de Pauncefoot's son was presented with twelve oaks from the forest of Dean and Humphrey de Bohun acquired six bucks from the forest of Waubridge.<sup>62</sup>

The justice of the forest had power over the seisin of land in the forest. For instance in 1289 Roger Lestrangle was ordered to deliver the bailwick and forest of Somerset to Nicholas Pecche and his wife. The justice would also intervene if the holder of the land acted contrary to the law. In 1289 Roger had taken Reginald Balin's wood into his hands for waste.<sup>63</sup>

Lestrangle was often employed on investigations concerning the enclosure of land or the felling of trees. In 1284 he was ordered to inquire into the Abbot of Shrewsbury's proposal to enclose ten acres of his own waste land at Astley by Bridgenorth.<sup>64</sup>

The king usually appointed the justice of the forest as one of the justices to hear the pleas of the forest in a particular

---

<sup>62</sup> CCR 1279-88, 257, 259, 260, 270, 340, 342; CCR 1288-96, 12, 14, 22, 71, 73-4, 79, 80, 93, 95, 98-100, 102, 230

<sup>63</sup> CFR 1272-1307, 262, 290; CCR 1288-96, 25

<sup>64</sup> CPR 1281-92, 119

county. Roger Lestrangle served as a justice of the forest eyre in Derby in 1285, in Huntingdon, Staffordshire and Northampton in 1286, in Buckingham in 1287, in Rutland and in Essex in 1288 and Essex in 1292. These justices drew upon the records of the courts of attachment and regard. They heard indictments and presentments of forest transgressions since the last eyre. They would also investigate claims to rights or exemptions and abuses.<sup>65</sup>

In Huntingdon in 1286 Lestrangle dealt with several pleas concerning trespass in the king's warren of Cambridge. Philip Colleville, Henry son of Henry of Childerley and Roger son of Roger a clerk were all accused of trespass. They all failed to attend and were fined £10, one mark and £10, respectively. The justices would grant a respite if there were sufficient reason; for example Thomas Middleton received a respite because he was overseas with the king.<sup>66</sup>

Turner stated that the justices of the forest had deputies but that they were only used occasionally during the thirteenth century. However, the demands placed upon those household knights who were justices of the forest from 1272 to 1307 casts considerable doubt upon this supposition.<sup>67</sup> Luke de Tany was justice of the forest in 1281-2. During part of this period Tany was on campaign with Edward I in Wales where he met his death.<sup>68</sup> Hugh Despenser played an important role in royal diplomacy between 1296 and 1307. He was also with the king in Scotland in 1300 and 1301.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> C.R. Young, *Royal Forests of Medieval England* (Leicester, 1979), 88; *CCR 1279-88*, 363, 418, 436, 449, 538, 548; *CCR 1288-96*, 272, 348

<sup>66</sup> *Select Pleas of the Forest*, ed. G.J. Turner (Selden Society, 1899), 129-30

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, xv, xvi

<sup>68</sup> See above, vol. 1, p 106

<sup>69</sup> See chapter 8

It seems probable that Roger Lestrangle operated without a deputy for most of his tenure in office. However, there were periods of time when a deputy may have been employed. In July 1287 he was sent to Wales to suppress the rebellion of Rhys ap Maredudd. He and Reginald Grey were captains of the army in south Wales. They remained in Wales until September. His absence may have been extended. An order issued to him in November 1287 told him to stay on his own lands in Wales until the rebellion was over. If he obeyed he must have remained in Wales until 20 January 1288. There is no record of a deputy being appointed but it is inconceivable that arrangements were not made to deal with matters arising during his absence.<sup>70</sup>

A deputy for Lestrangle was chosen in 1291. In October 1291 Roger received a protection to go to Rome on the king's business, Simon Ellesworth was named as his deputy. Ellesworth may have been reappointed in 1294-5 when Lestrangle went to play a part in the crushing of the final Welsh rebellion.<sup>71</sup>

Robert Clifford became justice of the forest north of the Trent in 1297. From then until the end of the reign he spent most of his time in Scotland.<sup>72</sup> Once again it is inconceivable that arrangements were not made to ensure that the administration of the forest continued smoothly. In some instances the deputy may not have been formally appointed. During the summer campaign of 1300 his place in a perambulation of the forest in Nottingham was being filled by his attorney Hugh Louther.<sup>73</sup>

Below the justice of the forest were the wardens of the

---

<sup>70</sup> CWR, 306, 315; Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, p xx, no. 3467

<sup>71</sup> CWR, 360; *Cal. Papal Registers 1198-1304*, 555; *CPR 1281-92*, 477

<sup>72</sup> See above, vol. 1, pp 92-93, 96

<sup>73</sup> *Select Pleas of the Forest*, ed. Turner, 118

individual forests. Thirteen household knights were appointed as wardens. Four household knights held the position of steward of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford from 1272 to 1307. They were Thomas de Clare, Elias Hauville, Thomas Hauville and Adam de Welles. Three knights were wardens of the forest of Dean: Grimbald de Pauncefoot (1281-7), Thomas de Clare, (1287) and John Botetourt (1290). John St John and Thomas de Clare were both custodians of Porchester.

The other knights who were responsible for royal forests were Richard de Boys, keeper of the forest of Bernwood in 1291, Roger Lestrangle, guardian of the forest of Kingswood and bailiff of the Peak, William Leyburn, holder of Inglewood in 1272-9 and Robert de Bures keeper of Cannock.<sup>74</sup> In addition there were knights who had custody of a forest by virtue of holding another office.<sup>75</sup>

Numerically, household knights did not form a significant proportion of the total number of forest wardens. Young, based on the work of Bazeley, calculated that there were 69 forest areas in the thirteenth century. Household knights held only seven or eight of these forests.<sup>76</sup>

Wardens of the forest, like sheriffs, were generally local men. Most of the household knights were given the custody of a forest because of their local connections. Grimbald de Pauncefoot held lands in Worcester and Hereford which bordered onto the forest of Dean. William Leyburn actually inherited the bailwick of the forest of Inglewood from his father Roger Leyburn and then

---

<sup>74</sup> Moor, *Knights*, iv, 63; *G.E.C.*, vii, 634; *CCR* 1279-88, 171; *CCR* 1288-96, 161, 172, 220, 221, 243, 343; *CCR* 1296-1302, 285; *CPR* 1281-92, 412

<sup>75</sup> See below, vol 1, p 213

<sup>76</sup> Young, *Royal Forests*, 77

quitclaimed it to the king in 1279.<sup>77</sup> Elias Hauville and Thomas de Clare, stewards of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford, both had land in Oxford. Thomas Hauville had a manor in Buckinghamshire. Adam de Welles, the final steward of that forest area during Edward I's reign had extensive lands in Northampton and Lincolnshire. John St John, custodian of the forest of Porchester on the south coast, held considerable estates in Southampton.<sup>78</sup>

However, household knights were frequently appointed as wardens of particular forests. The forest of Dean and the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford were important areas of royal forest. The stewards of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford were responsible for the wardens of the forests of Northampton, Huntingdon, Oxford and Buckingham. The appointment of household knights to these areas was part of Edward I's policy to install either nobles or important royal servants in a key area. This policy can be demonstrated by a study of the background and experience of those men who held the office but who did not belong to the king's household.<sup>79</sup>

William de Beauchamp was the first keeper of the forest of Dean and steward of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford in 1287. He was the son and heir of William de Beauchamp of Elmley in Worcestershire and elder brother of Walter, household knight and steward. He was the nephew of William Mauduit, earl of Warwick and inherited that title after his uncle's death in 1268.

---

<sup>77</sup> *G.E.C.*, vii, 634-5

<sup>78</sup> *CChR 1257-1300*, 248, 258, 339; *CIPM*, iv, nos 96, 109; v, no. 352

<sup>80</sup> There were exceptions. William Hatheway, keeper of the forest of Dean 1287-91, was a local landowner probably related to or father of the Ralph Hatheway who died in Edward II's reign, holding 30 acres of arable land in the manor of St Briavel and other land in the forest of Dean. *CIPM*, ii, no. 696; v, no. 624

<sup>80</sup> *G.E.C.* xii, part ii, 368-9

As such he held extensive land in Warwickshire which bordered onto the forest of Dean and was within the area of forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford.<sup>81</sup>

Ralph Sandwich, brother of Henry de Sandwich, bishop of London was another keeper of the forest of Dean. Ralph had been a rebel keeper of the Wardrobe during Henry III's reign, escheator south of the Trent in 1282 and constable of the Tower and keeper of London. In 1303 he was appointed as chief justice of the king's bench.

Richard Holbrook, steward of the forest between the bridges, had been escheator south of Trent in 1275. In 1276 he had been appointed as keeper of castle and towns of Orford, Dunwich and the hundred of Sanford. He served on a commission of oyer and terminer in Suffolk in 1283 and as keeper of the forest of Whittlewood in 1276.<sup>82</sup>

In general the household knights chosen as wardens of the forest were of lower standing than those who were appointed as justice of the forest north or south of the Trent. A number, including Robert de Bures, Thomas Hauville and Elias Hauville were not bannerets. Nor were the lands and families of such men as Richard de Boys or John Botetourt as important as those who held the position of justice of the forest.

However, those knights who were appointed as custodian of the forest of Dean or steward of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford did have an impressive family background or a very impressive record in royal service. Thomas de Clare was the younger son of Richard, earl of Gloucester; he was the king's

---

<sup>81</sup> *G.E.C* xii, part ii, 368-9

<sup>82</sup> *CPR* 1272-81, 112, 117, 121, 141, 149, 322; *CCR* 1272-9, 171, 289; *CCR* 1279-88, 135; *CPR* 1281-92, 270; *Dict. Nat. Biog*, xvii, 769-70



lieutenant in Gascony in 1272. Elias Hauville had been marshal of the household, Adam de Welles was part of the king's council and John Botetourt held a number of important offices.<sup>83</sup> The appointment of these men was clearly due to their household connections as many of them did not hold land near to the forest. John Botetourt had land in Norfolk, Suffolk, Buckingham and Essex but none in the area close to the forest of Dean.<sup>84</sup>

As wardens these household knights undertook tasks similar to those performed by the justices of the forest north and south of the Trent but on a smaller scale. The warden was in charge of a large administrative staff. Botetourt and Pauncefoot as wardens of the forest of Dean were in charge of nine foresters in fee and nine sergeants in fee.<sup>85</sup>

The warden was responsible for collecting the profits of the king's demense and other royal dues such as the annual rents of weirs and minor courts. For this privilege he made a fixed payment into the exchequer.<sup>86</sup> The wardens also ensured the execution of the forest law by conducting inquisitions and attaching offenders to appear before the justices of the forest eyre.

Upon the king's orders the wardens sold timber, distributed gifts of wood, and gave seisin of lands. In 1283 Grimbald de Pauncefoot, keeper of the forest of Dean was ordered to sell underwood to a value of £25 for the king's use. In 1291 John Botetourt was instructed to deliver ten oaks to the Prior of

---

<sup>83</sup> See above, vol. 1, pp 105, 107

<sup>84</sup> *CIPM*, vi, no. 587; *CPR 1266-72*, 625; M. Altschul, *A Baronial Family in Medieval England: The Clares, 1217-1314*, (Baltimore, 1965) 194

<sup>85</sup> Bazeley, *Forest of Dean*, 169, 187-88, 190, 199

<sup>86</sup> Young, *Royal Forests*, 78, 80; *CPR 1281-92*, 496

Woodspring.<sup>87</sup> The following year Botetourt received an order to assign dower to Agatha, the widow of Henry Dean.<sup>88</sup>

Few of the household knights performed their duties in person. Grimbold de Pauncefoot served as warden of the forest of Dean between 1281 and 1287. He was in Wales for the greater part of 1282-3. His attendance upon the king at court in subsequent years can have left him little time to visit the forest of Dean. He was in court from 21 November to 31 December 1283. He remained with the king from 1 January to 9 February 1284. He spent a further 35 days in court between that day and 31 May.<sup>89</sup>

John Botetourt's extensive military service in Flanders and Scotland and his appointment to numerous judicial commissions meant that he can rarely, if ever, have visited the forest of Dean. However, it is interesting to note that Botetourt did not surrender his custodianship when he went abroad in 1297. In contrast, Elias Hauville, steward of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford, was replaced by Thomas Hauville when he left for Gascony in 1294.

Elias cannot have spent much time in the forest between 1291 and 1294. He was sent to Scotland in November 1290 with the Bishop of Durham. In June 1291 his protection was extended until Christmas. In 1292 he was back in England. He served on a commission of goal delivery in Norfolk in October of that year. In 1293 he was commissioner of oyer and terminer in Southampton, Wiltshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> *CCR 1288-96*, 183; *CPR 1281-92*, 67

<sup>88</sup> *CCR 1288-96*, 238

<sup>89</sup> *CWR*, 244, 251, 256, 280; E101/4/8

<sup>90</sup> *CPR 1281-92*, 412, 424, 434, 510, 521; *CPR 1292-1301*, 45, 84; *CPR 1292-1301*, 84, 294; *CDS*, ii, p 287, nos 1136, 1170

It is safe to assume that most of a knight's duties as warden of a forest were performed by a deputy. Grimbald de Pauncefoot's deputy in the forest of Dean was Alexander Bicknor. John Botetourt had three deputies during his period in office.<sup>91</sup>

With the exception of those household knights who were justice of the forest north or south of the Trent, few knights served as justices in the forest eyres. Three household knights, Richard Bosco, Hugh de Brok and Roger de Molis were appointed to investigate trespasses of venison in the forests of Southampton, Wiltshire, Somerset, and Bernwood in 1291.<sup>92</sup>

In general the justices of the forest pleas consisted mainly of important justices of Common Pleas or of the King's Bench such as William Saham and John Metingham. Others, including Solomom Rochester, Nicholas Gras, Robert Loveday, Thomas Sodington and Richard Boyland, had served extensively as itinerant justices.<sup>93</sup>

The role of household knights as justices of the forest eyres was clearly negligible but they played an important part in other areas of royal justice. The Court of the King's Bench travelled with the king taking over the judicial business of other commissions in the counties which it visited. One household knight was a member of the Court of the King's Bench during Edward I's reign.

Robert Malet was appointed to the King's Bench in 1290.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Bazeley, 'The Forest of Dean in its Relations with the Crown during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', 181, 186

<sup>92</sup> C47/4/5, f 3v

<sup>93</sup> E. Foss, *The Judges of England* (1848-64), 135, 166; *CPR 1281-92*, 73, 81, 91, 94, 99, 101, 105, 187, 197, 212, 263, 477, 506; *CPR 1272-81*, 46, 131, 145, 199, 244, 265, 273, 277, 283, 284, 289, 347, 408, 409, 421, 423, 471, 473-4, 475; *Select Cases in Court of the King's Bench* ed. H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, i (Selden Society, 1936), xliv

<sup>94</sup> *Select Cases in the Court of the King's Bench*, i, cxxxi-cxxxii

This was probably the same Robert Malet who was in receipt of fees and robes as a knight simple of the household in 1288-9.<sup>95</sup> The appointment of a household knight in 1290 is unsurprising. The so-called 'state trials' which began in 1289 led to the dismissal, arrest and fining of a number of top judges and administrators. Among those removed from the Bench were Ralph Hengham, chief justice who was fined 8,000 marks, William Saham, fined 2,500 marks and Walter Hopton.

Tout argued that when Edward returned from Gascony in 1289 there was a great public outcry about the abuses of royal officials.<sup>96</sup> More recently Paul Brand has claimed that the corruption amounted to only a minute proportion of the cases handled. He suggests that the crisis was precipitated only by the actions of Thomas Weyland. Weyland, chief justice of the Common Pleas protected two of his men who had committed murder. It was only when this case was brought before the Hilary parliament of 1290 that other judges were involved and the commission into the misdeeds of sheriffs was diverted to deal with the justices.<sup>97</sup> As time went on the financial gain from the large fines became Edward's motive.

---

<sup>95</sup> Robert Malet the judge died in 1295. The reference to a Robert Malet, an officer of the household, in 1296-7 was probably a reference to his son and heir who was 28 in 1295. He was a valet of the household in 1297. The tendency for a son to follow his father into royal service was discussed in chapter 2; E101/354/8 f 3; *CIPM*, iv, no. 276; B1 Add Ms 7965, f 32

<sup>96</sup> *The State Trials of Edward 1*, ed. T.F. Tout and H. Johnstone (Camden Society, 3rd series, ix, 1906), xi-xii

<sup>97</sup> Two households knights, William Latimer and John St John, were appointed to the commission although their duties meant that they were regularly absent. John St John was appointed as an envoy from the king to the Pope in 1291. He and William Latimer were absent again in January 1293 when they were in Scotland with the king. In July 1293 John St John received a protection to go overseas in the king's service. Prestwich, *Edward 1*, 340; *State Trials*, ed. Tout, xvi-xvii, xviii; *CPR 1292-1301*, 27

However, as Prestwich points out, the order for Hengham's arrest had already been given prior to the investigation. Prestwich, following Brand, suggested that his arrest was due to the king's displeasure at the independence he had shown during the Quo Warranto inquiries.<sup>98</sup>

These different explanations for the crisis suggest a number of reasons for Malet's appointment. As a household knight he was known and trusted by the king. He had been in Gascony with the king in 1286-9 and was therefore free from the taint of corruption. If Edward desired a man who was less independent than Hengham he may have considered that a household knight such as Malet was more malleable and more dependant upon him.<sup>99</sup>

No other household knight was a justice of the King's Bench or the Court of Common Pleas in Edward I's reign. However, Malet's appointment was not unique. William Inge, an itinerant justice who joined the household in 1305-6, served in both central courts during Edward II's reign.<sup>100</sup>

Other lay justices were often drawn from the households of other royal personages or magnates. Roger Brabazon, appointed in 1290, was connected to the household of Edmund, the king's brother. William Saham was linked to the household of Hugh Despenser and Gilbert de Thornton was possibly related to the William Bussey who was the seneschal of William of Valence.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 239-341; P.A. Brand, 'Edward I and the Judges: the State Trials of 1289-93', *Thirteenth Century England* 1 ed P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1985), 31, 33, 34-6

<sup>99</sup> Byerly, *Records 1286-9*, no. 1211

<sup>100</sup> E101/369/11, f 106; *Select Cases in the Court of the King's Bench* i, cxxiv, cxi

<sup>101</sup> A.L. Spitzer, 'The Legal careers of Thomas Weyland and Gilbert de Thornton', *Journal of Legal History*, vi-vii (1985-6), 63-4, 67-9

The appointment of household knights to the King's Bench was part of the process of secularization which was taking place among the judiciary. Sayles has argued that before 1290 there were an equal number of clerks and laymen on the Bench; after that date the laymen predominated.<sup>102</sup> William Inge was one of the new type of justices who rose through the ranks of the *narratores* or the pleaders in court. From 1287 until he became a justice of assize, William Inge was one of the king's pleaders.<sup>103</sup>

Malet had extensive judicial experience prior to his appointment. He delivered Aylesbury goal in 1279, he was a justice of assize in 1280 and he served on numerous oyer and terminer commissions in the early 1280s.<sup>104</sup> He acted as an inquisitor in Gascony in 1285-6. In 1289-90 he was conducting assizes in different parts of the country, including Essex, Oxford, Bedford, Buckingham, and Hertfordshire.<sup>105</sup>

Household knights had a more important role to play as itinerant justices. They served on commissions of oyer and terminer, gaol delivery and trailbaston.<sup>106</sup> Eighteen household knights were appointed as justices of gaol delivery during Edward

---

<sup>102</sup> Doubt has been cast on the validity of this argument by the work of R.V. Turner who points out that even as early as Henry II's reign half the judges were laymen. R.V. Turner, *The English Judiciary in the Age of Glanville & Bracton c. 1176-1239* (Cambridge, 1985), 291

<sup>103</sup> *Select Cases in the Court of the King's Bench* i, li-lij, lviii, lxiii, cix; Spitzer, 'The Legal careers of Thomas Weyland and Gilbert de Thorton', 63-4, 67-9

<sup>104</sup> *CPR* 1272-9, 341; *CCR* 1279-88, 6; *CPR* 1281-92, 49, 80, 99

<sup>105</sup> Byerly, *Records* 1286-9, no. 1211; C47/4/5 f 15; *Pleas of Various Courts* (List and Index Society, iv), 173; Trabut-Cussac, *L'administration Anglaise en Gascogne*, 274

<sup>106</sup> They never served as justices in general eyres. The majority of those appointed to the general eyres were the justices of the central courts, officers of the exchequer, professional administrators and officers of the court such as John Berwick or Hugh Cave

I's reign. The king sent these commissions to deliver a particular gaol. They would try the prisoners in it. Depending on the verdict the prisoners were either hanged or released. If the former, their lands and chattels were forfeit to the king. If the prisoner was not found guilty or there were extenuating circumstances then he would receive a pardon. For instance after the delivery of Norwich goal by Elias Hauville, Simon Ban received a pardon for the death of Thomas Deveroy because Elias decided that he had killed him in self defense.<sup>107</sup>

The household knights were appointed to two types of gaol delivery commissions. On some commissions the knight and his fellow justices would be told to go and deliver a particular gaol. In 1294, William Hauterive was sent to deliver Chichester gaol of all its prisoners except those who were in custody for the death of the forester of John de Warenne, earl of Surrey. On other occasions knights were instructed to deliver a particular person from gaol. In October 1292, Elias Hauville was ordered to deliver Norwich castle of seven men charged with the death of William, son of Robert le Sutere.<sup>108</sup>

The commissions of oyer and terminer were structured in a similar way to the commissions of goal delivery. A general commission investigated an entire class of offences over a whole set of counties while a special commission inquired into the complaint of one particular person. Thirty-nine household knights were appointed as justices of oyer and terminer between 1272 and 1307. The knights served on both types of commissions. For example Richard de Boys was appointed to a general commission in December

---

<sup>107</sup> CCR 1288-96, 373

<sup>108</sup> Jewell, *Local Administration*, 144; CPR 1292-1301, 20, 46, 72; CPR 1281-92, 521

1293 to search out the vagabonds in Dorset, Wiltshire, Devon, Southampton, Somerset, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Gloucestershire and Buckinghamshire. In contrast Hugh de Brok and Peter de Champagne were appointed to inquire into the killing of Roger, son of Robert Owen in Suffolk.<sup>109</sup>

The frequency with which household knights were appointed to commissions of gaol delivery or oyer and terminer varied. Some served only once or twice. Into this category fall such men as Thomas Chaucombe, Hugh d'Audley, William Craye, Robert Giffard, Eustace Hatch, William St Clare, Ralph Woodbrough, Thomas St Laudo (oyer and terminer), Ralph Basset, Grimbald de Pauncefoot, John d'Eyville and Edmund Mauley (gaol delivery). In contrast there were household knights who were appointed quite frequently. Robert FitzPayn, William Inge, Peter de Champagne, John Botetourt, Robert Malet, Geoffrey de Pitchford, Osbert de Spaldington and Gilbert and Bogo de knoville all served on a number of judicial commissions.<sup>110</sup>

It is not surprising to find that a considerable number of household knights were appointed to judicial commissions in an area where they held land. Walter de Beauchamp, John Botetourt, John Thorpe, William Dean, William St Clare, Elias Hauville, Guncelin de Badlesmere, Hugh de Brok, Bogo de Knoville, Geoffrey de Pitchford and Thomas Paynel all served in their home counties.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> R.W. Kauper, 'Law and Order in Fourteenth Century England: Commissions of Oyer and Terminer', *Speculum*, liiii (1979), 739; *CPR 1292-1301*, 108-9; *CPR 1281-1292*, 101, 331

<sup>110</sup> *CPR 1272-81*, 123, 290, 407; *CPR 1281-92*, 99, 323, 331, 405; *CPR 1288-96*, 91, 267, 359; *CPR 1292-1301*, 49, 99, 107, 112, 113, 144, 377, 381-2, 452, 462, 472, 476, 496, 553, 548, 622; *CPR 1301-7*, 80, 82, 92, 94, 197, 270, 286-7, 349, 499, 516, 544; *Cal Chanc Warrants 1244-1336*, 11

<sup>111</sup> Moor, *Knights* i, 74, 122, 149; ii, 205; iii, 20; iv, 63-4, 171; v, 18; *CPR 1281-92*, 99, 144; *CPR 1272-81*, 407; *CPR 1292-1301*, 45-6, 377, 399, 459; *CPR 1301-7*, 80, 459, 477, 545; *CChR 1257-1300*, 46, 343; *CFR 1272-1307*, 280; *CIPM*, vi, no. 587



However, at least eighteen knights served on a commission outside their own county. The majority of these knights, Robert Giffard, Thomas Chaucombe, William Craye, John d'Eyville, Ralph Basset, John Tregoz, Nicholas de Segrave, John Savage and Thomas St Laudo served on only one such commission. The knights were appointed because they were available at court when the king needed to set up the investigation. For example Robert Giffard and Geoffrey de Pitchford were appointed to deliver the gaol of Rhuddlan because they were on campaign in Wales with the king in 1282.<sup>112</sup>

Only five household knights were appointed regularly to commissions in a wide range of counties. John Botetourt served on commissions as far apart as Cambridge, Derby, Warwickshire, Nottingham, Hereford, Hertford and Berkshire. Geoffrey de Pitchford served in Norfolk, Herefordshire, Berkshire and Oxford. Osbert de Spaldington acted as a royal justice in Scotland and the Isle of Wight, Yorkshire, Lincoln, Nottingham and Derby. Robert FitzPayn participated in commissions in Devon, Derby, Somerset, Berkshire, Cornwall and Wiltshire. William Inge also served on numerous commissions in diverse counties.<sup>113</sup>

The number of household knights serving on judicial commissions in any one year was quite small and it fluctuated depending upon the political situation. Of 65 oyer and terminer justices appointed in 1300 only four household knights are mentioned: William Inge, Gilbert de Knoville, John de Bourne and Robert FitzPayn. Of these only one, Robert FitzPayn, was actually

---

<sup>112</sup> *Cal Chanc Warrants 1244-1336*, 11

<sup>113</sup> *CCR 1288-96*, 359, 394; *CPR 1292-1301*, 377, 382, 462, 472, 519, 548, 553, 582, 622; *CPR 1301-7*, 92, 197, 270, 282, 286, 544; *CDS*, ii, no. 143

in receipt of fees and robes that year. Certain household knights such as Botetourt did not act as justices in 1300 because of the Caerlaverock campaign. In 1302 there was a temporary truce with Scotland but the overall number of household knights who were appointed remained very small. Three men out of sixty-two justices were household knights.<sup>114</sup> However, the truce did mean that John Botetourt served on six commissions.<sup>115</sup>

The same proportion of knights served on the commissions of oyer and terminer in the earlier years of the reign. Of the 56 justices appointed in 1275-6 only three appear to have been household knights. Of the forty-five oyer and terminer justices named in 1274-5 four were household knights.<sup>116</sup>

Finally, the household knights had a small role to play on commissions of trailbaston which began in 1305. These commissions were established because of the serious decline in law and order in the later years of the reign. This was probably due to Edward I's absence on campaign, the abandonment of the system of general eyres and the practice of pardoning felons so that they could serve the king in Scotland. It is of course very difficult to measure any absolute increase in disorder; a rise in the figures could simply demonstrate an increase in the number of complaints rather than actual crimes.

In November 1304 an inquiry was set up to look into grievances at markets and fairs. Then in the parliament of 1305 the *Ordinance of Trailbaston* was promulgated and five judicial circuits were

---

<sup>114</sup> CPR 1292-1301, 545-555; CPR 1301-7, 80-92

<sup>115</sup> The most significant group of men appointed to these commissions were the justices of King's Bench, Common Pleas, and justices in eyre. According to Kaeuper 68% of oyer and terminer judges fell into this category in 1275 and 42% in 1300. Kaeuper, 'Law and Order in the Fourteenth Century', 752-3

<sup>116</sup> CPR 1272-81, 107-124, 172-183

established to hear cases that had occurred between Easter 1297 and 1305. Another group of justices were sent out in 1307.<sup>117</sup>

Three household knights were appointed in 1305: William Inge, John Botetourt and Gilbert de Knoville. The selection of William Inge and John Botetourt is easily explained. Both had extensive judicial experience and the latter had land in the area to which he was appointed. Gilbert de Knoville's appointment to a commission of trailbaston in the counties near Devon was due to the fact that he held land in that county.

In 1307 John Thorpe and Robert de Bures were chosen to serve in their home counties. The former served in Norfolk and Suffolk, the latter in Northumberland and Cumberland. Again the household knights remained a minority of those nominated to serve. The other men chosen were the usual mixture of local landowners and central administrators. For example in Northumberland and Cumberland where Robert de Bures served, the other commissioners included John de Insula, baron of the exchequer and Peter Mauley who held the barony of Musgrave in Yorkshire.<sup>118</sup>

The commissions of trailbaston were very unpopular. A poem was written about them called the Song of the Trailbaston. Gilbert de Knoville was mentioned with some approval in contrast to the professionals such as Henry Spigurnel. Knoville was described as a man of 'piety' who 'prayed for the poor'. Spigurnel, the poem claimed was a cruel man.<sup>119</sup>

Household knights provided a pool of men who could be actively

---

<sup>117</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 284-6; A. Harding, 'Early Trailbaston Proceedings from the Lincoln Roll of 1305', ed. R.F. Hunisett and J.B. Post, *Medieval Legal Records*, (1978), 144

<sup>118</sup> *CPR 1301-7*, 354, 543; Moor, *Knights*, i, 159; iv, 18

<sup>119</sup> *The Political Songs of England*, ed. Wright, 233

employed in many different aspects of local administration. They served as sheriffs, forest officials and royal justices. In most offices the household knights formed only a small fraction of the total number of royal officials appointed. In fact the number of household knights appointed as sheriff in the thirteenth century was declining due to the pressure exerted by the exchequer.

Only a small proportion of household knights were selected to serve as sheriffs, justices and wardens between 1272 and 1307. Less than 5% of the total number of knights in receipt of fees and robes were appointed as sheriffs or wardens of the forests. A larger number were employed as royal justices but they still amounted to less than 18% of the total number of household knights. However, as Edward's household was considerably larger than that of his predecessors it is likely that the number of knights who served as justices increased rather than decreased in the late thirteenth century. This must cast doubt on how far the magnates' practice of retaining local officers and justices was encouraged by a decline in the employment of *curiales*.<sup>120</sup>

In many cases it is difficult to decide whether a knight was appointed as a sheriff, warden or justice primarily because he was a member of the royal household. The knights who served as justices of the forest north and south of the Trent, keepers of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford and as custodians of Chester and the Isle of Wight do appear to have been appointed mainly because they were household knights. These were important offices which needed to be filled by loyal servants. Similarly, many household knights were chosen to serve as royal justices because they were at court when the investigation was set up.

---

<sup>120</sup> See above, p 27

However, the fact that most knights served as sheriffs and wardens of the forest in their home counties suggests that their local connections might be the reason why they were appointed. Even in these cases membership of the household may have been crucial in the sense that it enabled the knights to gain preferment over other local men.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this. Firstly the vast majority of household knights were never employed in local administration. Secondly some household knights such as John Botetourt, Grimbold de Pauncefoot, Geoffrey de Pitchford and Roger Lestrangle were employed repeatedly in different areas of royal administration. These were men who were attached to the king's household or another royal household for a considerable number of years. The knights who held the office of steward of the household did not usually hold a large number of administrative posts outside the court during their tenure in office. Walter de Beauchamp, unlike John Botetourt, served relatively infrequently upon judicial commissions.

The primary obligation of all the knights involved in local administration remained their military duties. Most of the offices which were held by the knights did not demand that they discharge their responsibilities in person. This left them free to join the king on campaign. Even prominent administrators like Botetourt were dropped from the ranks of the itinerant justices during a year of an important military expedition. The household knights were warriors first and foremost and not administrators.

## CHAPTER 5

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT II- Knights and Castles

In the century following the Norman Conquest castles and their constables had an essential military role to play. Castles were a form of defense against and a means of controlling a potentially hostile countryside. The constable was primarily a military commander in charge of a garrison. By the time of Edward I's reign this had all changed. Most castles in England had only a small standing force. This change in the function and the importance of the castle has led Denholm-Young to say of the constables of private castles that 'The constable sinks in importance as public security grows.....a mere bailiff, he combined the custody of the castle with administration and financial work of the bailwick'.<sup>1</sup>

This interpretation cannot be applied to the constables of royal castles.<sup>2</sup> This chapter will demonstrate that English castles were an integral part of local administration and the country's defenses. This dual role of a constable seems to justify a separate study of the role of household knights as constables. It will enable an assessment to be made of the relative importance of the knights' administrative and military roles.

Twenty-nine household knights served as constables of English castles in the period 1272-1307. Their appointments were usually made by a writ requesting all the people of the bailwick to be obedient to the new constable. His predecessor or his executors

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Bond, 'The Medieval Constables of Windsor', *EHR*, lxxxii, (1967), 230, 238; Denholm-Young, *Seignorial Administration*, 7

<sup>2</sup> See below, vol. 1, p 209

would be instructed to deliver the castle and its stock to the new man. For instance, on 10 March 1291 a writ sent to the executors of Richard Holbrook, late constable of Rockingham, demanded that they deliver the castle to Elias Hauville.<sup>3</sup>

The outgoing constable had to provide an inventory of the stock in the castle. Hugh d'Audley, the new constable of Berwick in 1298, received an inventory from John Burden, the previous constable. This included equipment for the garrison plus the contents of the hall, larder, kitchen, bake house, chapel and forge. The contents of the larder consisted of two pitchers and one bowl, all made of pewter. In 'the little chamber beyond the bake house' there was a 'green carpet with a red border'. The carpet was very worn: it had belonged to a previous constable, Osbert de Spaldington.<sup>4</sup>

The thirty household knights appointed as castle constables held the office at the 'king's pleasure': these were not hereditary grants. The knights were constables for varying lengths of time. Walter de Beauchamp, appointed constable of Gloucester in 1291, held the post until his death in 1303. Robert de Creuker was chosen as constable of Beeston castle in Cheshire in 1279. This became a life grant on 8 November 1289. Richard de Boys received custody of Corfe castle in Dorset in 1280. He was still constable in 1299 and probably held it until his death in 1304. At that date it passed to another household knight, Robert FitzPayn.

In contrast some household knights were constables for only a short period of time. For instance Thomas Hauville was constable of Rockingham castle from 1294-5. Others held the position for only three or four years. Bogo de Knoville was constable of the castles

---

<sup>3</sup> Bond, 'The Constables of Windsor', 226; *CFR 1272-1307*, 33, 290

<sup>4</sup> *Documents*, ed. Stevenson, ii, 318-25

of Bridgenorth and Shrewsbury from 1274-8.<sup>5</sup>

Six household knights were constables of castles because they were sheriff of the counties in which they lay. It was the custom in some counties for the sheriff to be the custodian of the local castle because it was a suitable place for prisoners to be kept. Into this category fall Robert FitzJohn, Bogo de Knoville, Miles Pychard and Thomas de Sandwich.

Robert FitzJohn held Norwich castle as sheriff of Norfolk from October 1274 to 11 November 1275. Bogo de Knoville was constable of two castles, Bridgenorth and Shrewsbury, during his tenure as sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire. Miles Pychard was the custodian of Hereford castle (1299-1303), Roger Lestrangle of York castle (1270-4) and Thomas de Sandwich of Colchester castle in Essex (1274-5) while each was sheriff of the counties. The appointment of these men as sheriff was discussed above.<sup>6</sup> In addition, Guncelin de Badlesmere, justice of Chester from 1274 to 1281, was constable of Chester castle and guardian of Beeston until it passed to Robert de Creuker. William Russel and Nicholas de Boys were constables of Carisbrooke because they were wardens of the Isle of Wight. Henry Cobeham was constable of Dover and warden of the Cinque Ports.<sup>7</sup>

Grimbald de Pauncefoot, Thomas de Clare and John Botetourt were constables of the castle of St Briavels because they were keeper of the forest of Dean in 1281-7, 1287 and 1290 respectively. Similarly, the guardians of Rockingham castle, Thomas de Clare (1272), Elias Hauville (1291-4), Thomas Hauville (1294-5) and Adam

---

<sup>5</sup> *CFR 1272-1307*, 31, 33, 36, 104, 115, 123, 286, 290, 339, 343, 401, 409, 468, 511; *CPR 1281-92*, 328; *CPR 1292-1301*, 155; *Moor, Knights*, i, 114; ii, 44

<sup>6</sup> See above; *Moor, Knights*, i, 31; ii, 44, 292; iii, 299; iv, 211; *CPR 1296-1302*, 354; *Rot. Scot.*, i, 23

<sup>7</sup> C62/57, m 6; *CFR 1272-1307*, 542



de Welles (1299-1307) were the keepers of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford.<sup>8</sup>

Leaving aside those household knights who were constables because they held the position of sheriff or keeper of a forest, the vast majority of the knights were attached to the household when they were holding the position of constable. Walter de Beauchamp, Robert Clifford, Eustace Hatch, William Leyburn and Osbert de Spaldington were all in receipt of fees and robes during their tenure as constables, albeit intermittently. Robert Clifford was a member of the household when he was appointed constable of Nottingham in 1297. He was not present in the fee list for 1299-1300 but he reappeared in the list for 1303-4. Richard de Boys and Robert de Creuker were members of the household when they received their appointments. They continued to hold the castle after their departure from the king's side. Richard de Boys was still in charge of Corfe castle in the late 1290s but he does not appear in the list of those in receipt of fees and robes in either 1297 or 1299. Robert de Creuker's continuation in office after his departure from the household is hardly surprising: his was a life grant.

Philip Darcy and Robert FitzPayn were household knights in the years preceding their appointment. Philip Darcy, constable of Durham castle in 1301, had been a member of the household in 1285-6 but not in later years. Similarly, Robert FitzPayn, appointed constable of Corfe in 1305, had been in receipt of fees and robes in 1299-1300.<sup>9</sup>

This suggests that the appointment of these knights as

---

<sup>8</sup> See chapter 4

<sup>9</sup> *Liber Quot*, 166-195; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, nos 1677-80; C47/4/5 f 36; B1 Add Ms 7965, f 60-1; B1 Add Ms 7966A, f 78; B1 Add Ms 8835 ff 52-3;

constables was the result of their household ties. Despite the declining military importance of most English castles, every castle was still a potential stronghold which could be held against the king.<sup>10</sup> In 1297, the king, fearing a possible rebellion, placed the major English castles on a state of alert.<sup>11</sup>

This demonstrates the need for royal castles to be in the hands of loyal subjects. The vast majority of Edward I's household knights were very loyal to the king from 1272 to 1307. The household was the one element which remained loyal to the king in the crisis of 1297. As men who were known personally to the king and dependant upon his favour they were ideal for the position of constable.

The loyalty of these men to the king was by no means the only reason for their appointment as constables. Some knights were chosen as constables because they had proved themselves to be good administrators. There were many constables who held more than one castle during their career. Similarly, William Leyburn, constable of Pevensey in 1294, had been constable of Criccieth ten years earlier. He had also held Leeds castle in Kent as a private castle until he surrendered it to the king in 1278.<sup>12</sup>

Castles were sometimes committed to knights who were important local men. Excluding those knights who held the post of sheriff or warden of a forest, at least six household knights held land in the

---

<sup>10</sup> The problems of a castle being held by a discontented subject were demonstrated in 1321. Bartholomew de Badlesmere, a household knight of Edward I and in royal favour in Edward II's reign, joined the baronial opposition to Edward II at Sherburn and held Leeds castle against the king in 1321. See J.R. Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster 1307-21* (1967), 293-6; *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, ed. N. Denholm-Young (1957), 116; M.C. Prestwich, 'The Charges against the Despensers', *BIHR*, lviii (1985), 95

<sup>11</sup> See below, vol. 1, p 210

<sup>12</sup> Moor, *Knights*, iv, 299-301; *CCR 1272-9*, 398; *CWR*, 296; *CCR 1272-9*, 449

county where they were constable. Richard de Boys was constable of Corfe castle in Dorset from 1280 until his death. His successor was another household knight, Robert FitzPayn. Both men possessed land in Dorset. Eustace Hatch, the constable of Marlborough castle, held the manor of Cost Hacche in Wiltshire. Walter de Beauchamp, constable of Gloucester, had over forty pounds worth of land in Gloucestershire. Roger Clifford the elder, custodian of Eardsley in the 1270s, held land in Herefordshire. Henry Cobeham of Rundale in Kent was constable of Dover castle in 1306.<sup>13</sup>

However, unlike the sheriffs, many constables did not hold lands in the county where the castle was situated. This continued to be a common phenomenon throughout Edward I's reign. Robert Clifford, constable of Nottingham in 1298, held no land in Nottinghamshire. His estates were in Westmorland, Cumberland, Worcester and Herefordshire. Clifford's predecessor, Robert Tibetot, did have lands in Nottinghamshire when he died in 1298. However, the manors of Langar and Barstan had been granted to him by the king in 1285. He had not held them when he was appointed constable in 1274.

John Dovedale, an Essex knight, was constable of Pevensey castle in Sussex in 1306. An earlier constable of that same castle, William Leyburn (1294), held land only in Kent. Philip Darcy, heir to the barony of Nocton in Lincolnshire, was constable of Durham castle in 1301. Geoffrey de Pitchford, a knight from Sussex, was constable of Windsor (Berkshire) from 1272 until his death in 1297. Roger Lestrangle, a major landowner in Cheshire, was constable of Chartley castle, Staffordshire.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Moor, *Knights*, i, 74, 114; ii, 67; *CChR 1257-1300*, 236, 454; *CFR 1272-1307*, 511; *CPR 1296-1301*, 286, 501; *CPR 1272-81*, 272

<sup>14</sup> Moor, *Knights*, i, 214, 250, 265; iii, 38; iv, 63-4, 299-301; *CPR 1281-92*, 328; *CFR 1272-1307*, 115, 339; *CIPM*, v, nos 220, 533; *CCR*

A study of the other constables of Windsor castle reveals that the castle was often in the hands of those who did not hold land in the county. Thomas Papworth, constable of Windsor from 14 December to 18 January 1273, was a clerk from Cambridgeshire. Geoffrey de Pitchford's successor John de London, constable from 1298 to 1305, did hold land in Berkshire but his successor, Roger Savage was a Kentish knight. Robert Hausted household knight, appointed on 12 December 1307, was heir to his father's land in Derby, Northants and Leicestershire.<sup>15</sup>

The main reason for the continued survival of the curial constable was the absence of any increase in financial pressure by the exchequer on the constable, equivalent to that upon the sheriffs. So an absentee constable could easily afford to pay for a deputy to take his place. It is quite clear that the custody of a castle was still an attractive proposition in this period. In 1289 Robert de Creuker agreed to quit claim to the king the manor of Saham in return for the grant of Beeston castle for life. He received £100 a year for its custody plus the issues of the king's mills and bridges of Chester.<sup>16</sup>

The position and function of the castles explains why some had constables who were local men and others did not. For instance there was a great contrast between the function and importance of the castles of Marlborough (Wiltshire) and Nottingham. Nottingham was a large castle and a major administrative centre. It was the only royal castle in the county. Perched high upon the rock above the Trent, its strategic position made it the major fortress of the

---

1302-7, 391

<sup>15</sup> *CIPM*, iii, no. 475; iv, no. 328; *G.E.C* xii, part ii, 91; *CCR* 1272-9, 98; *CCR* 1296-1301, 388; Moor, *Knights*, i, 128; ii, 203; Bond, 'Constables of Windsor', 226-40

<sup>16</sup> Bond 'Constables of Windsor', 240-1; *CFR* 1272-1307, 115; *CPR* 1281-92, 328

Midlands. Earlier in the thirteenth century, during the baronial troubles of John's reign, it had been the main centre of royal administration north of the Trent. In Edward I's reign it was important as a stronghold. It was used as a place to keep prisoners, especially Scottish prisoners or rebels, during the conflict with Scotland.<sup>17</sup>

As an important administrative centre and stronghold its constables were men of some standing with the king and who had a fair amount of administrative experience. Tibetot had been a staunch supporter of Prince Edward during the civil war of the 1260s. He was involved in the attempt to rescue Edward from Wallingford castle in July 1264. After the civil war he remained a close associate of the Prince. He went on crusade with him in 1270. He also had considerable experience of both defending and administering castles before he became constable of Nottingham. After the king's defeat at Lewes he and others held Bristol for the crown. They were forced to surrender Bristol to de Montfort but they retired to Salisbury castle which they held for the king. He was constable of Porchester castle 1265-66. His standing with Edward I and his administrative abilities can be seen from his numerous appointments in the period 1272-1298. He was one of the keepers of the Bishopric of Norwich in 1275.<sup>18</sup>

Clifford was a man of equally high standing and administrative ability. He held a vast amount of land in the form of half the hereditary sheriffdom of Westmorland. He had been appointed captain of the king's garrison for the defense of Cumberland in July 1297; the following month he was named as

---

<sup>17</sup> *KW*, ii, 755; *CDS*, ii, no. 1155

<sup>18</sup> *G.E.C* xii, part ii, 89-93

justice of the forest north of the Trent.<sup>19</sup>

In contrast the castle of Marlborough was of less significance. There were two other major castles in Wiltshire at that time, Old Sarum and Devizes. Both of these castles were more important in the administration of the shire than Marlborough. Old Sarum was under the control of the sheriff and it was probably his administrative headquarters. Devizes was used along with Old Sarum as a local prison. Marlborough was mainly a royal residence during Henry III's reign rather than a fortress. Henry III had spent £2000, a vast amount of money, between 1227 and 1272 upon its buildings. However, most of this expenditure was not upon its fortifications but its apartments, chambers and the chapel of St Nicholas. In Edward I's reign the castle formed part of the dower lands of Eleanor of Provence and then of Queen Margaret. The castle was also involved in the administration of the agricultural lands attached to it for the profit of the Queen.<sup>20</sup>

As the castle of Marlborough was of less importance than Nottingham as a stronghold and an administrative centre its constables were not men of equal prominence and experience. Eustace Hatch, household knight, was a local man. He had very limited administrative experience. He was closely connected to the household of Queen Eleanor and the Countess of Bar. In April 1294 he was appointed to make an extent of the dower assigned to her by Henry, Count of Bar. This was to ensure that it amounted to the value of 15,000 pounds of Tours a year. He was on one commission of oyer and terminer in Oxford in 1282 and he was the custodian of Lulworth manor in Dorset. He had quite extensive military

---

<sup>19</sup> CDS, ii, nos 734, 1011; CPR 1301-7, 49

<sup>20</sup> CPR 1272-81, 71-7; CCR 1301-7, 362; CFR 1272-1307, 191, 145; KW, ii, 735-7

experience serving in Wales in 1283, Gascony in 1294, Flanders in 1297 and Scotland in 1299 but he held no major commands equivalent to those of Clifford and Tibetot. The only other identifiable constable of Marlborough under Edward I was John Bradenham. He was a clerk.<sup>21</sup>

Chester and Berwick were very different to both Marlborough and Nottingham. Lying on the border of Wales and Scotland these castles were involved in the defence of the marches and provided a launching point for a campaign into hostile territory. Under these circumstances the men appointed to the border castles needed to have military skills and preferably experience of the newly conquered areas.<sup>22</sup>

Household knights were occasionally selected as the custodian of a private castle if the owner was dead and the heir was unable to take seisin of it immediately. For example, Osbert de Spaldington was constable of Wark castle in Northumberland in 1297. This was because its owner Robert de Ros had fancied himself in love with a Scottish lady and had sided with the Scots. When Robert de Ros died his lands were in the king's hands. Osbert as sheriff of Berwick held the castle until the heir's brother could do fealty for the lands and the castle.<sup>23</sup>

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries English castles were used by the Normans as a means of controlling a potentially hostile country. The constable of a castle was primarily a military commander in charge of a garrison. By the time of Edward I's reign

---

<sup>21</sup> *CPR 1281-92*, 44, 374; *CPR 1292-1301*, 65, 67, 87, 456; *CFR 1272-1307*, 105; E101/3/13; E101/3/21; E101/4/1

<sup>22</sup> See chapter 7

<sup>23</sup> *Rot. Scot.*, 1, 23, 31; *CPR 1292-1301*, 231; *CDS ii*, p 225; *Prestwich, Edward 1*, 471

this had changed. Most castles in England had only a small standing force; guard service due from the surrounding countryside had mainly been commuted and the men were paid soldiers. At Nottingham castle, Robert Tibetot had a garrison consisting of one constable and eight sergeants in 1297. Even at a border castle such as Montgomery in 1275-6 the garrison consisted of only twelve men.<sup>24</sup>

However, the constable had not become a 'mere bailiff' as Young suggested. He was clearly less of a military commander in the thirteenth century than he had been in the eleventh, but his military role could still be important in a political crisis. During the civil war of the 1260s castles such as Pevensey often acted as bastions of the king's loyalty against the rebel forces controlling the surrounding countryside. The fear of an outbreak of a new civil war during the crisis of 1297 led to a number of major castles being placed on a general alert. An order issued in September 1297 urged the household knights holding Gloucester, Corfe, Porchester, Montgomery, St Briavels and Pevensey to ensure that the castles were safely guarded against the king's enemies. A separate order was issued to Robert Tibetot and his wife ordering them to expand the garrison and to ensure that the castle was well provisioned.<sup>25</sup> Their failure to take prompt action led to the king sending the sheriff of Nottingham to oversee the operation.<sup>26</sup>

During Edward I's reign the constables of the castles on the

---

<sup>24</sup> C62/52, m 2; *CCR 1296-1302*, 59, 61

<sup>25</sup> *CCR 1296-1302*, 59, 61, 131

<sup>26</sup> It was not unusual for a sheriff to be used in this way. In 1294-5 Richard Ashton, sheriff of Southampton, was overseeing the work at Carisbrooke castle, in spite of the fact that there was a separate warden of the castle and the island. In 1294-5 £40 11s 11d was spent on improving the defenses and increasing the stores of the castle. A large number of quarrels were bought, plus 80 tiles for the furnace, 172 quarters of charcoal and 250 saplings to improve the towers battlements. Such measures were of course due to the growing threat from the French; E372/147



Welsh and Scottish borders retained a distinctly military role. As discussed above, the castles of Berwick, Chester and Montgomery were vital in the defense of the marches and as the launch pads for a campaign. Even castles further inland appear to have needed to protect themselves from attacks by the Welsh. For instance in 1299 John Botetourt, the constable of St Briavels, received an allowance for expenses caused by a recent invasion by the Welsh.<sup>27</sup>

During the conflict with France the castles on the south coast were placed on alert. Richard de Boys, who was constable of Corfe castle, built up the military supplies of the castle against a possible French attack. In October 1293 John Botetourt, keeper of the forest of Dean, was ordered to prepare 6,000 quarrels, 3,000 of which had to be for two foot cross bows while the remainder had to be suitable for one foot crossbows. These had to be delivered to Richard de Boys at Corfe.<sup>28</sup>

Nor was it unknown for a constable of a castle to take military action to enforce a decision. For instance Philip Darcy was constable of Durham during Anthony Bek's dispute with Richard Hoton, Prior of Durham. In 1300 the group of monks who supported Bek asked the Bishop to name a new Prior. Bek appointed Henry de Luceby prior of Holy Island. To enforce this decision, Darcy, with a contingent of 300 men, attacked the priory. On 24 August, the Prior was taken and incarcerated in the castle where he was 'persuaded' to resign his position.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> *List of Welsh Entries in the Memoranda Rolls 1282-1343*, ed. N.B. Fryde (Cardiff, 1974), 17

<sup>28</sup> Bond, 'Constables of Windsor', 230, 232; *CCR 1288-96*, 303; These measures were part of the coastal defense system set up in 1294-5. Areas of the south and east coast were divided into military defense zones and placed under the command of a special custodian. See Freeman, 'A Moat defensive; The Coast Defense Scheme of 1295', 446

<sup>29</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, 543; Durham Dean and Chapter Muniments, Loc 7, 14

The constable was also responsible for seeing that the castle was well supplied with victuals. The importance of this varied with the differing military significance of the castle. Obviously, the provision of victuals in Chester or Berwick on the eve of a campaign was a much more important task than providing for a few sergeants at Nottingham. The importance of ensuring that castles were well stocked increased when a crisis threatened, as in 1297. Hence the king's concern when no action was taken at Nottingham to improve their stores.<sup>30</sup>

When the king visited a town he would sometimes stay at the castle. On occasion the constable would make preparations for his visit. For instance in 1275 Guncelin de Badlesmere was ordered to place 20 tuns of wine in the castle of Chester and another 20 in the town in preparation for the arrival of Edward 1 and his household.<sup>31</sup>

As constable a household knight was responsible for the maintenance of castle buildings and the hunting lodges and manor houses that were attached to the castle. The scale of the building works varied. For instance, little building work was done at Beeston castle until 1303-4, when Edward of Carnarvon was earl of Chester. Prior to that, in spite of the dilapidated state of its defenses, no more than £5 a year was spent on building work by the constable Robert de Creuker. After 1303-4 the castle was refurbished, the towers of the inner bailey were heightened and a large stone wall was built along the ditch.

In contrast Richard de Boys' tenure at Corfe saw three major building projects from 1280 to 1294. The period 1280-5 saw a programme to complete the work started by Henry III on the outer

---

<sup>30</sup> CCR 1296-1302, 59, 61

<sup>31</sup> CCR 1272-9, 196

bailey. This involved work on its outer gateway, the chambers and possibly four of its towers, known as 'Butavant', 'Cockayne' 'Plenty' and 'Sauveray'. The second major work scheme was in 1290-3 and involved the rebuilding of two chambers, while the third project, which ran between May 1293 and January 1294 was an operation to raise the castle's keep.<sup>32</sup>

The type of building work carried out varied depending upon the situation and function of the castle but with the exception of castles on the Scottish and Welsh border most of the work undertaken was designed to improve their domestic amenities.<sup>33</sup> The work carried out at Marlborough under Eustace Hatch was mainly concerned with the improvement of the castle's great hall, chamber and residential quarters. Similarly, at Colchester in 1275-6, Thomas de Sandwich received 103s 4d for repairs to the great hall, the pantry and the cellars. A further 64s 2d covered work done in the kitchen.<sup>34</sup>

The constable was also responsible for the maintenance of the mills, fisheries, vineyards and gardens attached to the castle. Grimbold de Pauncefoot, constable of St Briavels in 1283, was ordered to build a mill. In 1301, Eustace Hatch was ordered to repair the sluices of the great slew at Marlborough. The repair work done at Windsor castle in 1287 included work to the bridges, vineyards and gardens.<sup>35</sup>

In some cases the constable of the castle was given a grant of money or wood to pay for the repair work. Elias Hauville received 60 oak trees for repair work at Rockingham castle. Eustace Hatch

---

<sup>32</sup> *KW*, ii, 559, 622, 755

<sup>33</sup> For castles in Scotland and Wales see chapter 7

<sup>34</sup> *KW*, ii, 563; *CCR 1296-1302*, 286, 341; C62/52 m 6

<sup>35</sup> *CCR 1279-88*, 204; *CCR 1296-1301*, 510

was granted 90 oaks from the forest of Savernake for renovation work taking place in the great hall and chamber at Marlborough castle in 1299. Geoffrey de Pitchford was given 265 oaks and 100 pounds for repairs to the castle and tower at Windsor in 1276. Further alterations to the houses at Windsor were ordered in 1287. In 1288 he received eight oaks from Salisbury for this work.

In the case of very minor work the constable was ordered to pay for it out of the farm of the bailwick. In 1283 Grimbald de Pauncefoot paid for the construction of a mill at St Briavels out of the revenue he collected. Eustace Hatch took 10 marks out of his farm to cover the repair to the sluices at Marlborough.<sup>36</sup>

The constable had to account at the exchequer in writing for building work. Richard de Boys' accounts as constable of Corfe reveal the amount of money spent on each building project. For instance the repairs to the outer bailey between 1280-5 amounted to £165 11s 3/4d. The constable's account recorded the building materials purchased for the project and enables its progress to be charted. In the summer of 1280, free stone was bought for the outer bailey and iron hinges and hooks for the gates. Planks were bought for the outer bridge in 1285 plus lead and planks for the towers. Thus the constable was clearly responsible for the purchasing of materials for the work and for paying the wages of the workmen.<sup>37</sup>

However, the constable supervised repairs to his castle only if the work was on a fairly small scale. For large scale enterprises a special keeper of the works would be appointed. The work of heightening the keep at Corfe was done under the supervision of Henry Bindon as keeper of the works and chief

---

<sup>36</sup> Bond, 'Constables of Windsor', 234-5; *CCR* 1272-9, 141, 265, 268; *CCR* 1279-88, 2, 204, 446, 502; *CCR* 1288-96, 241; *CCR* 1296-1302, 286, 510

<sup>37</sup> *KW*, ii, 621

carpenter. At Berwick in 1296 the work was initiated by the king himself who gave the order for ditchers, masons and carpenters to be brought from Northumberland. One chronicler said that the king himself did a little token physical work on the new ditch that was being built by the town. After the king's departure the responsibility for the works did not fall entirely upon the constable, Osbert de Spaldington. The work appears in the account of the treasurer of Scotland, Hugh Cressingham and it was he whom some chroniclers blamed for the work being uncompleted.<sup>38</sup>

Some sheriffs who were custodians of castles used them as a stronghold where prisoners could be kept. Bridgnorth and Shrewsbury were used to hold the prisoners of both Shropshire and Staffordshire during Knoville's tenure in office. Other castles not directly under the control of the sheriff were used as supplementary royal prisons. There were two prisons in Nottingham, one in the town under the control of the sheriff and one in the castle under the control of the constable. The same situation existed at Windsor after the building of a new prison in the town in the 1260s and 1270s.<sup>39</sup>

The constables were responsible for the prisoners. Prisoners had to be transferred to the care of the new constable when the castle was reassigned. When Robert Hausted the younger became constable of Windsor in 1308 he refused to take over the current prisoners from the last constable Roger Savage. He quickly received an order from the king commanding him to assume responsibility for them without delay. The escape of a prisoner could have serious

---

<sup>38</sup> *KW*, ii, 563; *Rishanger*, 375

<sup>39</sup> Orders for the repair of the goal in Staffordshire were issued in 1272. Bridgnorth was no longer used in the later years of the reign because the barbiacan had collapsed and prisoners had to be kept in the keep. R.B. Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England*, (Cambridge, 1968), 62, 64, 74-5

consequences for a custodian of the castle. He could be dismissed or even imprisoned and ransomed. Bogo de Knoville received a pardon for the prisoners he had allowed to escape while he was sheriff of Staffordshire and Shrewsbury but Amaury St Amand, constable of Oxford, was imprisoned in the Tower in 1305. He was brought before the king's bench concerning a riot which had taken place in Oxford and the escape of some prisoners.<sup>40</sup>

The type of prisoner under the care of the constable varied considerably. If the castle was connected to a royal forest such as Rockingham or St Briavels then it was a natural place for those who had infringed the forest law to be held. Elias Hauville, keeper of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford was ordered to deliver to twelve mainpainors, John de Mese and others imprisoned at Rockingham. They had been arrested for hunting venison in the forest in 1291.<sup>41</sup>

Castles in the heart of England well away from the Scottish border and potential besieging forces were an ideal place to keep Scottish prisoners. Walter de Beauchamp, constable of Gloucester received three prisoners and their warders after the battle of Dunbar. In 1300 Robert Clifford as constable of Nottingham was ordered to receive William Chartres, a Scottish rebel.<sup>42</sup>

A castle was also a useful place to keep potentially valuable hostages. Eleanor, daughter of Simon de Montfort and prospective bride of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd Prince of Wales, was kept within the safety of Windsor castle under the watchful eye of Geoffrey de Pitchford during the first Welsh war.

---

<sup>40</sup> Bond, 'Constables of Windsor', 233; Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England*, 232; *CPR 1272-81*, 442; *Memoranda de Parlamento 1305*, ed. F.W. Maitland (Rolls Series, 1893), lxxviii, 453

<sup>41</sup> *CCR 1288-96*, 211

<sup>42</sup> *CDS*, ii, nos 938, 1155

It was often the duty of the constable to ensure the safe transfer of a prisoner from one place to another. For example in 1274 Geoffrey de Pitchford was ordered to convey Ralph de Adam personally from Windsor to the castle of Northampton. Of course this would depend upon the importance of the prisoner. In many cases the constable must have delegated this task to a subordinate. The constable was also responsible for the admittance of visitors to see his prisoners. For instance Geoffrey de Pitchford was ordered by the king to permit the envoys of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd, Prince of Wales, to see his future bride Eleanor.<sup>43</sup>

Not all constables had the responsibility of guarding prisoners in their castles. Marlborough castle was used as a prison at the beginning of Edward I's reign but it fell into disuse in later years. This role appears to have been taken on by the other two major castles in Wiltshire, Old Sarum and Devizes.<sup>44</sup>

An important role of the constables was the collection of revenue from the royal demesne in the area under their control. The exact scale of the land under the control of the constable varied from castle to castle. Geoffrey de Pitchford as constable of Windsor was in charge of the town and forest of Windsor and the manors of Cookham Bray and Kempston. Thomas de Sandwich as constable of Colchester held the hundred of Tenringg. The area of land could easily change during their tenure in office if the king decided to grant a section of the land to someone else. Cookham and Bray were no longer under the jurisdiction of Geoffrey de Pitchford after 1281 because the king had made them part of the Queen of England's dowry.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> CCR 1272-9, 105; CFR 1272-1307, 322, 502

<sup>44</sup> Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England*, 84

<sup>45</sup> Bond, 'Constables of Windsor', 233

After the revenue had been collected the constable had to account for it at the exchequer twice a year, either in person or by proxy. William Russel, warden of the Isle of Wight from 1299 to 1307, was also constable of Carisbrooke. Russel collected a varying amount of income from sources such as the the sale of produce from the lands attached to the castle itself. In 1299-1300 his account reveals that he collected 65s 8d from the sale of hay and fruits from the castle's orchard. The income from such sales fluctuated; 23s in 1301, 22s 4d in 1302, 21s 7d 1303, 48s 7d in 1304 and 33s 4d in 1305-6.<sup>46</sup>

Out of the revenue collected expenses such as the wages of the workmen employed at the castle and other members of staff had to be met. In 1301 money had to be found for the purchase of lathes, wood and nails for work to the windows in the hall, chamber and other areas of the castle. Such expenses usually amounted to more than the sale of produce from the castle. In 1299-1300 expenses amounted to 75s 6d, 65s 5d in 1301 and £4 16s 5d in 1305-6. Money was allocated from the profits of the court attached to the castle to counterbalance this deficit.<sup>47</sup> In 1299-1300 profits of the court amounted to £30 19s 7d; of this £4 13s 10d was allocated to meet the expenses of the castle. In 1301 53s 7d was taken from the court's profit to balance the account; 63s 1d was taken in 1305-6.<sup>48</sup>

The farm of a castle was often much higher. Bogo de Knoville as constable of the border castle of Oswestry accounted for £112 19s 4d in 1275-6. This included 26s from the hamlet of Sheldene, £15 5s 6d from the manor of Izile and 100s 19d in rent from other

---

<sup>46</sup> E372/147; SC6/984/21; SC6/985/2; SC6/985/4

<sup>47</sup> In earlier years money had been allocated from the manor of Bowcombe to cover expenses relating to the castle. £10 17s was sent in 1277-8, £40 in 1294-5 and £30 in 1295-6. SC6/984/6; E372/147

<sup>48</sup> E372/147; SC6/985/4; SC6/985/8



lands. The farm of the local mills amounted to £24. The burgess rendered £12 3s. The sale of hay and pasture brought in 13s and the profits of the local court £12 5s 6d.<sup>49</sup>

Leaving aside those constables who were the keeper of a major royal forest, others such as Geoffrey de Pitchford and Walter de Beauchamp were in charge of the wood and parks attached to the castle. As constable of Windsor, Geoffrey de Pitchford was responsible for the delivery of wood and animals to those who had had such gifts bestowed upon them by the king. Nor was the delivery of these gifts always efficient. The most notorious case was that of the Abbot of Westminster. He was supposed to receive eight bucks a year from the forest of Windsor. There is an order from the king dated 1294 informing Pitchford that the Abbot was owed 24 bucks because he had not received the correct number each year during the period 1290-4. The king had clearly ordered Pitchford to make good the deficiency but only twelve bucks had so far been delivered. In spite of the king's orders the problems persisted and Pitchford was still fourteen bucks in arrears in 1296.<sup>50</sup>

The constable was also responsible for the felling of trees upon the king's order. For instance in 1297 Walter de Beauchamp, constable of Gloucester, was ordered to have 30 oak stumps felled in the wood of the Barton near Gloucester. It was the duty of the constable to care for the animals within the king's parks and forests. Geoffrey de Pitchford was ordered by the king to ensure that hay and oats were provided for the winter season for the king's deer at Windsor and Kenyton. Until they passed into the care of John de Merk, Pitchford was also responsible for the king's mews

---

<sup>49</sup> See enrolled account for Staffordshire and Shropshire E372/119

<sup>50</sup> *CCR 1279-88*, 392, 498; *CCR 1288-96*, 19, 422, 485

at Windsor.<sup>51</sup>

Finally, as constable of a castle a household knight would often find himself given miscellaneous tasks to do in the surrounding area. Geoffrey de Pitchford was a witness to the charter founding the borough of New Windsor in 1277. Under the king's orders he would take into his hands the lands of the recently deceased. In 1274 Geoffrey de Pitchford was ordered to deliver to the escheator south of the Trent the manors which had belonged to the king's brother and his wife Aveline because the latter had just died. Similarly, Walter de Beauchamp was appointed to a number of oyer and terminer commissions in Gloucester, probably because he was constable of Gloucester.<sup>52</sup>

It is unlikely that as constable a household knight would have performed all of the above tasks in person. Many such as Robert FitzJohn had deputy constables. Few spent any great length of time at their castles during their tenure in office. The wage accounts for those attending the king's court in 1283-4 reveal that Geoffrey de Pitchford was in court for most of the time. He received 2s per day for being in attendance upon the king from 21 November to 31 December. He seems to have remained in court until the following September.<sup>53</sup>

Others such as John Botetourt, Elias Hauville, and Adam de Welles who were constables because they were keepers of a major forest area appear, as discussed earlier, to have spent little time at their castles.<sup>54</sup> Walter de Beauchamp was appointed constable of Gloucester in 1291. He was steward of the king's household. This

---

<sup>51</sup> CCR 1296-1302, 50; Byerly, *Records 1285-6*, p xxix

<sup>52</sup> Bond, 'Constables of Windsor', 236-7; CFR 1272-1307, 38; CPR 1281-92, 519

<sup>53</sup> E101/4/8; C62/51 m 9

<sup>54</sup> See chapter 4

was a post which required him to spend nearly all his time at court: Richard de Boys, constable of Corfe, was marshal of the household. His position meant that he had to be a regular attender at the king's court; he was with the king in Gascony in 1286-9. This suggests that his visits to Corfe must have been quite infrequent. A great deal of the work at Nottingham must have been done by a deputy because Robert Clifford spent most of his time in Scotland in the early 1300s.<sup>55</sup>

Not all household knights who were constables were as preoccupied as Clifford, Beauchamp and Boys. Eustace Hatch as discussed earlier had fewer administrative responsibilities so he may have spent time at Marlborough. However, the war in Scotland meant that he had to spend a considerable amount of time on campaign from 1300 to 1306. He was in Scotland in December 1299, the summer of 1300 and the summers of 1303 and 1304. Robert FitzPayn may have spent some time at Corfe after he was appointed in 1305. FitzPayn was an important itinerant justice but in the years following his appointment many of the commissions appear to have been in Somerset or Dorset.<sup>56</sup>

Those knights who were constables of castles on the Welsh or Scottish borders did stay at the castle during their tenure in office. Osbert de Spaldington was constable of Berwick in 1296-7. It seems that he spent most of that year in Scotland. On 13 September 1296 he received a protection to stay in Scotland for a year. This was renewed on 13 December 1296. He was still in Scotland in May 1297, issuing orders to the men going to Flanders with the king.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> See chapter 2

<sup>56</sup> CDS, ii, no. 302; *Liber Quot*, 196; *Cal Chanc Warr*, 175, 226; *CPR 1301-7*, 349, 544

<sup>57</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, 200, 231, 249

Household knights played a more significant role as the guardians of royal castles than they did in other areas of local administration. More knights were appointed as constables of castles than the total number who were employed as sheriffs and forest wardens. The reasons for this were twofold. Firstly the constables of royal castles were not subjected to the same amount of financial pressure as the sheriffs. Therefore the appointment of a *curial* was still viable. The knights did not have to be resident during their tenure in office so even the steward of the household could hold such an office.

Secondly, many of the castles were still seen in the thirteenth century as royal military strongholds as well as administrative centres. While England enjoyed peace and domestic harmony the constables were occupied with various administrative duties but during a crisis the castles might have to be defended and secured. This made the appointment of household knights with dual military and administrative experience an attractive proposition. A number of knights were appointed to castles in the region where they had lands. However, this was only a small proportion compared with the number of knights who held the office of sheriff in their home counties. This suggests that their household connection was the crucial element in their appointment as constables. It also indicates that the king saw his household knights primarily as warriors. Prominent local men could replace *curiales* as sheriffs but the royal castles had to be held by knights whose military abilities could be relied upon to guard the stronghold during a crisis. Edward would not have forgotten the importance of castles in the turmoil of the 1260s.