**Girard d'Athée and the Men from the Touraine**

Their Roles under King John

Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 proscribes a group of men who are never again to hold office in England. They are described as Girard d'Athée's relatives (*parentes*), and although some of their names appear, no reasons are given for their inclusion in the clause. This thesis traces the lives of Girard d'Athée and his group, from their origins in the Touraine, through their arrival in England, through their responsibilities and influence under John, concluding with a brief resumé of their careers under Henry III. It also analyses the reasons for the inclusion of Clause 50 in the 1215 version of Magna Carta. Were the men proscribed because of their foreign birth or because they abused their positions as servants of the king? Did the barons fear their military might, or merely object to their misdemeanours? Did the established baronage and zealous *parvenus* covet the rewards bestowed on Athée and his clan or were they simply jealous of the increasingly close friendship these men were forging with John? Or was the clause nothing more than the result of a personal vendetta against members of the clan? By comparing and contrasting the careers of the men from the Touraine with that of another contemporary of theirs from the same area, Peter de Maulay, who was not proscribed in Clause 50, a clear appreciation of their value to the king and country can be determined. A balanced judgement suggests that their actions justified the king's confidence in them, and that they did not deserve the censure and suspicion of the chroniclers, some influential members of the baronage, and several modern historians.
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**Part One:**

**Girard d'Athée and the Men from the Touraine**

Chapter 1: Introduction

In January 1215 a group of northern rebels ('the Northerners') complained to King John at his court that they felt they were not sharing in the profits of government, that they were not receiving grants of land or offices, and that privileges were held from them, or if granted, they had to pay too high a price.[[1]](#footnote-1) On 5 May the barons formally defied King John and on 17 May the Londoners let the rebels into the city, thus handing to them their financial resources and fortifications. The Continuator of Newburgh stated that the barons were fighting for the good customs of the realm which had been perverted by the obstinacy of the king and the cruelty of wrong-headed foreigners.[[2]](#footnote-2) It was these loyal and skilful foreigners in command of the royal castles of Nottingham, Bristol, Hereford, Gloucester and Corfe, together with their associated provincial treasuries and stores of armaments and supplies, who gave John the confidence and power to defy the malcontents. By 27 May a truce had been called and on 10 June it was extended when John agreed to accept the Articles of the Barons as a basis for further negotiations - its chapters becoming the foundation upon which Magna Carta was built. Sometime between 15 and 24 June the terms were settled and at Runnymede John confirmed the final draft of what later became known as Magna Carta 1215. [[3]](#footnote-3)

Although Magna Carta 1215 says very little about the personnel of John's government, Clause 50 (which was based on chapter 40 of the Articles) does proscribe by name a group of men who originated from the Touraine. Girard d'Athée, the lynchpin of the clause, is first found serving Richard, but on his death moved seemlessly to serve John first in France and then in England. For over ten years, he assisted the king, carrying out his orders as his military commander, seneschal, sheriff, constable, bailiff and custodian, in the course of which he won his friendship and appreciation and the enmity of certain barons. Athée introduced into England a group of men from the Touraine who were also included in Clause 50, namely Engelard de Cigogny, Andrew, Peter and Guy de Chanceaux, Philip Mark, Geoffrey de Martigny, and some other less eminent relatives and followers. Like Athée, these men served John with total loyalty, as his castellans and sheriffs and military leaders. According to Powicke these men were the main source of his strength, but in turn they were one of the chief reasons for his failure to secure the support of the king's subjects.[[4]](#footnote-4) They gained the king's approval rather than his friendship, but at the same time they too earned the distrust, if not hatred, of some influential barons who insisted that they be removed from office. The baronial demands were incorporated into Magna Carta 1215 as Clause 50 - a clause which harked back to the past, including the *parentes* of Athée, but which hoped to protect the future by including the *sequela* of all those cited in the writ. Despite their proscription, most of these men from the Touraine continued to serve John until the end of his reign, and were taken on by the minority government of Henry III, which recognised their abilities rather than their failings. Clauses 50 and 51 were dropped from Magna Carta 1216 and subsequent reissues.

Girard d'Athée earned the criticism of the chroniclers on both sides of the Channel, who despite his valour and unwavering loyalty judged him harshly, either because of what they perceived he had done, or because he was swept along in their general condemnation of John’s reign. In France the chroniclers viewed him as a domestic enemy, a man who ravaged his own homeland. In England, Wendover, and in particular Matthew Paris, were so biased against Athée and his clan that they made their version of Clause 50 (and 51) even more far reaching than the clause in the charter itself, stating that the men were to be banished from the kingdom, rather than just from office. Most modern historians have taken the stance that Athée and his men had few redeeming features and represented the worst of John's government. Hollister wrote that 'King John went out of his way to subordinate even the greatest of barons to ruthless mercenary captains of lowly origin such as Athée', and Vincent stated that 'the men were associated in both France and England with the worst excesses of mercenary warfare'.[[5]](#footnote-5) An accurate appraisal of their roles has proved difficult as there is only a limited range of evidence. Even Vincent with his access to many unusual French sources is concerned that the evidence on the aliens 'is negligible for their family background and landed holdings', and there is a similar lack of information on their responsibilities and roles in France.[[6]](#footnote-6) After they came to England, the French documents and chronicles grow almost silent and historians have been forced to rely on the brief references in the English chronicles to the men by name, or more usually to the groups of foreigners who held power in England in John and Henry's reign. Convinced that the group could only have been proscribed because of their evil deeds, they have taken Matthew Paris's usually reliable (but sometimes biased) reporting at face value, and have failed to refer back to Chapter 40 of the Articles of Barons and Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 itself to ascertain the true position - Vincent, Holden and Holt to name a few, have all stated that Magna Carta insisted that the men be removed from the kingdom, and even Painter included Athée in the list even though he had not been in power for several years and was almost certainly dead.[[7]](#footnote-7) In fact Clause 50 states merely that *Nos amovebimus* *penitus de balliis parentes Gerardi de Athyes, quod decetero nullam habeant balliam in Anglia*. Likewise they have resorted to the other main source of information on these men, *The Pleas of the Crown in Gloucester*, and have picked out only those cases which shed a negative light on the men from the Touraine.[[8]](#footnote-8) They have failed to take into consideration the fact that the men were following John's orders, and that the itinerant justices were only inquiring into the cases in Gloucester which had not been heard since John's reign, and it is therefore not surprising that Athée, Engelard and Guy de Chanceaux feature prominently because it was they who had held authority in that county at that time. There are however many royal writs and charters which if carefully studied are able to provide reliable information on the men from the Touraine and their responsibilities during the turbulent years of John's reign. They clarify the precise names of those intended to be proscribed, as well as considerable detail on their backgrounds and actions. They also shed light on why these particular men were proscribed - indicating more clearly whether the barons were demonstrating their power over the king by demanding the removal of his loyal and efficient servants, whether they were acting altruistically by saving their country from the tentacles of cruel and ruthless foreigners, or indeed whether the clause should simply be interpreted as a vendetta by certain individual barons who wished to further their own personal interests. By collating the information from the various sources and then contrasting the careers and reputations of Athée's clan with that of another contemporary from the Touraine, Peter de Maulay, who was not proscribed in Clause 50, the depth of resentment against this particular group of men from the Touraine can be accurately determined. A balanced judgment can then be made on whether the actions of these men from the Touraine justified the king's confidence in them, or whether they deserved the censure and suspicion of the English baronage and some modern historians.

Chapter 2: Girard d'Athée and his Role in France

Although originally thought to have come from Poitou, it is now generally acknowledged that Girard d’Athée came from the Touraine, that is from Athée which is situated on the left bank of the Cher, 6 kilometres from Bléré and 21 from Tours.[[9]](#footnote-9) He was probably born between 1150 and 1160 and by December 1205 was married with at least two sons, as letters of safe conduct were granted then to ‘Lue, wife of Girard d’Athée, and her sons for coming and staying in England’.[[10]](#footnote-10) By September 1207, just one son remained as the Master of the Templars was asked to escort the wife of Athée and son to the coast.[[11]](#footnote-11) Chroniclers and historians have stated that he was of low birth - William Le Breton called him ‘ a serf born of a mother and father who were serfs’ and Maitland believed that 'some now forgotten exploits of border warfare may have raised this base-born man above his fellow-serfs'.[[12]](#footnote-12) In fact the Athée family held land in the parish of Athée, for in 1305 a title of acquisition made by the religious of the Carthusians of Liget mentions land near the road which runs from Amboise to St Martin le Beau, which *attenant à la saulaye de Girard d’Athée.*[[13]](#footnote-13) Athée may even have been a property owner near Tours as he granted a house and land to the cathedral church of St Maurice before he died, and in 1217 Philip Augustus handed to Robert d’Orleans vines and other goods *qui étaient échus dans la chatellenie de Tours à la veuve de Girard d’Athee*.[[14]](#footnote-14) It is unclear whether his lands were inherited or gained, but as the parish of Athée dates back to the twelfth or thirteenth century it is quite likely that it belonged to his family, and as was the custom in those days, he had taken his name from his place of birth, as the *Philippide* claims.[[15]](#footnote-15) He was more likely to have been a vassal rather than a serf - William le Breton describes him as being brought up in the area and being subservient to Sulplice Amboise, lord of the nearby chateau of Amboise.[[16]](#footnote-16) Alternatively he may have been a subtenant of the abbey of St Julien at Tours, patron of the churches of Athée and nearby Cigogny.[[17]](#footnote-17) Although he was described by Le Breton as uncivilised (*ferus*), by 1201 he had already gained the trappings of power and influence as he was not only witnessing and passing judgments side by side with the French nobility - men who would have been unwilling to submit to the decisions of a 'serf' - but he was also important and ambitious enough to have his own heraldic emblem which he based on that of the king (namely a beast *contrepassante qui retourne sa tete*) which he placed next to the seal of the pre-eminent magnate of Anjou, William des Roches.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Because of the lack of French sources, little is known of Athée’s early career except that he was important enough under Richard to witness (with Robert de Turnham, Peter des Roches, William de Mauleon, and other magnates) a charter on 12 August 1198 which repeated the terms of a donation made to Marmoutier a year earlier.[[19]](#footnote-19) On Richard’s death in April 1199, Athée moved seamlessly to serve Richard’s chosen successor, John, rather than joining the barons of his native area of Anjou, Maine and Touraine, who, led by William des Roches, had declared for Arthur. During that year, according to Chalmel, John gave control of the castle of Chinon to Athée ‘who defended it feebly, because Arthur was able to take it after only a few days’.[[20]](#footnote-20) The *Chronicon Turonense Magnum*, however, which is the only other main chronicle to write of Chinon at this time, indicates that Athée was with Robert de Turnham at this stage and the two men were responsible for stocking the castle (along with Loches and others belonging to the king), thus helping to secure it for the new king.[[21]](#footnote-21) The date in the *Chronicon* is given as 1200 but Salmon was confident that this was an error and it should be dated to immediately after the death of Richard, perhaps even connected to John’s visit to Chinon on 14 April 1199 (it was certainly before July 1199 when Aymery de Thouars became seneschal). Turnham, as seneschal of Anjou, was in charge and responsible for the handing over of Chinon castle together with its treasure to John, but Athée was given useful experience under him. However this did not last for long as within a few days of John's departure for England on 27 May, Turnham also left France, as just after the coronation John was in Northampton where he witnessed a final concord between Robert de Turnham and his wife and the monks of Meaux.[[22]](#footnote-22)

In July 1199 Thouars replaced Turnham as seneschal of Anjou, but although Turnham technically held no seneschalship in France (he was not formally made seneschal of Poitou until 29 October 1201), he appears to have retained some authority and Athée continued to act under him. In March 1201 Athée and Jean de Lemozine acted as judges in place of Turnham in a case held at Loches - *qui vicem Roberti de Ternebau, tunc temporis senescalli agebant*.[[23]](#footnote-23) In the presence of William d’Azay, provost of Loches, they ruled on a dispute between Tancrède de Plessis and the monks of Villeloin, over certain rights over the woods of Chédon. It was an important case and showed Athée's growing expertise and influence - the case was held in front of members of the French nobility, including Peter d'Achard and the lords of Perenai and Azay le Rideau (who reappear in 1213 as knights bannerets of Touraine), and the judgment was ratified by William des Roches, then hereditary seneschal of Anjou, Maine and the Touraine, and sealed with his seal and that of Girard d’Athée. These judicial responsibilities were not the only ones taken on by Athée at this time – a thirteenth-century inquest mentions Master Philip, Geoffrey or Hugh d'Achard, Girard d'Athée and Geoffrey de Celle being responsible for the collection of the rents and dues from the castle built by Richard at St-Remy de la Haye (which dates this to before the summer of 1201, at which stage Celle was dead).[[24]](#footnote-24)

Although John had still not given Athée a position of his own, he placed increasing faith in him in the first few years of his reign. In June 1202 he reinforced Athée's position at Loches by sending Roger de Salceto, Pagan de Rochefort and William l'Etang to help him with the defence of the castle. They were to act as his associates and defer to him - John stressed that nobody was to be allowed into the castle whom they did not trust and that there was to be no conference with the enemy unless at least two out of the three of them were present, and one of these should always be Athée.[[25]](#footnote-25)

In July 1202 when the queen mother was besieged at Mirebeau by Arthur along with 200 knights and the Lusignans, John rushed to the castle together with troops under the seneschal William des Roches. They forced their way in and took command of the castle, slaying or capturing all those present – 'God be praised for our happy success'.[[26]](#footnote-26) Although Athée is not specifically mentioned as being present, shortly afterwards, as if in recognition of some help Athée had given but which has not survived in the records, he had his powers extended - on 5 August, John ordered Roches to give him the land of William de Pressigny to guard until the submission of his rebel vassal, and to raze his fortresses of St Maure and Pressigny so that they would not be a threat. He was also to seize the rebels wherever he found them and to retain them and ransom them for the benefit of the king and seneschal – he himself was not yet benefitting from these important perks of office.[[27]](#footnote-27)

Although William des Roches with his troops had helped save the day at Mirebeau, soon John was forced to marginalise him when he (and Aymery de Thouars) fled to Philip Augustus because they felt that John had not honoured his promise to let them have a say in the fate of the prisoners, many of whom were well known to them. The Continuator of the Annals of St Aubin was quite clear that Roches started war because *rex Johannes ei promiserat se de Arturo liberando suam facere voluntatem et consilium et quia rex noluit*.[[28]](#footnote-28) By 18 August Roches' castles were being seized and important nobles from the Touraine, such as William de Pressigny who had supported William des Roches after Mirebeau, were being persuaded to come over to John, thus correcting those things which they had begun against the king 'not by felony but by thoughtlessness'.[[29]](#footnote-29) Roches had been John's ace card and his support would have secured Anjou for the king, but John had failed to observe the conventions of war and the personal agreement made with his seneschal – William des Roches *noverit insidias et perfida corda Johannis*.[[30]](#footnote-30) In one single act John lost the support of the most powerful baron in Anjou as well as the cooperation of powerful magnates like Mayenne, Thouars and Craon whose allegiance remained with Roches. Roches had been seneschal since December 1199 and hereditary seneschal of the three areas of Anjou, Maine and Touraine since 24 June 1200 and his removal left a great void, especially as he was considered to be the most important seneschal in the area - in February 1202 John specifically referred to him as the *capitalem senescallum nostrum Andegaviae*.[[31]](#footnote-31) Thus when the relationship between Roches and John foundered, and the novel experiment of a triple seneschalship was shown to be a failure, John had to find quickly a new way of exerting his control in the province. It was important for him to make the correct decision this time - he had already had three seneschals in Anjou since he came to the throne only three years earlier.

Since he became king John had found it difficult to fill his posts of seneschal successfully, either because of bad luck or poor judgement. Initially he had retained Richard's seneschals but within a year of his accession William FitzRalph and Peter de Bertin had died, and Turnham had asked to be relieved of his duties. In Anjou, John had in turn promoted two magnates, but both Thouars and Roches had shown their treachery – as primary magnates they had become used to holding power in their province and resented having to take orders from the king. In Normandy, after a brief flirtation with Guérin de Glapion, John had also turned to a major magnate in the area, Ralph de Tesson who still held office. In Poitou, John had also relied on a major magnate, Ralph de Mauleon, but he died within a few weeks of taking office, and the king was forced to make a quick replacement, this time turning to Mauleon's deputy Geoffrey de Celle. He was replaced by a safe choice in the autumn of 1201, namely Robert de Turnham who had previously served as seneschal of Anjou. Faced with the treachery of two magnates who had been his seneschal - Thouars and Roches - and with another magnate still in place in Normandy, John decided to implement a novel experiment in Anjou, this time bypassing all the available magnates and settling on a compromise which would ensure that no one man was able to gain excessive control in Anjou, Maine and the Touraine. For the first time he opted to split the seneschalship into two distinct and apparently equal parts, handing the positions to two men of differing characters and backgrounds who would balance each other, thus ensuring that neither acquired so much power that he could consider himself the *capitalem senescallum nostrum Andegaviae*. He now promoted two men who had demonstrated complete loyalty but at the same time had not displayed any long-term ambitions of their own. On 24 August, John granted Girard d'Athée the seneschalship of the 'whole of the Touraine', having been impressed by his actions at Chinon and his military control and administrative ability at Loches. To balance him, a week later he gave Anjou and Maine to Brice the Chamberlain, a man who had served Richard since at least 1194 when he paid the expenses of the king at Rouen, and who had taken on increased responsibilities under John, for example paying troops in Poitou, commanding the castles of Tillières and Pontorson, and just after Mirebeau accompanying the seneschal into Poitou to deal with those who had left through 'foolhardiness'.[[32]](#footnote-32) He had shown himself to be an unobtrusive but obedient, talented and loyal servant with no great aspirations - a man who would not threaten John's position and power but if he did, there would always be the more aggressive Athée in control nearby – a man described by Warren as 'a ruthless adventurer, notorious for his crushing role in the Touraine'.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Although John had been relying increasingly on Athée, he had delayed giving him the promotion which he doubtless sought. He had failed to promote him to La Marche a couple of months earlier when Robert de Turnham ceased to hold it, instead handing it to Brandin on 13 July 1202, along with the castle of Torigni in Normandy free of tallage and returning to him fully the land in La Marche which he had held under Richard.[[34]](#footnote-34) Although Brandin had served both Henry II and Richard he was primarily a *routier* chief, like Algais and Lupescaire. He had briefly been seneschal of Gascony before being put in charge of the garrison of Gournay along with his son. By July 1202 Philip Augustus had flooded its defences and Gournay had fallen, but despite this he was promoted to the seneschalship of La Marche.[[35]](#footnote-35) The ambitious Athée may have felt that he had more right to this seneschalship than a failed *routier* chief, but in the event the decision rested with the king who was still clearly experimenting with his choices of seneschal, and Athée had to wait until August 1202 for his own promotion. Robert de Turnham, who was still John's loyal seneschal in Poitou and had the ear of the king, may have encouraged John to promote Athée to the seneschalship of the Touraine as he would have wanted a strong ally there, especially one who had worked so well with him at Chinon and Loches.[[36]](#footnote-36) It was well worth the wait, however, for Athée as the position of seneschal of the Touraine was a far more desirable one than that of La Marche - at the latter Brandin remained intendent to Turnham, whereas in the Touraine Athée was his own master.

Atheé's seneschalship started well, and in his first few months important nobles continued to revert to John. However problems soon arose at Tours where John's lieutenant, Hamelin de la Roorte, hearing of William des Roches' fall, himself took flight. After marching on Tours and gaining control of it, John left Brandin in charge. Within a day, Philip Augustus had arrived and Brandin, reverting to his mercenary instincts, made an agreement with him which would enable him to leave with his men and booty.[[37]](#footnote-37) It is unclear from the chronicles what role Athée played in the subsequent recovery of the town. William le Breton accused him of being a domestic enemy, a man who was responsible for the pillage of Tours, Amboise and its neighbourhood, and according to Coggeshall the Tourangeaux were so upset by John's actions that they became his mortal enemies. The *Chronicon Turonense Magnum* however is quite clear that it was Algais with his routier band who ravaged the area, and that Athée was not entrusted with the guard of Tours until two days after the original assault.[[38]](#footnote-38) Certainly Algais was flush with booty as on 7 September the bailiffs of Normandy were 'to suffer no evil, molestation or damage to be done to the servant of Martin Algais, carrying the booty of the same Martin into Normandy'.[[39]](#footnote-39) Tours suffered again later that year when Sulpice d’Amboise with a small army advanced on Tours, burned the city and placed his men at the Chateauneuf. Lignim believes that with the greatest diplomacy, Athée, provisioned the castle before leaving it in the able hands of William le Batille whilst he himself departed for Loches so that he would not have to fight in person against Sulpice, his liege lord.[[40]](#footnote-40) Back at Loches, he was involved with the frequent skirmishes which occurred in his area, some of them affecting ecclesiastical properties, for example on 13 February the king ordered Athée to give money to the Carthusians near Loches for the repair of their church.[[41]](#footnote-41) Athée successfully kept control of his area, capturing many of the enemy, and on 4 December he was commanded to send 2,500 pounds angevin to Chinon which he had received from the ransoms of his many prisoners.[[42]](#footnote-42)

In 1203, Athée continued to earn the king's attention and appreciation. When the castle of Gwerche had to be dealt with, John relied heavily on Athée's estimation of the situation. He took his advice (and that of Eschiward de Prouilly) about who should be given control of the castle, and on 23 January 1203 the king ordered them to hand it over to the man they had chosen as constable. Athée had such control of the situation that on 26 January, the king felt confident enough of his safety to stay at Seez for three days. There was some delay in settling on a suitable constable - Athée and Prouilly first had to ensure the fidelity of the new castellan by taking good security, and then to make sure that neither Robert, Count of Seez, nor his wife (who was the first born and heiress of Josbert de la Gwerche) were able to occupy the castle for as long as they remained enemies of the king.[[43]](#footnote-43) Initially, therefore, on 31 March, Athée took on the role himself and the soldiers and custodians of the castle were commanded to hand the castle over to him. In turn he handed it over to his choice of constable, namely Hugh V of Chateaudun, who at one stage had been a prisoner of the king but had been released and had returned to the king’s side.[[44]](#footnote-44) His choice was a clever one, showing not only that the king would be fair to those who returned to him, but, by choosing Hugh who was married to the second daughter of Josbert de la Gwerche, demonstrating that he could if necessary act diplomatically and discretely.[[45]](#footnote-45) Athée had also shown his ability to carefully assess a difficult situation encouraging John not to confiscate the lordship nor its revenues but to place a garrison there in order to stop the legitimate owner from benefiting from the castle - this policy of moderation by John reaped its reward when the following year Count Robert fought for John against Philip Augustus at Rouen.[[46]](#footnote-46)

On 3 April 1203, Arthur of Brittany disappeared in mysterious circumstances but there is no evidence to show that Athée was involved in any way in the crime – indeed on 7 April John was following up correspondence he had had from Athée, who was still addressed as seneschal of Touraine, about the exchange of prisoners (one of whom was William Mark who may have been a relative of Philip Mark), as if nothing untoward had taken place.[[47]](#footnote-47) Some historians believe that when John wrote on 16 April to the bishop of Bordeaux, the seneschals Robert de Turnham (Poitou), Algais (Gascony), and Brice (Anjou) and others saying that John de Valerant (described as a man who was closer to the king than he can say to them) was being sent to them 'who sees those things that are happening around us and will be able to inform you about our state', that he was bringing these important men information on the fate of Arthur. If this is the case, Athée was not party to the details of his disappearance as he was not specifically named in the list of recipients of the writ, although Brice his counterpart was.[[48]](#footnote-48) Soon afterwards, however, around 18 April 1203, John removed Brice from his post as he ceases to be referred to as seneschal - although he had not fallen out of favour with John as that September he was sent to Normandy where he was put in charge of the castles of Mortain and Tinchebray, and was given some of the lands of Guy de Thouars.[[49]](#footnote-49) Fearing repercussions from Arthur's disappearance, John may have wanted a more military and proactive presence in the province, someone who would be a powerful aid to Athée in the Touraine. It would appear that Hubert de Burgh (with the assistance of Philip Oldcotes) had been sent to the area to take over Brice's responsibilities as seneschal as he was given powers in the area, in particular at Chinon – there is no extant writ granting him the position, although a writ addressed to de Burgh and William Butemont dated 5 April orders him to free a prisoner from Chinon if he sees fit.[[50]](#footnote-50) Although the writ of 7 April is the last extant one in which he is given the title of seneschal, Athée however appears to have remained centred at Loches where his military talents were now needed more than ever (he kept guard of the Touraine until 1205).[[51]](#footnote-51) Thus at this difficult time both Athée and de Burgh were acting as John's main seneschal's but were not addressed by title in any of the extant writs.

In June 1203, the situation in Normandy became critical when Vaudreuil surrendered to Philip Augustus and deteriorated still further in August when Philip Augustus began the siege of Chateau Gaillard, the key to the Seine above Rouen and the symbol of Angevin rule in Normandy. While the war was centred on the north, Athée continued to be based at Loches as that August he assigned the rent on the lordship of Loches to a servant, Raletot.[[52]](#footnote-52) John continued to rely on his judgment and on 8 August agreed to Athée's plan for the release of Geoffrey de Pallaue, lord of Montresor. Athée was told to go ahead with the plan if he judged it to be suitable – 'we agreed to the plan and conceded what was resolved and notified to us through your letters patent'.[[53]](#footnote-53) After he had made sure that he had taken hostages and control of the castle itself, Athée was ordered to raze the castle to the ground along with all other castles belonging to the enemies of the king to prevent them from falling into enemy hands - Loches which was under his strong control was to be maintained. The same day the king made sure that Geoffrey himself realised that he was being freed and pardoned as a result of the prayers and counsel of his faithful subjects Athée and his colleagues, and he was warned to keep to the agreement made.[[54]](#footnote-54) It was important for John to retain not only the loyalty of the principal magnates of the Touraine, but also more minor ones, and the many writs at this time give an indication not only of some of the principal lords of Touraine who were loyal to John even after the disappearance of Arthur, but they also show a number of other lesser magnates who were wooed - later that month, on 12 August, Athée was instructed to give Bartholomew de Savario (probably attached to the Isle of Savary in Touraine/Berry) the rent due to him, in an attempt to keep him loyal.[[55]](#footnote-55) He was not however initially successful as Savario remained with Philip Augustus.[[56]](#footnote-56)

By the end of autumn 1203 John’s control was so precarious that he faced difficulties moving around the country. It was perhaps in this atmosphere of fear that on 2 September, the king ordered Athée to make a gift of 60 shillings Anjou to the Carthusians of Liget.[[57]](#footnote-57) In October John diverted from the straight path between Verneuil and Rouen - 'the route he had chosen was not a direct one', states the biographer of William the Marshal, 'but the alternative one he thought risky for there were men who had no love for him who had it under watch'.[[58]](#footnote-58) By November the king was skulking at Bonneville, in the castle not the town, because he feared treason. He left it secretly and went on towards Barfleur where many of his followers bade him farewell. Athée may have been one of those who accompanied John on his final journey to the coast as on 13 November, just before John departed, a writ was issued through Athée from Le Plessis-Grimould in Normandy.[[59]](#footnote-59) No one expected the king to return soon.

The king arrived at Portsmouth on 6 December, leaving behind him a motley collection of seneschals whose duty was to preserve what was left of his continental dominions - William le Breton remarked that the king abandoned his realm to bands of *routiers*, especially Algais and Lupescaire.[[60]](#footnote-60) Algais, a mercenary leader who had assisted John at Mirebeau and Tours in 1202 before being captured later that year, was left in charge of Gascony. John had promised him the seneschalship in return for his loyalty and friendship and in acknowledgement of the imprisonment he had had to suffer as a result of his service to the king.[[61]](#footnote-61) Robert de Turnham remained as seneschal of Poitou, soon to be helped by Savaric de Mauleon and Andrew de Beauchamp, as well as by the economic concessions which were being granted to keep it loyal (but these were not enough to keep the local lords on John's side and defections continued throughout the year).[[62]](#footnote-62) In Normandy, John left William Crassus in control - a man described by Powicke as little more than a mercenary, a *parvenu*, but by Vincent as a well connected Norman landowner of ancient lineage who had gained administrative experience as seneschal of Mortain in 1193-4, as a royal justice at Falaise in 1199, and as castellan in 1202.[[63]](#footnote-63) He was given the assistance of Peter de Preaux, Richard de Fontenay, William Mortimer, Louvrecaire and other mercenaries, as well as the Earls of Salisbury and Chester, Roger de Lacy and Robert de Plessey. In the Touraine, Athée remained in charge, although seemingly without title and with little assistance, although he now did have a powerful counterpart in Anjou, namely Hubert de Burgh, assisted by Philip Oldcotes.

On 6 March 1204, after a six month siege, the castle of Chateau Gaillard fell, paving the way for a French advance on Rouen. Towns and castles opened their gates to Philip Augustus.[[64]](#footnote-64) In May Philip besieged Falaise and soon completed his conquest of south-west Normandy, moving on to Rouen which surrendered without a fight on l June. At the end of June and with the fall of Arques and Verneuil, the whole of Normandy save only for the Channel Islands was lost to the English crown. Philip Augustus now turned his attention to Aquitaine and within a few weeks all of the province apart from La Rochelle, Niort and Thouars had submitted to the French king. Athée, who remained based in the Touraine, was not involved in these momentous events occurring around him, and the writs relating to him are silent for this period. It was not until 29 July 1204 that his name appears in an extant writ - now the king wrote to the seneschal of Loches and all bailiffs and faithful people stating that he was ratifying the gift which Athée had made to Jobertus, his messenger, and his heirs of a perpetual rent of up to 100 shillings from the rents at Loches.[[65]](#footnote-65) As the writ is addressed to the seneschal of Loches it is possible that the town had its own seneschal who was acting independently of Athée who had moved temporarily to control other areas nearby - he may for example have been at Angers in July as he was ordered to give Rabot and his brothers some lands and rents in that area to sustain them whilst in John’s service.[[66]](#footnote-66) Athée may even have moved to Poitou to assist Robert de Turnham, as on 8 August, he, Turnham, Hubert de Burgh and Savaric de Mauleon ratified a treaty which offered a truce to those who had left the king's side to join the enemy. Athée however did not play the leading role in the negotiations as this was done by Savaric, who had only recently been released from prison by John, as men were said to be returning 'at the plan of Savaric'.[[67]](#footnote-67) (Two days' later, on 10 August, Savaric was rewarded with the grant of all the lands which his father Ralph had held on the day of his death.)[[68]](#footnote-68) It is unclear how long Athée remained in Poitou – the situation there was difficult and the seneschal needed help with his dealings with William des Roches, William de Mauleon and Aimery de Thouars. However, Athée's presence was urgently needed in the Touraine where that autumn Philip Augustus had begun an assault on John's two remaining castles in Anjou/Touraine, placing Draconus de Mello in charge of the siege of Loches and William des Roches in charge of the siege of Chinon, whilst he himself went to Paris.[[69]](#footnote-69) John may have felt that the situation at Loches was under control as Athée appears to have remained in Poitou with Turnham until the end of November - on 30 November William de Briwerre was ordered to find a good ship to transport the Brothers of the Hospital of Jerusalem who were taking treasure to Athée in Poitou, the passage costing £5 11s 8d.[[70]](#footnote-70) Turnham was definitely based in Poitou as on the same date £1,000 was sent to him there.

The winter of 1204/1205 was an exceptionally harsh one and the situation in England was tense - in January there was an invasion scare or rumours of treason and John was forced to spend one quarter of the year’s revenue on military and naval preparations alone.[[71]](#footnote-71) Lines of communication between England and the continent however remained open and on 23 December Athée was able to get messages to the king in England as his messenger, Jobertus, was to be paid whilst at port waiting to cross over in the king's service – at a cost of 4 marks – and on 5 February and 6 April ships were to be found for men going there.[[72]](#footnote-72) Athée was facing an increasingly serious situation as the siege at Loches was entering its sixth month. In the spring of 1205 Philip Augustus advanced on Loches with a formidable army of archers and cavalry and a large number of huge siege machines. Despite all his valiant efforts, Athée and his 120 men were unable to save Loches and it fell that June, shortly before the fall of Chinon. Unlike the sieges at Falaise and Chateau Gaillard, Athée and his men had managed to hold on at Loches for over six months. His valiant defence was recognized by chroniclers such as Coggeshall who referred to him as the man *qui ferociter contra hostes saepius decertabat atque castellum illud viriliter* *tuebatur*.[[73]](#footnote-73) However, some French chroniclers such as Rigord and William le Breton failed even to mention Athée’s role in the defence of the castle, although they went into considerable detail about siege itself and the knights and vassals who had defended the castle with honour.[[74]](#footnote-74) In the event, Athée was captured along with his garrison, and he was imprisoned in the castle of Compiègne. Again only Coggeshall managed a compliment *captus est Girardus d’Athée et castellum de Loches, quod viriliter diutius custodierat*, while William le Breton reserves his venom in the *Philippide* for Athée's capture, stating that the French king captured the 'serf' Girard and put him in chains and held him for a long time in the prison of Compiègne, *lui infligeant un supplice proportionné à ses crimes*.[[75]](#footnote-75) He was however less damning in his *Vie de Philippe Auguste*, stating merely that Philip Augustus *prit dans le chateau de Loches, Girard d’Athée*. The castle was subsequently handed over by Philip Augustus to Draconus and his heirs in perpetuity.[[76]](#footnote-76)

Athée was not the only one of John's loyal seneschals to have been taken prisoner at this time. At the end of 1204 or beginning of 1205, Robert de Turnham, John's seneschal in Poitou, was captured after he had gone to help de Burgh at Chinon - the siege had started in August 1204 and the castle fell on 23 June 1205.[[77]](#footnote-77) His capture took place before 3 February 1205 as on that date all those in Poitou were ordered to be intendent to Savaric de Mauleon as if he were seneschal 'until such time as Robert de Turnham will be freed from prison and able to direct the seneschalship'.[[78]](#footnote-78) Coggeshall links the capture of the two seneschals - whilst relating the capture of Turnham by the army of the king of France, he also stated that 'captured also was Girard d'Athée and the stronghold of Loches'.[[79]](#footnote-79) De Burgh and Oldcotes were also captured at Chinon but not until June, when the French army levelled the castle walls and forced them out into the open to fight for their lives. In less than six months, John had lost three of his seneschals (and Philip Oldcotes) who had become prisoners in the hands of Philip Augustus and were all held in prison at Compiègne. With the loss of these crucial castles and their loyal defenders, the foothold of the Angevins in the Touraine and the north frontier of Poitou was lost to John - only Niort and La Rochelle now remained in his hands.

Negotiations for Athée's release may have started soon after his capture and there was no apparent reason for them failing to be successful, as Turnham had been released from the same prison in the summer of 1205, after an imprisonment of only a few months. Letters of protection were therefore issued to his wife and sons in December 1205 and it is possible also that at this time, in gratitude for his forthcoming release that Athée donated a house at Tours, with the consent of his wife Lue and son John for his soul and that of his wife and ancestors and heirs. Although Vincent dates this donation to a period up to 1210 and probably to England, there is no reason for supposing that it was not issued in France (as it survived in the cartulary of St Maurice) and in the period before the witnesses established themselves in England at Hurstbourne (especially as Athée had some contact with his family whilst in prison as his nephew was given money to pass to him in August 1205 ).[[80]](#footnote-80) In 1206 negotiations again started in earnest for Athée's release - John was feeling confident at the start of the year as this time when he assembled the fleet again at Portsmouth at Whitsun he received the support of many barons, especially those from the north. Just before he departed for France he felt he was in a strong enough position to press forward with his negotiations with the French king for Athée’s release from Compiègne prison. This time John approached the negotiations in an organised way, thus ensuring that as little as possible could go wrong. On 14 May 1206 he turned to the Templars to negotiate with the French king as they were the main financial institution and had a large and efficient network which enabled money to be easily transferred. It was proposed that the ransom be fixed at 2,000 marks silver, payable at the feast of St John (25 July) and that the Master would pay a caution of 500 marks in Paris, to be reimbursed by the Exchequer in London - the writ was witnessed by Peter des Roches, Geoffrey FitzPeter and William de Briwerre.[[81]](#footnote-81)

However a problem with his release must have occurred with the result that throughout 1206-1207 efforts continued to achieve Athée's freedom. Again, hopes were high and several of Athée's friends and relatives from the Touraine, namely Andrew, Peter and Guy de Chanceaux, and Engelard de Cigogny arrived in England in early 1207. It was not until the autumn however, on 21 September, that John was able to graciously ask the Master of the Templars in France to escort Athée’s wife and a single son to the coast where they were expected to depart for England, probably in anticipation of being joined by Athée.[[82]](#footnote-82) An agreement had finally been reached with the French king, and on the same day Reginald Cornhill was ordered to pay to the prior of the hospital of Jerusalem in England 1,000 marks silver which were to be spent on the ransom of Athée.[[83]](#footnote-83) Again, Philip Augustus was taking no chances, and the amount was to be paid in new money. By 23 November this payment had taken place because the barons of the Exchequer were informed that the Master of the Hospital had paid 1,000 marks for the ransom of Girard d’Athée (which he received from Reginald Cornhill for the ransom of the same Girard), and that he was to be made quit for this.[[84]](#footnote-84) On 26 February 1208, a writ addressed to the barons of the Exchequer repeated that ‘it is accounted to Reginald Cornhill 1,000 marks which he paid for the ransom of Girard d’Athée at the feast of St Michael in the 9th year of the king through our order.'[[85]](#footnote-85) This amount may have been in addition to the 2,000 marks originally agreed in May 1206 to be contributed by the king to the ransom, as the first amount was to be handed over at the feast of St John, and this new 1,000 marks at the feast of St Michael. The Pipe Rolls for 10 John refer to 2,000 marks for Athée's redemption as well as other monies being paid towards the ransom - a further £200 was received by the king's writ, and may have come from Honorius, archdeacon of Richmond, who according to the Dunstable annalist owed it for letters of protection he had requested in 1201. He had failed to pay the instalments and was imprisoned at Gloucester castle, and as it was at Gloucester that he was to pay the money direct to Athée, the account may have been accurate.[[86]](#footnote-86) Another large fine was paid direct to Athée this year for his ransom - ‘the men of the Cinque Ports for having the king’s benevolence, 1,000 marks. And to Girard d’Athée 1,000 marks for his ransom’.[[87]](#footnote-87) The Dunstable annalist said that the men of the Cinque ports had fled into exile but afterwards bought the king's favour.[[88]](#footnote-88)

There must have been consternation among the barons (who normally had to pay their own ransoms and fines) as well as at the Exchequer when it became clear that over £2,000 was being contributed by the king towards the ransom of a man not yet known in England. Athée's career had been steady, rather than meteoric, and he had not even held one of the three major seneschalships in France, but only the seneschalship of the Touraine, and even that for some time without title. Even the contemporary chroniclers, for example the *Chronicon Turonense Magnum*, noticed its size, saying that Athée was redeemed with *infinita pecunia*.[[89]](#footnote-89) For John to make such a generous contribution to Athée's ransom was unusual and it contrasted with John's later treatment of Hubert de Burgh who after an imprisonment of two years received only a small contribution to his ransom from John - in February 1206 the king ordered 300 marks to be paid 'for the pledge of Hubert de Burgh', following this up with a further £100 at the end of the year.[[90]](#footnote-90) After his capture Burgh ceased to be sheriff and chamberlain, and lost his Three Castles on the Welsh borders and the lands which he held in Norfolk, Suffolk and Somerset.[[91]](#footnote-91) It is possible that John may have been disappointed with Burgh's defence of Chinon, but more likely he felt the need to place alternative men in Burgh's offices until he was released. The king showed a similar initial lack of generosity towards Robert de Turnham who, unlike Athée and de Burgh, was released from Compiègne prison after only a few months - by the end of July 1205 he was witnessing at Freemantle and Mitcheldever.[[92]](#footnote-92) At his request, John stood surety for the 300 marks which Turnham needed for his ransom, borrowed on the security of his lands. At Michaelmas 1207, Turnham was pardoned of 300 marks, but it is unclear whether that related to the money he had borrowed from John. A gift of £400 also appears in the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1205, although it does not state whether this was towards his ransom. As a special concession in February 1206 for his ransom Turnham was also allowed to sell in Flanders corn produced from his own ploughs, security given that the grain would be actually grown - an indication that Turnham was still paying off his ransom.[[93]](#footnote-93) He was also pardoned of various aids as well as the second scutage as John particularly ordered that he ought not to be summoned for these, and he was also excused scutage due on the land he held from the count of Eu and John de St Legère.[[94]](#footnote-94) John may have felt that it was necessary for him to make only a small contribution towards the ransom, as Turnham held the huge Fossard fee through his wife. Strangely, although Turnham was sheriff of Surrey, the account for Surrey in the Pipe Rolls for that year does not mention either his capture, captivity or release, although his absence was acknowledged as at Michaelmas 1205, Richard de Maisi and William de St Laudo were listed as *custos* for the county of Surrey, rather than Turnham. The king made similar small contributions to the ransom of Oldcotes who had been captured along with Burgh at Chinon (200 marks) and William de Briwerre's son (a total of 1,700 marks first as a loan and then as a gift).[[95]](#footnote-95) Although John issued letters patent saying that Vaudreuil had been handed over on his instructions, he appears to have made no contribution to the ransom of Robert FitzWalter and Saher de Quency who had been thrown into prison by Philip Augustus. It was left to FitzWalter's first cousin, William d'Aubigny, to sell and pledge FitzWalter's estates to raise the money.[[96]](#footnote-96)

It is unclear why Philip Augustus demanded such a large ransom from Athée, one which was so much higher than those demanded from John's other important seneschals held with him at Compiègne. Athée had never been granted one of the great seneschalships, unlike Turnham who was seneschal of the whole of Poitou and de Burgh who was acting as seneschal of Anjou and also a close adviser of the king in England. Indeed his career had not always been upwards – he had for example been passed over as seneschal of La Marche. It is possible that he was more active than the extant writs show for although he was in his 40s and by now would have had a full career, there are few early references to his duties in France (or England). It is possible that his area of influence was far wider than just the Touraine, which would explain why he was in Poitou when Loches was first being besieged.

John may have been willing to pay a large sum for Athée's release because he respected him as an obedient servant who had served him loyally in the Touraine, especially at Loches. Unlike his other seneschals such as Thouars, Roches, Brice, Brandin and Glapion, he had not deserted the king when his position became untenable. He now fully deserved the king's support and financial help. It is possible also that John loved him as a friend – in November 1208 when John granted letters of safe conduct to Robert de Lorne to go and visit Athée in England, he did this 'for the love of Athée'.[[97]](#footnote-97) John had forged a similar friendship with Algais – in a writ he stated 'since the commencement of our war, no misfortune has happened which we have taken more to heart than what has befallen our beloved and faithful Martin Algais...'[[98]](#footnote-98) It is also possible that John was prepared to pay such a large ransom as by doing so he acquired not only the services of Athée himself but also those of his clan, many of whom were known to him as he had granted them letters of protection in 1200, and who, from early 1207, were ensconced at Hurstbourne awaiting the arrival of their leader. Algais, whom John had made seneschal of Gascony after his release, was surrounded by a similar group of loyal *routiers*, and John had taken on responsibility for them as well, agreeing to pay them their wages whilst Algais was in prison. The animosity of Le Breton towards Athée could have been due to his dislike of a man of low birth having acquired the support of such a large clan – it could not only have been because he objected to Athée's supposed treachery towards Sulpice d'Amboise, as he had no complaints about William des Roches's treachery first to Arthur, then to Philip Augustus and finally to John. The importance of Athée's extended clan continued to be recognised in the Articles of Barons in 1215 – its Chapter 40 made sure that his *parentes et totam sequelam* were proscribed.

Philip Augustus had not only insisted on a large ransom, but he had delayed in releasing Athée immediately the terms had been agreed. John had played a similar game with Savaric de Mauleon who had been captured at Mirebeau in August 1202. Although John initially ordered his release on 20 August 1203, he was still in prison on 11 January 1204 as servants were sent to England then to procure his freedom.[[99]](#footnote-99) He was probably finally released on 6 August 1204 as the justiciar was ordered to pay him 200 marks then and by 8 August as he was working alongside Turnham and Athée.[[100]](#footnote-100) Even so his wife and mother were not released until 1208.[[101]](#footnote-101) The *Histoire des Ducs* and the *History of William Marshal* noted that Savaric was held for a long time in prison. Both kings in their own way were showing that they were not beholden to each other.[[102]](#footnote-102)

Chapter 3: The Arrival in England of Girard d'Athée and the Men from the Touraine

After his release from Philip Augustus's prison, Athée did not linger in France. The area around Loches had been lost to Philip Augustus and John had ignominiously departed for England - there was little now to keep him and his clan in France. It is of course possible that the final ransom arrangements may have stipulated that Athée had to leave France on his release from Compiègne prison. This would not be without precedent as the rules of war at that time forbade a man from serving in the area where he had been captured. In 1202, for example, after paying Algais' ransom, John had to find Algais a position in a new area - on 4 December 1202 he made him his seneschal in Gascony and Perigord even though he knew that Robert de Turnham, the seneschal of both Poitou and Gascony, would not approve. John was forced to write to Turnham to say that he would have liked to have discussed the matter with him personally, but because he had not come, he had to make the decision without him.[[103]](#footnote-103) More likely, as far as the clan was concerned, they were drawn to England where there was always the prospect (and hope) that they would be able to emulate men like Vieuxpont or Brian de Lisle who were rapidly rising in wealth and importance.[[104]](#footnote-104)

It is possible that John had particular posts in mind in England which he planned to fill with the men from the Touraine - for example placing them in counties which abutted the Briouse lands or making them heads of his new provincial treasures - but the initial negotiations for Athee's release began well before Briouse was a major problem, or the provincial treasuries were fully functioning. That is not to say that he did not promise them some sort of role in England as they would not have agreed to leave their homeland without at least the promise of royal assistance, as they had no family ties in England nor any means of support there unless it came from the king. By the time Athée and his clan were finally able to come to England in 1207, John was in urgent need of their help and support as his relations with the church were foundering, his dealings with his barons proving increasingly uneasy, his problems in Ireland escalating, and his general relationship with the country tense as he imposed the unwelcome thirteenth. John's decision to bring these men to England was one of the most astute of his reign, as they gave him their unwavering support and constant loyalty not only at this pressing time but until the day he died.

Sometime after September 1207, Athée sailed for England probably accompanied by his wife and son who held letters of safe conduct and who had been escorted to the coast by the Master of the Templars in France. In January 1208, he and his wife were both safely in England as they were given the Wiltshire manors of Aldbourne and Wanborough by John to support them.[[105]](#footnote-105) These were originally *terrae normannorum*, retained by the king when he had granted Faulkes de Cantiloupe's the lands of the countess of Perche in 1208. Faulkes de Cantiloupe's account in the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1210 confirms that he had held the lands of the Countess of Perche for two years, except for Aldbourne and Wanborough which Athée and his wife had held from the feast of St John the Baptist until the feast of St Vincent. The *Red Book of the Exchequer* corroborates this, stating that Athée's wife was given Wanborough through King John.[[106]](#footnote-106)

By the time of Athée's arrival in England, several other men from the Touraine were already in the country. Peter de Maulay had arrived in England by late 1204, as in September of that year he was responsible for carrying instructions from Lurgashall to William de Briwerre, and he was also granted land at Upavon that October.[[107]](#footnote-107) Although Matthew Paris described him as *natione Pictavensis*, it is however more likely that he came from the Touraine, namely from Maulay, which lies between Loudun and Richelieu and was an ancient chatellanie connected to the archbishopric of Tours, and which passed out of Plantagenet control in 1204.[[108]](#footnote-108) The Meaux Chronicle takes the middle ground stating that he came *de partibus Turonensibus et Pictavensibus* but was *in pago Pictavensi oriundus* - the word Poitou being used by chroniclers not in its geographical sense but to bring back memories of the unpopular scutage for Poitou in 1214, the expensive expeditions there in 1206, 1214 and 1225, and the influx of Lusignans later in the reign.[[109]](#footnote-109) The *Histoire des Ducs* implies that he was of humble birth but the *Meaux Chronicle* states that he had inherited lands from his father, which he left to his younger brother Aimery to guard whilst he came to England.[[110]](#footnote-110) Vincent associates this Aymery with a namesake holding land at Quincay in 1237 and 1259, and at La Rochelle in 1218, but it is possible that this Aymery may even have come to England himself as an Aymery de Maulay is found in the Pipe Rolls for 5 Henry III owing l mark for a disseisin in Somerset/Dorset.[[111]](#footnote-111) It is even possible that Peter de Maulay may have had some earlier connection with England as a Peter de Maulay witnessed a charter of Robert of Newburgh in the mid-twelfth century, which confirmed the church of St Mary Bindon (Dorset).[[112]](#footnote-112) This connection is plausible as the first-born children of King John's Peter de Maulay were all named Peter.[[113]](#footnote-113) Maulay was an early protégé of John, and Matthew Paris describes him as being educated and enriched under his protection.[[114]](#footnote-114) He had been given lands in the region of Loudun by the king in 1202 (perhaps to enlarge his inherited lands in nearby Maulay) and was established enough to have a messenger who could accept these on his behalf.[[115]](#footnote-115) He may have been related to Geoffrey de Lucy as in February 1203 he and Lucy had joint letters of protection directed at Lupescaire concerning *their* lands of Amenesch - letters which were probably needed as at that time Lupescaire dominated Normandy as a *routier* leader and was notorious for his treachery and vice.[[116]](#footnote-116)

Although both Athée and Maulay came from the Touraine, they were not close neighbours and it is likely that the impetus for Maulay's arrival came not from Athée but, if the chroniclers are to be believed, from his possible involvement with the murder of Arthur which would have made him an outcast in France. Wendover links the king with the disappearance if not murder of Arthur in April 1203 and Walter of Guisborough wrote that the king killed the young boy *per manum armigeri sui Petri de Mal-lacu, cui postea haeredem baroniae de Mulgresse dedit in uxorem*. Guisborough may have had inside information as his monastery was not far from Peter de Maulay’s *caput* at Mulgrave, but he was also an unreliable chronicler who used anything 'without much regard for kind or quality'.[[117]](#footnote-117) Maulay was not the only candidate for causing Arthur's demise – Hubert de Burgh who had custody of Arthur at Falaise in 1202 had been ordered to blind and castrate Arthur (although he apparently refused, leaving it to the unprincipled foreigner Maulay to carry out the evil deed) or even John himself. Nevertheless, his connection with the death of Arthur continued not only to haunt Peter de Maulay into 1221 when he was implicated in a plot involving Arthur’s sister, Eleanor of Brittany but it also tied him even more closely to John as possible joint perpetrators of the crime.

Maulay was followed to England in 1205 by Girard d'Athée's nephew - a writ of 23 August 1205 issued through the king himself ordered Geoffrey FitzPeter to give Girard, 'the nephew of Athée', 40 marks for the expenses of Athée himself, and 10 marks for his own expenses and those of his father.[[118]](#footnote-118) The fact that this Girard was to pass on the 40 marks to the elder Girard who was in prison would indicate that he was indeed a true nephew, a detail supported by the fact that a Girard d'Athée junior witnessed Girard d'Athée's grant of a house. His father, who accompanied him, may have been the same man as Andrew de Loches, 'a relative of Athée', whom the custodians of the bishopric of Winchester were ordered to support in November 1205.[[119]](#footnote-119) Girard the younger remained in John's service for many years, retaining contact with both Roches and Engelard - the Pipe Rolls for 13 John show that the bishopric of Durham paid his expenses and those of Eudo de la Jaille, in 1213 he may have been given custody of *Kingeslan* which was within Engelard's bailiwick, and in 1214 he may have been with the king in Poitiers as he received a prest of 32 marks, summoned again against Engelard.[[120]](#footnote-120)

In March 1207, a few months after John had arrived ignominiously back in England and nearly two years after Athée had been captured, the main influx of Athée's friends and relatives arrived in England - Andrew, Guy and Peter de Chanceaux (Cancellis) and Engelard de Cygogny. These men had left their homeland after it had fallen to Philip Augustus - they may have viewed it as a temporary move until John recouped his losses in the Touraine, but more likely they wished to follow their leader, Athée, to England where lay a brighter future, as John had far more to bestow there than in his now lost continental possessions.[[121]](#footnote-121) They probably found no difficulty in leaving their homeland as they were all young men at the time of their arrival in England and were not heads of families with responsibilities in France - Engelard who came with his wife Agatha and son Oliver was young enough to live until 1243, and Peter and Andrew de Chanceaux lived until the late 1240s. They may have been landless as in Magna Carta they are described as *sequela*, which Vincent considers to be a disparaging term reserved for serfs (or broods of animals) but which was more likely used to denote a 'following'.[[122]](#footnote-122) However, one of the extended Chanceaux clan, Aymery, held land at Perrusson in Indre et Loire, and allocated its rents.[[123]](#footnote-123) There was little to keep them in France but there was no real means of support in England apart from that which they hoped to receive from the king - unlike the Anglo-Normans who had an entrée into the country through their lands, the lack of Anglo-Tourangeaux lordships meant that they had no friends and relatives already established in England to fall back upon. They knew however that they had caught the eye of the king whilst in France - as early as October 1200 letters of protection were granted by the king to Andrew de Chanceaux, John and Mathias, Peter and Guy, who are all described as brothers (a relationship confirmed elsewhere in the French witness lists).[[124]](#footnote-124) By March 1207, therefore, some of the brothers had arrived in England, confident of John's earlier support continuing on their arrival. They were not mistaken and that month the manor of Hurstbourne was granted to Andrew, Guy (Geon) and Peter de Chanceaux (Chancels), as well as to Engelard de Cigogny, to sustain them whilst in royal service. The Pipe Rolls for that year were less precise about who was benefitting from the king's benevolence, stating that Hurstbourne had been granted to Engelard, Andrew de Chanceaux et *socios* whilst it pleased the king - which could indicate that other as yet unnamed members of the extended family had also arrived – and that this group had held the manor for three parts of the year – which could mean that they had arrived before March.[[125]](#footnote-125) In fact they were not the only ones to benefit from Hurstbourne that year – Henry de Berneval also appears as a beneficiary although there is no reason to believe that he was connected to the group.

This group of men were described as Girard d'Athée's *socios* in the grant of Hurstbourne, and they were also his neighbours in the Touraine. Engelard probably came from Cigogné, a commune in the canton of Bleré, 26 kilometres from Tours and 10 kilometres from Bleré, which was bordered in the north by the commune of Athée.[[126]](#footnote-126) The Chanceaux group originated either from Chanceaux sur Choisille, ten kilometres from Tours, or the Chanceaux which lay five kilometres from Loches and 31 kilometres from Tours. The latter is more likely as Aymery de Chanceaux held land at Perrusson, which lay only a few miles from Chanceaux près Loches. If this is the case it would mean that they would have been particularly affected when Loches fell at Easter 1205, and when Athée was taken prisoner. The group were well acquainted with each and their friendship continued well into the reign of John when Andrew and Peter de Chanceaux, Engelard and Guy de Cigogné and Girard d'Athée all witnessed Aimery de Chanceaux' grants at Perrusson. Aymery, Guy and Peter de Chanceaux, along with Geoffrey, Matthew and Aymery de Martigny, as well as Engelard de Cigogny and Peter des Roches also all witnessed Athée's grant of a house and land at Tours.

Andrew de Chanceaux was probably the eldest of the three brothers as he is the first named in the letters of safe conduct in 1200 and by 1211 was the only one named in the Pipe Rolls for Hurstbourne. He also was named first in the Articles of the Barons and Magna Carta 1215, and he was also the brother responsible for arranging the marriage of his sister Susannah to the son of Walter de Baskerville on 20 December 1213, and for giving security that the fine for the marriage would be paid to the king.[[127]](#footnote-127) He is also the only Chanceaux brother named in the *Histoire des Ducs*.[[128]](#footnote-128) Vincent states that Andrew started his career as a canon in the cathedral church of Tours in 1189/9 and was a witness to charters of the Charterhouse of Liget near Loches and the abbey of La Merce Dieu in Poitiers. Before 1208, he believes that he was involved with the household of the bishop of Poitiers during which time he witnessed one of the bishop's charters as well as granting 40 shillings to the cathedral church at Tours.[[129]](#footnote-129) He equates him both with Athée's 'relative' Andrew de Loches, and Andrew de Cancellarius, a clerk, who appears as such as a guest of Peter des Roches at Witney in Spring 1209, and it is perhaps with this appendate of 'Cancellarius' that he witnessed Athée's grant of a house.[[130]](#footnote-130) However, when Andrew and his brothers received their letters of protection in 1200 from John he is not described as a canon at Tours but simply as Andrew de Cancellis, and the royal writs show that he was in the king's service perhaps from the date of these letters, but certainly from 1207 when he received the grant of Hurstbourne from the king to sustain him in royal service and continuously from 1209 when he first acted as Engelard's deputy. It seems unlikely that he was the same man as Andrew de Cancellarius as in the witness lists which Vincent himself gives, *Andrea Cancellerio canonico Turonensi* appears well separated from Guy and Peter de Chanceaux, which is unlikely if they were all brothers.

As for the other brothers, Guy (Gioni) de Chanceaux was one of the group given letters of protection in 1200 and was also a beneficiary of Hurstbourne. Turner believed that he may have been the same man as Guy de Cigogny. However a writ in May 1215 is quite clearly addressed to a man who bore the name Guy de Cigogny (who was to hand over some weapons at Trowbridge) and Matthew Paris in his version of Clause 50 clearly mentions both Guy de Chanceaux and Guy de Cigogny.[[131]](#footnote-131) Peter de Chanceaux is not specifically named in the Pipe Rolls' entry for the grant of Hurstbourne, although he received letters of protection in 1200 along with his brothers Andrew and Guy, and probably arrived in England at the same time as them in 1207. His early career is unclear although it is possible that like Andrew he was connected to Peter des Roches as the bishop apparently had no hesitation in employing him in his inner household after Magna Carta.[[132]](#footnote-132) The difficulty is that there may have been two Peter de Chanceaux – one in the service of the king and another, a relation, in the service of the bishop. This seems plausible not only because the Chanceaux family were renown for giving their children the same name (Aymery's son was called Aymery) but because 'Peter de Chanceaux' was apparently helping Engelard at Windsor in 1221, receiving money from him in 1230, accounting as deputy sheriff for Oxfordshire in 1233, and acting as keeper of the forest of Windsor in 1240, at the same time as he was serving in the bishop's butlery, keeping his seal, and supervising his food and entertainment, even accompanying the bishop abroad. A P. de Chanceaux was important enough to have his death marked by the Tewkesbury annalist in November 1236 – but either the annalist was mistaken in the date or there was still another P. de Chanceaux worthy of note.[[133]](#footnote-133)

Some chroniclers and historians consider that the Chanceaux and Athée families were related by blood – the *Histoire des Ducs*, for example, refers to Guy de Chanceaux as Guy d'Athies.[[134]](#footnote-134) Vincent (and Turner) believes that John de Chanceaux was probably the same man as Athée's son, John d'Athée. However, apart from the similarity of forename, the two men led totally different lives – John d'Athée received his first royal grant of land in 1216, went on to receive a pension of £50 a year from the king after he lost Kingston in June 1222, remaining in the king's service until at least 1230; John de Chanceaux on the other hand first appears in 1221, married well and died by 1251.[[135]](#footnote-135) On the basis of this connection, and believing Matthew de Chanceaux to be the same man as Matthew de Cigogny (Engelard's brother), Vincent goes on to conclude that the Chanceaux brothers were all sons of Athée.[[136]](#footnote-136) This however is unlikely as according to the letters of protection granted to Athée's wife Lue in 1207 there was only one son who accompanied her to England (although a year earlier letters of protection were granted to his wife and sons). Matthew Paris, in one version of *Chronica Majora*, does indicate that Athee had several children but he distinguishes them from the group from the Touraine - *Engelardum scilicet, Andream, Petrum, Gyonem de Chanceles, Gyonem de Ciguini, uxorem praedicti Girardi cum omnibus liberis suis*. In addition when Hurstbourne was granted to Engelard and the Chanceaux brothers, they are described not as Athée's sons but only as his *socios*.

Of all the Hurstbourne group, Engelard de Cigogny is most likely to have been a blood relative of Athée, perhaps even a nephew. Wendover referred to him as such and Matthew Paris not only named 'Girard d'Athée and Engelard his nephew' as two of John's evil councillors but he also calls him Engelard d'Athée in his list of those who wished to disturb the peace of the kingdom in 1223/3.[[137]](#footnote-137) As with Guy de Chanceaux, the *Histoire de Ducs* also refers to Engelard as 'Engelars d'Athies' when he and Andrew de Chanceaux guarded Windsor castle, and as late as 1241 a royal writ was still referring to him as Engelard d'Athée.[[138]](#footnote-138) Vincent again would like to take this relationship even closer believing that Engelard like the Chanceaux brothers was also a son of Athée, but Engelard himself made a point of denying his relationship to Athée, and the Pipe Rolls for 4 Henry quite clearly state that 'Engelard himself is not the heir of Girard d'Athée'.[[139]](#footnote-139) Although the group may not have been Athée's sons, he knew them well and according to the grant of Hurstbourne, and its entries in the Pipe Rolls, Guy, Peter and Andrew de Chanceaux as well as Engelard de Cigogny, were his friends (*sociis*) and they had come to England to join him.

It is likely that the original plan was for the members of Athée's clan to arrive in England at the same time as Athée. It was probably presumed that Athée would be released within a few months of his capture - after all Robert de Turnham had gained his freedom after only a few months at Compiègne prison - and that is why on 23 August 1205 Athée's nephew and his father had come to England and why in December 1205 letters of safe conduct to come and stay in England were given to Athée's wife and sons (although they were not used). It would also account for why, after the renewal of negotiations in May 1206, Engelard and the three Chanceaux brothers felt confident to leave France, arriving in England by March 1207.[[140]](#footnote-140) But there had been a miscalculation and Athée had still not been released. This left the group for several months in England without his support, during which time they appear to have held no office but were entirely dependent on the king's largesse at Hurstbourne.[[141]](#footnote-141)

Philip Mark, another young man from the Touraine, also came to England to seek his fortune, although not at the same time as Engelard and the Chanceaux brothers as he was not included in the grant of Hurstbourne unless he was included as one of the 'friends of Girard d’Athée'.[[142]](#footnote-142) He may have been expected by October 1208, as a writ witnessed by Peter des Roches entrusted the county of Nottingham to him then.[[143]](#footnote-143) However, this was not enrolled, perhaps because there had been a delay in his arrival. It is however possible that he was in the country, but John decided that on reflection Mark did not yet have the necessary experience to be entrusted with a shrievalty of his own. Although Matthew Paris describes him as *natione pictavensem*, according to Holt and Vincent he was related to the Marques family, the hereditary lords of the manor of Chenonceaux, and he was therefore a neighbour of Athée as the family held land in Chenonceaux and Bleré, near Athée.[[144]](#footnote-144) The Marques family according to Vincent can be traced back to 1194 when a Robert Marques witnessed a grant by the lord of Amboise.[[145]](#footnote-145) Busserolle and Marquet however believe that the Marques family were attested in the Touraine from the 1170s, although Bartholomew Marques did not become first lord of Chenonceaux until 1207, when the family name begins to appear frequently in local records.[[146]](#footnote-146) In the family tree created by Marquet, Philip Mark does not appear although a Peter Mark does appear, the grandson of Bartholomew. He was dead by 1243 when prayers were said for him at the family's *caput* at Chenonceaux, which would make him unlikely to be the same Peter Mark who was Philip's brother and who acted as his deputy at Nottingham, later becoming constable of Nottingham. It is possible however that Philip Mark was not related to this family but to another family of that name - Marquet believes that the family name 'Marques' could have devolved from the word for province '*marche*', which itself derived from the word '*marka*' or frontier which would explain the existence of other families with this name, for example the noble family of Marques who lived in the Périgord at this time.[[147]](#footnote-147) Turner on the other hand favoured the view that Philip's surname denoted not place of birth but the Christian name of his father - relying on a writ of 27 February 1216 in which the king granted lands to Mark de Cigogny upon his giving security that he would remain in the castle of Nottingham. 'This Mark de Cigogny if not the father of Philip may have been his brother, having been so called after their father'.[[148]](#footnote-148) If he was correct then the Cigogny and Mark families were closely related. Philip Mark may also have been a relative of Athée as Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 described him as one of Athée's *parentes*. This relationship may have been the reason why in April 1203 Athée was ordered to release a man named William Mark, who according to Vincent was also part of this extended family, and why Philip Mark's first role in England was under Athée at Nottingham.[[149]](#footnote-149) Philip Mark also had close connections with the Chanceaux brothers, and their sister, Susannah, was later in his custody (with Philip Glory) and they were ordered to allow her marriage to take place at Nottingham in January 1214.[[150]](#footnote-150) Philip Mark had two brothers but their early careers are obscure although they did join him at some stage in England and grew greatly in importance during John's reign - Peter who became Philip's deputy at Nottingham in 1210, and Reginald who is first found in the Prest Roll for 14-15 John, and in 1216 was responsible for carrying 1,000 marks for the king.[[151]](#footnote-151) He also had a shadowy nephew, Geoffrey Mark, who appears in the *Prestita* Roll for 14 John along with Philip Mark's brother, Reginald, as well as Clause 50 of Magna Carta and a writ of 1229.[[152]](#footnote-152)

Engelard was joined in England by other close relations. A brother, Matthew, was in England in 1210 as the *Liberate* Rolls for 12 John described 100 shillings being paid to a Matthew de Cigogny and the soldiers of Engelard his brother.[[153]](#footnote-153) He was also responsible for making several prests - on two occasions he paid £300 to general mariners and galleymen and a further prest to some who had come from Normandy. He was also at some stage in Dublin as he and Lutterel were given £4,000 for making further prests to mariners and galleymen there.[[154]](#footnote-154) This Matthew de Cigogny was apparently also granted the church of Mucklestone as a gift of king in December 1209, the church of Skenfrith in July 1214, and the church of Burford in October 1214. He was also involved with the movement of money on 25 March 1215.[[155]](#footnote-155) Turner believed that this Matthew de Cigogny was the same man as Matthew de Martigny, and Vincent that he was the same man as Matthew de Chanceaux, but the relationship is even less straightforward as the Patent Rolls confusingly state that Mucklestone church was granted not to a Martigny (or a Cigogny) but to a Chanceaux, to Geoffrey, at the end of 1208.[[156]](#footnote-156) A Guy de Cigogny is also found in the writs, but he is often equated with Guy de Chanceaux, although as shown later this is unlikely to have been the case. A Mark de Cigogny is also found in John's service, but his exact relationship to Engelard is not known - a writ of 27 February 1216 ordered the sheriff of Lincoln and the constable of Nottingham to give him the lands of Roland Sutton for delaying in Nottingham castle.[[157]](#footnote-157) Other friends of Engelard also came to England from the Touraine - a Maurice de Rouvre who witnessed Aymery de Chanceaux' grant along with Athée and Engelard (as well as Andrew, Guy and Peter Chanceaux) is also found in the chancery writs for November 1214 being sent to stay with Engelard.[[158]](#footnote-158)

Two brothers, Geoffrey and Matthew de Martigny, were also proscribed in the Articles of Barons and in Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215. Unfortunately the name Martigny is so common in France that it is difficult to say whether they came from the Touraine, or even Marcigny in Sâone et Loire.[[159]](#footnote-159) The former is more likely though as Geoffrey de Martigny had been part of the group from the Touraine, and had witnessed the grant Athée made to the cathedral church of St Maurice at Tours. However he does not appear in the English writs until September 1212, several years after the arrival of his friends and relatives from the Touraine. He may however have had previous experience in England which has not come down in the writs, as in 1212 he was given a supervisory role in the queen's household - he had to arrange for two sons of the northern baron Richard Umfraville to serve at the queen's table and he had to ensure that their master (or teacher) did not come before the queen and that they themselves slept at night in the hall. In November 1212, Martigny and Ralph de Ralegh were told that they could respond at the Exchequer for certain expenses of the queen. These were responsibilities which would not have been given to an untried man.[[160]](#footnote-160) His brother Matthew is often found connected either to Engelard or to Northampton – he is found for example providing wax for wax tablets at Lincoln and Northampton in 1213.[[161]](#footnote-161) After Magna Carta, Matthew was given some lands which had belonged to the former sheriff of Northamptonshire, Henry Braybrook.[[162]](#footnote-162) Other brothers and the nephew of Matthew de Martigny or, as Clause 50 of Magna Carta corrected it, the brothers of Geoffrey de Martigny and the nephew of Mark, may also have also settled in England. One of these Martigny brothers may have been Aymery de Martigny who had an unfinished writ addressed to him in January 1212, who was sent to Engelard in April 1213 with instructions about the general call to arms, and who in February 1215 pledged at Gloucester and Hereford castles, which at that time were also held by Engelard.[[163]](#footnote-163) However he or a namesake was described in May 1221 as a burgess of La Rochelle (rather than coming from the Touraine) when he helped transport Henry's sister to Poitou.[[164]](#footnote-164) The nephew of Philip Mark may have been the shadowy Geoffrey Mark found in the 1212 *Prestita* roll, Magna Carta 1215 and a writ of 1220.[[165]](#footnote-165)

Further Chanceaux relatives also came to England at some stage. John (who was one of the brothers included in the letters of protection in 1200) did not come to England at the same time as his brothers Andrew, Peter and Guy because he was not included in the grant of Hurstbourne. He is however found in 1221 holding land in Upton and Norham through his wife, the daughter of Robert FitzHugh of Upton.[[166]](#footnote-166) Aymery de Chanceaux, who according to Vincent was the son or brother of Andrew, may have been in England by 1215, and later served in Roches' garrison at Farnham castle between 1215-1217. It seems unlikely however (as Vincent believes) that he could have been a son of Andrew, as Andrew and his other brothers witnessed one of his charters before 1213, and he appears to have had the highest social status of all the Chanceaux – at least initially - holding land at Perrusson and having his own seal.[[167]](#footnote-167) It is however surprising that if he was a brother rather than a son that he was not included in the letters of protection in 1200. He may however have been a member of Engelard's close household, as in a writ dated 1230, he is referred to as *Emericus de Cancellis de familia Engelardi*.[[168]](#footnote-168) As with Peter de Maulay, sons were often given the same name as their father, and the writs confirm that Aymery had a son called Aymery, which leaves room for endless confusion.[[169]](#footnote-169)

Although most of the men had come to England in expectation of being with Athée who was their mentor, friend and probably relative, encouragement may also have come from Peter des Roches, a fellow Tourangeaux. He may have known many as neighbours (especially the Chanceaux brothers if they came from Chanceaux sur Choisille as this was a chatellanie of the chateau of Rochecorbon (Rupibus) with its lord Robert de Brenne enjoying proprietary rights over the priory of Chanceaux sur Choisille, or when he was treasurer of St Hilaire in Poitiers, or even when he was in Poitou for six months in 1206, fighting alongside the king. After arriving in England himself, Roches played an important curial and ecclesiastical role under John, especially after he was enthroned as Bishop of Winchester in March 1206 - an appointment which gave him a huge income and great status. Although he was often abroad, when he was in the country he was centred at court, the Exchequer, the itinerant household and the *camera regis* and this central position meant that he was well placed to help his neighbours from the Touraine. He was an important influence on them at the start of their careers, and remained so during their lives - he witnessed the arrangements for Athée's ransom, and it can be no coincidence that the manor of Hurstbourne lay within his see. In 1208 he witnessed the appointment of curial sheriffs in five counties, including the appointment of Philip Mark to Nottingham and Derby, although this was not enrolled; in 1213 the marriage arrangements for Susannah de Chanceaux took place in front of him; and in 1214 he was the chief guarantor for Peter de Maulay's fine for his marriage to the Fossard heiress. He not only oversaw the activities of the main members of the clan but other more minor relations such as William de Maulay who is found in his household between 1207-1214, and Aimery de Chanceaux who may have been in his garrison at Farnham castle between 1215-27. He was, as Vincent describes, 'the central figure in a circle of French exiles', and he should bear at least some of the credit or responsibility for encouraging into the country a group of men whom Holt described, as will be shown unjustly, as men 'who were a marked intrusion, a dangerous and unpleasant novelty for the established interest of the counties'.[[170]](#footnote-170)

Chapter 4: The Initial Roles of Girard d'Athée and the Men from the Touraine in England

It is not surprising that John continued to press for Athée's release from prison, even if it meant paying a huge amount towards his ransom. It was becoming increasingly important for John to redress the balance of power in his kingdom, to demonstrate royal control and strength of purpose over barons such as William de Briouse, and Athée was an ideal choice to help the king achieve his aims. He had shown his military strength at Loches and his administrative ability in the Touraine, and more significantly he had behind him a closely knit clan of friends and relatives who were already safely in England ready to serve the king – men who were entirely dependent on John as they had been granted Hurstbourne only whilst it pleased the king. It was incumbent upon John not only to find a way to reward Athée for his loyal support in France but also to compensate him for the months of imprisonment he had been forced to endure after being captured by the French.

Although Athée himself had gained considerable administrative experience in France which would be of value to John, this was not the case with his clan. They appear to have held no positions of authority in France, although it is possible that Engelard was castellan at St Remy sur Creuse before 1205, as an associate of Girard d'Athée, although the evidence for this comes from the much later accounts of the count of Poitou, 1253-69.[[171]](#footnote-171) If Philip Mark was a member of the Marques family at Chenonceaux then it is possible that he had gained experience in France dealing with the many aspects of his rising family, but historians such as Morris believe that he started his career as a mere mercenary and was unlikely to have held any administrative position in France.[[172]](#footnote-172) It is possible too that the Chanceaux brothers had gained experience helping John in some way in France before the Fall as they were important enough for the king to grant them simple letters of protection in October 1200, but there are no extant writs which would illuminate what positions they held.

Athée may have made an agreement with the king when he arrived in England that members of his clan would be placed under him - they were after all his friends and possibly relatives, and if he was going to take on major roles in a new country then he would have felt secure with them acting as his deputies. There was never any question of Athée coping alone with the many offices he was granted – the roles he was to be given were far too extensive and far reaching to be run by one man, and he would need to rely on deputies during his absences. John had not given Athée's clan any positions of authority in England when they first arrived in 1207, he merely maintained them at Hurstbourne – he was not going to promote them to positions of authority until Athée had arrived in England. Roches too needed loyal men to supervise the provincial treasuries which he was setting up, and he would have felt confident relying on Athée and his fellow Tourangeaux, although he may have been concerned about their lack of experience. However John, Roches and Athée were confident of these men's inherent abilities, although it is possible that they recognised their limitations (at least administratively) as their roles were initially restricted - for example although Engelard and Guy de Chanceaux were Athée's deputies, it was left to Richard Burgeis to account at the Exchequer for Gloucestershire and Herefordshire.

On 5 January 1208 the king rewarded the newly arrived Athée with the county and castle of Gloucester, together with all the prisoners who had previously been in the custody of his predecessor, Richard de Mucegros, an ally of the Marshal.[[173]](#footnote-173) The Pipe Rolls show that this year Richard Burgeis was accounting on behalf of Athée and that the amount due for Gloucestershire had been apportioned between the two sheriffs who had held the post that year - £38 7s 9d through Athée and £115s through Mucegros.[[174]](#footnote-174) By making Athée sheriff of Gloucester, John now had a strong man in this important shire which along with Hereford bordered the Briouse fiefs and guarded the approaches to Wales, acting as a buffer both against the Marshal and William de Briouse. Just before it was announced that Athée had been given the county, on 2 January, a sum of 1,000 marks was sent to Stephen de Turnham at Winchester to give to Athée who was to take it to Gloucester to be placed in the treasury there for safekeeping - a writ witnessed by Peter des Roches. On 22 January, a writ issued through the king and Peter des Roches arranged for a further 2,000 marks to be sent to Athée, now sheriff, for guarding in his castle. These may have been advance payments for preparations for war against Marshal at Chepstow or more likely for an attack on Briouse.[[175]](#footnote-175) A few weeks later, on 18 February, John's warlike approach continued when Athée was ordered to produce armaments - he was told to allow Peter Balistarius to work on the crossbows which were held there, as well as to make new ones, and he was to pay him not only for past work but also for future work as payments were to be made up to 6 March, this order coming through Peter des Roches.[[176]](#footnote-176) The possibility of a military confrontation was now in the forefront of John's mind, and it was clearly the security of the realm rather than the possibility of increasing the income from the shrievalty which was the reason for John's promotion of Athée.

Athée was initially assisted by Guy de Chanceaux at Gloucester, although Richard Burgeis, a burgher of Gloucester, accounted at the Exchequer (until at least 1214).[[177]](#footnote-177) Guy rapidly rose in importance and by 30 April 1208 in two writs he was referred to as the 'constable' of the castle of Gloucester. In that capacity (and through his own writ) he received ten sacks of money from the treasury at Gloucester, containing 1,500 marks – an event supervised by the burghers of Gloucester including Richard Burgeis.[[178]](#footnote-178) He was not yet however in sole command as a further writ of 30 April indicates that it was Girard d'Athée who received the money from the treasury at Gloucester.[[179]](#footnote-179) Guy was still relatively unknown to the chancery scribes, with the result that in the first writ he is called Guy de 'Castell', and in the second duplicate writ as Guy de 'Cancell'. Guy may have taken on increased authority at this time as Athée was fully occupied with the Briouse problem - he was waiting to receive the money which Briouse had been charged for the royal expedition to Wales, which was due four days after the receipt of letters of 29 April. Vincent believes that by August 1209 Engelard was also assisting Athée as constable at Gloucester, when he took an inquest into services owed to Cirencester abbey.[[180]](#footnote-180)

The king continued to bestow other important positions on Athée - on 6 March 1208, one of John’s household knights, Robert de Ropesley, was ordered to hand over the castle of Bristol with its *castellaria* and barton with its apurtenances to Athée to guard.[[181]](#footnote-181) Ropesley was held responsible for part of the revenues but he was allowed a 26 shillings reduction because of a robe he had paid for at the king’s request. Athée was to account thereafter and the barons of the Exchequer were warned not to let the farm of the bailiwick to suffer – an indication that this time the king was more concerned about his income than his military power at Bristol.[[182]](#footnote-182) As at Gloucester, Athée immediately was immediately given orders about prisoners now in his care – he was told to guard Peter (who had previously been held at Bristol under Ropesley’s guard) with care.[[183]](#footnote-183) As at Gloucester, shortly after being granted Bristol, he was sent a large sum of money, in this case 17,000 marks, which was being transferred from Marlborough to Bristol by 12 April.[[184]](#footnote-184) (The writ made it quite clear that Hugh de Neville had sent the money on the Friday in the week of Easter 2008).[[185]](#footnote-185) At Bristol, although the Pipe Rolls for 1209 only show Athée in charge with no one else accounting at the Exchequer, he was probably assisted by Engelard who slipped easily into the primary position there by Michaelmas 1210. The king spent considerable time at Bristol during this year, as from there he could keep an eye on the disturbances in Wales, the Briouse crisis and the looming problems in Ireland. Even at this stage, John was making sure that he had the necessary armaments ready if there was trouble– Peter Balistarius moved between Gloucester and Bristol, and the Pipe Rolls show many payments made to him and his associates at Bristol for their wages and materials between 6 March 1208 and Michaelmas 1209.[[186]](#footnote-186)

In the spring of 1208, when the king made several changes to the administration of English bishoprics (for example in April, Robert de Vieuxpont was given custody of the bishopric of Durham), Athée was again one of the beneficiaries.[[187]](#footnote-187) On 17 March, he was given custody of the bishopric of Bath, and all laymen and clerics were ordered to put their trust in what he said about the king’s affairs. During his period of tenure he appears to have placed his friends into vacant livings there.[[188]](#footnote-188) On 23 May, after Athée had taken over Herefordshire, he gained custody of the see of Hereford itself – Giles de Briouse, its bishop, joining his fellow exiles in France.[[189]](#footnote-189)

John was now relying on Athée to help him deal with the growing problem of the Briouses and their relatives. As a first step he had placed Athée in the shires which bordered Briouse's fiefs, but now he also wanted to make sure that Athée had responsibility and powers in Wales itself. In early spring 1208 John made Athée his bailiff in Wales, acting as the king's lieutenant there. He hoped that he would be able to control the powers of William de Briouse, whom John had rewarded too lavishly, giving him lands and good marriage rights for his children, and making one son Giles bishop of Hereford. At the time of Athée's promotion, Briouse and the Marshal controlled huge areas west of the Severn - the Marshal holding Pembrokeshire and the lordship of Chepstow as well as acting as custodian of the royal castles of Cardigan and St Briavel, and Briouse holding Abergavenny, Brecon, Radnor and Gower as well as the castles of Grosmont and Skenfrith. Only three important fiefs in the area were not under their control, namely Henry Bohun's lands and the barony of Mortimer and Clifford - but Bohun was Briouse's first cousin once removed, Clifford his second cousin, and Mortimer's son and heir was his son in law.[[190]](#footnote-190) The power of the Briouse/Marshal alliance also stretched into Ireland, where the Marshal was lord of Leinster, Briouse lord of Limerick, his son in law (Walter de Lacy) lord of Meath and his brother, Hugh Lacy, in control of Ulster.

Whilst Athée was in prison, the king had been gradually reducing the powers of William Briouse and the Marshal by other means - in February 1207 he had removed Briouse as bailiff of Glamorgan, granting the position to Faulkes de Breauté; in August he had stripped the Marshal of the shrievalty of Gloucester, awarding it to Richard de Mucegros; and he had also placed William de Briwerre in west country shires to oversee the many Briouse lands in that area.[[191]](#footnote-191) Even at the time of Athée's arrival in England, the situation was unstable and concessions were still being made to William de Briouse - one of Athée's first duties, on 17 March 1208, was to return to Briouse the manor of *Wikewan* which had been taken into the king's hands.[[192]](#footnote-192) On 19 March (just after John began to seize the lands of the clergy), it was announced – as a compromise -that Briouse had delivered his son to Walter de Lacy as hostage for good behaviour.[[193]](#footnote-193) It is not known what caused John to have a change of heart - even the biographer of William Marshal says that he does not know what caused his banishment 'nor would it be wise for me, even if I did, to speak of it'.[[194]](#footnote-194) The chroniclers, royal writs, John's own Proclamation, and the *Black Book of the Exchequer* all give different accounts of what followed. Wendover believed that John sought hostages from men like Briouse who knew too much about what had happened to Arthur and whose friendship with William Marshal was worryingly close. He also felt that John had singled out the Briouses because William's wife, Matilda, had accused John of parricide. John himself in his Proclamation in 1212 claimed that he had been forced to take action because Briouse had defaulted in payment of his debts (especially the fines he had offered for the lordship of Munster in Ireland, and Limerick) and had reacted to the resultant distraint with armed resistance. He argued that as king he was acting *secundum consuetudinem regni et per legem scaccarii* (rather than the laws of the courts).[[195]](#footnote-195) There must have been some credence to John's Proclamation as five earls and seven barons (six of whom were later found amongst the Twenty-Five of Magna Carta 1215) felt reassured enough to act as witnesses to it. Still, it was an ominous interpretation by the king of his rights.

Whatever the true reason for his actions, it can safely be said that John was incensed at Briouse's attitude. Although a meeting had taken place at Hereford in March between the king and Briouse at which the latter had handed over his lordships of Hay, Brycheiniog and Radnor until the debt was paid, nonetheless John ordered Athée, as his bailiff in Wales, to go into Wales to seize Briouse's possessions as security for the debt, or to seize members of the Briouse family, or simply, as the chancery writs say, on 18 April to immediately raise a large force so that ‘he could come into those parts which had been invaded’. By mid-April 1208 Athée and Thomas Erdington (sheriff of Staffordshire/Shropshire) had marched into Briouse country on the king’s orders with 500 foot soldiers and 25 mounted serjeants – probably the expedition described by Wendover. The expedition lasted nine days and on 27 April Erdington was sent a writ allowing him to collect some £60 6s for the wages he had paid for the men which he and Athée had led.[[196]](#footnote-196) On 28 April, surprisingly, Giles de Briouse, as bishop of Hereford, was given back all the lands, tenements and things of the see along with other ecclesiastical property, although the king was careful to retain the castles of the see.[[197]](#footnote-197) A day later, on 29 April, William de Briouse was ordered to pay Athée 1,000 marks to cover the cost of the expedition of 18 April - this had to be done within four days of receiving the letters patent.[[198]](#footnote-198) Briouse was not cowed however and in the late summer he gathered a large force to try and liberate his Welsh castles which had been committed to Athée. When Athée ordered the constables to come to him and receive their pay as was the custom, Briouse took the opportunity of their absence to invade his castles, moving on to burn Leominster and to slaughter the king's men there. This led to full scale war but finding himself with little support by the autumn Briouse and his family had fled to Ireland where they were received by the Marshal who after three weeks escorted them to Walter de Lacy, the lord of Meath, and to Hugh de Lacy for protection. As the forces available to the justiciar of Ireland were insufficient for a military attack on the lords of Leinster, Meath and Ulster, William and his family were safe – at least for a while. By September, however, Athée was justifying John's confidence in him - he was persuasive enough to successfully make arrangements for many of Briouse's men to come to the king in peace and war, the letters patent confirming this being witnessed by Peter des Roches.[[199]](#footnote-199)

Perhaps as a reward for leading the successful expedition against William de Briouse, on 22 May 1208 Athée was given increased responsibilities in the Gloucester area when he was formally made custodian of the Honour of Gloucester. William of Falaise, who had farmed the honour since the beginning of the reign, was ordered to hand it over and all things in it to Athée without delay, and the soldiers and free tenants and others of the honour were ordered to be intendent to him.[[200]](#footnote-200) The Pipe Rolls for this year do not mention that Athée had been placed in charge, although they do confirm that Falaise accounted for only half the year. It is unclear whether the several manors of the earldom of Gloucester which were still in royal hands after 1208 (apart from Bristol and its barton which continue to account at the Exchequer after 1208) were placed in Athée's hands at this time - some, like the manor of Cheltenham, do appear to have been put under the direct control of Athée in the summer of 1208 (he was responsible for it for one part of the year), although this did not subsequently account at the Exchequer.[[201]](#footnote-201) Although the writs show that Athée had been granted the Honour of Gloucester on 22 May 1208, he soon appears to have handed over complete control to his deputy, Guy de Chanceaux, who accounted at the Exchequer for the Honour in his own right by Michaelmas 1208.[[202]](#footnote-202) By Michaelmas 1209, reference is made to those things which Guy de Chanceaux responds for in the honour of Gloucester.[[203]](#footnote-203) This was in contrast to the situation at Bristol, Gloucester and Hereford, where Athée shared important duties with his deputies, but yet they did not account at the Exchequer, this duty being left to Athée himself or Richard Burgeis.

On 23 May 1208, a day after being given custody of the Honour of Gloucester, Athée was granted the county and castle of Hereford, probably again in recognition of his services against the Briouses. (This was not the only change in shrievalty this week - on 19 May the king had given Alberic de Vere Essex and Hertford, and on 20 May Robert de Braybrook had been placed at Northampton.). On the same day, Athée gained control of the see of Hereford itself, and received the rents of the lands of the bishop of Hereford ('and other things which are of the bishop') as well as his castles - Giles de Briouse, the bishop, joining his fellow exiles in France. [[204]](#footnote-204) John needed to address the problems being experienced at Hereford, where Walter Clifford had been sheriff since Easter 1205 but was not running his county competently - he later had to offer 1,000 marks to avoid inquiries into his exactions in the county.[[205]](#footnote-205) The king was also fearful that he was showing excessive favouritism to his relative, William de Briouse, and he turned again to Athée to provide a strong and loyal presence in this important shrievalty. It is likely that Athée and Clifford overlapped briefly for the account of the county in the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1208 names them both as sheriff, and states that Richard Burgeis was accounting for *them*, and the *Misae* Rolls show messengers going to them jointly.[[206]](#footnote-206) However, when the change came, John made sure that Clifford was in no doubt about the transfer as in the writ directed to him personally, the king also stated that he had sent to him his son Walter who would also tell him the same about the matter.[[207]](#footnote-207) With the difficulties there, John was not taking any risks with the security of his castle and that year at least 50s 4d was allowed for repairs.[[208]](#footnote-208) In the following year at Michaelmas 1209, Richard Burgeis accounted only for Athée - the changeover had taken place without incident.[[209]](#footnote-209)

Athée's tentacles of power stretched even further - in May 1208, he also had some influence in Somerset as he was given full powers to go to the bailiffs on the sea coast of Somerset and Wales and to seize the ships of all nations berthed in their bailiwicks (apart from Denmark, Norway and the islands not at war with England), and to take the vessels to a place agreed by the king.[[210]](#footnote-210) Similar instructions were given to other sheriffs. Perhaps it was because of good service here that the Pipe Rolls' entry for Somerset for Michaelmas 1209 shows that towards a debt of 300 marks, the king gave Athée 100 marks as a gift - all but one mark having been paid by Michaelmas 1210.[[211]](#footnote-211)

Several months later, by 7 September 1208, Athée was also in a position of responsibility at Nottingham as Gerard, hostage of Savaric de Mauleon, with Alexander his master were sent to him there and he was ordered to guard them honourably and to give them two robes.[[212]](#footnote-212) There is no formal writ extant giving Athée custody of Nottingham and the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1208 do not clarify the situation as they contain no main entry for Nottingham/Derby and the 'view of account' shows Vieuxpont with his deputy Richard de Beauchamp there. By Michaelmas 1209, although the Pipe Rolls in the first line of the entry for the county show Robert de Vieuxpont and Richard de Beauchamp as the sheriffs of the county, later in the entry it states that Girard d’Athée with Philip Mark acting as his deputy were responsible for the farm of the county. The shrievalty of Nottingham/Derby was one of the most important in the country (the town itself lay where one of the main roads to the north crossed the River Trent) and one of the richest (its forests brought in considerable revenues). As Count of Mortain, John had held the area between 1189 and 1194 and he continued to frequently stay there, either on business or to hunt in its forests. The county of Nottingham/Derby however had been in disarray for many years – In October 1204 it had been given to Vieuxpont as a reward for serving John loyally in Normandy, but he had become overwhelmed by his many duties and had failed to present proper reckoning. Although he was allowed to delay presenting his accounts in February 1208, he then had to offer 4,000 marks for the king's benevolence as well as some of the lands of Doun Bardolf, which he had held since 1205. In order to ensure that Vieuxpont kept to the new arrangements, the king laid down regulations for future accounts and made him leave his nephew as hostage and pay 1,000 marks. Although he was eventually pardoned of the remaining 3,000 marks, in 1208 he was removed from his post as sheriff of Nottingham/Derby.[[213]](#footnote-213) Although Athée had replaced him there by September, initially the king may have planned to give the shrievalty to Philip Mark, as a writ of October 1208 announced that he had entrusted the county to Mark.[[214]](#footnote-214) It may be there were problems with Mark's appointment – either he had been delayed in arriving in England from the Touraine, or the king considered that he was too inexperienced to be given the post after such a short time in the country - and the promotion did not take place and Athée remained in control (although Mark had certain responsibilities, for example for making a bridge there).[[215]](#footnote-215) It was not until 3 October 1210 that Mark was made sheriff in his own right. That Michaelmas the Pipe Rolls make this quite unambiguous - 'Nottingham/Derby: Philip Mark. Peter Mark for him' - and he was carrying out shrieval duties - 'amercements of 16 marks through Philip Mark and his friends' (and the same sheriff accounted for them), and 'Philip Mark (Peter Mark for him) rendered his account for the expenses of the King of Scotland’s daughters'.[[216]](#footnote-216)

Peter de Maulay, who also came from the Touraine, was by this time already well established in the king's service, and was not given any position under Athée nor did he benefit from his influence. Since well before the Fall, Maulay had gained administrative experience in France and had been rewarded by John with lands in the region of Loudon as early as 1202 and had been given letters of protection in February 1203. By September 1204, he was carrying writs for the king in England, for example from William de Briwerre at Ludgershall in Surrey to the chancellor, and he was witnessing with barons such as the Earl of Salisbury and the Bigods.[[217]](#footnote-217) The Pipe Rolls also show that influential men like Geoffrey FitzPeter, John FitzHugh and William de Briwerre owed him palfreys - as these palfreys continue to feature in the Pipe Rolls and *Memoranda* Roll for several years, they were clearly considered serious debts.[[218]](#footnote-218) Unfortunately little is known about the reason for these many debts, although Peter Stokes owed his for the king's dog and a pledge of Peter de Maulay, and William de Briwerre owed his for an injured dog which belonged to the king.[[219]](#footnote-219)

Maulay may have acted as a chamberlain as early as 1205 after Burgh left the post, as a writ commands William Cornhill to give Peter the Chamberlain 40 marks 'for making payments of our expenses'.[[220]](#footnote-220) He probably continued to hold this role after Geoffrey de Neville became the main chamberlain in January 1207, as he was given the lands of Robert de St Remy in Wilden, Bedfordshire, to sustain him in the king's service.[[221]](#footnote-221) The *Histoire des Ducs* refers to him as an usher [*huissiers*] in John's household at this time, and the *Misae* Rolls also show him carrying out the type of duties expected of a chamberlain, at a time when the chamber was playing a major administrative role (as the wardrobe did later).[[222]](#footnote-222) It was a busy period for him and he had the opportunity to continue his important friendships with Roches and Robert de Turnham, as he witnessed many charters with them.[[223]](#footnote-223)

In the spring of 1210, the chancery writs begin to indicate that something was amiss and that Athée's control of his positions was wavering. When John finally crossed to Ireland and marched on Ulster, according to Matthew Paris he did this with a numerous army, composed of the feudal force and some Flemish mercenaries - but significantly Athée was not there to support him.[[224]](#footnote-224) He also did not take part in the other expeditions to the Marches and Wales that year which were recounted by the chroniclers, and instead these were led by Roger de Lacy, FitzPeter, Roches and the Earl of Chester, but not by Athée although he still held the title of bailiff of Wales.[[225]](#footnote-225) Moreover, that year many of the chancery writs were addressed to Athée's deputies rather than to Athée himself, as if Athée was gradually being replaced in many of his positions by the men who up to now had been assisting him. By Michaelmas 1210 Engelard had taken the place of Athée at Hereford, where he was helped by Andrew de Chanceaux who acted as his deputy and by Richard Burgeis who accounted at the Exchequer as he had done for both Clifford and Athée.[[226]](#footnote-226) Andrew de Chanceaux and Engelard were on occasion considered equal parties and were jointly responsible for paying soldiers and servants in the castle of Hereford - in October 1229 Engelard and Andrew de Chanceaux were pardoned £100 5s, handed to them at Hereford in the time of King John for this purpose.[[227]](#footnote-227) Engelard also received help from Godeschal de Malines as the *Misae* Rolls show a payment made through a soldier of Engelard's for the Welsh in the custody of Godeschal, who is described as constable of Hereford.[[228]](#footnote-228) Although Vincent states that at Hereford Engelard supervised the establishment of a vast provincial treasury, there is no evidence for this although Engelard did supervise the provincial treasuries at Gloucester and Bristol.[[229]](#footnote-229)

By Michaelmas 1210, Athée appears to be no longer in charge at Bristol - although there is no extant writ formally handing Bristol to Engelard, the Pipe Rolls show that it was Engelard with Richard Burgeis for him, who was accounting for the farm of Bristol and its barton.[[230]](#footnote-230) Peter de Chanceaux acted as Engelard's deputy, and just as Athée had shared important responsibilities with Engelard, so now Engelard on occasion depended on Peter de Chanceaux - by that same Michaelmas 1210 Peter de Chanceaux was described as having 275 marks in his custody which were to be given to Engelard. Although this entry falls under Gloucester, the precise whereabouts of Peter de Chanceaux is not made clear, although it is likely to have been Bristol.[[231]](#footnote-231)

At Gloucester, although again there is no extant writ removing Athée from the shrievalty, by Michaelmas 1210 the Pipe Rolls show that Engelard had replaced him as sheriff and Richard Burgeis was accounting at the Exchequer for the county.[[232]](#footnote-232) Amercements of the itinerant justices were now heard in front of Engelard as sheriff and he was made responsible for such shrieval duties as paying for Henry's nurse.[[233]](#footnote-233) Guy de Chanceaux who had had considerable authority under Athée as constable of the castle, remained in his post and continued to share responsibilities with his new sheriff, Engelard. His brother Peter may also have been there on occasion as the entry for Gloucester in the Pipe Rolls for that year not only mentions him being responsible for paying Engelard the 275 marks, but also for paying off some of Athée's debts.

It is unclear why Athée did not accompany the king to Ireland and why his deputies took over from him so soon after he himself had been granted his positions by the king. He controlled his posts sometimes for as little as a few months (as at the Honour of Gloucester) and never for more than two years. There are no extant writs granting his deputies their new posts officially - Engelard for example slipped without official written royal sanction into Athée's posts at Bristol, Gloucester and Hereford, as did Guy de Chanceaux at the Honour of Gloucester, Peter de Chanceaux at Bristol and Andrew de Chanceaux at Hereford. Their assumption of their titles was gradual but they were always considered to have obtained their power with the king's permission, and were considered to be acting officially as either Athée or Engelard's replacements - so much so that in 1215 Andrew and Peter de Chanceaux were responsible for handing over Hereford and Bristol respectively. Their promotions must have taken place with the king's full consent or at least conscious acquiescence - he had no objection to what was taking place, despite their lack of experience. However, John made sure that if there were any lapses of judgement because of their lack of experience, that his coffers did not suffer - he arranged for Richard Burgeis, who had accounted at Gloucester and Hereford for Athée, to carry out this same role for Engelard at those two shrievalties as well as now Bristol.

It is possible that Athée was no longer found in his shrievalties as the king simply liked to keep him close to him at court (as Henry III did with Engelard in 1233). He was certainly on intimate terms with the king on occasion and his views were respected - *The* *History of William Marshal* relates an episode when Athée was with the king, Meilier and the king's chief counsellors discussing the possibility of Meilier going to to Ireland to capture both the Marshal and Briouse. Athée opined:'if you can manage to collect them all up like that you are a strong and brave man and the Marshal will be undone.'[[234]](#footnote-234) Alternatively, like Vieuxpont, Athée may have been forced to relinquish some of his responsibilities because he had become overstretched in the many posts he held - according to the *Misae* and *Liberate* Rolls for 1209/1210 his messengers were constantly on the move, taking messages to and from him.[[235]](#footnote-235) Rather than punishing Athée for neglecting his responsibilities (as he had done with Vieuxpont), John permitted Athée's deputies to carry out these for him – a tacit acknowledgement by John that Athée had good reason to be absent and that at least some of his responsibilities would need to be carried out by others, preferably by members of Athée's own clan.

It seems unlikely that Athée lost his posts because he had fallen out of the king’s favour - on 25 December 1208 he was clearly part of the king's court and was present at Bristol when Llewelyn sent letters of submission to the king (his name appears along with those of the bishops of Winchester and Bath, the justiciar, the chancellor, William de Briwerre and other faithful), and there is no hint of any displeasure in the writs or chronicles.[[236]](#footnote-236) Nor had he lost the affection of the king as in November 1208 *pro amore d'Athée* Robert le Lorne was allowed to go to him in England and return to his lands.[[237]](#footnote-237) Athée continued to be found among the king's advisers (for example when Meilier put forward his proposals for going to Ireland), and the king listened to his views not only then but when Athée was ordered to give Robert Evercy's wife her dowry and permit her to be married 'if he thought it expedient'.[[238]](#footnote-238) If Athée or any member of his clan had fallen out of favour, there were always magnates or rising stars anxiously waiting in the wings for promotion, but promotions at Athée's areas of responsibility were always made within the clan itself, as John wanted the offices to remain in the safe and loyal hands of Athée's men.

It is of course possible that the chronicles fall almost completely silent on Athée after 1210 because he had succumbed to ill-health or old age. If he had been born between 1150 and 1160 by 1210 he would have been a man of respectable age (in 1188 William FitzRalph at much the same age was considered by Painter to be too old to take part in a battle of 'champions').[[239]](#footnote-239) The fact that Athée's deputies were not promoted by a chancery writ but just gradually absorbed Athée's responsibilities would seem to indicate a gradual decline in Athée's power and influence due to illness or severe injury.

There is however evidence that Athée did die around 1210 - the Pipe Rolls for that year show Peter de Chanceaux acquitting some of Athée's debts and the Pipe Rolls for 14 John state that Engelard had been responsible for the seven hundreds from year 12.[[240]](#footnote-240) However it is possible that he died at a later date – Warren dates his death to 1213 and Vincent to between 1210 and 1215.[[241]](#footnote-241) Wendover still considered him to be alive and a powerful influence on the king in 1210/1211, naming him along with Engelard (called Athée’s nephew), Philip Mark, Peter de Maulay 'together with many others' whom he considered to be John's most evil counsellors.[[242]](#footnote-242) But Athée's inclusion in the list may merely reflect the animosity which Wendover had towards him and his family, and which surfaced again in Paris's version of Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215. It is possible that Athée was still alive in 1212 as Hugh, the exiled bishop of Lincoln, requested in his will of that year that 40 marks 'be left to a knight of Nottinghamshire holding of the archbishop of York, whose daughter Girard d’Athée wished for his son', but whether this indicates that Athée was alive and wanting to root his family in England, or whether it represents an attempt to help the couple after Athée's death will never be known.[[243]](#footnote-243) It is also possible that he may even have been alive as late as September 1213, for the king wrote to Engelard then commanding him to give Girard d'Athée the custody of the manor of *Kingeslan* (which had belonged to Reginald de Briouse) to sustain him, but this however was likely to have been a grant to Athée's nephew, who bore the same name.[[244]](#footnote-244) A more far-fetched Indication that he was dead towards the end of 1213 could be given by a writ in January 1214 in which Guy de Chanceaux was instructed to let Jordan, the foldkeeper [*pacarium*] at Tewkesbury and his wife hold the land which was associated with the fold if he made the service which Athée had granted them to make - this could be taken to show that Athée had not been dead that long as the land was still waiting to be handed over.[[245]](#footnote-245) However that year, Engelard paid 32 marks into the Exchequer for Athée, which might indicate that he was dead.[[246]](#footnote-246) On balance it would appear that Athée died sometime between 1210 and 1212 after a prolonged illness or accident. The inquests taken between those years and included in the *Red Book of the Exchequer*, favour this conclusion as they show that the land of Wanborough which had been originally granted to Athée and his wife on their arrival in England in 1208 now was held only by Athée's wife.[[247]](#footnote-247) Unfortunately none of the chroniclers marked his death – in contrast to Algais whose death was considered such a momentous event that the writer at a Catalan Cistercian monastery mentions it along with only a handful of other incidents for the year 1212/13, and the death of a P. de Chanceaux which is mentioned in the Tewkesbury chronicle.[[248]](#footnote-248) What is certain is that he was certainly dead by 1217, as a writ of Philip Augustus for that year mentions the goods belonging to Athée's widow.[[249]](#footnote-249)

Chapter 5: The Roles of the Men from the Touraine after Athée

With Athée now firmly in the background or possibly dead, Engelard took on the role as head of the Hurstbourne group. Still in charge of Hereford, Gloucester and Bristol, he now also became heavily involved in Wales - fighting there in 1212 as the *Misae* Rolls show a payment of £300 given to him by Andrew de Chanceaux on 26 July for helping Vieuxpont who was besieged in Wales at Mathrafal. He may even have accompanied the king there as the expenses for Bridgnorth that year include the costs incurred during 'two days while the king went to give succour to Vieuxpont besieged in Wales'.[[250]](#footnote-250) He was one of several prominent men who were helping the royalist cause in Wales, for example Roger Bigod, Henry FitzCount, the Earl of Chester, as well as Faulkes de Breauté (who had been made sheriff of Glamorgan and constable of Carmarthen, Cardigan and Gower). Philip Mark and Brian de Lisle may also have been in Wales at the end of 1212, but not at the same time as the king who had remained at Westminster- the Pipe Rolls add, as an epithet to the abortive plans of the summer, that a fine in Bedfordshire would not be summoned because the king did not go to Wales.[[251]](#footnote-251)

With Engelard so often away, at Bristol his deputy Peter de Chanceaux took on increased responsibilities, although Richard Burgeis continued to act as *custos*.[[252]](#footnote-252) By 1211, Peter de Chanceaux had become so important that the Pipe Rolls state that 'through his own writ' he sent instructions about those things which he ought to respond.[[253]](#footnote-253) By 1212 he was beginning to be addressed as constable in the *Misae* Rolls and Close Rolls and was responsible for the despatch of swords, boots and flour.[[254]](#footnote-254) In 1213, for the first time, he was addressed as 'our chosen and faithful', and he was also treated as constable when he looked after huntsmen and dealt with wine.[[255]](#footnote-255) That December he took over Engelard's roles at the provincial treasury - at least temporarily - and was made responsible for handing over all the money held at Bristol except for 1,000 marks, and he also had to give Master Auclent the baggage train for carrying the treasure.[[256]](#footnote-256) It is unlikely however that he was in sole charge permanently as in 1227 he was described as Engelard's constable and it was Engelard who had paid money into the treasury. John did not expect him to be able to cope on his own at Bristol in Engelard's many absences, and on 9 June 1214, Aymery de Sacy was sent to help him. Although initially it was a temporary assignment, as he was to be paid for 10 days work, he was still there on 27 June as he and Peter de Chanceaux were responsible for paying £100 to Engelard from the treasury of Bristol.[[257]](#footnote-257) Peter de Chanceaux may have needed assistance because he had several other responsibilities - he may have also been responsible for Bath itself as the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1211 state that the farm of the vill of Barton had been received by Peter de Chanceaux who ought to respond for it rather than the prior. He also was in charge of the bishopric of Bath, succeeding Athée who had been in charge of it since March 1208 – in 1212 Peter de Chanceaux was said to have received £24 from the prior of Bath.[[258]](#footnote-258) Whilst there he witnessed several charters in favour of his kinsmen and friends, including John de Novo Vico (who had also witnessed Athée's grant of a house). His growing importance at Bristol meant that it was he rather than Engelard who handed over the castle to Philip d'Aubigny after Magna Carta 1215.[[259]](#footnote-259) This may simply have been because Engelard was based in Gloucester at the time - he moved constantly between the two, for example the *Misae* Rolls show that he was at Hereford at Epiphany and at Gloucester on the feast of St Hilary.[[260]](#footnote-260)

At Hereford Engelard remained as sheriff and was addressed as such in the majority of writs up to Magna Carta. Richard Burgeis continued as *custos* and Godeschal Malines probably as constable. However, now his deputy, Andrew de Chanceaux, began on occasion to be given the title of 'sheriff', for example in the *Misae* Roll of 14 John when he was instructed to pay Engelard £300 for helping Robert Vieuxpont in Wales. [[261]](#footnote-261) Andrew de Chanceaux' shrieval duties continued in May 1213 when he was given timber from Aconbury near Hereford to use to fortify the castle, and in December 1213 when he was told to account at the Exchequer for the cost of men and greyhounds hunting in the forest of Trevel, Hereford.[[262]](#footnote-262) In August 1214 he had such a degree of responsibility that Thomas Erdington and Henry de Vere were sent to him to speak about the castle and its guard (matters which were too secret to be put in writing) and it was Andrew, rather than Engelard, who was ordered to hand Hereford castle to Hubert de Burgh on 20 July 1215.[[263]](#footnote-263)

At Gloucester, again Engelard remained as sheriff, with Richard Burgeis accounting for him at the Exchequer until Michaelmas 1214 when the Pipe Rolls were discontinued. Guy de Chanceaux, who had been acting as constable since April 1208, continued in that role under Engelard. Guy however was now heavily involved at the Honour of Gloucester where by Michaelmas 1211 he was fully in charge, as the Pipe Rolls for that year state that scutages for the honour were due from Guy, and the honour is described as *de ballia sua*.[[264]](#footnote-264) His responsibilities at Tewkesbury (from where he administered the honour) included looking after the king and queen, and building a kitchen, dovecote, granary, larder, chamber, in expectation of their visit, and in 1213 he had to give robes to the queen's cook and carterers.[[265]](#footnote-265) Guy remained in charge of the honour until January 1214 when it was handed to Geoffrey de Mandeville on his marriage to Isabel of Gloucester. That month, the new custodian of the honour was ordered to give Guy the the land and heir of Geoffrey FitzRobert of Donnington, perhaps as compensation for loss of office, although it was described as a gift to maintain him in royal service.[[266]](#footnote-266) He may however have continued to have a degree of responsibility at the honour even after Magna Carta 1215 as on 8 October 1215 he was instructed to give John Cleric custody of Hugh de Boves' daughter.[[267]](#footnote-267)

Vincent believes that as early as 1208 Guy de Chanceaux and Robert de Turnham were involved in exploiting the Canterbury lands, although their full responsibilities there did not start until later - the Exchequer inquest taken on Turnham's death in 1210 reported that Turnham had held custody of the cathedral priory of Christchurch Canterbury for only 6 months, a position he took over after the death of Reginald Cornhill. Guy himself did not become custodian of the archbishopric until at least Easter 1211 when according to the account of John FitzHugh, Guy and 'his friends' were paid for going through the manor of the archbishop of Canterbury after the death of Robert de Turnham. This related to the circuit which Guy and Simon Nuers made to list the demesne stock of the archiepiscopal manors before and after Turnham's term of office, and for this he was paid 40s in expenses.[[268]](#footnote-268) In 1211-12 Guy also had custody of the bishopric of Worcester and was responsible, for example, for its scutage of Scotland.[[269]](#footnote-269) Often there was confusion over Guy's many roles - the account of Guy de Chanceaux 'concerning his bailiwick' which appears in the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1211 shows that the Berkeley fee, for example, was in the king's hands in the custody of Engelard, 'and therefore Engelard ought to respond (and responds in Gloucester, added)' - although elsewhere it was Guy who had custody of the lands during this period as a further entry for the account of Hugh de Neville in Marlborough states that money had been received from William Berkeley for year 12, 'before Guy de Chanceaux had custody', and in 1212 and 1214, Guy owed money for some of Roger Berkeley's fees.[[270]](#footnote-270)

At Nottingham, Mark acted as Athée's deputy until sometime before October 1210 when the Pipe Rolls show that he had replaced Athée as sheriff. Unlike Engelard, he was not ably assisted by Richard Burgeis or a Chanceaux brother but by his own brother, Peter, who first accounted at the Exchequer in 1210 and carried on accounting in 1211 and 1212 (although in 1212 additional help was received from Eustace de Lowdham who vouched for his master's expenditure of £107 on wine and pork).[[271]](#footnote-271) The Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1213 are not extant, but in 1214 Peter is no longer found accounting for his brother – this year his role at the Exchequer was taken over fully by Eustace de Lowdham.

Whilst Mark, Engelard and the Chanceaux brothers were entrenched in their castles, counties and honour, Peter de Maulay was rising up the ladder of success, securing the king's further favour and admiration - although by 1212 he still had not been given a castle or a treasury of his own. He continued to act independently of the other men from the Touraine, and was therefore not affected by Athée's demise. He took on no roles under Engelard, but instead remained based at court acting as a chamberlain and clearly expected to deal with confidential matters in a trustworthy way.[[272]](#footnote-272) He is however never referred to by name as a *camerarius* even though in 1209 he appears frequently in the allocation of *prests*, and in 1210, for example, he was given money from the chamber to make payments to the serjeants who were bringing treasure from London.[[273]](#footnote-273) He also carried out other duties of a chamberlain, for example arranging gifts of robes, dealing with the king's greyhounds, organising payments for the queen's cook, arranging *prests* for carterers taking treasure to Ireland, and in 1212 giving alms at Knaresborough on behalf of the king. He himself received money in 1210 for the expenses of his men *dum ipse non fuit ad curiam*.[[274]](#footnote-274) He was now important enough to be frequently found witnessing charters along with magnates like Philip d'Aubigny, the Earl of Chester, Eustace de Vescy as well as his 'relative' de Lucy, with senior officials such as William de Cantiloupe, Robert de Vieuxpont and Geoffrey de Lutterel, and with ecclesiastics such as Peter des Roches, and in the early period with Hugh of Wells, then archdeacon at Wells.[[275]](#footnote-275) He used his position to form close relationships with barons, thus strengthening his own personal power and influence - in 1210 when Brian de Lisle proffered two palfreys to the king, Peter de Maulay and the Earl of Salisbury were his backers.[[276]](#footnote-276) His friendship with Robert de Turnham, with whom he co-witnessed, may have encouraged his marriage in 1214 to Robert de Turnham's daughter, through whom he inherited the vast Fossard fee. He remained close to the Bishop of Winchester and in 1210/11 he received a gift of capons from the bishopric of Winchester *in dignatio*, in 1211-12 his men were at the bishop's manor of Farnham, in 1212 he was also with him and the Earl of Salisbury and Henry FitzCount as a messenger was paid for going to them, and he also witnessed with Roches for example on 18 May 1212 - this close relationship continuing well into the reign of Henry III.[[277]](#footnote-277)

His responsibilities widened in 1212 when he had been due to go in the king's service to Poitou - he was ready at Winchelsea where like Hugh de Boves he was given a gift of 50 pounds, but he did not sail. In August 1213 he was sent as an envoy to Rome with the bishop of Norwich, the abbot of Beaulieu, Hugh de Boves and Martel, returning by February 1214 with a letter from the Pope congratulating the king on his conversion and informing him of the Pope's answer in regard to his excommunication and interdict – namely the acceptance and confirmation of the king's offer of his realms of England and Ireland plus a yearly payment.[[278]](#footnote-278) Maulay was definitely present in Rome in July as a writ from the king ordered him to give 10 marks to Romanus Nicholai, citizen of Rome, as this was the fee agreed.[[279]](#footnote-279) In 1214, he was in charge of the garrison at La Rochelle and in control of the treasury overseas. On his return he was made constable of Corfe (from February 1215), and sheriff of Somerset and Dorset (in 1216). The *Histoire des Ducs* describes him as *chevaliers et connestables [dou castiel] del Corf, et si poissans que il guerroia al conte de Salesbieres*.[[280]](#footnote-280)

*Treasuries*

On their arrival in England, the men from the Touraine were placed in charge of some of the provincial treasuries which had been set up by Peter des Roches who was head of the king's chamber and responsible for the dispersal of coin, expenditure on castles and military operations. He believed that provincial treasuries were more suited to an itinerant king such as John, as money could reach John easily and speedily, and with no formal procedures to be followed the king could then distribute it whenever and wherever he wanted. By 1212, according to the *Misae* Rolls, provincial treasuries had been established at Gloucester, Bristol, Nottingham as well as at Rochester, Knaresborough and Northampton. Permanent deposits were also to be found at Devizes, Corfe and Marlborough, with Philip Oldcotes also controlling money at Durham.[[281]](#footnote-281) By delegating control of some of these treasuries to the men from the Touraine, both the king and Roches could be confident that the royal coffers were carefully guarded and that there was a consistent and reliable supply of money available if called for. Since 1210 there were large sums of money in John's coffers - for the first time the yearly revenue of the kingdom had reached over £50,000 (normally around £30,000) making John a very wealthy king. Up to 200,000 marks was on occasion stored in these treasuries, and it has been calculated that after the dismissal of the host, some 120,000 marks were sent back to Bristol alone to be redistributed.[[282]](#footnote-282)

The writs show that initially at Bristol Engelard received small amounts of money - for example 100 marks which was given to him to guard safely (and for which he was made quit), £400 which he was to place in the treasury at Bristol in December 1209, and 95 marks which came from the king himself *ad perficiendum thesaurum* at Bristol. However in 1210 when John set out to Ireland to reduce the power of the Lacys, establish the supremacy of the crown in Ireland, and wreak vengeance on William de Briouse and his wife who were being sheltered there, Engelard's responsibilities increased dramatically as historically the Irish treasure was always guarded at Bristol. He now became responsible for receiving and guarding the considerable sums of money which were being raised under the guise of either a tallage or simply as an 'aid' for Ireland.[[283]](#footnote-283) In 1210, 1,000 marks were due from both Bristol and Redcliffe, 300 marks from Hereford, 500 from Gloucester and the same from the Redcliffe Templars.[[284]](#footnote-284) The amounts demanded from Bristol were considerably larger than those sought, for example, from Portsmouth or Southampton – probably a reflection of its increased activity, with the associated benefits it brought to the town. A considerable proportion was successfully collected and retained at Bristol, including 975 marks from the aids of Bristol and Redcliffe, 275 marks received from Peter de Chanceaux, and 95 marks from the farm of Bristol.[[285]](#footnote-285) That year along with Robert de Wolfe Engelard was given the responsibility for dealing with the 10,106 marks which had come from the revenues of Durham, from fines and scutages for the Irish expedition collected by Brian de Lisle, and probably from some of the king of Scotland's fine after Norham.[[286]](#footnote-286) Braybrook at the provincial treasury at Northampton was ordered to send this large sum on to them to distribute to where they were ordered, and he paid a sparrow hawk for it to be recorded on the Great Roll that he brought letters of the king containing these words 'we command you that immediately you see these letters you hand to Engelard and Robert de Wolfe 10,106 marks and 8½d which you have at Northampton to transferring where we order which we freed to you through the hands of the archdeacon of Durham, Philip Oldcotes and Brian de Lisle.'[[287]](#footnote-287) He may have been worried about Engelard's lack of experience, or even his probity (although a few months earlier he had sent Engelard at Bristol some 1,600 marks), he may have been unsure of his own abilities (his provincial treasury had only recently been created) or more probably he was just a careful man (in 1210 he paid for an agreement he had made with John de Horsenden to be inscribed on the Great Roll).[[288]](#footnote-288) What is certain is that he was taking no chances with the money.

Mark too was busy at Nottingham, which not only acted as a centre of account when Brian de Lisle collected the scutage for the Irish campaign due from tenants-in-chief in Northumberland and Yorkshire there, but also had become a centre of deposit for the Irish effort.[[289]](#footnote-289) In 1211, Mark's treasury benefited from 7,000 marks of the king of Scotland's fine which was taken from Norham to Nottingham at a cost of £4 6s. (Henry de Vere was paid 100s for servants who carried the treasure to Nottingham). According to the account of the bishopric of Durham, a total of 8,919 marks were sent to Mark and Brian de Lisle to be placed at Nottingham, as well as 900 marks which were to be placed in the treasury of the king (at Nottingham added).[[290]](#footnote-290) That year the account of Brian de Lisle for Knaresborough in 1211 shows a payment of £346 13s 4d made to Philip Mark. In both 1210 and 1211, Philip Mark's brother, Peter, was accounting for him.[[291]](#footnote-291)

In 1212 John was still an astonishingly wealthy king with large amounts of money stored in his provincial treasuries - which made him feel confident that an expedition against Philip Augustus could take place.[[292]](#footnote-292) However when the Welsh followers of Llewelyn ab Iorwerth who were in revolt began attacking his castles, he had to change his plans to deal with them, summoning his force to Nottingham. The provincial treasury at Nottingham now took on increased importance - Holt believes that a total of at least 120,000 marks was held at Nottingham that year for the expedition.[[293]](#footnote-293) Mark was receiving monies from several sources - for example from the *denarii de scaccario* (he even claimed for the costs of the servants of the Treasury bringing the treasure), 1,000 marks from London, 10,000 marks from Hugh de Neville at Marlborough, and 4,000 marks from Rochester.[[294]](#footnote-294) Several large deliveries of coin were also received from his fellow Tourangeaux at Bristol -in July 1212 over 6,000 marks was sent from the Irish treasury (at Bristol) with the help of Engelard who was urged to take good care of the money. Engelard was also ordered to send 42,000 marks from the English treasury at Bristol to Nottingham, the reason being given that the king wished to increase the money at Nottingham and deplete all the gold at Bristol.[[295]](#footnote-295) The *Misae* Rolls also show 48,000 marks going from Bristol to Nottingham at a cost of 40 marks - the same cost appearing in the Pipe Rolls.[[296]](#footnote-296)

Although most of its funds had been dissipated, the treasury at Bristol however still had a role to play, acting on occasion as a half way house - the account of the bishopric of Durham includes the cost of carrying 3,000 marks from Durham to Bristol, and then to London. It also was the main collection point for the tallage of the Jews.[[297]](#footnote-297) Engelard's provincial treasury at Gloucester also retained its importance this year, and the *Misae* Rolls clearly refer to it as a castle treasury – according to some chroniclers in the summer of 1212 it was rumoured that the royal treasury at Gloucester had been plundered (and the queen raped, and her son Richard killed).[[298]](#footnote-298)

1213 proved to be an expensive year for John – he had had to pay for the immediate defence of the kingdom against Philip Augustus as well as to budget for the provisional settlement of 100,000 marks to resolve the dispute between the crown and clergy, to amass money for his proposed continental expedition, to bribe continental princes for their adherence, as well as to give monetary assistance to the Earl of Salisbury who had been despatched to Flanders with a large force in May (Maulay, for example, on 27 May 1213 was ordered to send him 300 marks for his expenses with the proviso that it was to be given only if he was still in Flanders).[[299]](#footnote-299) The king's coffers were filled with the large amount of booty which entered the country after the victory at La Damme, but on the whole the king's revenues were rapidly reducing as he received less income from church lands, and less money from his shrievalties as the increments which had been originally imposed by Richard were removed some time between Michaelmas 1212 and Michaelmas 1213.

After the cancellation of the Welsh expedition, the extant writs become increasingly silent on the involvement of the men from the Touraine in the movement of money, concentrating instead on their role in the redistribution of the supplies. Thus although the extant writs indicate that the intention had been to run down the treasury at Bristol in 1212, in fact in 1213 large amounts of money still apparently remained there which were used to help the war effort in the south - 50,000 marks were sent to Devizes, 20,000 marks to Canterbury, and 50,000 marks to Corfe. With Engelard often away, Peter de Chanceaux continued to carry out many of his important duties and a writ of December 1213 even refers to 'his' treasury. It is unlikely that he was in sole charge at this stage, as in 1227 he was described as Engelard's constable, and it was Engelard himself who paid money into the treasury. [[300]](#footnote-300) Mark too still had considerable sums of money in his treasury at Nottingham in the spring of 1213 which were also sent south - on 29 May just before La Damme he was ordered to hand over to Vieuxpont and Braybrook some 30,000 marks to take from Nottingham to wherever they were instructed - probably to Kent as the king at this time also ordered 10,000 marks to be held at Wingham, and 10,000 marks to be brought from Devizes to Kent.[[301]](#footnote-301) On 10 June, Mark was ordered to listen carefully to what Richard Marshal and Brian de Lisle told him about the treasury, jewels and regalia, as well as crossbows and quarrels which were to be transported by them back to the king.[[302]](#footnote-302) In August 1213, he was ordered to give Ernest Auclent 3,000 marks (after he had delivered some important hostages to him, namely the son of Llewelyn, and Gerard, hostage of Savaric de Mauleon).[[303]](#footnote-303)

In order to meet the many calls on his reserves during these years, John had been forced to turn to every possible means to keep his provincial treasuries well stocked. He made sure always that the smallest amount due was collected and registered – whether the monies came from the sale of surplus stores, wine and fines; even the account of Walter Preston shows 5 marks paid into Nottingham by him in September 1212.[[304]](#footnote-304) He was also careful with its distribution - in October 1212, when the Earl of Salisbury received 500 marks from the custody of Dover, the money was to be placed in the chamber at Nottingham, the earl being allowed to take 100 marks from it.[[305]](#footnote-305) John also asked for aid from his sheriffs – in 1214 Engelard (like many others) was promised that the loan would be paid back.[[306]](#footnote-306) He also did not hesitate to raise money from other sources - much wine and bacon was sold and forest fines were levied.[[307]](#footnote-307) Despite all these efforts, the treasuries at Bristol and Nottingham had to be emptied in December 1213 to help the king prepare for war.[[308]](#footnote-308) That month Peter de Chanceaux and the burghers who were guarding the treasure at Bristol were ordered to give Master Auclent all their money, bar 1,000 marks which they were to retain, as well as the baggage train and war chest for carrying the treasure to La Rochelle.[[309]](#footnote-309) Engelard later paid 103s for its transit, which was a small amount considering that it could have contained up to 200,000 marks as it also included the treasure of Northampton which was brought down that month (and it was joined by the treasure which came down from Corfe in January).[[310]](#footnote-310) On the same day that Peter de Chanceaux was ordered to empty the treasury at Bristol, so Mark was told that Vieuxpont and Braybrook would be coming to him again , and this time he should give them all the money he held, bar three thousand marks.[[311]](#footnote-311)

In February 1214, the expedition to Poitou finally went ahead and John set sail with a huge treasure, many barons, as well as with the queen, his son Richard, and Eleanor of Brittany, leaving Peter des Roches in charge as justiciar - an appointment resented by the barons who grumbled about having a foreigner set over them.[[312]](#footnote-312) Peter de Maulay was to be in charge of the garrison and treasure at La Rochelle, but first he had to collect together the large sums which were needed not only for the expedition itself but to bribe the continental princes whom John had been wooing for several months. In January, Maulay found time to make a visit to Philip Mark who was told to listen to what he said on the king's behalf.[[313]](#footnote-313) He also arranged for the delivery to the royal chamber (now at Portsmouth) of £1,200 which was coming from William Wrotham in Devon.[[314]](#footnote-314) He also took delivery of the money sent by Engelard from Bristol which had now arrived at Portsmouth, as well as 40,000 marks from the treasury at Devizes, and fifteen golden cups, one gold salt cellar, a golden crown and a shrine with gold and rubies which arrived in February.[[315]](#footnote-315)

John landed in France in February 1214 but hesitated to leave the area of La Rochelle for several weeks. The town itself was securely held by Maulay, but only a few miles away, for example at Milécu, there were problems.[[316]](#footnote-316) By 14 March, the chest of treasure had definitely arrived - Maulay was ordered to give to Reginald de Pontibus and the Earl Ferrers a chest with gold and two coffers with all the king's vessels of both gold and silver (and the king's great crown) which was now held at La Rochelle.[[317]](#footnote-317) Now Maulay was having to allocate the money which had been sent to him. He had to buy small and large petraries, pay crossbowmen such as Lupillinus, give the mayor and honest men of La Rochelle some 500 marks for paying a *prest*, and hand over 100 marks to Hubert de Burgh and the mayor of Niort for strengthening their town.[[318]](#footnote-318) In June 1214, he had to give even more generous gifts, for example over 11,250 marks to the preceptor of the Templars at La Rochelle to give to the count of Eu for his land in Normandy.[[319]](#footnote-319) His efficient control of the supply of money and armaments enabled John to enter Anjou on 17 June, but although the king was initially successful, when he reached Roches au Moins (accompanied by Maulay who witnessed there on 25 June) he found that his Poitevin allies refused to help him, and he was forced to retreat back to La Rochelle.[[320]](#footnote-320) The situation continued to deteriorate and on 27 June John's allies were defeated by Philip Augustus at the decisive battle of Bouvines and John was reduced to impotence, as his remaining forces made their peace with the French king. John however was still eager to continue with the war and he still had the means to do this as at that stage the royal coffers at La Rochelle had not yet been depleted. On 14 July, Maulay was instructed to take £100 from the barrel which contained £700 to pay merchants for horses, and it was calculated that £600 was left.[[321]](#footnote-321) This was not the only barrel of coin left in his treasury and on 30 July he was ordered to give Hubert de Burgh money from the 15 barrels of money which he still held, including £100 as a gift. There was however a sense of rising anxiety about the diminishing amounts of money, and on two occasions Maulay had to let Alan Martel know exactly how much money was left in the barrels.[[322]](#footnote-322) There were also problems with security and in September, when he had to send to St Jean d'Angély two barrels of money from the five barrels which he still held in his custody (in each barrel there were 7 sacks), the money had to be escorted by 20 horsemen.[[323]](#footnote-323) There was still enough money left to pay for the Countess of Angouleme's dowry and in one of his final duties before he left France Maulay was ordered to pay this to the Master of the Templars without delay, again making sure first that he had verified the seals of the letters ordering the release of money.[[324]](#footnote-324) As he made ready to depart from France, Maulay was sent some gold vessels to be placed with the king's other plate, but because of the rapidly disintegrating situation within a few days (23 October) he was reminded to take good and diligent care of all the king's things which were in his custody.[[325]](#footnote-325)

In 1215, although Mark and Engelard together with the Chanceaux brothers continued to be responsible for the money held at their provincial treasuries, their coffers were nearly empty and urgent payments had to wait until 'the next pences shall come to the Exchequer'. Even the money which had been deposited with the Templars had been spent and the treasure which Roches had supervised at the Tower was soon to fall to the rebels, although some managed to be removed to Corfe.[[326]](#footnote-326) The Pipe Rolls show that money had haemorrhaged out to pay for example for the troops in Flanders and the subsidies of foreign princes and had failed to come in because of the lost revenues from the church. Now the money which dribbled in had to be carefully allocated – usually to pay the wages of soldiers to ensure their loyalty. At the end of March Mark had to give Faulkes 200 pounds from the 700 marks he had been handed at Nottingham earlier that month, and in April he had to take from the treasury 'which was in his custody' over £105 to pay the soldiers at Scarborough, arranging for the money to be taken there in safe conduct - if he did not have enough men to ensure this then he was to let Geoffrey de Neville know so that help could be given.[[327]](#footnote-327) In May he had to pay the men and soldiers in his own castle of Nottingham £20 taking them up to the end of the quarter.[[328]](#footnote-328) The precarious financial situation did not stop Mark from taking time out to seek recompense for his expenses and on 8 April the king wrote to the barons of the Exchequer about the money Mark had spent on dogs and horses.[[329]](#footnote-329) At sometime during the year Eustace de Lowdham ceased to act as Mark's deputy - he had decided to support his lord, John de Lacy, constable of Chester and now a rebel.[[330]](#footnote-330)

Although they no longer held large reserves of money in their treasuries, the men from the Touraine had shown in the years since Athée disappeared from the limelight that they were competent replacements for him and that they had thoroughly mastered their responsibilities at the provincial treasuries. They had proved that they could act with total honesty - although there was little room for dishonesty as strict regulations demanded that the treasure was only opened with the joint authority of the constable and the burgess custodians. On 16 May 1215 Peter de Chanceaux had to break the locks in order to take out the money, but then he had to reseal everything in the sight of the guardians of the treasury and to keep the keys safely. The next day, when he took out 50-60 marks at a time out for castle operations, he had to oversee the custodians of the treasury of Bristol.[[331]](#footnote-331) The clan had demonstrated that they were well able to arrange for the efficient movement of the money over considerable distances, even though the journeys were slow, tortuous and probably often dangerous as there were no more Exchequer convoys but rather coin was moved in bulk in barrels on carts between the provincial treasuries - for example money was moved in carts from Bristol to Wells and on to Gillingham and Cranborne, and on one occasion it took six days for the carriage of money from Easingwold to Nottingham at a cost of 3s 4d. Carriage was not always straightforward as money was not necessarily moved all at once but by instalments – 4,000 marks was taken from Rochester to London and then moved by instalments to Nottingham. When problems arose, these men were able to show their creativity - at Nottingham keys and a hammer and other tools had to be acquired to empty the barrels of their money.[[332]](#footnote-332) The extant writs show that the clan obediently followed their orders as there were no repeat instructions to them, and Mark in particular appears to have been given a free hand at Nottingham. That is not to say that their duties on occasion did not prove too onerous for them - in 1212, with his increased responsibility for providing money for the Welsh expedition, Mark needed additional help in accounting and that year Eustace de Lowdham assisted his brother Peter, and vouched for Mark's expenditure of £107 on wine and pork. In 1214, Lowdham accounted at the treasury instead of Peter Mark.[[333]](#footnote-333) Engelard too needed the extra help of Peter de Chanceaux on occasion, who clearly took on the principal role at Bristol for example on 10 May and 27 June 1215, when he was instructed to pay Engelard money which was described as being in *his* custody.[[334]](#footnote-334) The king also turned to the Templars (in particular Alan Martel) who in 1213 took on an increasingly important role as custodians of the treasure, thus reducing the burdens placed on the heads of the provincial treasuries.[[335]](#footnote-335)

*Control of armaments, supplies and men*

The years 1209-12 were dominated by almost continuous military activity, and the men from the Touraine (acting as John's castellans and sheriffs) were heavily involved with the provision of armaments, supplies and men not only for John's expeditions abroad but for the protection of the country in times of crisis. In early 1210, shortly after they had taken over Athée's roles, the men from the Touraine were called upon to provide men and armaments for John's expedition to Ireland. Bristol with its position and importance was best placed for such an expedition and Engelard immediately started playing a central role, arranging for supplies to be sent to Ireland. The rolls show that 2,633 salted pigs, 50 cheeses, 260 hens, 152 quarters of barley, 631 quarters of corn, and 669 quarters of oats were sent there, and that over £90 was spent on wine for the king, and over £35 on cloth. [[336]](#footnote-336) As head of this crucial port, Engelard became responsible for the hire of ships to transport men, supplies and armaments, as well as for repairing the king's ships. He also provided 1,900 horseshoes and nails, over 654 hurdles, over 295 pontoons, as well as arranging for the carriage of arms.[[337]](#footnote-337) It was not a one-way movement for as these supplies went out, prisoners and hostages came in.

In the first half of 1212, all the men from the Touraine were heavily involved in the preparations for John's expedition against the Welsh who were attacking the border castles. At Gloucester Engelard had to purchase iron and produce quarrels and anchors – these and other works for the king cost £200. At Bristol, he was producing anchors for the Archdeacon of Taunton, and Peter Balistarius was hard at work with his men producing crossbows.[[338]](#footnote-338) Weapons were stockpiled there, and crossbows were also sent from London to increase the stocks.[[339]](#footnote-339) As he himself was away for considerable periods fighting in Wales, his deputy Andrew de Chanceaux and his constable at Hereford, Godeschal Malines (described as his soldier) and others took on his considerable duties. Andrew was ordered to make payments to the Welsh who were described as being in 'his' custody at Hereford, and 'a soldier of Engelard' was given an amount to pay the bill of £70 2s 6d received for well over one thousand Welshmen.[[340]](#footnote-340)

Philip Mark as sheriff of Nottingham was made responsible for collecting the stores which were needed for the army which had been summoned to Nottingham that summer – the king did not want a repetition of the situation in 1211 when the royal forces were nearly starved to death at Llewelyn's hands.[[341]](#footnote-341) Corn, flour, cheese, bacon, herrings and wine were amassed at both Nottingham and Chester, coming from areas as far away as York and Scarborough.[[342]](#footnote-342) Mark was also asked to provide 300 axes and the Earl of Derby 200 – a small contribution towards the 8,430 diggers and axemen who were summoned in the summer from all around England to construct castles against the Welsh.[[343]](#footnote-343) Peter des Roches was in Nottingham that July, giving instructions to Faulkes de Breauté about Glamorgan.[[344]](#footnote-344) Although the Welsh expedition was cancelled as well as the castle building that summer, the situation in the Welsh Marches continued to remain unstable and as late as June 1213 Peter de Maulay had to give 200 marks to John Marshal to sustain soldiers in the Welsh marches.[[345]](#footnote-345)

On 14 August 1212, just as preparations were nearing completion, John arrived at Nottingham where he heard that Robert FitzWalter and Eustace de Vescy, two northerners, were planning to have him killed or abandoned to the Welsh. According to Matthew Paris, John proceeded to hang 28 Welsh boys at Nottingham who had been left as hostages for their parents' good behaviour.[[346]](#footnote-346) The king was forced to cancel his expedition to Wales, even though this left Vieuxpont still besieged at Mathrafal (although the king did send Engelard and some money to help him). John remained in the security of the castle until 22 August, when he moved on to Rockingham - in all the chaos the constable of Chester forgot his hauberk and Mark forwarded it to him at Rockingham.[[347]](#footnote-347)

Initially, the extant writs show that Mark continued to amass and provide armaments – John may have cancelled the expedition, but he was not going to let the Welsh go unpunished.[[348]](#footnote-348) When Mark was ordered to produce 2 petraries on 24 August he was told that two carpenters were being sent to him and that Hugh de Neville would let him have wood from the royal forest for them, and that he was to account for the cost of their stay (and it duly appeared in the Pipe Rolls for John's 16th year).[[349]](#footnote-349) According to a fragment of a Praestita Roll for 14 John, armaments were also taken to Nottingham by Baldwin, man of Peter de Maulay.[[350]](#footnote-350) However, as news of the cancelled expedition seeped in, Philip Mark at Nottingham (rather than Engelard and the Chanceaux brothers further south) became responsible for dealing with the fall-out to the expedition, in particular sorting out the stores which were no longer required for Wales but which needed either to be retained or redistributed for the next expedition. These began arriving as early as 27 August when he was told to receive several tuns of wine, 275 hams (to be preserved in brine so they did not deteriorate) and horseshoes.[[351]](#footnote-351) Many of the supplies listed in the Pipe Rolls as arriving from Chester, Scarborough and York now had to be redistributed and that August over 51 marks was spent on thirty-four carts, five horses and two carters at Nottingham for seventeen days, and when ten tuns of wine was first bought at York then sent to Chester for the king and then sent back to Nottingham, along with quantities of wheat and barley and hogs, it cost over £106 to distribute.[[352]](#footnote-352)

In April 1213, the focus moved back to the south of England as Philip Augustus was threatening to invade England, and John was forced to station a large army in Kent to counter it. On 12 April Engelard as sheriff of Gloucester was ordered to provide men and arms from the county of Gloucester (leaving enough to garrison the castle) as well as men from Wales who were good and honest. From Hereford he had to provide crossbowmen and cavalry, and from Bristol ships.[[353]](#footnote-353) This writ pre-dated the general call to arms issued, according to Wendover, on 21 April – although this was not the only contradictory writ at this time.[[354]](#footnote-354) John was also faced with the problem of the Earl of Salisbury who needed to be assisted with men and weaponry in Flanders. Maulay, as an official of the chamber which at this time was responsible for financing the king's military expeditions, was not only ordered to give money to the Earl of Salisbury in Flanders but he had to pay the wages of four soldiers and fifteen servants for fifteen days. Later in July he had to make a *prest* to the soldiers and servants who had arrived from Flanders with Walter le Buc and were currently based at Southampton.[[355]](#footnote-355) Maulay like his fellow Tourangeaux was also responsible for the organisation of ships – in June after he had received the necessary security, he was ordered to hand over some ships which were to join the king's fleet, and a few days later he personally was ordered not only to come with ships but also to help Hugh de Boves prepare his ships for war.[[356]](#footnote-356) In July he also had to provide supplies for the messengers of the king of Aragon and of the Count of St Giles who were preparing their ships, and even as late as August he was sent as a messenger to the sheriff of Kent, to arrange for boats to go to Flanders. [[357]](#footnote-357) Despite these many responsibilities, that year he was able to leave the country to go as an envoy to Rome.

John still felt that a full-scale expedition to Poitou was possible and in 1213 arrangements also began in earnest for this. In June, when the king finally ordered his army to assemble and to sail with him to France, Engelard as sheriff of Hereford had to arrange for men and horses to come from Hereford - he had an allowance for their journey to Portsmouth to go and join the king.[[358]](#footnote-358) He was also responsible for the provision of weaponry and he sent 35 crossbows of different types as well as more than 20,000 quarrels to Portchester in June, and in July his deputy, Peter de Chanceaux, had to prepare two arkillos at Bristol and two at Gloucester, as well as a further 24 which also would be sent to him for preparation.[[359]](#footnote-359) Regularly acknowledged now in the writs as constable of Bristol, Peter was particularly involved with the provision of ships which were being made ready for the expedition to Poitou, as well as seamen – Faulkes de Warenne was to be provided with several ships including a galley and the armaments from a Norwegian galley. That summer, the masters and steersmen of ships at Bristol were to be ready in the king's service at Portsmouth, however shortly afterwards the expedition had to be cancelled.[[360]](#footnote-360)

By the end of 1213 John was confident enough of his position at home to contemplate proceeding again with his plans for Poitou – it was proposed that the expedition would sail at the beginning of February 1214, and in expectation of this the treasure from Corfe and Bristol was put on board.[[361]](#footnote-361) The men from the Touraine together with John's servants at London, Southampton, Norfolk and Suffolk started again in earnest to produce armaments and to supply men. In the spring of 1214 Engelard had particularly heavy responsibility and was ordered to send all the quarrels he had to Portsmouth as quickly as possible (keeping several thousand behind for the king's castle) – according to the Pipe Rolls they numbered 45,000. [[362]](#footnote-362) He was responsible for providing some well seasoned wood for making quarrels, as well as iron, and thirty anchors for the king's galleys. From Gloucester he also sent 6,000 quarrels and other weapons through the archdeacon of Taunton.[[363]](#footnote-363) Mark was similarly busy, employing carpenters and their friends to make Turkish petraries and two *talamos* in Nottingham castle - his account in the Pipe Roll for that year includes an amount of £39 19s 5½d for them.[[364]](#footnote-364) The Chanceaux brothers were also involved and as early as January 1214, Peter de Chanceaux was ordered to release a ship to two brothers who were going to Poitou with their family and armour, as well as providing robes for various crossbowmen.[[365]](#footnote-365) That same month, his brother Guy (in association with Henry de Braybrook) had to send all the horses in his custody to Porchester.[[366]](#footnote-366) Even Geoffrey de Martigny, still without a county or castle of his own, was also called upon to support the needs of the king and he was ordered to look after huntsmen and deermen with their dogs.[[367]](#footnote-367) Peter de Maulay, who was going to be in charge of the garrison and treasury at La Rochelle, had several duties to carry out before he left, including the organisation of ships and victuals - for example the release of a ship to go to Poitou on 25 January 1214, and the receipt of hogs from Berkhamstead.[[368]](#footnote-368)

John landed in France in February 1214 but by 27 July 1214, his allies' troops were routed at Bouvines, and the Earl of Salisbury, the counts of Flanders and Boulogne and many others were taken prisoner. Up to the last minute Maulay was attempting to further John's cause – as battle raged at Bouvines he was ordered to give a soldier of Ivan de Jallia some weaponry, as well as using the king's money to pay for three horses, which were to be given to Robert de Mucegros (his soldier) to take to the king.[[369]](#footnote-369) John was anxious not to admit defeat, and as he could not rely on the fickle Poitevins to support him he requested further Welsh troops - in August Engelard, through Peter des Roches, had to supply 300 good Welshmen who were to be ready at Portsmouth to go abroad and he was to pay them not only from the day their journey started but until they came back in order to persuade them to go.[[370]](#footnote-370)

In September 1214, John and Philip Augustus agreed to a truce to run for 5 years, and by 13 October John was back in England. It was left to Peter de Maulay to organise the subsequent retreat from La Rochelle. The day after Bouvines, 28 July, he had to find a ship to bring meat and wine into England and on 29 August he and the mayor of La Rochelle had to allow some ships at La Rochelle to be loaded with grain and other wheat to go to wherever their owners wished. On 1 September, in what was described as the first ship going to England, he had to arrange for two soldiers to be given space, as well as Fillota, the queen's maid, who was to be watched over safely until she reached the Bishop of Winchester who was then to send her on. Priority of passage was also to be given to huntsmen, as well as to Oliver, the bearer of letters, who on his arrival in England was also to be looked after by the Bishop of Winchester who was to give him a packhorse and pay his expenses. John honoured at least some of his debts and Maulay was ordered to reimburse several merchants for the supply of horses of various types (although this order had to be repeated in September), as well as to give a *prest* to men who had come from Ireland.[[371]](#footnote-371) He also had to give a wine cup worth 2 marks to the monks of St Peisance where the king had stayed (and if did not have one, to get one made).[[372]](#footnote-372)

Back in England, John found himself in a dangerously weak position - degraded by the military defeats in particular at Bouvines, in debt because of the cost of the truce, weakened because of the diminishing amount of money coming from royal revenues, and challenged by the animosity of the church and the refusal of barons like Vescy, FitzWalter, Clare, Bohun, Mandeville Brus, Montbegon and William Mowbray either to go overseas or to pay the scutage due at the beginning of September 1214. Up to now he had given the men from the Touraine considerable authority in the collection, production and movement of men, armaments and supplies and he never objected when Engelard for example, delegated his tasks to his deputies. However, now fearing a political crisis, John turned to Faulkes de Breauté to mastermind the distribution and pay of the mercenary forces which had been brought back from Poitou and were being sent to castles throughout the country. For the first time the men from the Touraine were no longer taking their orders directly from the king or making their own decisions but instead were having to listen to Faulkes de Breauté, a royal favourite of the king, and a soldier of obscure Norman parentage who had fought for the king in Poitou and Flanders and had gained a fearsome reputation in the Welsh marches, especially in 1212 when the king ordered him to destroy the Welsh abbey of Strata Florida. None of the men from the Touraine escaped Faulkes' orders - on occasion he was even described as 'our seneschal at Nottingham', a term which would not have pleased Philip Mark.[[373]](#footnote-373) On 30 October, Maulay was told that he was being sent ten serjeants who were skilled crossbowmen and he was to retain them and their armour as Faulkes signified to him and to pay them as Faulkes certified. (On the same day he was to send 20,000 quarrels to Marlborough.)[[374]](#footnote-374) Mark received similar orders at this time and he was told that Godfrey de Crowcombe would be leading twenty serjeants and crossbowmen who were to stay in the castle of Nottingham and he was to retain them, their horses and armour as Faulkes de Breauté instructed and to pay them according to Faulkes' order (on 4 November Faulkes and Crowcombe received £20 from the *prests* which they had made to these serjeants and crossbowmen).[[375]](#footnote-375) In November Mark too was ordered to pay the carpenters which had been sent to him to provide three good petraries an amount which would be decided by Faulkes, namely some 5d-9d per day. On 21 November it was confirmed that the carpenters were indeed arriving and that the petraries they made were destined for Hugh de Neville.[[376]](#footnote-376) Engelard too was ordered to take the advice of Faulkes, in particular when he was sent twenty crossbowmen and was told to retain them as Faulkes advised.[[377]](#footnote-377)

As John prepared for civil war, he relied increasingly on Engelard, Mark and the Chanceaux brothers for the supply of weapons, which were moved around the country to where they were most needed - many castles such as Cirencester, Marlborough and Corfe received extra men and arms to enable them to resist the baronial threat. In March 1215 when barons and knights were summoned to come to Cirencester with horses and arms, Engelard was ordered to give warhorses to Walter de Lacy and John de Monmouth, and in April it was explained that this was to be a *prest*.[[378]](#footnote-378) In May after John had ordered some of his forces to muster at Marlborough, Engelard and Peter de Chanceaux had to send 10,000 quarrels there which were to be released to the constable of its castle. He also had to give William Marshal two wooden siege engines for fortifying the castle which he was guarding for the king.[[379]](#footnote-379) The constable of Gloucester also had to send a mangonel and petrary to Corfe.[[380]](#footnote-380) Engelard himself was sent additional assistance at Hereford – following a visit on 3 February by three men despatched by the king, he was sent two soldiers on 8 May and another soldier on 5 June with his horse and armour. He was also repaid for the weapons which he had made, as he placed the cost of these at the Exchequer in April – at the same time as Mark was placing his.[[381]](#footnote-381) At Bristol, Peter de Chanceaux was often referred to as castellan. He was made responsible for sending armaments in particular to Marlborough (a fragment of a Close Roll shows that he sent 10,000 quarrels) - this he did this in his own right as it was in addition to that provided by Engelard. He also had to send all his ordinary helmets and iron helmets 'both ours and yours', and a further writ of 14 May states that 5 crossbows, three helmets, and one decorated iron helmet had been received at Marlborough from the custody of Peter de Chanceaux. On 17 May the king wrote to Peter de Chanceaux to confirm that twelve crossbows had been received at Marlborough through the hands of Roger Cordwaner (one of the guardians of the treasury at Bristol). On 19 May Chanceaux also had to give Thomas Sandford ropes for two mangonels and that month he also had to take 500 marks out of the monies he had in his custody to pay Engelard.[[382]](#footnote-382) He may have not been following his orders with total obedience as he was ordered not to impede the supplies being led from Bristol to Launceston castle. Mark too was active, supplying armaments to others and on 21 April he had to let Nichola de la Haye at Lincoln have seven crossbows of different types to help fortify the castle there.[[383]](#footnote-383) He also received additional help for himself at Nottingham and on 11 May it was agreed that William Harcourt would be sent there and that Mark was to ensure that he was given five or six crossbowmen who were good horsemen.[[384]](#footnote-384)

The fact that the men from the Touraine were a family group meant that they found it easy to liaise between themselves over the complicated arrangements for the distribution of supplies: on 3 November 1212 Peter de Chanceaux had to send to his brother Guy at Tewkesbury two of the better coats of mail which he held at Bristol as well as all his swords and boots, making sure that these supplies were taken from those which he had in his custody at Bristol and not from the demesne supplies; in June 1213 Guy de Chanceaux, at the Honour of Gloucester, had to arrange for the flour milled at Tewkesbury to be carried to Bristol in ships supplied by his brother Peter; and in 1211 supplies were sent from Gloucester to Nottingham – money was paid to Guy for seven days delay at Gloucester and 3 days' journey.[[385]](#footnote-385) They showed also that they were well able to deal with complicated arrangements for the movement of the supplies - payments were made for carts with two horses carrying grain from Gillingham to Bath to Bristol and then Bristol to Lacock, as well as carts of the wardrobe going from Bath to Bristol with the equipment of the wardrobe. They could also cope with any problems which arose, for example on one occasion they had to deal with the carts of the wardrobe which were going from Bristol to Porchester with the equipment of the wardrobe which had broken down at Farnham.[[386]](#footnote-386) They had shown themselves to be some of John's most able servants, capable of carrying out his orders efficiently and without complaint, and deserving of the trust he put in them.

*Castles*

The men from the Touraine were placed in some of the most important and strategically placed castles in the kingdom as John needed a strong and loyal presence in them. As castellans, they were responsible for keeping their castles in good condition and well garrisoned, and they were left in no doubt that the security of the kingdom and the power of the king rested on their shoulders. The control of the castle was considered to be the most important part of the office of sheriff, and custody of the castle was usually granted 'together with a county' in letters patent.[[387]](#footnote-387) John made sure that he always retained absolute control over his castles – when Geoffrey de Mandeville fined to marry Isabella of Gloucester, it was made clear that although his fine covered all her lands, tenements and fees, it did not include the castle of Bristol.[[388]](#footnote-388) He also made sure that they were always well maintained - especially between 1209-1212 when repairs were undertaken at the castles being guarded by the men from the Touraine namely Bristol, Hereford, Gloucester and Nottingham.[[389]](#footnote-389) It is not surprising that William de Newburgh described castles as being 'the bones of the kingdom'.

Only two of the men from the Touraine appear to have had experience as castellans in France before they came to England - Girard d'Athée had held the castle of Loches, and Engelard may have gained experience as castellan of St Remy sur Creuse. Relying on Athée's previous administrative experience and his considerable military prowess, on his arrival in England John had first placed Athée at Hereford and Gloucester, two counties which bordered the Briouse fiefs and which guarded the approaches to Wales, as well as giving him control of Bristol. His castles remained strong in his hands and he ensured that they were kept in good repair - the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1208 show that 50s 4d was allowed for repairs at Hereford, and the Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1210 confirm that 'Walter de Huntel's fine of 60 marks and a palfrey was paid to Athée for work on the castle of Bristol'.[[390]](#footnote-390)

Engelard gradually replaced Athée as sheriff of Herefordshire, Gloucestershire and castellan of Bristol, but because his responsibilities were so widespread (he also had duties in Wales where he had Ludlow castle in his custody) his deputies were often left in charge.[[391]](#footnote-391) At Hereford, Andrew de Chanceaux was on occasion treated as the sheriff with responsibility for the castle - on 28 May 1213, he was to be given timber from the wood of Aconbury near Hereford to fortify Hereford castle. He and Engelard carried out works at Hereford, and in October 1229 the barons were ordered to make both men quit of the £100 and 5s which had been exacted from them through the summons of the Exchequer in the time of King John. In January 1215, however, when further work was undertaken on the castle, the money was paid over only to Engelard.[[392]](#footnote-392) At Bristol, although Engelard continued to be nominally in charge, after 1213 Peter de Chanceaux was regularly described as castellan, and most instructions about the castle itself were sent to him. It played an important role in John's military strategy at that time, and many men were sent to strengthen it. In May 1215, Aimery de Sacy, Guy de Sezillac and others were sent to Peter de Chanceaux to discuss the guard of the castle and its works, and Peter was to be allowed to take 50 or 60 marks at a time from the treasury for the operations of the castle, with Roger Cordwaner and others (acting as the guardians) overseeing the amounts. John was anxious for Bristol to be strongly guarded and Sezillac and Sacy stayed on to assist Chanceaux there - all three were considered of equal rank as they were ordered jointly to receive some men into the castle and give them arms if they did not have any.[[393]](#footnote-393) On 24 June Sacy and Peter de Chanceaux were jointly ordered to take 30 marks to pay the soldiers at Bristol and also to pay £100 to Engelard.[[394]](#footnote-394) Peter de Chanceaux received further assistance over the coming months: on 20 May Robert Courtenay and Walter de Verdun were sent to Bristol with soldiers and crossbowmen to help fortify the castle; on 22 May Guy de Freschenville and William de Mesnill arrived and Peter de Chanceaux was ordered to give them arms if they had none; they were followed by some Welsh soldiers as well as three other men, some crossbowmen and their servants and two Norman soldiers and two men from Gascony.[[395]](#footnote-395)

Philip Mark was in charge of Nottingham castle, the principal royal fortress in the Midlands holding a vital defensive position as a convenient starting off place for northern England and Wales. The king spent considerable periods of time there – more than at any of the other castles in the hands of his men from the Touraine. John was always concerned about security in the area and his expenditure at Nottingham was only exceeded at two other castles.[[396]](#footnote-396) In 1209, shortly before Mark became sheriff, tents and lances were sent to the castle as well as crossbows. In 1212, when the burgesses of Nottingham and William FitzBaldwin fined 100m for the king's benevolence, the money was used to build a tower near the motte at Nottingham castle.[[397]](#footnote-397) So confident was John of the castle's good defences, considerable supplies and strong castellan, that in 1212 when he heard about the treachery of Vescy and FizWalter whilst he was staying at Nottingham, he did not hasten away as he felt safe – the Waverley annalist described the king as being at Nottingham *per aliquantum tempus*.[[398]](#footnote-398) It was not until 28 August, after mustering his forces and collecting men, supplies and siege engines that he briefly set off, returning on 9 September. Surprisingly, although that summer several northern castles were made ready for war (including Scarborough, Durham, Bamburgh and Newcastle), little reinforcement took place at Nottingham, although there were repairs to the gaol because of the number of prisoners being taken or expected that year.[[399]](#footnote-399) It was only in June 1213, that concerns were raised about the state of repair of the castle, as Richard Marshall and Brian de Lisle were sent to Mark and he was told to listen to what they said about his castle.[[400]](#footnote-400) Master Pinelli and ten of his friends were working on the castle this year, probably constructing a barbican at the outer gate for which they were paid £34 (an account which appears in the Pipe Rolls for John's 16th year) and in October 1213, 100 marks was ordered to be paid to Mark through his valet for works on the castle.[[401]](#footnote-401) At some stage in the reign the castle may have been enlarged as compensation was later paid for the property 'lost by the ditch of the barbican of the castle' and 'by the increase of the outer bailey of the castle'.[[402]](#footnote-402) When the Exchequer was restored in 1219, Mark obtained a writ of *computate* for £213 which he had spent on making a watchtower, and repairing walls and mills.[[403]](#footnote-403) He was given considerable independence in deciding what should be done to improve the castle - in August 1214 Peter des Roches was ordered to give him money for the castle, *sicut viderit expendere*.[[404]](#footnote-404)

John not only provided money to keep the structure of Nottingham castle strong, but he also sent men to Mark to ensure that it was well garrisoned. On 16 August 1214, fearing the effect which his defeat at Bouvines had had on the country, the king sent Thomas Erdington and Henry de Vere to several sheriffs including Philip Mark and Andrew de Chanceaux to tell them things which could not be put in writing about the king's castles and their defence.[[405]](#footnote-405) In October 1214 Godfrey de Crowcombe and his 80 crossbowmen were due to arrive to stay at Nottingham and at the end of the month a further 20 serjeants were sent to Mark.[[406]](#footnote-406) After the failure of discussions in January in London, John pressed on still further with his preparations for civil war, making sure that his castles were well manned. On 28 January Mark was ordered to allow Ralph de Troubleville with his men and horses to come into his castle and help guard it. He was also told that other armed men would also be coming - six more men were sent on 17 February and he was to repair their carts and make sure that they had the arms and armour required by good soldiers. He was allowed to send the bill to the Exchequer, on the understanding that he would be repaid *prout eos contingent*.[[407]](#footnote-407) At the end of March 1215 when the king and Faulkes stayed at Nottingham for several days, they were accompanied by carts containing, amongst other things, weapons which Mark was to look after.[[408]](#footnote-408) Whilst there the king reviewed his military arrangements, giving many instructions to other towns and castles: palisades were to be erected at Doncaster, Scarborough was to be strengthened and Oldcotes was to be given help with his garrisoning. As tensions grew still further in the Spring, Mark was sent further assistance - on 11 May William Harcourt was ordered to go to Nottingham and Mark was to give him five or six crossbowmen.[[409]](#footnote-409) Mark was also ordered to pay £80 for the expenses of the soldiers and serjeants in Nottingham castle. John was careful to ensure that Mark's shrievalty and not just the castle was properly secured - in October 1214 Robert Lexington was ordered to find twenty serjeants for guarding Nottinghamshire and twenty for Derbyshire, and the cost was to be computed at the Exchequer.[[410]](#footnote-410) The account of Brian de Lisle for Michaelmas 1214 also shows that three horsemen and ten footmen had been sent to Nottinghamshire for forty-two days, and the same number to Derbyshire.[[411]](#footnote-411) Although he was controlling one of the most important royal castles in the realm and one which was supremely well garrisoned and stocked, it never made him as militarily powerful as Ranulf, Earl of Chester, who could draw on a force of Marcher knights from his palatinate shire to augment the English levies of himself and Earl Ferrers.[[412]](#footnote-412)

By February 1215 Peter de Maulay was at Corfe with men and armour, and orders were given for his lands and possessions to be protected whilst he was in the king's service there.[[413]](#footnote-413) Maulay however may have had some earlier role there as early as in July 1213 Engelard was told that some hostages had been received through Peter de Maulay at Corfe. He may also have been sent there immediately on his return from La Rochelle as on 30 October 1214 he had to give John de Lisewis 20,000 quarrels to take to Marlborough, a subsequent writ of November showing that these quarrels had come from Corfe.[[414]](#footnote-414)

Surprisingly John did not entrust the county of Dorset/Somerset to Maulay when he gave him his responsibilities at Corfe castle. Instead in April the king granted the shrievalty to Ralph de Bray, and Peter de Maulay had to wait until 26 June 1216 before he took over.[[415]](#footnote-415) John may have felt that Maulay had too many responsibilities elsewhere in the kingdom – for example in the Fossard fee which he had gained through his marriage in 1214, and which included the important vill of Doncaster which formed part of a string of defence in the centre of rebel territory preventing the baronial rebels from taking concerted action. On 30 March 1215, the king ordered Maulay to instruct his bailiffs to enclose the vill with hertstone and stakes, and to build with all haste a light barbican on the bridge to defend it if necessary. [[416]](#footnote-416) Maulay also had personal responsibilities at his *caput* of Mulgrave in the Fossard fee, and he was also busy advising on other castles - not only did he have to send a soldier to check that Eudo de Martel, constable at Sherborne, was coping but he also had to give him 20 marks for arming and fortifying the castle.[[417]](#footnote-417) However, as far as the king was concerned, Maulay's main responsibilities lay at Corfe castle - a fragment of a Close Roll about Hugh de Poinz was directed to both Maulay and the sheriff of Dorset and Somerset, and on 25 May 1215, it was Maulay who was told to let Robert de Dreux into the castle and to show him hospitality, even going so far as allowing him into the tower if he so wished.[[418]](#footnote-418)

In the spring of 1215, changes had to be made at Northampton as John had become concerned about the loyalty of Henry de Braybrook, its castellan and sheriff. John was conscious of the need to maintain the security of this important castle deep in enemy territory, especially as in January 1215 it had been arranged that the king and the baronial rebels should meet there on 26 April. He originally ordered Richard Marsh to go there to make such alterations which would ensure the safety of the castle but Marsh did not acquit himself well and John had to find an alternative. Instead of turning to any of those experienced men waiting in the wings for promotion, John turned to one of Athée's friends, Geoffrey de Martigny, despite the fact that he appears to have had no previous experience as a castellan.[[419]](#footnote-419) Shortly after Easter 1215 John sent Geoffrey de Martigny to Northampton where he initially worked alongside Braybrook - on 14 April in an order given to Braybrook, the soldiers were said to be under both him and Martigny, and the arrangements for the despatch of supplies were to come through the agreement of Martigny.[[420]](#footnote-420) It was clearly a delicate situation but by 17 April, Martigny was considered to be the constable of Northampton – as such he was given permission to collect wood in Saucey forest to enclose and fortify the castle.[[421]](#footnote-421) Braybrook's fate began to be sealed when the barons marched to Northampton following their meeting at Stamford, even though they had been given letters of safe conduct and the Barnwell annalist stated that they did this 'without doing any act of violence'.[[422]](#footnote-422) After leaving Northampton without meeting the king, the barons moved on to Brackley where they sent messages to the king, but according to the *Chronica Majora* he would not accede to their demands. They therefore renounced their homage, chose FitzWalter as their leader, and then moved back to Northampton to begin their siege. Northampton was the first castle to be attacked after FitzWalter was put in charge of the rebel forces, but despite his leadership the siege was unsuccessful - mainly because the barons had not come with siege engines, preferring to rely on Henry de Braybrook to be disloyal and hand over the castle peaceably (he was still sheriff of Northamptonshire and therefore technically Martigny's superior).[[423]](#footnote-423) Martigny however put up a good defence and after two weeks the barons were forced to move on to Bedford castle, which unlike Northampton was handed over by its castellan, William de Beauchamp, without a struggle. By 14 May 1215 Braybrook was clearly in disgrace and his lands were being taken into the king's hands - a day later Martigny was made responsible for distributing them, and at the same time he was to permit others who wished to come back to the king to do so, provided they gave good security.[[424]](#footnote-424) Throughout the whole episode Geoffrey de Martigny acted with absolute probity although the situation at Northampton (according to the Barnwell annalist and Coggeshall) remained unsettled and it is possible that some townsmen rose up and killed members of the garrison.[[425]](#footnote-425) The king himself however failed to act decisively even though the siege placed the barons in open revolt. He may have sent the earls of Salisbury, Surrey and Pembroke to secure the royal castles around Northampton, but that was the extent of his intervention.[[426]](#footnote-426) It is possible that he was awaiting the arrival of his mercenary troops, or that he was hoping to negotiate with the barons (his meeting with Geoffrey de Mandeville and Giles Briouse took place during the siege). However John himself was pleased with Martigny's efforts and loyalty and he involved him in the negotiations with the barons which followed. On 10 June, when John wrote to his military agents in the south and Midlands to inform them that the truce had been extended and that they should desist from hostilities, Geoffrey de Martigny was one of the recipients of the writ.[[427]](#footnote-427) If, as Holt states, the Articles of Barons were being negotiated at this stage and that negotiations were no longer being carried out by envoys but by the full assembly of both parties, then Geoffrey was playing an important role in the prelude to Magna Carta 1215.[[428]](#footnote-428)

*Prisoners*

The fact that the men from the Touraine were given custody of many hostages would not have endeared them to the baronage - even though the taking of hostages was a normal disciplinary method of government. Hostages were regularly demanded from important barons such as Aubigny, Ros, Montbegon and Briouse, and even William Marshal was prepared to hand over all his children as hostages.[[429]](#footnote-429) As hostages were often held as 'personal' prisoners (a writ in April 1215, just before the king handed Dorset and Somerset to Ralph de Bray, stated that he had secured through William Harcourt at Corfe the hostages of the king of Scotland and other prisoners, 'and he was to be made quit'), the men from the Touraine were able to personally able to benefit from their retention. Before the loss of Normandy, John was becoming increasingly concerned about the value of his prisoners – so much so that even a few days after the turmoil of Arthur's disappearance, the king was in correspondence with Athée about the exchange of prisoners.[[430]](#footnote-430) Athée himself had been very successful at taking prisoners when he was in France, although he had to pass on most of the ransoms - when he was given the lands of William de Pressigny to guard in 1202, he was allowed to capture the enemy and redeem them but for the benefit of the king and seneschal. In 1202 he was so successful that he was able to send Vieuxpont at Chinon some £2,050 angevin which he had accumulated from the redemption of prisoners.[[431]](#footnote-431)

John had initially placed Athée at Hereford and Gloucester in order to curb the power of William de Briouse. When Engelard took over Athée's responsibilities, he continued to guard hostages connected with the Briouse family and its supporters, as well as distributing their lands.[[432]](#footnote-432) William de Briouse's wife Matilda may have been held in prison at Bristol as at her request she gave an audience there to her husband, who ratified the fine she had made with John (but regrettably he fled just before the instalment was due).[[433]](#footnote-433) Annora, sister of Giles de Briouse (the bishop of Hereford) and the wife of Hugh de Mortimer, was also placed in his custody after Giles joined the baronial opposition - Peter des Roches had allowed Hugh de Mortimer to succeed to Giles' estates on the condition that Annora was kept hostage under Engelard.[[434]](#footnote-434) On 27 October 1214, at a council held at Wigmore, the papal legate negotiated her release and Engelard was ordered to hand her over.[[435]](#footnote-435) Engelard was also responsible for the hostages who were left by Walter de Lacy when he was given back all his lands except Ludlow in July 1213.[[436]](#footnote-436) In 1215 Engelard was ordered to release certain prisoners after Walter de Lacy went bail for them, for example for William de Lacy (his half brother), John de Feypo and Roger de Tuit.[[437]](#footnote-437)

Engelard guarded at least some of his prisoners well, for example Arthur's sister Eleanor who it was said was imprisoned at Bristol for 40 years, although the chancery writs show that she was with the queen and daughter of the king of Scotland in 1204/5 and went to Aquitaine and Poitou with the king in 1214.[[438]](#footnote-438) But there were others who on occasion languished in gaol for long periods and were treated extremely harshly. According to the Dunstable annalist, at the instigation of the Earl of Salisbury, John imprisoned one of his ablest clerks, Geoffrey of Norwich, at Bristol after he withdrew from the Exchequer because he did not wish to serve an excommunicate king. John compounded the punishment by ordering that a leaden cope to be placed on him.[[439]](#footnote-439) In April 1215, Engelard was ordered to release a prisoner who had been captured before 1208 (when Vieuxpont had held Nottingham).[[440]](#footnote-440) On the whole, however, Engelard appears to have acted efficiently and released his prisoners when requested, as there are no repeat instructions to him. He moved quickly when ordered to release John de Monmouth's son 'because of his infirmity' - John mainperning through his charter that he would return the son unless he died earlier.[[441]](#footnote-441) In June 1213 when he was given an order to send three men under safe conduct who were in his custody, he fulfilled it promptly as on 2 September Reginald de Pontibus was given an order about the same hostages who had reached him.[[442]](#footnote-442) Engelard was not left out of pocket, and for example in 1210 he was compensated for transporting ten hostages from Bristol.[[443]](#footnote-443) He was ably supported by his deputy Peter de Chanceaux who on occasion acted as the constable in charge of prisoners, for example in July 1213 when he was ordered to put in prison those Jews who would not pay the tallage (all such culprits were to be incarcerated at Bristol prison).[[444]](#footnote-444) In June 1215 as constable he was ordered to release a man who was described as being in 'his' custody.[[445]](#footnote-445)

Philip Mark held several important prisoners at Nottingham, for example some hostages of Savaric de Mauleon who were being sent to him on 30 August 1213 and February 1214, as well as Llewelyn's son, and several prisoners from Guernsey and Jersey.[[446]](#footnote-446) He appears however to have been more ruthless in his treatment of prisoners at Nottingham, and they were not always so fortunate as Engelard's. On 14 August 1212 when the king arrived at Nottingham, having completed his preparations for going against Wales, he hanged twenty-eight hostages even before he had sat down to dinner.[[447]](#footnote-447) Although the *Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough* stated that they were punished because Llewelyn was unfaithful, Painter considered this act of John savage beyond the custom of the day.[[448]](#footnote-448) Ordinary prisoners could languish in squalor for many years at Nottingham, although this may have been due more to do with failure for them to be mainperned rather than any obstruction put forward by the castellan. Some men who had been turned down as hostages for William of Lancaster were held as prisoners by Mark for so long that a complaint was made about their imprisonment in 1222. The hostage left for William d'Aubigny was also unlawfully held well into the reign of Henry III.[[449]](#footnote-449)

Peter de Maulay who only started acting as constable of Corfe in February 1215 (shortly before Geoffrey de Martigny was placed at Northampton) had little time before Magna Carta 1215 to benefit from the ransom of prisoners. At this time John was treading carefully and trying to appease his barons rather than to take hostages - on 13 May, even though he had heard of an uprising in the south west led by William de Montagu and others, he commanded Maulay that if he captured William de Montagu, then he should release him without delay, along with any goods which had been captured.[[450]](#footnote-450)

Important hostages were frequently moved between castles, and John's men from the Touraine were often ordered to liaise with members of their own group as well as with other castellans around the country over their transfer: in July 1213, Engelard received some prisoners through Peter de Maulay at Corfe; in January 1214 he had to send some of his own prisoners to Portsmouth, and in April 1215, he and the Earl of Arundel and William de Cantiloupe were all ordered to send certain prisoners to the Tower of London.[[451]](#footnote-451) Engelard, Maulay and Geoffrey de Martigny were all involved with the son of the Count of Dreux, cousin of the French king, who had been captured at Nantes in June 1214 and was to be exchanged for the Earl of Salisbury who had been captured at Bouvines.[[452]](#footnote-452) Engelard had him in his custody on 17 January 1215, when Faulkes de Breauté was sent to him to collect him and take him to Winchester. Geoffrey de Martigny was to assist here along with Aymery de Sacy, liaising with Engelard over the transfer.[[453]](#footnote-453) Dreux was considered to be such an important prisoner that Engelard was ordered to provide men to guard him, making sure that he did not compromise the security of the king's castles and his own bailiwick. The exchange did not take place immediately as in May 1215, Peter de Mauley was told that if Robert de Dreux, the father, and his men appeared in his parts then he should receive them honourably and show them hospitality in the hall in the bailey of the castle, and if they wished to stay a while, then they were to be allowed to do so, and he was to let the king know when and if the count arrived.[[454]](#footnote-454)

The movement of prisoners on occasion confused the chroniclers – Dunstable stated that Geoffrey of Norwich was imprisoned at Bristol, whereas the annals of St Edmunds says that he was captured at Nottingham.[[455]](#footnote-455) Matthew Paris was totally confused placing the event under both 1209 and 1212, and stating that Geoffrey of Norwich had been captured and tortured to death at Nottingham. By the time he was writing the *Historia Anglorum*¸ he had merged the two stories, but kept the death at Nottingham.[[456]](#footnote-456) The murder of prisoners such as Geoffrey of Norwich and the family of William de Briouse, and the imprisonment of women and children generally, were associated with races like the Welsh and Irish who did not have a code of chivalry, and the inclusion of the men from the Touraine in these matters was yet another way for the chroniclers to blacken their names.

The men from the Touraine were not only entrusted with hostages left as security for barons, or men who had offended the king or been captured in battle, but were put in charge of members of the royal family who are often described as being 'in their custody'. Their loyalty was considered to be so unwavering that Maulay in particular was entrusted with the care of several members of the royal family - according to the *Histoire des Ducs* he had the queen and Henry in his care during the civil war. He also cared for Richard who arrived at Corfe with his teacher , Roger Acaster, as well as a washerwoman and two trumpeters, when he was six (on 29 April 1215). Maulay was assured that the cost would be met *inter nos*.[[457]](#footnote-457) Eleanor was also his responsibility at times - the extant writs show that she was at Corfe in July 1213 (before Maulay's arrival there), but she remained there under his care and in 1221 he was reimbursed for some of the money he had spent on her. He may even have had responsibilities towards her when he was at La Rochelle in 1214, as Coggeshall states that Eleanor, the Queen and Richard all accompanied the king to France, and a writ of July that year shows Maulay arranging for her to have robes, sheets and chemises. At that stage she was probably still in Vieuxpont's custody as in November 1214 William Malet and Faulkes were sent to Vieuxpont to discuss sending the king's *neptem* to Corfe. She arrived shortly afterwards as Maulay was ordered to allow Robert de Ropesley and others to visit her.[[458]](#footnote-458)

Early in 1214 when she married Geoffrey de Mandeville, Isabella of Gloucester was in the custody of Peter de Chanceaux - his brother Guy de Chanceaux and Thomas Sandford were sent to him to make arrangements for her and that same month Guy was paid over £13 for the robes which he had bought for the countess, her maids and the daughter of the king of Scotland.[[459]](#footnote-459) Engelard at Gloucester was responsible for Isabella of Angouleme, in December 1214 whenTerric the German was ordered to take her to Gloucester and to guard her in the chamber where she gave birth to Joan. As sheriff he was ordered to receive them and look after them, which would indicate that the queen was there for her own safety, rather than being 'imprisoned'. Strangely a writ of 19 June 1215 addressed to both her and Teutonicus ordered them to release a prisoner in their custody.[[460]](#footnote-460)

The king of Scotland's daughters were also placed in the care of the men from the Touraine and frequently moved between them. In 1210 Philip Mark rendered his account for them when they all stayed for one night at Ripon, and in 1212 Engelard bought robes for them and their governess.[[461]](#footnote-461) In that latter year Philip Mark was reimbursed for the expenses he incurred when they (and the daughter of the Countess of Aumale) travelled from Nottingham to Winchester - on this occasion the payments were made through Peter de Maulay, John FitzHugh and Robert Barville.[[462]](#footnote-462) Sometime during 1213/1214 Maulay travelled with this same group to Windsor, as the account of John FitzHugh shows a total of over £14 for the eight days they stayed there with Peter de Maulay and his friends.[[463]](#footnote-463) In January 1214, Peter de Chanceaux as constable of Bristol had at least one of the daughters of the king of Scotland in his custody, and in May 1216, his brother Guy still had some control over at least one of the king of Scotland's daughters as he had to find the essentials for her.[[464]](#footnote-464) At one stage, Engelard also held the son of Llewelyn (along with other hostages), and these were only released at the petition of John's daughter (wife of Llewelyn) in December 1214.[[465]](#footnote-465)

*Military duties*

It is most likely that John was originally attracted to the men from the Touraine because of their military skills – he always valued a good warrior – although details of their careers before they arrived in England are limited. Athée demonstrated great military promise in France when he fought at Tours and defended Loches with great courage, and Engelard may have demonstrated military strength when he acted as castellan of St Remy sur Creuse. Modern historians have described Athée and his group as mercenaries, for example Powicke who wrote that 'John's mercenaries were the main source of his strength' and that the king 'trusted mercenaries more than his barons, took a natural pleasure in ignoble vigour and delighted to flout social and political conventions'.[[466]](#footnote-466) However, unlike Algais and Lupescaire, Athée and his clan were not mercenaries who served whoever paid the highest price, and they were never rewarded with booty which was specially protected, nor did they have control of their own prisoners (although as John's castellans they may have benefited from their ransoms). Athée and his men may have been a close group whose members were connected by birth and territory, but as individuals and as a group their loyalties were always directed towards just one king, and that was the king of England, whether they were acting as military leaders, heads of provincial treasuries, sheriffs of counties, or castellans.

Although the men from the Touraine had considerable military experience and were in charge of some of John's most important castles, only Geoffrey de Martigny at Northampton (aided perhaps by his brother Matthew) was called upon to defend his castle before Runnymede - which he did with considerable success. The clan however was called upon to show its military muscle elsewhere. Athée as bailiff was sent to Wales to deal with William de Briouse, thus ‘when the axe fell on Briouse, it was Athée who yielded it’.[[467]](#footnote-467) Engelard was called upon to fight in northern England according to Vincent, and in Wales on several occasions, for example in 1212 and in 1213.[[468]](#footnote-468) Unlike Engelard who was constantly on the move leaving his deputies in charge, Mark had a semi-autonomous position at Nottingham and his presence was normally required there and that is from where he supported John. It is possible that Mark may have advised at Odiham castle as in 1211 his expenses were paid by the sheriff of Surrey and he also may have been at Hanley castle in 1212 (with Maulay), although this may have been his brother. He also went to Wales in 1212 although the *Misae* Roll is unclear on this issue as although it lists the expenses of the sheriff of Nottingham and Robert de Lisle , the verb used is in the singular (who is in Wales). He was not there at the same time as the king who remained in Westminster - a fine was not heard there 'because the king did not go to Wales'.[[469]](#footnote-469)

According to the extant records, after their arrival in England the men from the Touraine (apart from Maulay) appear never to have been called upon to assist John militarily on the continent. If, as Vincent states, the very *raison d'être* for their exile was so that they were around to 'share his [John's] ambition of reconquest in France', this is surprising, especially as John needed all the help he could get in France - shortly after Athée arrived in England, Robert de Turnham was heading back to France in February 1208 to help keep order there.[[470]](#footnote-470) In 1209 John could also have benefited from additional assistance - although Savaric had been helping in Poitou as seneschal, Geoffrey de Lucy who went out that year to Poitou with treasure reported back that 'it seems to us that the lord Savaric only concerns himself with your business to the extent of receiving all the fruits of your land and does absolutely nothing in carrying out your business.'[[471]](#footnote-471) It is possible that even if the original intention of the clan was to remain in England only until such time as their homeland was recovered, they may have found it difficult to return as they were viewed as turncoats.[[472]](#footnote-472) It is possible that Athée was prevented from returning to France because of the terms of his ransom release, but there were others who found no difficulty in serving on both sides of the channel, even after their capture by Philip Augustus and subsequent release on payment of a ransom. Robert de Turnham after his release still crossed between the two countries, sometimes several times a year - in April 1207 he was in La Rochelle, in October back in England, in December preparing to set sail for France with 12,000 quarrels, in February 1208 in Poitou and in December back in England.[[473]](#footnote-473) Hubert de Burgh, ransomed after Chinon, became deputy to Ivan de Jallia, the seneschal of Poitou in 1212, and then became seneschal in his own right in 1213/14. Similarly Savaric de Mauleon who was captured at Mirebeau and imprisoned by John, later changed sides and assisted Robert de Turnham in Poitou until the latter was taken prisoner. At this time he replaced him as seneschal of Poitou and moved between France and England with impunity - he is found helping John in England in early 1215 with his troops, and became one of John's closest advisers before Runnymede.

The only one from the group from the Touraine who returned to his homeland to try to help King John regain his continental lands was Peter de Maulay, but then he was not an integral part of Athée's clan. Initially he appears to have been based in England but in May 1213 he may have been in Flanders as he was ordered to pay the Earl of Salisbury 300 marks for his expenses whilst there, with the proviso that *si non remanserit ibi prout naves tunc illas referatis*.[[474]](#footnote-474) He also went to Rome as an envoy and in 1214 he was invaluable to John whilst in charge of the garrison and treasury at La Rochelle.

*Administrative and judicial duties*

It is possible that from late 1205 John was counting on Athée and his clan to come to England to carry out particular duties for him. However any roles which he had specifically allocated to them had to be temporarily put aside as Athée's ransom arrangements were protracted and it took over two years of negotiation to achieve his release. In 1206/7 the situation became more pressing as John needed to replace several sheriffs who were proving to be inefficient and possibly disloyal. He also needed to find efficient servants who could be placed in control of the new provincial treasuries which were now being set up, as well as strong, military experienced men who could be his sheriffs in counties which abutted the lands of powerful magnates such as Briouse. He therefore began to take a more proactive approach to Athée's release, enlisting for example the help of the Templars, and by the autumn of 1207 his negotiations had been successful and there was no impediment to Athée leaving France. Athée and his clan could now be placed in roles where they controled armaments, men and treasure, thus providing the king with the support which he needed. By bringing them to England, John was not following a policy of relying on foreign born men as his sheriffs - Morris has demonstrated that of the 100 or so sheriffs in office between 1199 and 1215, only six or seven were foreign born. Instead John had turned to this particular group because he was personally attracted to them and he knew that he could count on their loyalty.[[475]](#footnote-475) Although he had no concerns about relying on Athée who had already demonstrated that he was militarily skilful and administratively competent, he was more circumspect about granting important posts to Athée's relatives and friends as he was conscious of their lack of experience. They therefore had to wait for several months at Hurstbourne without any specific duties, until Athée arrived in the country and they could be placed under him.

During the course of his reign John retained the group on the whole in the same shrievalties in which they had started their English careers, only moving them around the country when assistance was temporarily needed elsewhere. Although it was unusual to have relatives in adjoining shrievalties and for sheriffs to remain based in one shrievalty for long periods (especially as it was virtually unknown for a shrievalty to be an hereditary appointment), the men from the Touraine acted so expertly, reliably and loyally that John did not feel the necessity or inclination to make any changes – especially as he was also aware that much of their strength came from their interdependence.[[476]](#footnote-476)

In France Athée had administered his areas competently and had demonstrated sound judgement, and once placed in his many positions in England, he continued to show that with the help of his clan he was able to carry out John's instructions just as efficiently. His decisions continued to be respected by the king - not only were his views listened to when Meilier put forward his proposals, but the king gave him considerable leeway in other decisions, for example when the king agreed to accept Robert Evercy's wife's offer if Athée thought it expedient.[[477]](#footnote-477) He also proved himself to be administratively competent and in the months following the proclamation of the interdict, the king was able to count on him to seize the property of the clergy, both secular and monastic, in his bailiwicks. As each case of confiscation was considered on its own merits, and as there were no set rules for dealing with the goods, Athée's abilities were sorely tested. Sometimes he had to hand the lands to barons who were acting as guardians for the crown for all church property on their estates or who had been entrusted with property which had been seized – for example on 17 March 1208 Athée was ordered to seize the manors of the bishop of Worcester (who had left the country when the interdict was proclaimed) and to hand them over to William de Cantiloupe or his bailiffs.[[478]](#footnote-478) Sometimes Athée had to return lands to the clergy who had been able to purchase a writ which gave them back their property, for example lands were returned to the Abbess of Wilton, the Abbot of Muchelney, the Abbot of St Augustine Bristol, as well as the canons of Keynsham and the bishop of Bath.[[479]](#footnote-479) Sometimes however restrictions were placed on the return - Athée was ordered to give back all the lands to the bishop of Hereford in his bailiwick 'except those things which we spoke about'. Some arrangements were easier than others for Athée to carry out as they were designed to cause as little problem as possible - on several occasions the goods were to be looked after by the owners' servants or close associates - both Athée and Vieuxpont were informed separately that de Lisle had been granted the lands, rents and goods of Alexander of Dorset because of the interdict, and that they were not to interfere with them as de Lisle would answer to the king.[[480]](#footnote-480)

Not all the arrangements for return of property however were carried out by Athée without problem. He retained the seven Gloucester hundreds, an extensive area over which Cirencester abbey claimed jurisdiction, and it was not until 9 July 1215 that these were finally restored to the abbot and canons of Cirencester by the new sheriff of Gloucester, who was to let them have them in peace. Athée’s seizure of this land was remembered as late as 1224 when an entry in the Fine Rolls stated that an inquisition had been made into the matter of the seven hundreds, and refers to the time they were given by the king’s predecessor up to the time when ‘Athée, custodian of the county of Gloucester, disseised the said’.[[481]](#footnote-481) Athée was also remembered for disseising the lepers of St Laurence, Bristol - in August 1215 Philip d'Aubigny was ordered to give them back some land which was taken by him following the order given by Athée.[[482]](#footnote-482) The cases of the seven hundreds and the lepers were seized upon by later historians to illustrate what they perceived to be Athée's evil character. Although Maitland concluded that the churches in the Midlands in particular felt his heavy hand, Athée should not bear the criticism alone as he was only following the king's instructions at the time to seize all ecclesiastical goods. In the case of the seven hundreds and the lepers, reparation also could have been made at any time by any of his successors - Engelard for example was still in control of the seven hundreds at Michaelmas 1214, four years after Athée had left the limelight, and these were only returned after he was replaced on 8 July.[[483]](#footnote-483)

Athée has also been criticised for his administration of local justice, particularly in the county of Gloucester, but as John's sheriff he had to make sure that the crown received the full amounts owed to it from every conceivable source, whether it be dues, fines or judicial amercements. Maitland, for example, believed that the chief charge against Athée's clan in 1221 was that they took ransoms from all pleas of the crown. The Gloucester crown pleas of 1221 purport to show several cases in which Athée abused his position as sheriff. He was said to have occasionally released prisoners for money – two men who killed Geva de Pinbury were imprisoned by Athée who then released them for five marks. In another case, two women who were imprisoned for killing a man whose body was found in a lake, were subsequently released by Athée, presumably for a small fee. On occasion Athée appears to have taken money even though the death was an accident - Nicholas le Bindère's sister accused three of his servants of beating him to death a year before, but despite a judgment of death by accident being pronounced, Athée took 50 marks from one man for his own use.[[484]](#footnote-484) Turner however summed up Athée's judicial approach correctly when he stated that the pleas do show certain irregularities but 'nothing which suggests that he was arbitrary, cruel or extortionate'.[[485]](#footnote-485)

Athée was also accused of hearing cases in his own county – but he heard just one case as sheriff before 1210, and that was just after he had taken over the shrievalty of Gloucester.[[486]](#footnote-486) Although an ordinance of 1194 had forbidden any sheriff from judging in his own county (although there was no objection to a local man acting as a judge in his own country, and no objection to a sheriff being a judge outside of his county), it proved difficult to enforce as it was almost impossible to get the correct balance between the prevention of abuse by sheriffs and the retention of the invaluable expertise of judges who were also sheriffs. It was therefore not unusual for sheriffs to hear cases in their own counties, and between 1194 and 1209 there were twenty occasions when a sheriff or under-sheriff acted as judge in his own county and two when they may have done so (and four when a judge sat in a shire where he had previously been sheriff).[[487]](#footnote-487) Even William Marshal when sheriff had imposed amercements on the men of Cheltenham.

Engelard who replaced Athée at Gloucester, Hereford and Bristol, was curiously always formally referred to in the Pipe Rolls as Engelardus de Ciconiaco (as sheriff of the county) but as Engelardus de Cigogny in the general text for the county. He appears to have acquitted himself reasonably well as sheriff of Gloucester and Hereford, partly because of the assistance given to him by Richard Burgeis (who accounted for him at the Exchequer from Michaelmas 1209 until the last Pipe Roll in 1214), and Andrew and Peter de Chanceaux (who took on many of his responsibilities whilst he was away). Engelard was so adroit in managing the affairs of his shrievalties that he was able to escape many of his liabilities and debts. He was helped by the fact that the liabilities of the county were unclear – when the Marshal was sheriff it was ruled that he was not responsible for the increment and no further action was taken to exact it, but when Mucegros replaced him, he was ordered to pay an increment of £100 a year, and when Athée took over from him, he was held responsible *de firma ville sue cum crementis*.[[488]](#footnote-488) When John began introducing a system whereby the sheriffs instead of being farmers became custodian sheriffs who rendered the account for the shire farm plus an additional and variable amount *de proficuo comitatus*, the profit for Gloucester (for 1208, 1209 and 1210) was set at 60 marks per year, which was midway between the amount set for Wiltshire (40 marks) and Hampshire (100 marks). Engelard successfully managed to escape most of what was due even though it took many years for him to achieve this. [[489]](#footnote-489) When the Pipe Rolls for 17 John were compiled in the early 1220s, Gloucester does not even feature, perhaps because Engelard was making it difficult for the Exchequer to gather information on his shrievalty.[[490]](#footnote-490) However the barons of the Exchequer were not willing to allow Engelard to escape paying the arrears they considered were due - the Pipe Roll for 3 Henry III clearly stating, for example, that his debt for the profits of the county had reached 180 marks. In the following year his arrears (which included scutages, tallages, chattels, castle works at Bristol and Hereford, and expenses at Gloucester) were totalled up, but (like Mark) he was cleared of all £2,666 of them on the grounds that he had spent all he owed on repairs to castles and accommodating the king and his followers in particular at Bristol and Hereford. The Exchequer at this stage also tried to reclaim the profits as well as the outstanding increments due from Gloucester for 4 ½ years but Engelard was pardoned of these as 'he ought not to be summoned since he received the county as *custos et non ut inde redderet crementum* (a similar decision was taken in Lancaster).[[491]](#footnote-491)

Engelard like Athée was also criticised by later chroniclers and historians for several of his actions when he was at Bristol. Whereas Athée was remembered in later years for raising the amount which the constable of Bristol was anciently accustomed to take from the brews of beer there from 2d to 4d (in 1230, the men of Bristol fined 30 marks to be quit from the 4d custom), Engelard was remembered for requisitioning supplies there to meet royal needs as a plea was brought against him in 1232 for taking twelve tuns of wine.[[492]](#footnote-492) He also was said to have taken barrels of wine as 'prise' from ships entering Bristol, which he later sold to the king - in 1210 he was allowed to deduct 60s from the farm of Bristol in respect of four tuns of red wine *de prisa*.[[493]](#footnote-493) He may have interfered with Bristol's chartered liberties as he also accounted for the farm of the burgh of Bristol. A cartulary of Cirencester Abbey appears to show that in 1209 Engelard intervened in the abbey, but it was in fact Athée who had disseised the monks originally. He also attacked the privileges of Abbey Dore and was summoned to account for his actions - according to Vincent, even Roches apparently refused to sanction his attacks here, despite their friendship.[[494]](#footnote-494)

In 1221 when the pleas of the Crown which had not been pleaded since the time of King John were heard, Engelard like Athée was accused of keeping money without reference to the coroners to whom that duty had been specifically entrusted under Richard.[[495]](#footnote-495) In several cases, although the accused had received the judgment of his peers and had been found not guilty, Engelard appears to have exacted money. He was also said to have released prisoners for money, taken money even when the verdict was an accident (the custom was that nothing should by taken by the sheriff in such a case), perverted the course of justice by taking *prises*, and demanded money from men who were not even suspects. In one case he is even accused of sending men to a woman's house to seize her animals and chattels.[[496]](#footnote-496) But many of these cases were five years old and were being looked into when memories were fading. It was easy to blame Engelard who was no longer sheriff of Gloucester but who in 1221, when the judges were looking at Gloucester, still had a high profile as he held Windsor and Odiham. The easiest route for the complainants in Gloucester was to put the blame on past sheriffs, either Athée and failing him on Engelard or Guy de Cigogny, or even just the 'heirs of Athée' or Richard Burgeis who accounted for him, or even Richard de Mucegros who had been sheriff of Gloucester before Athée.[[497]](#footnote-497) There are several inaccuracies, for example Engelard was accused of taking 20 marks, but the duplicate entry (A) has Athée taking the amount. Several show the considerable guesswork involved - in one case, it was not known how the man was freed, except through Engelard *ut credunt*, and in another case the jurors were uncertain whether Engelard had done it on his own authority or through the king's writ. Sometimes Engelard was shown to have properly accounted for the money at the time, but when the case was looked into again in 1221, because the accused had subsequently been found not guilty, it was inferred that Engelard should not have taken the money.[[498]](#footnote-498) In one case Engelard made himself responsible for paying over to the king the fine which Elias Cokerel had made to be released from prison in Gloucester as well as delivering certain lampreys to Roches and FitzPeter, but as there is no evidence to show whether he did so or not, he cannot be found guilty in this instance.[[499]](#footnote-499) Out of the 507 cases covered in the account for Gloucester, only a small proportion blame Engelard, the sheriff, for the exactions. Engelard after all was only carrying out his duty to maximise the amount owing to the king. Maitland also took the view that 'even more noteworthy than the direct charges made against them is the curious tone of suspicion in which the jurors speak about them - they cannot say what Engelard and Guy have done, but that presumably it was wrong.'[[500]](#footnote-500) The very fact that Gloucester was not one of the first group of counties to be investigated by the itinerant justices could show that although matters may have been bad there, they were worse elsewhere - although there were probably other factors which influenced the order. It is safe to say however, that these cases, like those involving the other men from the Touraine, involved such minor personalities that it is difficult to see how they would have aroused any resentment amongst the barons who before Runnymede were far more interested in the great legal cases taking place around them, for example between Geoffrey de Say and Geoffrey de Mandeville in 1214.

Engelard, however, did hear pleas of the crown in his own shrievalty but in 1210 this was becoming a more common occurrence and at least 14 sheriffs or under sheriffs judged in their own county that year.[[501]](#footnote-501) He heard several cases for example for disseisin and false clamore in Gloucester - the Pipe Rolls include an entry for the amercements of the justices itinerant before Engelard, and his account included over £22 in amercements that year. Similarly he heard cases in Hereford, and the same Pipe Rolls show that amercements were imposed by Engelard and Walter Clifford, the previous sheriff of Hereford who still maintained land in the area.[[502]](#footnote-502) In the autumn of that year, justices (referred to as the autumnal justices) were sent out to review the efficiency of the previous judges, and twelve of the twenty-eight individuals who had sat as judges were fined. However, neither Engelard (nor Mark) had to pay a penalty, although Richard the Fleming, another foreign sheriff, did.

Mark was normally addressed in the writs as Philip Mark or alternatively as sheriff of Nottingham and very occasionally as sheriff of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. Only in a handful of writs is he addressed as sheriff of Derbyshire, and then only because the content was specific to that county. Occasionally writs were addressed to the sheriff of Nottingham, even though they related to him personally - for example he was to take away property from himself - and sometimes the clerk had a crisis of confidence as to who should receive the writ - and his name was simply crossed out, leaving just Philip. Very occasionally he is addressed as 'chosen and faithful'.[[503]](#footnote-503)

Although Holt concluded that for fifteen years 'Mark envenomed the local politics of Nottingham and Derby' and 'his conduct of the shrievalty included robbery, false arrest, unjust disseisin and persistent attacks on local landed interests both secular and ecclesiastical', the extant writs give a different impression showing that in the period up to Magna Carta 1215 Mark on the whole acted as a good, loyal and hardworking sheriff. [[504]](#footnote-504) In 1212 when John ordered an inquiry into the demesnes and fees which were alienated from him (just before the conspiracy of Vescy and FitzWalter) he naturally wanted it to be carried out quickly and thoroughly.[[505]](#footnote-505) Mark with the help of over fifteen knights acquitted himself well as he was one of the first to submit the results - he had delivered them by 6 July 1212 (only Cumberland submitted theirs before the deadline of the morrow of Midsummer). This was an important inquisition by John who not only wanted to prevent the barons from escaping their obligations as tenants in chief, but he also hoped to uncover flaws in the titles of the barons suspected of disloyalty, as well as the source of lands granted to monastic establishments. It may have goaded barons like Eustace de Vescy into action – they may have feared that John was demanding details of feudal service as he was planning another continental expedition.

Mark was able to show occasional acts of generosity - for example he allowed the widow of Gervase de Winterton to have custody of her husband's estates even though they should have fallen into his hands (although she probably had to pay for them!).[[506]](#footnote-506) He was also considered trustworthy enough to be allowed to spend what he wished on Nottingham castle in August 1214, *sicut viderit expendere*.[[507]](#footnote-507) He appears to have been very organised - if not greedy - as he submitted his account for dogs and horses on 8 April, just as the barons were assembling at Stamford.[[508]](#footnote-508) Like his fellow Tourangeaux he also heard cases occasionally in his own county, and amercements were imposed by him and his friends. However many of these fines were correctly handed over to the crown - in 1210 the names of those amerced were annotated in the role which Mark and his friends placed in the treasury.[[509]](#footnote-509)

Mark was not without fault – historians, for example, point to an inquisition which refers to the 100s paid yearly by the burgesses of Nottingham to Philip Mark as sheriff for his good will so that he would allow them to retain their liberties, but this amount was first paid 'of grace and not of debt'- in other words he was seeking it not as a customary demand but as of grace and only for a particular occasion.[[510]](#footnote-510) There are even some who see Philip Mark (and Eustace de Lowdham) as candidates for the evil sheriff of Nottingham in the tales of Robin Hood – a reflection on what some perceive to be his excesses as sheriff. It is possible that the tales date back to this period, as there is a Robin 'Hod' in the Pleas of the Crown for Gloucester, but it has yet to be proved that Philip Mark was the basis of later story-telling.[[511]](#footnote-511)

Mark may not have always dealt with his shrieval accounts to the letter but this may have been due to the fact that historically the sheriff's liability was not defined. Although it had been agreed that Vieuxpont, his predecessor at Nottingham, would respond for £100 for the profits of the county, the amount was described as both profit and increment which made it unclear whether the profit should be regarded as additional to the increment or as a substitute for it.[[512]](#footnote-512) After Mark had replaced Vieuxpont as sheriff, the amount of 'profit' was not mentioned –it was entered as an item in the accounts but nothing was actually demanded until 1214 when the Exchequer started considering what profits should have been paid over the past 6 years.[[513]](#footnote-513) Mark was spared from answering difficult questions about his accounts as the king and barons were shortly at war and the Exchequer was suspended.[[514]](#footnote-514) The Pipe Rolls, however, for 16 John include the audit of Mark's account but as some of the entries date to 1215, the audit must have taken place not in 1214 but much later, probably in 1220. (On closer scrutiny it can be seen that Philip Mark's account is entered in a later hand). His casual expenses for the period 1212-1215 include many small entries but each was itemised and costed, for example money for carpenters (£38), for oats and wine (£58) and horses and grooms, and totalled £211 10s 1/2d. Although Mark had the king's writ for many of the entries, it was deemed that they were not sufficient, and his claims were therefore partly disallowed.[[515]](#footnote-515) The Pipe Roll for 17 John (which does not include any entries for Engelard's shrievalties of Gloucester and Hereford nor for the counties of Oxford, Cumberland or Westmorland), does include an entry for Nottingham, although this contains a huge number of erasures and corrections which could either indicate the absence of the firm hands of Peter Mark or Eustace de Lowdham in the presentation of accounts, or, as is more likely, it was compiled in retrospect. It includes expenses for his brother Peter, and Geoffrey his nephew as well as Baldwin, a man of Philip Mark who led weapons to Nottingham.[[516]](#footnote-516) The Pipe Roll for 2 Henry III (the first of the new reign, made possible by the reopening of the Exchequer in November 1217) spans the end of John's reign and the early years of the Minority. It does not however include the accounts for nine shires – one of these being Philip Mark's Nottingham/Derby which could indicate Mark's deliberate suppression of information, his inability to collect such information, or merely that fact that Henry III's council was still re-establishing control. Although it was probably written during the current accounting year or soon after, the clerks may not have had enough time to complete their difficult task. In early Henry III, probably 1220, the Exchequer was finally in a position to consider Mark's debts and the Pipe Roll for 4 Henry III also includes a list of his casual expenses, which differs only slightly from that in the earlier Pipe Roll. Now the Exchequer also tried to chase him for the profits of Nottingham/Derbyshire for 8½ years - that is not only for the 6 ½ years under John but also for 2 Henry III and 3 Henry III.[[517]](#footnote-517) Mark like Engelard however was successfully able to claim quittance for almost everything, in contrast to his predecessor at Nottingham, Robert de Vieuxpont, who was found guilty of the way he managed his accounts.

Philip Mark was ably assisted at Nottingham by his brother, Peter, who according to the extant Pipe Rolls accounted at the Exchequer for him at least in 1210, 1211 and 1212. In 1214, Eustace de Lowdham took on Peter's role, having previously helped Philip Mark with his accounts for pork and wine in 1212.[[518]](#footnote-518) 1214 may have been a difficult time for Mark as his treasury was nearly empty and that year (according to Matthew Paris) Geoffrey of Norwich had been murdered at Nottingham castle. The king was also in an angry mood – he had been forced to cancel his continental expedition, and when he wanted to punish the Northerners, he had been thwarted by Langton - and he may have vented his fury on Mark when shortly afterwards he stayed at Nottingham. It is however possible that Mark and his brother Peter may have exceeded their authority and briefly fallen out of favour with the king as the writs show several episodes of disobedience around this time - on 10 September 1213, Mark appears to have exceeded his control of the lands of Bulwell as he was ordered to return without delay to Master Henry of Nottingham, his church of Bulwell; on 4 December when he was ordered to allow Geoffrey FitzPeter's executors to make testament of his possessions he was told that if anything was moved after his death, then it was to be returned without delay; on 29 August 1214, when Mark was ordered to return some lands and chattels to Earl Ferrers he was told that if he did not do this, then the Bishop of Winchester would make sure it was done.[[519]](#footnote-519) Problems continued into early 1215 by which time Eustace de Lowdham had left Philip Mark to join his lord John de Lacy in rebellion - he may have fallen out with Mark, or he may have felt inextricably drawn to John de Lacy as Lowdham itself was a dependency of Tickhill. The Pipe Rolls for that year now show that Philip Mark was himself accounting at the treasury.[[520]](#footnote-520)

The Chanceaux brothers, who were often left in charge in Engelard's absence, showed themselves on the whole to have acted competently, although on occasion they too were chastised in the writs. In September 1213 the king ordered the barons of the Exchequer not to pay for some bad wine which Peter de Chanceaux had ordered, since 'we do not wish it to be retained for our work', and in October 1213 Peter was chastised for harassing the Welsh wool merchants and taking chattels from them – in no uncertain terms he was told to leave everything to Faulkes de Breauté and the itinerant justices.[[521]](#footnote-521) The Pleas of the Crown in Gloucester in 1221 also allude to the days when Peter de Chanceaux as constable of Bristol began the practice of measuring woad just to the level of the brim rather than a quarter measure above the brim. As this was to the disadvantage of the town, it was now determined that the bailiffs should be able to sell the woad just as they were accustomed to.[[522]](#footnote-522)

Guy de Chanceaux was also occasionally criticised, for example, for disseising Amitia, the countess of Clare, of her lands (although in the event she had to pay to have them back).[[523]](#footnote-523) In his role as head of the Honour of Gloucester he appears not always to have been efficient with his accounts. In 1210 only the heading for the honour appears for the year before, the present year and half 1208, but nothing else, leaving it unclear as to his exact role in the honour (especially as the heading appears after Bristol which was held by Engelard).[[524]](#footnote-524) The absence of detail could indicate that no accounts had been submitted, but it is also possible that originally they might have been included – this particular roll is very damaged, and reference is made elsewhere to the account for the Honour of Gloucester as if one had existed.[[525]](#footnote-525) In 1210, Guy de Chanceaux's specific account for William de Beauchamp's barony is equally sketchy – the heading appears and from this it can be seen that he held it for the full year, during which time he received the tallage and perquisites of the men of Worcester and Tewkesbury for half year 10, year 11 and all year 12. The account is however found with the amercements of the autumnal justices in Hereford and Gloucester and after the entries for Warwickshire and Leicester – a note to this effect being placed under the heading for Gloucester – and it too is not complete as many lines are left blank.[[526]](#footnote-526)

In 1211, the entry appears in the Pipe Rolls 'concerning the Honour of Gloucester for half year 10, year 11, year 12 and this year,' but is then followed by nine blank lines.[[527]](#footnote-527) However, later in one version of the same Pipe Rolls the 'account of Guy de Chanceaux concerning his bailiwick' appears under 'Divers Counties' and includes amounts for the scutage of Wales for the honour, for which Guy de Chanceaux responds. It is followed by the account of Tewkesbury for half year 10, year 11, year 12 and 13 as well as the account for William de Beauchamp's barony for two years. The barony's income was considerable (£917 7s 1½d), but although £359 11s 1d, was paid into the kings treasury and £610 16s 4d to the king's chamber, Guy was not made quit as he had spent more money than the income he received. His expenses included £63 on the kings' hounds and horses, £32 11s 6d on manorial expenses and the cost of servants (including the expenses of the king and queen on numerous occasions which involved the building of a new kitchen, dovecote, granary, houses in expectation of their visits), and £5 to make salt (although the salt itself had to be brought in for £33). Payments were also made to the young owner of the barony who was being maintained in the king's houshold. It is possible that all the accounts had not been submitted as 10 lines are left blank at the end.[[528]](#footnote-528)

Guy de Chanceaux's specific account for William de Beauchamp's barony is again equally sketchy. In 1211 Guy's responsibilities for the barony are confirmed in the account of John FitzHugh which states that he should respond for the lands of William de Beauchamp which are in the hands of the king, and the entry for Worcester, which again states that Guy had custody of the lands of William de Beauchamp and received 32 marks from 16 fees (as well as 30 marks from 15 fees of the Bishop of Worcester).[[529]](#footnote-529) This entry originally began just with *et custos*, but then Giun de Chancels was interlined.[[530]](#footnote-530)

Guy de Chanceaux like Engelard and Athée was also said to have taken money from the pleas of the crown. He was accused of taking chattels from someone who had slandered the king (as Engelard had done), as well as chattels in cases where the verdict was misadventure or the men released. It was even alleged that Guy had simply kept the money which had been found on the accused.[[531]](#footnote-531) Guy however can be seen to have handed over at least some of the amercements, for example in 1210 and 1211.[[532]](#footnote-532) However as with Engelard, memories were fading, and the scribes were either ignorant or careless as there was little consistency in his name - in number 238 he is referred to as Guy de Cigogny in one version and as Guy de Chanceaux in the second version; and in number 405 a prisoner was imprisoned in the time of Guy de Cigogny in one version and in the time of Guy de Cancellis in the second version. Some have taken this to mean that Guy de Chanceaux (or Cancellis) and Guy de Cigogny were the same person. As will be seen later this is unlikely to be the case, and the various differences in name serve only to illustrate that memories were hazy and the scribes not always accurate.

Peter de Maulay appears to have carried out all his orders with efficiency and loyalty, although a curious series of charters give the impression that sometime during 1212 he fell briefly out of favour with the king. On 27 May 1212 these charters show that at the request of many barons John had restored his office to Peter de Maulay. The barons guaranteed that Maulay would never again offend against the king and if he did, they would deliver his body to the king and they would not resent any action John might take against the culprit. Four of the guarantors agreed to pay penalties if Maulay failed in his duty - the Earl of Salisbury would give John all his hawks, Peter des Roches would give him twenty palfreys, William de Cantiloupe two, and Henry FitzCount would allow himself to be whipped.[[533]](#footnote-533) Painter views this episode as a medieval joke, and sees grim humour in it because whipping was a disgraceful punishment reserved for servants and not for men like Henry FitzCount who was John’s second cousin.[[534]](#footnote-534) What the charter does illustrate is that Peter de Maulay could whip up important support - his pledgers included the bishops of Winchester and Norwich, the justiciar, the earls of Salisbury, Chester, Arundel and Oxford, Richard Marsh, Henry of London, the archdeacons of Stafford and Huntingdon, William Cornhill, Hugh de Neville, William de Briwerre and thirteen lesser persons both ecclesiastic and lay. Indeed thirteen of his pledgers had been in Wendover's list of John's most evil counsellors, in other words the men closest to the king. In 1210 Maulay and the Earl of Salisbury had pledged for de Lisle, and now the favour was being returned. Interestingly the pledge for de Lisle was considered to be quit this year.[[535]](#footnote-535)

Due to the lack of chancery records for the previous years, it is unclear what Maulay had done as from the extant writs he still appears to be in favour - he was still making payments to troops, witnessing with *familiars*, and visiting castles such as Hanley with Philip Mark, Alverton (where money was received from the archdeacon of Durham and Philip Oldcotes) and Winchelsea.[[536]](#footnote-536) However his office had definitely been taken away as it was to be *reddidit* and Maulay was not to offend *amplius*. The main charter was witnessed at Melves, and all charters were to be given to Robert of Gloucester and the archdeacon of Huntingdon to be placed in the Treasury. It is possible that Peter des Roches had arranged the reinstatement of Peter de Maulay as the bishop appears to have played an important part in the arrangements for the charters - one stating that 'we mainperned through our lord Bishop of Winchester', another that 'I, the count of Arundel, at the request of the Bishop of Winchester, place my seal on the charter for him and me.' Roches moreover is first on the list of pledgers, and Melves may also have been his manor of Meon which lay south of Bishops Sutton (the king's court on this day was at Bishops Sutton on its way to Winchester), although Hardy believes it to be Woolmer.[[537]](#footnote-537) The fact that Engelard unusually acted as a witness could also show the influence of his fellow Tourangeaux. Maulay did not suffer from the incident in the long term and went on to serve the king well – not only did he mastermind the expedition to Poitou in 1213/1214, but he also acted as a diplomat to Rome, commander of the garrison and treasury at La Rochelle, and was later placed in charge of Corfe castle and the shrievalty of Somerset/Dorset. It was not unusual to lose office but still remain in favour - John was a deeply suspicious man and only Marsh, Roches, Briwerre and John and Walter Grey can be said to have consistently held his favour.[[538]](#footnote-538)

John was so satisfied with the service given to him by his men from the Touraine that not only did he allow them to take over each other's duties, but he also kept them in the same areas until he was forced to make changes because of Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215. That is not to say that he did not expect them to help him elsewhere in his kingdom. The *Misae* Rolls show that Engelard moved all over England, and Mark too was frequently found outside of his shrievalty, at least until the baronial revolt. In 1210, whilst Mark was involved with the care of the king of Scotland's daughters, he had accompanied them to Ripon as the Pipe Rolls for that year show that Mark rendered his account for the king of Scotland's daughters and Robert FitzRoger and the constable of Chester for one night at Ripon.[[539]](#footnote-539) In 1211, he was also at some stage at Odiham as the account of John FitzHugh, sheriff of Surrey, allowed £7 11s 7d for the expenses *per plures vices* of Philip Mark and Thomas Sandford there. In 1212 FitzHugh's account included expenses for Philip Mark (and John de Bassingbourne) again *per plures vices et plura loca*.[[540]](#footnote-540) Mark may have been sent to Hanley castle that year (a new castle just finished near Worcester) as the account of the bishop of Worcester shows expenses of Peter de Maulay and Philip Mark of £4 16s 10d, as well as making a short visit to Northamptonshire as he and Brassingbourne were allowed £33 6s for four days there.[[541]](#footnote-541) It is possible that like Engelard he went to Wales but he was not there at the same time as the king. Maulay too moved around the country – in 1211 like Mark he had been staying in the area of Odiham as FitzHugh's account shows an entry for the expenses of Peter de Maulay and friends for five days.[[542]](#footnote-542) In 1214 he found time to stay at Windsor, as John FitzHugh's account there includes a sum for Peter de Maulay and his companions who were there for 8 days.[[543]](#footnote-543) Unlike his fellow men from the Touraine Peter de Maulay was the only one to serve abroad - in 1213 he was an envoy to Rome and he also may have served in Flanders, and for much of 1214 he was based at La Rochelle in charge of the garrison and treasure there.

\*\*\*\*

Since their arrival in England in 1207, John's men from the Touraine had grown in stature to the extent that by 1210/1211, according to Wendover, they had become some of John's most evil (*iniquissimos*) counsellors, who in order to please the king 'gave their advice not according to reason, but as the king's pleasure dictated'. However Wendover's list as a value as a judgement on the men from the Touraine has to be used with some caution as it was not compiled contemporaneously and was probably based on those who later supported the king during the civil war. It can only give a general indication of who remained prominent at court during the interdict and who were closest to the king in 1210/1211.[[544]](#footnote-544) Maulay was included because of his influence at court, although some also considered him to be a man of merit - in 1210/1211, he received money from the bishopric of Winchester *in dignatio* (as well as four capons). Engelard appears because of his many responsibilities, including a military role in Wales. Similarly Mark, who is only referred to as constable of Nottingham, not even as sheriff - he is only one of two laymen who were described by office which could mean that Wendover's readers may have had to be reminded as to who he was. The Chanceaux brothers were not included by Wendover, perhaps because in 1211 they still did not officially hold any sheriffdoms or castles in their own right, although they may have acted as the primaries on occasion. Their star was yet to come - as far as Wendover was concerned they had not yet caught the king's eye. Although Athée was listed by Wendover, he had recently retired from office and was probably dead – only his reputation still lingered on.

The chancery writs and charters show that despite Wendover's attempt to portray them as ruthless and sycophantic royal servants, the men from the Touraine continued to follow Athée's example and carry out John's orders quickly, competently, effectively and on the whole obediently. They became strong castellans, honest and efficient heads of provincial treasuries, and competent administrators, even if they did juggle the system to achieve the maximum remission of their debts. Although only Martigny was called upon to defend his castle against the baronial rebels, the men from the Touraine helped John's war effort by providing him with the men, money, supplies and armaments which he needed if he was to maintain his position as king of England. In the event, it was not enough and eventually John and the baronial rebels had to agree to a compromise. In June 1215 they met at Runnymede where Magna Carta 1215 was sealed and issued to the country. The Charter contained a specific clause which demanded the removal from office of some of Athée's relatives. Clause 50 was very clear about the end result wanted, but it was less clear about why the demand was included, who made it, and who exactly was to be removed from office. In order to clarify these important points, it is necessary not only to study Clause 50 in greater detail, but also to ascertain its connection to the adjoining Clause 51.

**Part Two: Clauses 50 and 51 of Magna Carta 1215**

Articles of Barons, Chapter 40:*Ut rex amoveat penitus de balliva parentes et totam sequelam Gerardi de Atyes, quod de cetero balliam non habeant, scilicet Engelardum, Andream, Petrum et Gyonem de Cancellis, Gyonem de Cygony, Matheum de Martiny, et fratres eius, et Galfridum nepotem eius et Philippum Mark*.

Articles of Barons, Chapter 41: *Et ut rex amoveat alienigenas, milites, stipendiarios, balistarios, et ruttarios, et servientes qui veniunt cum equis et armis ad nocumentum regni.*

Magna Carta 1215, Clause 50: *Nos amovebimus penitus de balliis parentes Gerardi de Athyes, quod decetero nullam habeant balliam in Anglia, Engelardum de Cygony, Petrum et Gionem et Andream de Cancellis, Gionem de Cygony, Galfridum de Martiny et fratres eius, Philippum Marc et fratres eius, et Galfridum nepotem eius, et totam sequelam eorundem.*

Magna Carta 1215, Clause 51: *Et statim post pacem reformacionem amovebimus de regno omnes alienigenas milites, balistarios, servientes, stipendiarios qui venerint cum equis et armis ad nocumentum regni.*

Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora, ii, pp. 603-4: *Et nos amovebimus omnes alienigenas a terra, parentes omnes Girardi de Athies, Engelardum scilicet, Andream, Petrum, Gyonem de Chanceles, Gyonem de Ciguini, uxorem praedicti Girardi cum omnibus liberis suis, Galfridum de Marteinni et fratres eius, Philippum Marc et fratres eius, et G[alfridum] nepotem eius, Falconem, et Flandrenses omnes et ruptarios, qui sunt ad nocumentum regni.*

Chapter 6: Clauses 50 and 51

In June 1215, the barons entered into negotiations with the king with their demands clearly stated. Their document, now referred to as the Articles of Barons, was headed: 'These are the clauses which the barons seek and which the lord king concedes'. One of its chapters, known as Chapter 40, states that a group of men were to be removed from their bailiwicks. As this was a demand of the barons of the king, in the form of a petition to which the king accedes, it is given as a subjunctive clause with the king as its subject - *ut rex amoveat penitus de balliva……* The men were described as the *parentes et totam sequelam* of Girard d'Athée, and many of their names were given. Unfortunately for historians, the barons themselves were hazy about the precise details of the men they wished to proscribe. This is surprising as it is one of the few clauses in the charter 'rooted in its own time and place' rather than being a commentary on fifty years of Angevin rule. Errors in drafting also arose as the barons had nothing on which to base their demands for proscription in Chapter 40 – there was no precedence in the Unknown Charter, upon which several clauses of Magna Carta 1215 were based. The barons may have been confused about their names and hesitant in their drafting but they were adamant that there was to be no room for error in the outcome of the clause, as the men were to be removed from their bailiwicks *penitus*.

Although it is likely that a preparatory agreement had been reached with the king as early as 10 June, many chapters needed to be improved or clarified in order to make them watertight - the Barnwell annalist claimed that agreement was made only after much discussion.[[545]](#footnote-545) Chapter 40 was no exception but the chancery scribes who worked on improving it were well qualified to make corrections - it was not difficult for them as the men cited were loyal servants of John and on many occasions chancery writs had been addressed to them. Chapter 40 of the Articles and Clause 50 of the Charter are almost identical in structure and content: both demanded that those named were to be removed from office; both made Girard d'Athée the lynchpin of the proscription (even though he had probably been dead for up to five years and at the time of Runnymede was no longer a threat in his own right); and both omit the titles of those to be proscribed. Because of alterations made at Runnymede, however, there are several crucial differences. Firstly the names cited by the barons in their Articles differ from those in Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215. This may simply be because the barons were confused about whom exactly they were wishing to cite as they did not know them well - most of the Twenty-Five came from the north and west of England and London and were therefore not neighbours of the men from the Touraine whose positions kept them mainly in Hereford, Gloucester, Bristol and Nottingham. Secondly, the Articles give the impression that the names of Engelard, Andrew, Peter and Guy de Chanceaux are all linked, indicating perhaps that they were all brothers (*scilicet Engelardum, Andream, Petrum et Gyonem de Cancellis*), but Engelard's name is given in its shortened form as it is preceded by the word *scilicet* – in other words his own family name was not required as he was so well known. It was left to the scribes of Magna Carta, who were producing an official document, to make the clause more official by dropping the word *scilice*t and giving Engelard his full name – Engelard de Cygogny - thus differentiating him from the members of the Chanceaux family (*Engelardum de Cygony, Petrum et Gionem et Andream de Cancellis*).[[546]](#footnote-546) Thirdly, whereas the Articles listed Matthew de Martigny and his brothers as meriting proscription, the scribes of Magna Carta rightly chose to give prominence to Matthew's brother Geoffrey de Martigny rather than Matthew himself, as Geoffrey was the most influential of the brothers at the time of Runnymede, having been placed at Northampton castle that April ostensibly to keep an eye on Henry Braybrook whose loyalty had been questionned.[[547]](#footnote-547) Fourthly, the scribes also altered Philip Mark's position in the clause - whereas Philip Mark's name stands alone at the end of the clause in the Articles, in Magna Carta this is rightly corrected to 'Philip Mark and his brothers' as he did indeed have two influential brothers, namely Peter Mark who was his under-sheriff at Nottingham and accounted at the Exchequer for the county from 1210, and Reginald who was important enough to be carrying money from the king in March 1216 and in 1220 was so powerful that the king sent men to spy on him and the large house he was building outside Nottingham.[[548]](#footnote-548) Fifthly, although the Articles states that those proscribed were not to hold any office (*balliam non habeant*), Clause 50 uses a positive verb stating that they were to hold no office in England (*nullam habeant balliam in Anglia*). The fact that 'in England' was added could be an indication that it was recognised that the members of the clan had proved to be such good sheriffs and castellans that although the barons did not wish them to remain in England, they were not adverse to them holding office elsewhere in John's continental possessions. Finally, whereas the Articles demanded that the *parentes* and *totam sequelam* of Athée were to be proscribed, the scribes of Magna Carta were aware that Athée had been powerless or even dead for several years , and as the object of the clause was to protect the country from the deprivations of his clan for years to come, then it was not the *totam sequelam* of Athée who needed also to be proscribed but the *totam sequelam* of those named. This may appear to have been only a minor amendment, but it is clear from Clause 50 of Magna Carta that it is Engelard and his clan and followers who were the target of the displeasure and not Athée and the memory of him. The finished clause, which became Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215, was not only more accurate in its detail, but as an agreement had been reached between the barons and the king about its form and content, it ceases to be given in the subjunctive but is given in the first person plural in the future tense. The barons were now confident that their demands would be carried out shortly by the king.

Although Holt believes that some of the differences between the Articles and Magna Carta 1215 were the work of the baronial leaders, the changes in Clauses 50 and 51 were more probably due to the clerks of the chancery. These highly intelligent men had a thorough knowledge of English government and were able not only to make improvements to the text itself but also to the positioning of the clauses in the charter.[[549]](#footnote-549) Whereas Chapter 40 of the Articles fell after the chapter dealing with hostages and the return of charters (38) and the chapter dealing with the forest (39), in Magna Carta 1215 the new, corrected and improved clauses on the men from the Touraine and John's foreign troops (namely 50 and 51) were more appropriately placed after clause 48 which called for an investigation into the evil customs of sheriffs amongst others (relevant to the men from the Touraine) and clause 49 which restored all hostages and charters delivered by *Englishmen* as securities for peace (as opposed to foreigners like the men from the Touraine) – the latter clause like Clauses 50 and 51 was relevant to John's reign alone. Clause 52, which followed, restored the lands, castles, liberties and rights which had been disseised without the lawful judgement of peers – a clause of the greatest interest to the barons as individuals, such as Giles de Briouse who as will be seen also may have pressed for Clause 50. Both Wendover and Matthew Paris however were not satisfied with the improvements made in Magna Carta 1215 and went on to make even further alterations - not only was Matthew Paris more extreme (adding new culprits such as *all* the relatives of Athée, as well as Faulkes, Athée's wife and all their children, and the Flemings and *ruptarios*), but he also called for the banishment of Athée's relatives rather than just their removal from office, even though this was clearly not a requirement demanded in Magna Carta 1215. This change is not found in any of the known copies of Magna Carta 1215, and only in the margin of one particular copy of *Chronica Majora*, where Faulkes is listed as one of the alien disturbers of the peace. Matthew Paris also placed his new expanded clause after the first sentence of what is Clause 62 in the original charter, finishing off with the rest of Clause 62. Many modern historians have fallen into the same trap as Wendover and Paris, stating that Magna Carta 1215 demanded that the men proscribed were to be banished from the country - for example Vincent, as well as Holt, and Holden and his fellow editors of *The* *History of William Marshal*.[[550]](#footnote-550) Painter too falls into the trap of referring to the removal from office of Athée, even though he no longer held any position of responsibility and was probably dead. Paris also included a clause which had been inserted by Wendover from another source and which reported that the castellans of Nottingham and Northampton (as well as Kenilworth and Scarborough) were to swear that they would respect the orders of the Twenty-Five, and that the castellans for these particular castles should be chosen from men who were trustworthy and would execute orders faithfully.[[551]](#footnote-551) These four castles were of great strategic importance (Geoffrey de Martigny had held out at Northampton in spring 1215, and Philip Mark was in control at Nottingham), and Paris considered the clause to be of the essence as it is the only section of the charter which he gives in his *Historia Anglorum*.[[552]](#footnote-552) The *Histoire des Ducs* also states that no one should be made a bailiff except with the agreement of the Twenty-Five. Despite the presence of this requirement in two significant chronicles – which could indicate that it had formed part of a separate and distinct document which has not survived - it is not found in the charter itself nor its copies. If it had, it would have been a radical development as it was essentially calling for a positive control of the king's choice of royal agents.

Many historians however believe that Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 still contains inaccuracies and despite its corrections that it still shows inattention to detail. They claim that both the Articles and Magna Carta 1215 are in error when they name Guy de Chanceaux and Guy de Cigogny as two different men as they were in fact the same person. They point to the pleas of the Crown in Gloucester in which Guy de Cigogny is mentioned in one version and Guy de Chanceaux in the other.[[553]](#footnote-553) But Maitland has shown that one roll was not copied from the other, but that the two rolls were two accounts written down simultaneously by scribes sitting side by side at the time of the hearings, and it is therefore most likely that the difference in name is due merely to the slip of a pen. The pleas are not without other errata, for example in number 238 Guy de Cancellis appears as Guy de Chanceaux in the second roll - no attempt this time to change his name to Cigogny. With at least three Chanceaux brothers holding important positions under John, there was always likely to be some confusion. There are several cases in the royal writs where the chancery scribes were uncertain about the family, and had to make alterations to their names: in December 1213, Susannah was first described as Andrew’s daughter, but this was crossed out to 'sister'; in April 1242, oaks were to be given to Giles (Aymery erased) from the wood near Calewedon.[[554]](#footnote-554) The *Misae* Rolls also make the mistake of placing Guy de Chanceaux at Bristol when it was his brother Peter who was constable there.[[555]](#footnote-555) It is undisputed that there was a Guy de Chanceaux in charge at the Honour of Gloucester and Gloucester castle, but there is also mention in the chancery writs of a separate individual, Guy de Cigogny, who appears in his own right in the Patent Rolls for 14 May 1215 when he appears to hold the position of castellan or under castellan - the king's writ states that two hauberks and some other weapons which had been in his custody had been received at Trowbridge.[[556]](#footnote-556) Aymery Chanceaux's grants at Perrusson are also witnessed by Guy de Cigogny who is clearly differentiated from the Andrew de Cancellis and Petrus de Cancellis whose names fall on either side of his. Matthew Paris, even though he did not hesitate to make other alterations to the text of Magna Carta 1215, also leaves them as two distinct individuals, citing both *Gyonem de Chanceles and Gyonem de Ciguini*.[[557]](#footnote-557) As to whether *Galfridum nepotem eius* in the Articles was referring to Matthew de Martigny's nephew is unclear but what is more certain is that he was definitely not the Geoffrey de Martigny, already proscribed by name in Magna Carta 1215 for his many duties in the king's service. Magna Carta 1215 may in fact have been more accurate when it referred to him as Philip Mark's nephew, as a Geoffrey Mark does appear in a writ in 1229.[[558]](#footnote-558)

\*\*\*\*\*

It is clear therefore that Clause 50 (and its associated Clause 51) was compiled with care and attention to detail, and it can therefore be presumed that the names which it contains are an accurate representation of the truth. Unfortunately Clause 50 is not so complete as to explain the detailed reasons for the men's proscription, apart from the fact that they were all relatives of Athée. No titles are given for the men - the barons presumed that all who were aware of the chapter would know who was meant, in particular Engelard who is introduced by the adverb *scilicet*. Moreover, the scribes in the king's service had so frequently addressed writs to them that they also felt that no further explanation was necessary. It is possible however that their titles were not given as these men were being cited for their misdemeanors as individuals. There are of course several other possible reasons for their proscription which cannot be discounted: the dislike of their foreign birth and their low status; resentment at their actions as the king's representatives; fear of their military prowess; or envy at the rewards they received. The clause may also merely represent the animosity of certain powerful individual barons or groups of barons who would benefit from their fall from grace as they themselves would then have access to their positions and lands, or even of the church itself. It is also possible that the men may have been proscribed simply because, as relative newcomers to the country with no family ties to the barons of England, they were the most vulnerable recipients of the barons' envy and displeasure about the king's general distribution of power and reward.

Chapter 7: Reasons for their Proscription

*Foreign origins*

It is often presumed that the men from the Touraine were proscribed in Clause 50 because they were foreigners, and as such were distrusted and disliked by the barons who resented them for taking over the lucrative positions which they felt were theirs by right and custom. Vincent takes the view that Clause 50 'is indicative not only of the increasing strength of the anti-alien card in English politics but of the way that such demonstrations of xenophobia in 1215…… were on the whole to be carefully stage managed by the English baronage.'[[559]](#footnote-559) Painter concluded that 'the dislike of seeing foreigners in profitable offices was the chief cause for the baronial hatred of Girard d'Athée and his relatives'.[[560]](#footnote-560) It is undisputed that the men cited in Clause 50 were foreigners - their origins can be traced back to the Touraine where they were all neighbours - but it is far less certain that it was their nationality which caused their proscription.

Distrust of foreigners was not a new concept in John's reign. Since well before he came to the throne, chroniclers had viewed foreigners with suspicion - the Anglo Saxon Chronicle criticised King Edgar for inviting foreigners to England and being too fond of evil customs. William of Newburgh , when writing about the reign of Richard, remarked that Longchamp was objected to as a foreigner of obscure name as well as a man who deprived free and lawful men of their lands and offices, giving them to unknown newcomers.[[561]](#footnote-561) Chroniclers who wrote in the very early years of John's reign and who had not been influenced by the Fall of Normandy and the disputed Canterbury election, also had their concerns about foreigners, but they were less hostile with their comments about John's use of them than those chroniclers who wrote after his death - Gerald of Wales, for example, acknowledged the problems that could be caused by foreign mercenaries, but in his case his criticism was reserved for the barons whose opposition came too late to save the country from their degradation.[[562]](#footnote-562)

However, most of the main chroniclers of John's reign were writing well after his death and had been influenced not only by the later events of John's reign, such as the defeat in Poitou, Magna Carta 1215 and civil war, but also by events in the reign of Henry III when anti-alien feeling had been exacerbated by the French invasion of 1216, the behaviour of Louis' entourage, Faulkes' misbehaviour in 1221 and later, the need for the resumption of castles in 1224, and also the importation of the Poitevin and Savoyard relatives later in the reign. As Holt concluded – 'John's reputation was made to carry the burden not only of the past but also of the future'.[[563]](#footnote-563) The biographer of William Marshal wrote between 1219 and 1225/6, the Barnwell annalist started writing in the 1220s and continued until 1232, Coggeshall was prolific around 1221, Waverley (on John) between 1221-7, Margam even later, and Wendover did not begin writing until 1225. On the continent the situation was similar - William le Breton wrote the *Philippide* between 1214-24 and the *Histoire des Ducs* was not compiled until after the 1220s.[[564]](#footnote-564) The chronicles were only accurate and unbiased when commenting on events which occurred during Henry III's reign when they were personally observing the situation - for example Osney could not be faulted when it stated that Henry loved aliens more than the English and enriched them with innumerable gifts and possessions, or when the Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester poeticised that Henry favoured aliens 'who annoyed the land sore', and Bermondsey that in 1224 *omnes alienigenae de regno expellerentur*.[[565]](#footnote-565)

The situation however is different for John's reign when these chroniclers were writing retrospectively and were naturally biased by events which had coloured John's reign. For this reason the criticism of foreigners which appears in their writing for this period cannot be taken at face value. Although there are frequent references to John's employment of foreigners in their accounts and the problems this caused for the country as a whole, in many cases these can be shown to be generalisations, misinterpretations or not restricted to any particular person or category. It is necessary therefore to be cautious in applying their comments to John's men from the Touraine, who were cited in Clause 50. The Bury annalist who wrote about the treachery of FitzWalter and Vescy in 1212 recounted how John had promised to remove aliens from his intimate circle and rely on the advice of native-born magnates. However, there is no corroboration for this in any contemporary writs or even chronicles (apart from Barnwell which stated that John's actions became kinder), and there was no change in the offices of the men from the Touraine.[[566]](#footnote-566) It is true that the Continuator of Newburgh singled out Clauses 50 and 51 of Magna Carta 1215 along with clauses on the church in his annals, but against this, when referring to Magna Carta 1215 he only stated that the barons were fighting for the laws and good customs of the realm which had been pervaded by the obstinacy of the king and by the cruelty of wrongheaded foreigners (*crudilitatem alienorum perversorum*) whom the king loved and whom he made his judges, sheriffs and castellans at the expense of the natural and free men of his land. But he did not nominate anyone in particular.[[567]](#footnote-567) Coggeshall, who initially had been generous towards John, was especially disparaging about foreigners, but his particular objects of dislike were Peter des Roches, John's foreign troops and Faulkes de Breauté at Bedford, rather than the men from the Touraine.[[568]](#footnote-568) The adverse comments of the Barnwell annalist, who gradually escalated his criticisms of John, were also directed at the king's intimate advisers generally, his foreign mercenaries, Faulkes and the period after Magna Carta (for example when Louis arrived in England, and during Henry's reign when he claimed that foreigners deliberately broke the peace) rather than the men from the Touraine by name.[[569]](#footnote-569) Waverley too was critical of the king surrounding himself with aliens and he was correct when he stated that in the time of John castles were *sub custodia alienigenarum* as Nottingham, Bristol, Gloucester, Hereford, Northampton were at that time in the hands of the men from the Touraine - but this particular sentence goes on to name Faulkes as the main culprit describing him as a man who frequently perambulated the country, devastating it and taking booty. Other of his derogatory comments were applicable only to Henry's reign, for example when he said that 'numerous foreigners of various tongues have so increased over the years and are so richly endowed with rents, lands, vills and other benefits that they hold the English in contempt as inferiors'.[[570]](#footnote-570) The *Histoire des Ducs* was content with saying that John had many evil men.

It is significant that the word *alienigenas* does not appear in either Chapter 40 or Clause 50. It was only Wendover and Matthew Paris who tarred Athée and the men from the Touraine with this description, thus insinuating that they had an adverse affect on the kingdom because they were foreigners (*Et nos amovebimus omnes alienigenas a terra, parentes omnes Girardi de Athies, Engelardum scilicet, Andream, Petrum, Gyonem de Chanceles, Gyonem de Ciguin…)*. In their versions of Magna Carta 1215 they also demanded that the men from the Touraine be banished, rather than just removed from office as demanded in the Articles and Magna Carta 1215 itself. Wendover may have made these alterations (or mistakes) because he did not have the facts to hand (although it is possible that his reference to banishment may have been based on an earlier draft of the Articles) or because he was blinded by his obsession with loyalty. Matthew Paris, however, had no such excuse for the changes he made, as he had a version of Magna Carta 1215 to hand, and also was privy to information from John's closest advisers. He also had in his possession details of the barons' agreement of 1214 (as he used many words from it) and also the writ of 1215 which ordered Magna Carta to be carried through villages and towns. Yet he conflated the text with his own amendments and failed to distinguish between them, even going so far as to place his clause in the middle of Magna Carta's Clause 62. He knew from his sources that Chapters 50 and 51 of Magna Carta were not as extreme as his own, but just as Wendover was blinkered by a sense of loyalty, so he was blinkered by the events which were taking place in the country at the time he was writing - when he started *Chronica Majora* in 1240 and *Historia Anglorum* in 1250 the country was overrun with Henry III's relatives who benefited from lucrative gifts and positions of great authority.[[571]](#footnote-571) It could be argued that he was so overwhelmed with the abundance of documents and sources to hand, and so patriotic that he failed not only to correct Wendover's mistakes but also his own additions, but the reality is that he was biased against many groups - describing the Welsh as faithless, the Poitevins as wily, and the Flemings as filthy. He was not acute enough to realise that he was moving away from reality not only in his detailing of Magna Carta but also when later he labelled the men from the Touraine as Poitevins - a word which at his time of writing was associated with untrustworthiness and unpopular deeds such as the scutage for Poitou in 1214 and the Poitevin expeditions in 1206 and 1214 as well as the actions of the Lusignans. His obsession with foreign birth also caused him to make other unusually careless corrections – in one of his versions of Magna Carta 1215 he included Faulkes de Breauté (from Normandy) in the list of those men who in Clause 50 were to hold no office in England, at the same time stating that he was one of the Twenty-Five to uphold Magna Carta.[[572]](#footnote-572) Paris however may have included Faulkes not so much because of the close relationship he had with the king nor his place of birth but because of the hatred he had inspired at St Albans abbey when in January 1217 he made a sudden attack at dusk, sacking the town before entering the abbey and demanding 100 marks from the abbot for his abbey to be spared.[[573]](#footnote-573)

The fact that during John's reign there was no single derogatory word for 'foreigner' shows that the concept of 'foreignness' was still in its infancy. Even by the reign of Henry III, men were described as coming from *transmarine* or *cismarine* parts, or were *alienis* or *alienigenas* or *externos*. The Margam annalist wrote of peace breaking out in 1136 i*nter Walenses et alienigenas*, and Coggeshall wrote for example about *alienigenae transmarini* assembling at Bedford; Barnwell was uncertain about which term to use - when John as Count of Mortain came to England in 1193 he came with *multos alienigenas*, when king he confided *plus in alienis quam in suis* and in 1215 he assembled an army at Dover *cum aliquibus alienis*. He also described the army John used at Oxford and Northampton as including Poitevins, Gascons and men of *transmarinis nationibus*, and that John was *munificus et liberalis in externos*.[[574]](#footnote-574) That is not to say that there was not a growing realisation that England was a nation in its own right and that people born elsewhere were different, whether they be magnates or unpopular castellans. Prestwich rightly stated that 'it would be wrong to see xenophobic attitudes as a prime cause of the political problems of the 13th century, but it would be equally wrong to deny the importance of national feelings.'[[575]](#footnote-575) Maddicott too attempts to demonstrate 'a growing division between the king's friends from overseas and magnates who were by implication native born'.[[576]](#footnote-576) It is true that commentators on John's reign recognised that a division existed between the two groups. The Barnwell annalist contrasted the two emerging groups when he wrote that Aumale seized Fotheringay *per consilium plurimorum magnatum Angliae tam indigenarum quam alienigenarum* and when he commented that *castella multa, ab alienigenis et indigenis pluribus diu detenta ad suum revocavit dominium*.[[577]](#footnote-577) Coggeshall when remarking on Louis' defeat in 1217, referred to God striking his enemies who had come to destroy the English people and Dunstable accused Louis of thrusting nobles from their castles and retaining them and not restoring their rights to the English.[[578]](#footnote-578) But such a division between the groups was not new and had begun to show itself since the mid twelth century when language began to be seen as a distinguishing feature.[[579]](#footnote-579) Jordan Fantosme for example referred to the English of England and Hoveden pointed out Longchamp's inability to speak English.[[580]](#footnote-580) A command of language was beginning to be an asset and by the mid-thirteenth century a political song intentionally contains words of bad French 'to increase the hilarity of the listeners, at the expense of the English and the king'.[[581]](#footnote-581) But others failed to acknowledge the distinction between men of different counties and different languages – some barons had no qualms in 1212 turning to a Frenchman Simon de Montfort as a replacement for John, or to Louis in 1216 whom they invited to invade England 'to prevent the realm being pillaged by aliens'.[[582]](#footnote-582) In 1224 Stephen Langton expressed anger against Faulkes even though he himself was educated in Paris, and was disliked by John on the grounds that he was too Parisian. Although two political songs dating to John's reign are addressed to the English nation, and 'Oh England', it was not until the 1250s that a clear view of nationality was beginning to be established, for example it was only in 1258 that it was demanded that castles should only be entrusted to native-born Englishmen.[[583]](#footnote-583) Even so, by 1260 the ridiculous situation had developed where Simon de Montfort, whose upbringing had been solely French and who was himself regarded as an unscrupulous foreigner, claimed at his trial that the king 'put his trust more in foreigners than in the men of his own land'.

In John's reign, therefore, there was no question of ingrained hostility to all aliens, but if there were simmering grievances against the men from the Touraine, the very fact of their being foreign helped to focus these grievances.[[584]](#footnote-584) However these were not strong enough for their correct names to be ingrained in the barons' minds. These men were not the only group to be disliked and distrusted - foreign merchants, the Jews, Flemings and foreign clerics all came under the chroniclers' critical eye, as well as the Count of Nevers (Dunstable), and particularly Faulkes de Breauté who was described by the annalist at Worcester as 'foreign and ignoble' and by Waverley as *furiosus*. Even the appointment of Peter des Roches was criticised by Coggeshall, who said that the barons grumbled at having a foreigner set over them (but that they did not know it until the expedition had sailed and their discontent could vent itself only in useless words).[[585]](#footnote-585) Modern historians have also been influenced by the events taking place at the time of writing - Powicke for example who was writing just after the war when the United Nations was being established placed no emphasis in his writings at all on the importance of nationality

There is however more positive evidence to show that the men from the Touraine were not singled out by the chroniclers for their foreign birth - the biographer of William Marshal, when describing a meeting with Girard d'Athée and the king, makes no reference to the former's foreignness although he did not hesitate to be rude about Meilier who was also present.[[586]](#footnote-586) Significantly Clause 50 itself was not concerned with whether the men they proscribed were foreigners or not, and does not use any of the words commonly found in the chronicles to describe men who came from areas other than England. This is in contrast to Clause 51 which follows it and which specifically refers to the foreign birth of the knights and soldiers cited (*amovebimus de regno omnes alienigenas milites, balistarios, servientes, stipendiarios….*). This clause was probably directed at the Flemish troops who had recently arrived and who were feared by the barons not only for their crossbow skills but also because many were in debt to them, including John.[[587]](#footnote-587)

Finally, in the Articles, Chapter 42 (which immediately follows the chapters on proscription and the removal of foreign troops) states that the king should choose his justices, constables, sheriffs and bailiffs from those who know the law of the land and mean to observe it well. It could rightly be assumed that these three clauses are interconnected and were meant to infer that the men from the Touraine were foreigners who were not well versed in the laws of England. Indeed Holt viewed these three clauses as a means 'not so much to reform local administration as to strip John of the support the aliens gave him'.[[588]](#footnote-588) However in Magna Carta 1215, although the exact wording of chapter 42 is kept, the connection between these three chapters is broken – the chapters now become Clauses 50, 51 and 45. The formulators of Magna Carta 1215 wanted to make clear that the men were not being proscribed because they were foreigners who did not know the laws of the land. These three clauses were dropped in Magna Carta 1216 showing that the barons were not overtly concerned about the men from the Touraine being of foreign birth – after all, some 12 months later they were hardly less foreign, but they were more in demand as their experience was now needed by Henry III and his minority government. Alternatively, on reflection they may have simply appreciated the futility of the clauses – whereas Clause 50 allows the barons to dictate whom the king should not have as his castellans/sheriffs, Clause 45 makes the king the sole judge of the men appointed and gives no means of enforcement and no standard of fitness to follow.

*Low birth*

The barons may have been concerned about the lowliness of their birth as thisalong with their birth in the Touraine would have made the men proscribed not only the ethnic inferiors of the English but also their social inferiors and even less worthy of the offices they held. Just as the chroniclers often defaulted to suspicion of foreigners generally, so too they enjoyed the notion of low birth. A pilgrim's guide dating back to the mid-twelfth century takes great satisfaction in giving details of the primitive birth and low habits of the inhabitants of areas of France which would be crossed by the pilgrims on their way to Compostella.[[589]](#footnote-589) The *Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis* and the *Gesta Stephani* both claimed that Henry I had taken men of low birth, enriched them and stationed them above earls and foreign castellans. Ralph Niger accused Henry II of 'bringing bastard serfs and common soldiers' to act as his officials, as did Gerald of Wales who said that Henry II 'raised the lowly higher'. The chroniclers commenting on John's reign were no different - the Barnwell annalist wrote that John 'had raised Faulkes *with others* from being a poor attendant into a knight and then made him the equal of an earl', and Geoffrey FitzPeter was objected to because '*n'estoit nie de grant lineage*'. Complaints such as these were not unique to England - Guiot de Provins, writing around 1206, complained that modern kings took counsel with mere soldiers instead of seeking to use the barons' advice'.[[590]](#footnote-590) Surprisingly Matthew Paris did not complain about the low birth of some of John's *curiales*, preferring to denounce them for their greed and foreignness.

In Clause 50, the clerks chose the word *sequela* to encompass those who were connected to the men from the Touraine, and whom they wished proscribed now and in the future. It was a fitting noun to denote 'a following' as it was derived from the root *sequor* and it was an apt antonym to *parentes*. Many historians, like Vincent, however claim that it was deliberately chosen to expose the low birth of the men proscribed and thus denigrate them, as it was a word often used for serfs or even a brood of animals. However, a vernacular text (in French) of Magna Carta 1215 simply refers to *'tote lor siute*' and the Continuator of Newburgh, writing about Magna Carta 1215, used the words *ceteros omnes* instead of *sequela*. Matthew Paris omitted completely the word *sequela* in his version of Magna Carta. [[591]](#footnote-591) The members of the clan may have come to England with no titles or estates, only to be given the type of offices which by custom had fallen to the magnates and their associates - William le Breton in the *Philippide* clearly described Athée as a serf (which made the men proscribed therefore a serf's relatives). However, as shown, Athée may have inherited land in France and was important enough to have his own heraldic emblem in 1201, Mark might have been a member of the Marques family at Chenonceaux, and the Chanceaux family held land near Perrusson.[[592]](#footnote-592) There were many others in John's favour of equally low birth who were not proscribed. Hubert de Burgh had such obscure origins that the name of his father was not known, but yet he became an earl of Kent with little objection from the chroniclers. Thomas Erdington, Philip Oldcotes, Geoffrey de Neville and Brian de Lisle were also examples of *curiales* who were lowly born but rose to a high feudal position. Although it was not unusual for a king to raise a man from low birth - Henry I had promoted Geoffrey Clinton to high office, and in Germany in the thirteenth century, unfree knights held positions of authority as *ministeriales* - it is however likely that a man's status at birth was becoming increasingly of concern to certain barons. Magna Carta 1215 (as well as the Unknown Charter) also includes a clause on disparagement which indicates that there was some awareness of the distinction between different classes, although Warren is probably correct in concluding that it is going too far to say that 'the baronial rebels were reactionaries pursuing selfish class interests'.[[593]](#footnote-593) However Painter, for example, believes that the barons had the 'foreign mercenaries' in mind although there is no extant evidence for any widow fining not to marry one of the men from the Touraine. Indeed it was unlikely to have been directed at the men from the Touraine as there should have been no concerns about them marrying into the nobility - Athée was already married with a son when he arrived in England, Engelard arrived with his wife Agatha and son Oliver, and Philip Mark was also probably married on his arrival as there are no extant references to this marriage taking place whilst in England and he remained married to his wife Anne until his death. Only Susannah Chanceaux, sister of the Chanceaux brothers (who was in the custody of Philip Mark and Philip Glory) increased her social status by marrying the son of a minor baron, Walter de Baskerville. However, as Savaric de Mauleon and Peter de Maulay showed, it was easier to be accepted by the English baronage if one was of relatively high birth or had married well: Savaric de Mauleon, who arrived in February 1215 with mercenary troops to aid the king's cause was one of the great nobles of Poitou and the social and political equal of the barons in England; similarly Peter de Maulay became the equal of many barons by his marriage to the heiress of the Fossard fee. Neither man was proscribed in Clause 50 or Chapter 40.

*Abuse of position*

Initially most barons probably did not feel threatened by Athée and his clan whom they viewed as new, friendless men in the country, inexperienced in their positions, and without the ties of history which bound men together. Although some may have begrudged John for allowing so many positions of authority to fall to these *parvenus* from the Touraine, they may have viewed their promotions as a passing phase. They may even initially have been grateful for their talents, as under their capable hands at the provincial treasuries, English money was moved efficiently and speedily around the country to finance the king's various expeditions - it contributed to the defeat of the Welsh, to the success of the king at La Damme and although the king had been defeated at Bouvines, it was not because of problems with the supply of money. To start with men such as Braybrook, who was in charge of the provincial treasury at Northampton before he joined the baronial faction in 1215, were happy to liaise as equals with the men from the Touraine over the movement of money. However, it gradually became clear to the barons that the clan were becoming more established, were acquiring ever more responsibilities, and that the king was giving them his total support. The barons realised that the men from the Touraine were tied together more intensely than any baronial group and rather than acting as inexperienced foreign individuals, they were proving as a group to be very efficient at their jobs. As the years progressed and the clan remained embedded in their counties, it also became clear that there was little likelihood that John would remove them, thus allowing the lucrative positions which they held to revert to the barons, their relatives or friends. The barons were now in the invidious position where it was difficult for them to object to the way the clan were carrying out their orders and to claim that they themselves would be more efficient if the positions were handed to them. Although nine leaders of the baronial movement had been sheriffs and some had been justices and had acted competently in their roles, there were others whose reputations were tarnished, for example William de Cantiloupe who was known as 'the gaoler of baronial hostages', Hugh de Neville in 1212 who was fined 6,000 marks for ostensibly allowing two knights captured at Carrickfergus to escape, and Robert de Ros who was also infamous for his inefficient guarding of prisoners.[[594]](#footnote-594)

Since the early years of John's reign, the king had been plagued by inefficient and disloyal sheriffs - at a council held at St Albans in 1213 bishops and magnates condemned the corrupt and extortionate role of sheriffs, and, as an act of appeasement, John sent letters patent to his subjects in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire expressing his concern that his sheriffs and other officials there were said to have been extorting money from them which never reached the Exchequer. He then ordered Robert de Ros, William d'Aubigny, Simon de Kyme and Thomas Moulton (men who were later either at Stamford or part of the Twenty-Five) to investigate, giving them a list of questions which he wanted asked, for example what sums had been exacted since 1210, how much had the revenues increased, and had any of his officers been hearing pleas of the crown. Although Painter believes that the inquest was unique to these two counties - which is possible as both sheriffs were removed by Michaelmas 1213 - the Dunstable annalist indicates that this inquest was part of a more general inquiry and that several sheriffs were captured whilst others fled. The Barnwell annalist confirmed that John began 'to restrain the violence and greed of the sheriffs and their agents…and he removed such men from office and substituted officers who would treat the people justly'.[[595]](#footnote-595) However there is no evidence that the men from the Touraine were investigated nor were they removed from office.[[596]](#footnote-596)

There may have been concerns about the way the men from the Touraine manipulated the judicial system, and their actions here were exposed in 1221 when the justices in eyre looked into cases which had not yet been heard but which dated back to the reign of John. However, the faults stemmed not necessarily from the men themselves but from the system itself which viewed everything as a means for royal extortion, oppression or tyranny, whether it was the sale, refusal or delay of justice, or the imposition of fines which bore no relation to the severity of the offence. It's aim was to maximise the amount which could be raised for the king's coffers. It was in the interest of both the king and his officials to exact the most from the people, as both would benefit when the money was divided up. But the group from the Touraine were no worse than other sheriffs, several of whom - unlike the group from the Touraine - were fined for their judicial misdemeanours: for example, Gilbert FitzReinfrey, sheriff of Yorkshire, was investigated in 1213, and in 1219 was found to have accepted bribes and to have seized chattels of accused felons in some 50 cases. In 1216 he had to proffer 12,000 marks in order to cancel his private debts at the Exchequer, but still the king stipulated that he was accountable for the offices he had held. Brian de Lisle in 1218 was accused of retaining escheated chattels, and even Roches was said to have accepted fines and payments for assizes and judicial proceedings.[[597]](#footnote-597)

It is possible that the barons felt that the men from the Touraine, acting as the king's financial officers, were not administering their shrievalties as well as they themselves could. It is however difficult to ascertain the clan's success rate in collecting the monies due to the crown – because they retained their shrievalties for many years, it is difficult to make a useful comparison with their successor or predecessor. This was in contrast to Roger de Lacy in Yorkshire who accounted for £200 in profits, whereas his successor demonstrated his efficiency (or honesty) by accounting for £700 in the first year and £587 in the second. In any event, a record of efficiency would have been the concern of the king rather than the barons.

It cannot therefore be discounted that the barons may have demanded the insertion of Clause 50 in Magna Carta 1215 in order to gain more influence over the removal of unsatisfactory sheriffs. Until Runnymede, they had little means of controlling the excesses of the king's officials. They could request the replacement of an unsatisfactory sheriff and hope that action would be taken - for example in 1210 the men of Dorset and Somerset were able to make an agreement with the king which specifically excluded William de Briwerre as their sheriff – but that was there only option.[[598]](#footnote-598) This was in contrast to the king who could easily correct a situation either by removing the offending official or by imposing a large fine –Reginald Cornhill's son had to give 10,000 marks to clear up his father's accounts; Vieuxpont had to proffer 4,000 marks for royal grace and favour and also submit delayed accounts – although eventually he was pardoned of 3,000 marks; Walter Clifford had to pay a fine of 1,000 marks to avoid inquiry into his role as sheriff of Hereford; and William Malet in 1214 had to offer 2,000 marks for his arrears, after only two years at Dorset and Somerset.[[599]](#footnote-599)

It is however unlikely that the barons had such magnanimous intentions and in any event there were other clauses in Magna Carta 1215 which applied to inefficient sheriffs and could have been used against the men from the Touraine - for example Clause 24 (no sheriff can hold pleas of the crown) and Clause 40 (will not sell, deny or delay justice). It could be argued that the compilers of Clause 45 (which stated that sheriffs, justices, constables and bailiffs should know the law of the land) were thinking in particular of John's foreign sheriffs, but Turner believes that this clause was directed mainly at the justices. (In any event, the fact that its position was altered between the Articles and Magna Carta shows that no such link was intended, and it was subsequently dropped from the reissues of the charter). The fact that Clause 50 of Magna Carta, unlike Chapter 40, stated that the men were to hold no office 'in England', might be a tacit approval of their worth – the barons did not want them in England, but did not object to the king using their abilities elsewhere in his continental possessions – one of them for example could have been sent as seneschal of Poitou instead of Geoffrey de Neville who was given that post shortly after Magna Carta, on 29 July.[[600]](#footnote-600)

*Military prowess*

It would be easy to conclude that the men from the Touraine were proscribed because the barons feared their military skills. Although there is little detailed evidence for their skills in actual combat, it is known that Athée had fought well at Tours and Loches and once in England had acquitted himself well against the Briouses. Engelard and Mark acquitted themselves well in Wales and it was partly due to them that by the end of 1211 John was stronger in Wales than any previous king.[[601]](#footnote-601) As civil war beckoned, the military capabilities of the men from the Touraine became of greater threat to the rebels, very few of whom were experienced militarily.[[602]](#footnote-602) The members of the clan far outskilled the many knights in the country who at the time were untested on the battle field, having become accustomed to paying scutage rather than fighting. They even outshone the household knights who surrounded the king to give him a military presence - these men playing a central role in the administration of war, rather than the battle itself.[[603]](#footnote-603) Not only did they know how to fight but they also had the ability to keep John's army in the field – they were to be feared as much for their skill in military administration as in their prowess in actual fighting. They were able to create with very little fuss tens of thousands of quarrels, and build or repair large war machines such as petraries - all of which could be used against the barons as their grievances led them inexorably towards civil war. As more and more friends and relatives from the Touraine came into the country to join the royal cause taking on military roles (such as Matthew and Geoffrey de Martigny at Northampton), the barons' concern about the military strength which this clan afforded the king increased and they became a running sore in the baronial side.

The military skills and experience of the clan led Turner to state that they were 'men of action……and they owed their positions to their military talents' and that the barons wished for the group of men to be proscribed because they resented their military prowess and the strength that this gave to John. Norgate also concluded that the barons feared them because they were soldiers.[[604]](#footnote-604) Both Powicke and Turner labelled the men from the Touraine as mercenary captains – the latter concluding that Clause 50 should be read in conjunction with Clause 51 to show that the men proscribed were considered as mercenary captains whose possession of fortresses and command of troops offered a constant threat to the baronial party - 'they were neither courtiers nor politicians but soldiers of experience, whom the barons feared with good cause'.[[605]](#footnote-605) Matthew Paris may also have treated them as mercenaries as he merged Clause 50 on their proscription with Clause 51 on the removal of foreign troops, placing his combined clause in the middle of Clause 62. However, it is unlikely that the barons included these men solely because they viewed them as powerful mercenary leaders.[[606]](#footnote-606) The Articles of Barons make a clear distinction between the men from the Touraine and the mercenary troops: Athée and his clan in Chapter 40 are specifically named, are not described as mercenaries, and are only to be removed from their posts, whereas the anonymous foreign-born knights, crossbowmen, serjeants and mercenary troops (*ruttarios*) in Chapter 41 are to leave the kingdom. Magna Carta 1215 retains the same distinction, although it does not specifically mention the *ruttarios* as a group in Clause 51. Even Matthew Paris in his version of the charter does not consider the men from the Touraine to be mercenaries, and like the Articles, he specifically adds the group *ruptarios* to the list of those who are to be banished.

When chroniclers such as Paris referred to mercenaries they were more likely thinking of the group of military men who were flooding into the country to assist the king who was becoming increasingly dependent on them and their crossbow skills - namely the Flemings. John had regularly turned to them in times of crisis - in 1212, he had sent Hugh de Boves to recruit Flemish mercenaries, and in the Irish campaign some thirty-three Flemings received *prests*. So dependent was he on them that after his successful defence of Northampton in Easter 1215 he delayed pursuing the rebels into open country where they could be picked off as he was still awaiting their arrival (they did not land until the rebels were safely within London's walls).[[607]](#footnote-607) Matthew Paris reflected this animosity towards the Flemings in his version of Magna Carta 1215, when he specifically added the Flemish mercenaries *Flandrenses omnes* to his list of those who should be banished from the country.

*Excessive Rewards*

Holt argued that the real complaint against John was his distribution of offices and spoils of government, and that 'those who attacked [the aliens] were seeking amongst other things a cut for themselves'.[[608]](#footnote-608) When John granted powerful positions to the men from the Touraine, he not only gave them authority and influence but he also gave them access to unheard of wealth. This would have alienated many barons who had become accustomed to being given important positions with their associated benefits such as gifts of land and marriage rights. As many barons were heavily in debt they wished to retain control over these offices whose benefits enabled them to extend their territories and increase their coffers. John however knew the power which control over the granting of gifts and offices gave him - he could win men's loyalty by the careful distribution of rewards and by threatening to deprive men of the royal favour they had been given, he could ensure that he was given continuing support as 'at a nod they could be deprived of everything'. By placing his own choice of foreign-born servants in important positions not only did John benefit from their unwavering loyalty, but he also showed the barons that important positions would no longer fall on them by custom, and if they themselves wanted to continue to receive power and its associated benefits then they too would have to prove their loyalty to him – as Holt stated, men had 'little alternative to loyalty'.[[609]](#footnote-609)

Lyon believes that men like Engelard de Cigogny and Hugh de Boves benefited from money fiefs, which were awarded to them for supplying the king with knights, men at arms and crossbowmen, but it is unlikely that this was the case.[[610]](#footnote-610) He describes these men as John's mercenary captains but Engelard and the men from the Touraine were not mere mercenary captains willing to fight for anyone in return for monetary advantage, nor did they depend on payments for services provided - unlike the Flemings. [[611]](#footnote-611) It is possible that the annual income which Engelard and the Chanceaux brothers received from Hurstbourne could be viewed as a money fief but on the other hand this seems to have been granted to them for their early needs, and the Pipe Rolls' entries are not precise about the recipients, naming only Engelard, Andrew de Chanceaux '….*et socios*'. Maulay's payment of 50 marks in 1212, along with Hugh de Boves and Geoffrey de Lucy, could again be viewed as a money fief but this was described as a gift to those going in the service of the king in ships at Winchelsea and it far exceeded the payments made to the mercenary soldiers accompanying them who received 3 marks.[[612]](#footnote-612) In any event, if they did on occasion receive wages, this was not unheard of – the Marshal himself was given money in 1193 and the Earl of Salisbury received an annual fee from John.[[613]](#footnote-613)

It is unlikely also that they were household knights who benefited from gifts from the king – men like Geoffrey de Lutterel and John Russell who held little land when they joined the king's service but by marriage and grants of land were able to rise greatly in status. According to Church, the household knights formed John's entourage and carried out a multitude of tasks for him including protecting his person, demonstrating his military strength and bolstering the administrative arm of his rule. Their main aim was to acquire land and other trappings of wealth (half those listed before the civil war had acquired wardships and marriages).[[614]](#footnote-614) Their large number (a total of some 100) confirmed John's status and standing, especially when compared to the number which even leading magnates such as William Marshal could muster (some 10). Although the men from the Touraine performed similar duties - they organised troops, led contingents on campaign, took charge of the disbursement of monies to those serving in the king' armies, acted as castellans of royal castles and royal diplomats, and were the eyes and ears of the king away from court – they do not appear by name in any of the extant lists of household knights. They are not found in the list for the campaign in Scotland in 1209 (which names 36 household knights), nor in the Prest Roll of 1210 for the Irish expedition (which names 16) nor in the muster roll during the baronial rebellion of 1215 (which names 47). Moreover they did not have the background of the usual household knight who according to Church entered the king's household as a fully fledged knight who had received his training and served his apprenticeship earlier. They could not have fulfilled the criteria of coming on the recommendation of a magnate, or showing that they had ties of kinship with an English magnate, as they had originated from the Touraine rather than Normandy and subsequently they had had little previous interaction with those settled in England. (That is not to say that a household knight could not be foreign born as the lists included nine foreign born men like themselves.)[[615]](#footnote-615) According to the extant writs, unlike the household knights they did not receive robes from John nor more significantly are they found in regular attendance at court - Engelard for example only witnessed on three occasions and had to wait until the reign of Henry III to receive robes. Athée may have taken over from a household knight, Robert de Ropesley, but there is no reason to believe that he had been one himself before he took over the shrievalty. There seems to have been no special contractual arrangement between any of the group and the king.

Although the men from the Touraine had arrived in England totally reliant on the king's largesse, they did not receive large grants or lasting rewards during the many years that they loyally served John. John made sure throughout that his generosity was carefully limited – he never granted any of the clan a shrievalty in perpetuity (unlike Matthew de Montell and his heirs who in 1204 were given Essex and Hertford in perpetuity) or even for a set term but whilst it pleased the king (unlike Thomas de Moulton who was given Lincoln in 1205 for seven years). Similarly the gifts which he made to them were also restricted, in contrast to the rewards given to William Briwerre who acquired manors, baronies, heirs, fairs, markets, knights fees and castles to the benefit not only of himself but also his family.[[616]](#footnote-616) Although the royal demesne had been heavily reduced by the actions of Henry II who had made large grants to his favourites such as Robert de Redvers, after 1204 John had the *terrae normannorum* to distribute.[[617]](#footnote-617) However, unlike Brian de Lisle who was granted lands of Ralph de Taisson, most of the group had not made their mark in the king's service in France or England in 1204, and only Peter de Maulay benefited from the initial grant of such lands when he was given Upavon in October 1204. Although Athée was given the *terra normannorum* of Aldbourne and Wanborough, this was not until 1207 and they had been retained in the king's hands for several years. Engelard who was eventually granted Hailes by Henry III (which had belonged to the chamberlains of Tancarville) was not a primary recipient as it had already been held by Geoffrey de Lucy, and when Maulay later was given Gomshall, this had been in the hands of William de Briouse. Unfortunately for the recipients, the grants of *terrae normannorum* were not intended to be solemn grants in perpetuity nor grants in hereditary right but were only given them while it pleased the king. John wanted to ensure that the new recipients would continue to support his campaigns to recover his lost provinces - even if this meant that the former dispossessed holders were able to reclaim their seized lands when the two countries were reunified.

According to Holt, medieval government depended for its stability on an acceptable distribution of office, and that John could never get the balance right.[[618]](#footnote-618) However, it could never be said that John rewarded his men from the Touraine over generously, but rather that he was always conscious to reward them adequately rather than lavishly. He may have wanted not to upset his loyal barons but more likely he did not feel the need to lavish gifts on them, as they made no demands on him for such demonstrations of generosity. John may have not felt the need to reward Athée generously as he had already contributed at least £2,000-3,000 to his ransom. In 1202 Athée was given the land of William de Pressigny but this was only until the submission of the king’s rebel vassal, and Athée had to raze the castles there. On his arrival in England he and his wife were granted the Wiltshire manors of Aldbourne and Wanborough to sustain them, and he later appears to have received several monetary gifts, for example £100 in 1209.[[619]](#footnote-619) Other transfers of money cited in the Pipe Rolls, for example £200 at Michaelmas 1208 under Northumberland and £1,000 under Sussex, were probably contributions towards his ransom. At the end of his life in September 1213 he may have been granted the custody of the manor of *Kingeslan* whilst it pleased the king but this was more likely a grant made to his nephew, of the same name.[[620]](#footnote-620) There is no evidence that he was granted any lands in perpetuity.

The king was similarly guarded with his grants to Engelard and Andrew Chanceaux who on their arrival in England in 1207 were granted Hurstbourne to sustain them in the king's service - they and their '*socios*' benefited from it until John's death. In 1211 Engelard was given custody of the fee of Roger Berkeley - this was in the king's hands and the Pipe Rolls state that Engelard should account for this (rather than Guy de Chanceaux in the Honour of Gloucester) and this he did certainly until November 1213 when the barons were ordered to place in respite the demands they made of him.[[621]](#footnote-621) Guy de Chanceaux, in January 1214 just before he had handed over the Honour of Gloucester to Geoffrey de Mandeville, was given custody of the lands and heir of Geoffrey FitzRobert of Donnington, a Gloucestershire landowner, to help sustain him in the king's service.[[622]](#footnote-622) In November 1215 he was given temporary custody of rebel lands in Gloucester and Somerset which had belonged to Nicholas de Poinz, but this was not a gift without its problems as in November 1215 Nicholas de Poinz had snatched some chattels back and the orders for Boddington for example had to be reissued to the sheriff of Gloucester in September 1216.[[623]](#footnote-623)

Many of the lands which the men from the Touraine received had been taken from rebellious barons, who regained them when they came back to the king, with the result that those gifts which were made were often accompanied by years of dispute. This is particularly true of those made to Philip Mark who suffered when the original owners successfully claimed their rights over them. In July 1212 whilst the king was staying at Nottingham, Mark (like his predecessor Robert Vieuxpont) was given some of the lands of Doun Bardolf which stretched through Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Lincolnshire, but he had to return some in August 1215 and by March 1216 he had lost them completely to de Burgh.[[624]](#footnote-624) At the same time he was also given some lands of Robert of Muskham, but these were claimed a year later by Ralph de Greasley in the right of his wife. As consolation, Mark was given the proffer which Greasley had made for the lands, but as Ralph did not pay initially, Mark kept the lands. In June 1215 he was being pressed to hand them back, and in the end the case went by default - but even by 1221 Mark was still demanding arrears of payment and stock from Greasley.[[625]](#footnote-625) These were not the only lands which caused difficulties for Mark. By September 1213, he also had rights to Bulwell, but these were restricted and did not for example include the church as he was ordered to restore this to Master Henry of Nottingham, a charter witnessed by Peter de Maulay.[[626]](#footnote-626) His problems at Bulwell continued well into the next reign, with Philip Mark insisting at an inquiry held in 1219 that he held the manor through a gift of King John - but this was not confirmed to him and his wife until near his death.[[627]](#footnote-627) At some stage he also gained Eaton in Derbyshire from Peter Marshal as security for a loan - but this may have been after Magna Carta and his claims rumbled on for many years, eventually forming the basis of a court case in 1228. Mark also had custody of Andrew de Lutterel (of Gamston and West Bridgeford) and Matthew Haversage. Philip Mark's brother Peter was also rewarded by the king, for example in September 1213, Engelard was ordered to find some place in the lands of William de Briouse which could be used to support him, his wife and family. Reginald, Philip's other brother, was later given the lands of Robert Chaworth, a tenant of the honour of Tickhill.[[628]](#footnote-628)

Peter de Maulay had received a gift of land in France from John as early as December 1202, and in October 1204 he was granted the *terra normannorum* of Upavon in Wiltshire. The manor came without its wheat and stock of the present year as the king had ordered most of it to be sold by the sheriff of Wiltshire on 30 September and the rest was taken in October to stock his manor of Bere.[[629]](#footnote-629) Maulay used Upavon as a residence as in the *Misae* Rolls for 1210, huntsmen are shown going to Peter de Maulay at Upavon with greyhounds.[[630]](#footnote-630) This was a barbed gift as it caused endless problems for Maulay. In 1211 there was an assize of darrein presentment between Maulay and the abbot of St Wandrille over the advowson of the church of Upavon, which was temporarily put into respite because of the default of a juror but which continued to rumble on through 1212.[[631]](#footnote-631) It also caused problems for Henry III as Gilbert Bassett felt slighted that the king had not recognised his claim to hold it by charter, and he subsequently moved into open revolt.

Maulay held other lands in England - in March 1205 he appears to have held lands in Oxford - 'to the sheriff of Wiltshire 4 marks from the lands of Peter de Maulay in your bailiwick at Oxford'.[[632]](#footnote-632) It is tempting to connect the many pledges owed to Maulay in 1205 with his acquisition of land at this time - in December 1205, Maulay received the lands of Guy de Laval in the bailiwick of the sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk and he himself responded at that time at the treasury for £20.[[633]](#footnote-633) In January 1207 the lands of the late Robert of St Remy in Wilden ( Bedfordshire) were given to him to sustain him in the king's service (and he was still benefitting from these at Michaelmas 1214).[[634]](#footnote-634) In 1209 he received land at Gomshall [Towerhill] which had previously belonged to William de Briouse, and according to the *Red Book of the Exchequer* by 1210-1212 he had retained this and also had acquired land at Paddington (also once held by William de Briouse) and *Dudelega* (Surrey) and *Peverel de Dovva* in Bedfordshire as well as land in the honour of Dover and the honour of the count of Leicester.[[635]](#footnote-635) Paddington and Gomshall were eventually restored to William de Briouse's nephew, although on 7 December 1215, the sheriff of Surrey was ordered to restore to Peter de Maulay his land and chattels at Gomshall.[[636]](#footnote-636) The Pipe Rolls for Michaelmas 1214 also show that he owned land in Gasterd, near Corsham, Wiltshire.[[637]](#footnote-637) Maulay also received other benefits, for example 50 marks in 1212 for 'going in the service of the king into Poitou', and in February 1215, the royal officials were told to protect his lands whilst he was in the king's service at Corfe - Maulay being acquitted of suits of shires and hundreds, sheriffs aids, pleas and complaints. [[638]](#footnote-638) On 26 April 1215, the sheriff of Yorkshire was ordered to excuse Maulay of all the debts to the king.

Apart from the remission of all his debts, the king's most valuable gift to Maulay was to allow him on 25 April 1214 to marry Isabel, the only child of the late Robert de Turnham and heiress to the Fossard fee which was divided between Doncaster in the West Riding and Mulgrave in Cleveland. It accounted for thirty knights’ fees - which was not a huge amount since seventeen of the great barons held lands with more than ninety-five knights’ fees - but on her father's death the fee was valued at £411 9s 3d, with £200 of additional revenues (whereas the average baronial income from good lands was £200).[[639]](#footnote-639) Isabel had been born in 1200 - not before as when the Chronicle of Meaux recounted the monks' case about Wharram Grange for 1199 it stated 'if Robert and his wife have an heir' - and was therefore a minor at the time of the marriage and the estate was in the king's hands. Gilbert FitzRenfrew who had held it for the king until 25 April 1214 may have wanted to retain it for his own family as John had to warn him to fulfil the justiciar's orders *omni dilatione et occasione postpositis exequi non ommitatis* – an indication that it was thought that the order might not be obeyed. In May the king again ordered him to hand the lands over, this time to Master Revellus and William Poher who would hold them for Peter de Maulay's work - Maulay may have been in La Rochelle at this time.[[640]](#footnote-640)

Although Guisborough claimed that the king gave Maulay the Fossard fee in lieu of wages as a reward for the part he played in the murder of Arthur, this is unlikely not only because there is no confirmation that Peter de Maulay was involved in that murder (only Guisborough makes the connection), but because the Pipe Rolls show that he was not 'given' the barony but instead had to pay a fine of 7,000 marks to the king for the hand of Isabel.[[641]](#footnote-641) John may have agreed to the marriage in order to obtain this large fine - marriages and wardships and the custody of abbeys and bishoprics were always viewed as an easy source of money. Large fines were attractive to the king as by holding the threat of repayment over his subjects, the king retained control over them - for if they failed to meet the repayments at the Exchequer they could be imprisoned at the king's will and their lands and the proportion of the fine paid could be forfeited, as Geoffrey de Mandeville for example found when he failed to make the first payment due after his marriage to Isabella of Gloucester, and the Honour of Gloucester was seized. Maulay's fine was not excessive but it was still considerable and could be an indication that Maulay was not yet a great favourite of the king, especially as several of the king's close friends had benefited from valuable royal gifts without payment of a large fine, for example Roger de Lacy had recovered twenty fees in his honour of Pontefract and custody of the land and heirs of Richard de Muntfichet, and William de Briwerre had acquired several wardships and good marriages for his daughter and nephews. It is possible that John was trying not to alienate his loyal barons and was making a point of showing them that the men from the Touraine did not get privileges which were not readily handed out elsewhere. It is also possible that he had not yet forgiven Maulay completely for his 'misdemeanors' in 1212. It is however far more likely that King John was facing increasing problems at home and needed to strengthen his influence in the north where the native barons, held together by family ties, grievances, debts and guarantees, were coalescing together. By placing a strong, loyal and obedient man like Maulay in the north at Doncaster, the king was able to maintain a good balance to the Yorkshire Lacys in the West Riding.[[642]](#footnote-642) Doncaster was one of the first towns to have its defences strengthened - in March 1215 Peter de Maulay's bailiffs there were told to construct palisades behind the ditch surrounding the town and to barricade the bridge. (John was making other adjustments in the northern part of his kingdom at this time - placing Oldcotes, Vieuxpont and de Lisle in northern captaincies, perhaps even offering York and then Durham to Roches, and on 18 August, ordering Robert Lexington to find twenty serjeants for guarding the county of Nottingham and twenty for guarding parts of Derbyshire).[[643]](#footnote-643) The raising of a considerable fine at this time had the advantage that it helped fill John's coffers as he prepared to sail for France – Mandeville's first instalment was also due the day John left for Poitou, and it coincided with FitzAlan offering 10,000 marks for succession to his barony, and John de Lacy offering 7,000 marks for succession to the honour of Pontefract.

Robert de Turnham may have suggested that Peter de Maulay would be a suitable husband for his daughter - he knew him and they had witnessed together on several occasions.[[644]](#footnote-644) Turnham himself had earlier shown an interest in the perpetuation of the family line - a charter of his of 15 December 1207 stated that the heirs of Robert de Mesnill (over whom he had custody) were to be married only to his nephews and nieces and his fine of 1,000 marks for this appears in the Pipe Roll for that year.[[645]](#footnote-645) Maulay's marriage to Isabel reflected Turnham's own marriage to Isabel's mother - Turnham himself had been only a minor magnate when he married Joanna Fossard, Isabel's mother. The marriage - which had taken place by Michaelmas 1197 as the Pipe Rolls refer to the quittance of the manor of Doncaster 'which is of the inheritance of his wife Joan and which was pledged to Henry I for 500 marks' - was probably a reward from Richard for the support Turnham had given him in Cyprus and in France (the Chronicle of Meaux states that William Fossard's only child was given in marriage by Richard to a favourite knight, Sir Robert de Thornham of Kent *seneschallo Vasconie strenuo et in expeditione probatissimo*).[[646]](#footnote-646) It is likely that Joanna, like her daughter Isabel, was under age at the time of her marriage (*infra aetatem constituta*) and, like Maulay, Turnham was almost immediately summoned back abroad as by Michaelmas of that year Alan de Wicheton again accounted for the farm of Surrey.[[647]](#footnote-647) However, there was one significant difference between the two marriages - in Turnham's case no fine was demanded.

It is remarkable that Peter de Maulay, who had been in England and in the king’s service for only a decade, could aspire to such a marriage with its intendant rise in rank. It is possible that originally he may have expected to be given the marriage without payment of a fine – like Turnham – especially as generous rewards for loyalty were common in this period (John's bastard son, Richard, was married to Rohese of Dover with her barony of Chilham that July, Ralph de Lusignan through his wife the Countess of Eu was placed in possession of the great fiefs of Hastings and Tickhill, and Aumale was granted his English inheritances of Holderness and Skipton) - and he may have expected to benefit in a similar way. However, when a fine of 7,000 marks instead was set, he did not waver, perhaps because the payments were to be staggered over six years.[[648]](#footnote-648) Maulay had shown himself to be an astute and ambitious man, and he would have been aware that the king was not in desperate need of money - it is estimated that the royal treasure in 1214 stood at the enormous sum of £130,000 - and he may have taken the gamble therefore that the king would never pursue the repayment of the fine, as long as he continued to serve the king loyally and continued to prove himself to be indispensable - after all, he was about to be trusted not only with a great treasure at La Rochelle, but also with the organisation of the war effort there.[[649]](#footnote-649) He may also have been counting on the king's fickle nature and erratic behaviour over the enforcement of debt - as a chamberlain he was no doubt aware that it was rare for the full amount of a fine to be demanded by the Exchequer - John frequently relaxed his demands to get greater political subservience, for example when he relaxed John de Lacy's fine of 7,000 marks in 1214 as he needed his friendship. [[650]](#footnote-650) At the back of his mind however must have been the fate of William de Briouse, who was pursued with vengeance by John because of his failure to pay the fine agreed for Limerick, as well as Thomas de Moulton who was imprisoned for unpaid debts.

When he fined 7,000 marks for having Isabella 'with all her lands which belonged to Robert Turnham on date of death', he was given several concessions, for example he was allowed to pay by instalments - 2,000 marks in the first year, and 1,000 marks thereafter until the debt was paid. The use of instalments was becoming increasingly common as they ensured ready payment – Richard de Rivers for example was allowed to pay in five instalments.[[651]](#footnote-651) The king however was careful to ensure that good sureties were given, and Maulay had no difficulty in resorting to the friendships he had been cultivating since he first arrived in England. Several good and influential men agreed to be his chief guarantors: a total of 4,900 marks was pledged by eminent men such as the Earls of Chester, Derby and Salisbury, as well as Savaric de Mauleon, Reginald de Pontibus, Hubert de Burgh, Arnold de Auclent and Walter de Gray (bishop of Worcester). Peter des Roches may have been the main backer – an unprinted fragment of a Fine Roll states *super omnibus aliis plegiis suis constituit se dominus Wint. Episcopus superiorem plegium* – although it is strange that his name does not appear as a guarantor in the Pipe Rolls. Although the list of backers was impressive, it did not include any Northerner - unlike the group consisting of Eustace de Vescy, Robert de Ros and Roger de Montbegon who had pledged for the debts of the Stutevilles and Mowbrays in 1209.[[652]](#footnote-652) For the residue Maulay put his lands in counter pledge agreeing that if the terms of the payment were not punctually observed, he was to lose all the first annual repayments he may have made. John was making sure that his generosity was well protected - if the Maulay fine was not paid, the crown would not incur any loss.

As it was, Maulay took the correct gamble, and soon after the marriage he began to benefit further from the king's indulgence – either in recognition of his loyalty and efficiency at La Rochelle or because John wanted to ensure that this powerful northern lord Maulay remained loyal to the crown in the run-up to Magna Carta (especially as several of the Fossard tenants were beginning to show signs of disloyalty).[[653]](#footnote-653) In February 1215 letters were issued to all royal officials instructing them to protect Maulay's lands whilst he was in the king's service, and he was acquitted of suit at shire and hundreds, of sheriff's aids and all pleas and complaints. Like John de Lacy who had received respite from his debts after his faithful service in Poitou in 1214, so on 29 April while he was at Corfe Maulay's debts to the king were excused until further notice because of his devoted service, and in 1221, he was let off the amount because of the monies he had spent on Corfe castle, guarding Eleanor and Richard, the daughter of the king of Scotland and other expenses of the king incurred at Corfe after Louis, son of the king of France, arrived in England.[[654]](#footnote-654) The Fossard barony gave Maulay access to a constant income, making him financially independent of the king - this came in useful when he fell out of favour in 1222-23 when he was able to return to his *caput* at Mulgrave to concentrate on its castle building.

However, the gift of the barony to Maulay was not without problems. There had been trouble with its transfer from Gilbert FitzRenfrew and some of his newly acquired lands were weighed down with the debts of William Fossard to the Jews, the abbey of Meaux, and the Exchequer, and as late as 1219 Turnham's heirs still owed money for Robert de Turnham's scutages. Maulay was also involved with several legal cases with members of the Fossard family, for example Idonea. Matters were not helped by the fact that shortly after acquiring the fee, Maulay had to leave for France (by 8 May 1214 he is found witnessing at St Legère, and by June he was at La Rochelle).[[655]](#footnote-655)

It is possible that some barons may have resented marriages such as Maulay's and this led them to demand the insertion in Magna Carta 1215 of Clause 6 on heirs marrying without disparagement. William Marshal, Geoffrey FitzPeter and Saher de Quency had all benefited from good marriages, but as John's reign progressed, there was growing disquiet as more and more marriages were beginning to pass into the hands of new men such as Hubert de Burgh and Vieuxpont (who owed his interests in Tickhill to his marriage to Idonea, heiress of John de Bully). There are however no extant complaints about the marriages of Athée's clan members (most of whom were already married when they arrived in the country) and it is more likely that the clause was directed against the many *parvenus* who were climbing the ladder of success. John was not particularly worried about the clause and in the autumn of 1216 he married Margaret, widow of Baldwin de Redvers and heiress of the barony of Stoke Courcy, Somerset, to Faulkes de Breauté. Although the chroniclers described them as 'beauty to the foul, unwilling and coerced', and that Faulkes was made 'the equal of an earl' by the marriage, in fact the arrangements received the blessing of the establishment and were witnessed by Peter des Roches and William Marshal amongst others.[[656]](#footnote-656) The clause on disparagement was excluded from the reissues of the charter in 1216/1217 and 1225, and it was not until 1258 that the demand was made again by the barons in their Petition of Barons which demanded that women *non marietentur ubi disparagentur videlicet homibus qui non sunt de natione regni Anglie*.*[[657]](#footnote-657)*

The men from the Touraine may not have married heiresses (apart from Maulay) but they did acquire several good marriage rights and wardships. These were considered to be good investments and men expected reasonable profits from them. In 1214, Philip Mark had the marriage rights of a certain squire.[[658]](#footnote-658) The lands and marriage rights of Matthew Haversage were also given to him by John, and he married him to his daughter Annora - or as a genealogical calendar states, 'in the time of war, Philip Mark captured Matthew Haversage and held him in his castle [of Nottingham] and married him to his daughter'.[[659]](#footnote-659) He (and Philip Glory) also had Susannah de Chanceaux, sister of the Chanceaux brothers (daughter crossed out) in their custody before she married Baskerville's son. Andrew de Chanceaux had paid 50 marks and some palfreys worth 10 marks to have the marriage rights for his sister. In January 1214 before Susanna's marriage took place (in the presence of Peter des Roches), Mark was ordered to allow her to come into his bailiwick and stay for one or two days.[[660]](#footnote-660) The Baskerville family were interlinked with other members of the clan - the previous year Engelard had been responsible for restoring the dower lands to Walter de Baskerville's widow, and later on 26 March 1215, Mark was ordered not to distrain her for his debts.[[661]](#footnote-661)

Engelard and his men received considerable enrichment from the king, but its level was far less than could be expected.[[662]](#footnote-662) They appear to have received no money fiefs nor benefitted from being households knights, unlike Geoffrey de Lutterel, a man of obscure origin who made a good marriage and gained much property, including several royal manors and lands in Ireland.[[663]](#footnote-663) They never emulated other men who like them had served John in France before the Fall, for example Vieuxpont who was awarded Westmorland and who married an important heiress, gained custody of the lands and heirs of FitzRanulph, and through other purchases and leases acquired an extensive landholding - eventually achieving an hereditary lordship. Similarly they did not acquire the substantial holdings, for example, of William Wrotham (also of obscure origin), who was rewarded for his skill in naval matters with lands, tenements and escheats, nor even Philip Oldcotes who was given custody of the lands of Robert de Ros in 1213 as well as several manors, and was allowed to marry the daughter of Robert de Meinil on the payment of £100 and a complete (!) horse.[[664]](#footnote-664) Instead the Chanceaux brothers, Philip Mark and Engelard received nothing in perpetuity from the king, and little of great value. Rather than John rewarding them well, he was in fact cautious and limited with his generosity, granting them lands mainly when it helped him secure his presence in an area – for example the grant of Doun Bardolf's lands in Nottingham to bolster Philip Mark's power and influence as sheriff of Nottingham, the grant of the Fossard fee to Peter de Maulay to enable the king to have a strong presence in the north in particular at Doncaster. There were many others around them whose loyalty and efficiency was far more generously rewarded

*Closeness to the king*

Many barons may have felt that the group of men from the Touraine had the ear of the king, and were using this to further their careers if not their coffers. Historians such as Maddicott believe that John relied heavily on them for their counsel - but Engelard never considered himself, nor was considered, part of the inner circle of the king at court. [[665]](#footnote-665) He was never a royal favourite nor a political adviser and he witnessed only a few charters - one in March 1212 concerned with the vacant church at Norton (along with Peter de Maulay, the Earl of Salisbury, and others), one concerned with the restoration of Peter de Maulay's offices in May 1212, and only one royal writ before Runnymede.[[666]](#footnote-666) He was rarely found moving amongst the barons, although surprisingly he did act as a guarantor with them when the king was persuaded in 1212 to restore Peter de Maulay to office. It was only after Magna Carta 1215 when he had been made castellan at Windsor that he had the opportunity to forge a greater friendship with the king (who often enjoyed the forests and parks around the castle), but even then he did not take advantage of his position there. Philip Mark may have had a closer relationship with the king as John often visited Nottingham, sometimes as often as three times a year as he enjoyed Sherwood forest and his hunting lodge at Clipstone. But Mark too never became part of the inner circle nor a frequent witness to writs, but preferred to lead a semi-independent life at Nottingham which he made his own personal powerbase. Peter de Maulay was far closer to the king, witnessing frequently with him, carrying writs for him, acting as one of his chamberlains, or as his envoy to Rome.

The men from the Touraine never positively sought the favour of the king, unlike Briwerre who used every method and opportunity to ingratiate himself and increase his wealth. They were not part of the *familia regis* but quite the opposite – they never had the ear of the king, but rather had to listen carefully to men like Brian de Lisle (or occasionally Peter de Maulay) told them on the king's behalf.[[667]](#footnote-667) That is not to say that the king did not take their advice on occasion – John listened to Athée's views on Gwerche, the future of Geoffrey de Pallaue and the Briouse situation, and he gave him full powers to deal with the ships of Somerset and Wales as he saw fit. Mark too was given an almost free rein in Nottingham. The king felt secure enough of their loyalty to entrust them not only with members of the royal family, but Guy de Chanceaux and Geoffrey de Martigny were given specific duties towards the queen herself.[[668]](#footnote-668) John also counted on the discretion of this group to deal with aspects of his and his wife's private life - Philip Mark's valet carried a posy of flowers to John's mistress (*amica*) in 1212, Peter de Maulay was involved in September 1214 with complicated arrangements for Fillota, the queen's 'maid', and Engelard had to send Alphesia, the queen's *domicella*, under escort of two knights to the king who was still in France.[[669]](#footnote-669) He was also responsible for paying Elena, the nurse of the future Henry III, although this was part of the duties of the sheriff of Gloucester.[[670]](#footnote-670) In all these matters, however, they were acting as officials carrying out the king's instructions, rather than as intimate friends, and the barons had no reason to feel or suspect that the men were using their relationship to the king to further their careers at their expense.

*Animosity of individual barons*

When commenting on the men from the Touraine, Warren stated that 'unfortunately we know little more about them than their names, but the hatred of them is obvious enough'.[[671]](#footnote-671) The very fact that Clause 50 was included in the charter confirms that there was a feeling of dislike, but the reasons for it are not so clear. It could have arisen from disputes over property, especially as some historians believe that the correct restoration of property lay at the heart of Magna Carta 1215- twelve of the Twenty-Five, for example, obtained letters of restitution between 19 and 28 June (for example FitzWalter to Hertford castle, Henry de Bohun to Trowbridge and Mandeville to lands in Gloucestershire Somerset) and fifty other claims were also met.[[672]](#footnote-672) However if the Barnwell annalist was correct in stating that it was the Northerners who were the leading rebels (as opposed to Wendover who felt that John and his evil counsellors were faced more by a united baronage), then grievances arising from property losses could not have been the reason for the proscription of the men from the Touraine as the Northerners were not threatened territorially by them nor did the men from the Touraine benefit from their lands. This group of barons were in debt to the king and not to the clan, and it was the king who (like his father) had allegedly lusted after their daughters and wives – there is no hint of impropriety by the men from the Touraine.

Likewise the Twenty-Five as a group had little reason to resent the men from the Touraine because of property losses, because most of them were not direct neighbours – eight of the Twenty-Five came from the northern part of England, the rest came from the west of England and London and their centres of power lay away from the areas of influence of the men proscribed.[[673]](#footnote-673) That is not to say that individual enforcers may not have had their own personal reasons for wishing to proscribe the men from the Touraine. Henry Bohun, Earl of Hereford, would have come up against Engelard who controlled the county and castle of Hereford. He was one of the first barons to benefit from the charter –on 19 June, the Earl of Salisbury was ordered to put Bohun's agent in possession of the barony of Trowbridge which he had laid claim to.[[674]](#footnote-674) There was probably friction between Engelard at Gloucester (and Guy de Chanceaux at the Honour of Gloucester) and Gilbert de Clare and his father who held vast Gloucester estates. Similarly between them and William de Mowbray who held lands in Gloucestershire which he had inherited from his father. Although it was specifically laid down that the Articles and Magna Carta should not be used to redress personal grievances, Mowbray used the Articles to claim back the castle of York and its associated forests - by 21 June 1215 he had told the king that a local inquiry had taken place.[[675]](#footnote-675) Geoffrey de Mandeville at Runnymede was still trying to establish what he felt was his rightful control of the Honour of Gloucester, previously held by Guy de Chanceaux. Philip Mark as sheriff of Nottinghamshire might have clashed with John de Lacy whose estates stretched well into Nottinghamshire and who was due to be entrusted with the rebel forces in Yorkshire in Nottinghamshire after Magna Carta.[[676]](#footnote-676) On the whole, though, Mark benefitted from the strength of the Earl of Chester and his brother in law the Earl of Derby whose great feudal power kept disloyalty at bay in the area of Nottingham/Derby.

Roger de Montbegon was the most likely enforcer to have sought the inclusion of the clan in Magna Carta 1215. He considered himself a great man – or so he was described during the court case involving Philip Mark under Henry III - and the *Histoire des Ducs* specifically named him as a Northerner.[[677]](#footnote-677) He was also in debt to the king, and his finances suffered when he refused to go to Poitou in 1214 and his stock was distrained. His importance as a leading rebel is shown by the fact that he was present when the arrangements for London were drawn up by the king and thirteen baronial leaders.[[678]](#footnote-678) The king was anxious to placate Montbegon and on 21 June 1215, shortly after the sealing of Magna Carta 1215 Mark and de Lisle were ordered to give him all the lands which he had originally been given when John was count of Mortain (although it took until January 1216 for Montbegon to come back to John's side).[[679]](#footnote-679) Although Montbegon's argument with Philip Mark did not degenerate into a very serious problem until after Magna Carta, it was rumbling before Magna Carta when that May Mark was ordered to restore some lands in Clayworth to him, and it is possible that that was enough for Montbegon to have wanted Mark at least proscribed.[[680]](#footnote-680)

There were other influential barons who were not necessarily enforcers of Magna Carta 1215 but who on occasion were in dispute with the men from the Touraine over land. There was animosity for example between Peter de Maulay and Gilbert FitzRenfrew (father of William Lancaster) who had held the Fossard barony in his custody before John granted it to Maulay.[[681]](#footnote-681) There was likely to have been ill-feeling also between Geoffrey de Martigny and Henry Braybrook after Martigny was placed at Northampton in 1215 ostensibly to keep an eye on Braybrook and who in May 1215 was ordered to take over Braybrook's lands after he had joined the rebels. Philip Mark was also storing up problems for himself with certain magnates such as Ralph de Greasley (over the lands of Robert of Muskham, an important Northumberland lord), Henry Bulwell (over the church and its appurtenances there), and Peter Marshall (over his land at Eaton).[[682]](#footnote-682)

It is possible that there were some influential barons who wanted to reduce the powers of the men from the Touraine, not because they were in dispute over property, but because they felt that their removal from office would lead to a reduction in the influence and importance of another Tourangeaux, namely Peter des Roches. His appointment to justiciar according to the Waverley annalist had been unwelcome and 'changed the barons anger into rage – nor has that age subsided even now'.[[683]](#footnote-683) Roches had alienated many, including barons such as Geoffrey de Mandeville over custody of the Tower of London and Geoffrey de Say over the honour of Berkhamstead, and both men were among the Twenty-Five. Although Roches' wealth, position and closeness to the king made him too powerful to be removed directly – according to the Preamble of Magna Carta 1215 he was also one of those whose counsel had been taken – it is unlikely that the removal of Athée's clan would have had any effect on his standing. There were other stronger forces at work and on 25 June shortly after the sealing of Magna Carta, but before the men from the Touraine had lost their positions, Hubert de Burgh replaced him as justiciar.[[684]](#footnote-684)

There were however some barons who may have hated Athée's clan but who were probably not the prime movers for their proscription. Eustace de Vescy - one of the main rebels (and the only one to receive a personal letter of rebuke from the Pope) - was unlikely to have played a part in the creation of Chapter 40, as he would have wanted to proscribe Philip Oldcotes - a man of possible Norman ancestry who had been put in joint charge of Northumberland in 1212 by John, becoming sole sheriff in 1214. On the day on which Vescy received letters of safe conduct to come back to England, John ordered Oldcotes to raze Vescy's castles of Alnwick and Malton. Any nomination made by him would have received the support of Robert de Ros, who was closely tied to him by blood and territory (both were married to daughters of William the Lion). Surprisingly, it seems unlikely that Robert FitzWalter pressed for the inclusion of the clause on proscription, for if he was involved he would have demanded the inclusion of Geoffrey de Martigny rather than his brother Matthew de Martigny - only a few weeks before Runnymede, FitzWalter had led the troops which had attacked Northampton where Geoffrey de Martigny was castellan, his standard bearer being killed on that occasion. FitzWalter may have contributed to the success of the rebels (as leader of the Army of God he held considerable power) and he may have been one of the first to benefit from Magna Carta 1215 (as he was restored Hertford castle on 19 June), but he seems to have been lacking in negotiating skills, being better known for his lack of loyalty and dominating aggressiveness.[[685]](#footnote-685) His lack of input was important for if he had pressed for proscription, any nominations by him would have had the support of several other barons who were tied to him by blood and friendship (Matthew Paris described him as 'encompassed by a multitude of blood relatives and strengthened by numerous relatives in marriage') - one of his daughters (who died in 1214) had been married to Geoffrey de Mandeville and another was married to Geoffrey's brother; he also had a close kinship with Richard de Montfichet (his grandfather had married Montfichet's aunt)as well as with Aubigny who was his cousin. His allies included William Huntingfield who was a fellow East Anglian landholder, and Saher de Quency who was his brother-in-arms and had been his joint castellan at Vaudreuil. The latter (who held a major manor at Brackley, near Northampton, where the principal rebels met before they marched on to Northampton) could be considered a candidate for one of the barons responsible for Chapter 40 (Clause 50). John considered Quency a threat and he made sure that he too was one of the first to have his grievances redressed after Magna Carta (on 19 June he regained Montsorrel castle after claiming that John had kept it back from his inheritance). However, he would most likely have wanted the inclusion of Geoffrey de Martigny who held a royal castle close to his *caput* of Brackley and, like FitzWalter, would not have confused him with his less well-known brother Matthew. However fortunately for John, if FitzWalter and Quency had been responsible for naming particular men for proscription, their nominations would not necessarily have received the full support of all the barons - many still had not forgotten their treachery at Vaudreuil and they remained despised even by the French king who viewed them as cowards.

The stress on Athée in Chapter 40, however, does hint at the possibility that there were certain people who were harbouring a long-standing grievance against him and that this had flowed into resentment against his whole clan from the Touraine – a resentment which had not run its course by Magna Carta 1215. Although Girard d'Athée occurs as the lynchpin of Chapter 40 of the Articles of Barons - *ut rex amoveat penitus de balliva parentes et totam sequelam Gerardi de Atyes* – the stress on him (as well as his parentes and all his *sequela*) is suprising as he had probably been dead for some years, and certainly had not been in the limelight since 1210. Despite this, Matthew Paris in his version of Magna Carta 1215 increased the stress placed on Athée in the charter by including *all* the *parentes* of Athée as well as his wife with all their children. It is well documented that Athée and Engelard had upset members of the House of Clare in their dealings for example with William de Briouse. They were a dangerous faction to alienate - according to Painter all but two of the descendants of Earl Richard of Clare who were of baronial rank rebelled against John.[[686]](#footnote-686) There was however one particular man who had very valid reasons for wanting Girard d'Athée and his relatives to be proscribed and that was Giles de Briouse, son of William de Briouse. Giles de Briouse, who had been made bishop of Hereford in 1200, had been connected to Athée since 1208 when Athée was made sheriff and castellan at Hereford. Although a man of the church, he always remained a marcher lord at heart, heavily involved with border politics, and he would have crossed with Athée throughout the whole Briouse episode. Although he was not one of the Twenty-Five, he had been closely interlinked with the rebels for many years - when Vescy and FitzWalter fled abroad in 1212, he was in contact with them as he was also in exile at that time; as bishop of Hereford he was also in close contact with FitzWalter's brother, William, who was archdeacon of Hereford and who had been outlawed at the same time. According to the Barnwell annalist he was at Stamford, along with five earls, forty barons, and a host of 2,000, but not acting as a bishop but as the avenger of his father.[[687]](#footnote-687) When Llewelyn ab Iorwerth seized Shrewsbury on 17 May 1215, Briouse took the opportunity to rise in rebellion and he and his brother Reginald took possession of their family's castles of Brecon, Hay, Radnor and Builth. His importance to the baronial clause is further illustrated by the fact that he and William FitzWalter were excommunicated by name in September 1215.[[688]](#footnote-688)

Giles had many reasons for wishing anyone closely connected to Girard d'Athée to be proscribed. It was Athée who had pursued his father, leading an army into Wales, which his father was then asked to pay for. It was also Athée who had taken Radnor from his father and persuaded his father's men to return to the king's side. Athée also had replaced Briouse's second cousin at Hereford, and may even have condoned John's involvement with Arthur's death, the death of whom Matilda de Briouse claimed caused the split between the king and her husband. Engelard had continued the alienation of Briouse and his relatives: he had held Ludlow castle (and vill) in his custody; he had guarded the hostages which Walter de Lacy had to leave as well as the son of John de Monmouth (a ward of William de Briouse) and Annora, Giles' sister; in June 1213 he had been responsible for distributing William de Briouse's lands to the Brothers of the Middle Temple; and in September he had to find some place in William de Briouse's land which could be used to sustain Peter Mark (brother of Philip Mark) and his wife and family.[[689]](#footnote-689) The fate of the Briouse family was not an issue which would go away - as Painter concluded 'it was through Athée that the bitter hatred of the Briouses towards King John was passed on to other baronial elements'.[[690]](#footnote-690)

The Briouse episode was considered of great importance in the thirteenth century and was covered by most of the main chronicles - the Continuator of William of Newburgh criticised John for his treatment of the Briouse family, and the Barnwell annalist mentions John's excessive fury with Briouse as does the *Histoire des Ducs* and the *History of William Marshal*.[[691]](#footnote-691) The turbulent events were covered also by Coggeshall, Wendover, Brut, Dunstable, Osney, Coventry, Margam, Tewkesbury, Waverley and Winchester.[[692]](#footnote-692) Although several of the Twenty-Five appear to have sanctioned John's actions, as they were prepared to be witnesses to his Proclamation, for example Quency, Bohun, Aubigny and Mowbray, many barons must have felt that John's actions and his decision to make a public example of Giles' father and mother were contrary to equity and reason. John's claim that he was acting against Briouse *secundum consuetudinem regni et per legem scaccarii* was an ominous interpretation of the king's rights – if he had resorted to forfeiture and distraint in the Briouse case, what might he do in other cases where the baron involved was not one of his closest friends? Such fears would have led to Giles de Briouse receiving the support not only of the Briouse relatives but of other barons who had reason to mistrust a king who had had no qualms in destroying one of his oldest friends.

In the run-up to Magna Carta there are several indications that John was seeking some sort of a rapprochement with Giles de Briouse. On 10 May 1215 when John made a peace offer to the rebels promising not to seize their lands until *consideracio facta fuit*, he offered him special treatment saying that he could have judgment in the king's court for the 9,000 mark fine he had made for his Briouse inheritance - a fine which Giles clearly considered unacceptable and grounds for complaint.[[693]](#footnote-693) However on 12 May the king gave special orders for his lands to be seized (along with those of Mandeville and Braybrook) and the matter was not settled until after Runnymede as the lands were still in the king's hands on 22 July, and Giles did not regain them until after he rejoined the king on 20 October, a month before he died. In Magna Carta 1215, there is also one other clause which would have helped alleviate Giles's grievances - Clause 52 stated that if anyone had been disseised or deprived by the king without the lawful judgement of his peers of lands, castles, liberties or his rights, that they would be restored to him at once. It could be said that Giles de Briouse's grievances against Athée were so much in the forefront of the minds of the compilers of the Articles and Magna Carta 1215 that one concession and two clauses pandered to them. The Briouse episode also remained in John's mind – as he lay dying he donated land to Margaret de Lacy on which to build a religious house in memory of her parents, William and Matilda de Briouse.

Giles was probably not acting alone and would have been supported by his influential friends and relatives –Walter de Lacy, Henry Bohun (his first cousin once removed), Walter Clifford (his second cousin), the son and heir of Mortimer (William's son in law), and the Earl of Hertford (Richard de Clare) who was also a relation. His network of powerful allies can be seen in 1218 when the names of those who guaranteed that the sons of William de Briouse would faithfully serve the king, and who promised to distrain them if they offended, included the Earls of Arundel, Gloucester and Derby, as well as William de Mandeville, Reginald de Briouse, Walter de Lacy, Hugh and Robert Mortimer, Robert FitzWalter and William d'Aubigny.[[694]](#footnote-694) Whether William Marshall with his reputation for integrity and loyalty would have allowed Giles de Briouse to pursue his hatred in this way is another matter. According to Painter, the only thing which prevented the Briouse incident from leading to the destruction of John was the deep loyalty of the Marshal.[[695]](#footnote-695) Although the murder of William de Briouse's family must have rankled with Giles de Briouse and other members of the baronage, it is surprising that they were not concerned with Peter de Maulay who was also involved with the Briouse family, yet was not proscribed in Clause 50. If it was true, as Guisborough stated, that Peter de Maulay was responsible for Arthur's death this would have made him the mortal enemy of the Briouses and their friends as it was William de Briouse's knowledge of Arthur's fate and his wife's threat to divulge that information which some say caused that family's downfall. Peter de Maulay also personally benefitted from Briouse's death - Paddington and Gumshall which the king gave him had previously belonged to William de Briouse (and was later reclaimed by Giles de Briouse).

*Animosity of the Church*

There are many historians – and chroniclers – who see Langton's hand in the compilation of Magna Carta 1215. Holt believed he played a particularly important role in the last weeks of the negotiations leading up to Runnymede, and Wendover gave him credit for the charter itself. He is not included in the list of Enforcers, however, but it is likely that he acted as a mediator as a copy of the Articles does appear in the Canterbury archives.[[696]](#footnote-696) Vincent believes that the activities of the men from the Touraine were 'singled out by chroniclers as most damaging to the estates of the church', which would not have not endeared them to Langton.[[697]](#footnote-697) Guy de Chanceaux had exploited the Canterbury lands, and Athée who had custody of the see of Bath had placed his own men in vacant livings. Athée had also deseized the Gloucester seven hundreds, and his successor Engelard had failed to restore them – this had to wait until 1215. Engelard had also seized the lands of Abbey Dore and was ordered to appear in front of the justices at Westminster over the matter. However, if Langton was heavily involved in the charter, he would have had far more important matters to deal with than the proscription of a group of men who were not alone in carrying out the king's orders as they applied to ecclesiastical lands and positions. He would have been far more interested for example in Clause 1 which confirmed the liberties of the church as well as the other clauses such as Clause 40 which asserted the principle of free justice (which had been laid down in Langton's decrees in 1213-1214), or any of the other clauses which required the intervention of the archbishop , for example 55. In any event, if Carpenter is correct in his assertion that there is compelling evidence that Langton had nothing to do with the Articles of Barons, then he had nothing to do with Clause 50 which is based almost entirely on Chapter 40 of the Articles.[[698]](#footnote-698)

Chapter 8: Conclusion

Chapter 40 of the Articles of Barons and Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 singled out for proscription a group of men who were connected to Athée by blood and territory. In France, they had acted as a clan, witnessing together for their own charters, and as far as the Chanceaux brothers were concerned, receiving letters of safe conduct as a group. There may have been consternation in England at the size of the king's contribution to Athée's ransom but there seemed little reason to fear his arrival (and that of his friends) as he was still a little-known servant who had previously been restricted to the Touraine and Poitou, and his clan were seemingly young men without any previous experience - they were all new men with no friends in the country. At first the barons accepted the men as individuals as they did not seem to be seeking excessive rewards for themselves or trying to insinuate themselves into the king's confidence, but soon Athée incurred the animosity of William de Briouse and his baronial friends and relatives when he was sent to sieze his chattels in Wales. As Athée began to retreat from the limelight (or died), the barons became concerned when they saw the members of his clan taking over from him without any specific royal writ. They could see that a network of foreigners was now in action, where important positions were passed between its members, and from which they were ostracised and had no influence. The clan was beginning to appear invincible - they were bound together by ties not only of blood but also of territory and mutual dependency. These ties were deeper, stronger and less complicated than those of the barons who may have been connected by blood but were often torn apart by inbuilt grievances which resulted in members or families fighting on different sides (for example Marshal and his son, and Robert and Ivo de Vieuxpont). Unlike the men from the Touraine whose loyalty to the king was unwavering and everlasting, many barons were not consistent with their loyalty (for example Aumale returned to the king after 2 months, and John de Lacy surrendered in winter 1215).

As civil war beckoned, it was becoming clear to the barons that they had real cause to fear this clan whose members had a stranglehold on some of the strongest castles in the west and Midlands - castles which were garrisoned with experienced, well armed men, and whose castellans were considered reliable enough to keep these strong *sicut viderit expendere*. The clan had control of some of the main provincial treasuries which meant that they could move money quickly to where it was most needed and it was considered always to be safe in their hands. They had stockpiles of weapons, and when these became in short supply they were able to create more or refurbish those remaining using the materials which they had in and around their bailiwicks. They had the organisational ability and experience to be able to move supplies to and from expeditions, whether it was herrings, bacons or wine, mangonels or petraries - liaising with each other for example over the provision of boats or the supply of armaments. They kept their shrievalties under control with little central interference, especially at Nottingham, and the king on very few occasions had to chastise them, and was content to let them take on each other's responsibilities, leaving them for many years in their posts. They could work on their own initiative, or they could take orders from a fellow foreigner like Faulkes de Breauté without resentment, even though they had become used to working on their own initiative. Rather than acting as individual agents (except on occasion Mark), their strength lay in their close ties to each other and the intertwining of their roles - acting sometimes as deputy, at other times as the primary official, moving goods between themselves and sharing wardships and marriages as well as Richard Burgeis who accounted for several of them at the Exchequer. There was always also a seemingly endless supply of their relatives and friends who could be called upon in time of crisis, for example the Martigny brothers, Aymery de Chanceaux and Matthew de Cigogny. The very existence of Clause 50 in the charter, if nothing else, reflects the amount of strength the group gave John.

The extant writs make it quite clear that the men from the Touraine could not be accused of maladministration - although Matthew Paris and a host of historians would like one to think otherwise. They were not ruthless mercenaries, evil judges or cruel sheriffs whose presence was a blight on the kingdom. Although the barons may have had concerns about their foreign birth or low status, there were many other *parvenus* who were climbing up the ladder of success and benefiting from the king's patronage but who were not singled out for proscription. Some barons may have wanted to ensure that they did not benefit from the king's largesse, but the few lands which they were given were never granted in perpetuity, and there were many other men, both new and alien, who profited more than they did. The clan members never sought the trappings of wealth nor were they interested in being some of the king's closest advisers. They were men who were loyal to John not because of the rewards which they could accrue, but because they respected him as their king - thus disproving Holt's view that there is little evidence that 'the tie between the king and men was based on anything but the continued expectation and provision of material reward in return for material service', and Vincent's conclusion that Roches' alien following were 'a diverse collection of individuals each of them out for his own personal advantage'.[[699]](#footnote-699) That is not to say that they were totally unambitious: Girard d'Athée had acquired his own seal by 1201, and it would appear that Mark and Aymery de Chanceaux had similar trappings.[[700]](#footnote-700) The Chanceaux brothers may have sought a good marriage for their sister but on the whole the men from the Touraine did not need the power which money or obsequiousness could buy, nor the social standing which a good marriage could bring. Although McKechnie believed that their differences with the baronial leaders lay too deep for reconciliation, it is unlikely that they incurred the hatred of the baronage as a whole. It is more likely that they offended individual barons or groups of barons who had their own reasons for wanting their proscription - for example Giles de Briouse who wanted to avenge his father, or the members of the House of Clare who had suffered under both Athée and Engelard.[[701]](#footnote-701)

Although there were several reasons which would have encouraged the animosity of certain barons, they were all peripheral to the barons' main cause of concern, namely that they were faced by a group of men which was strong and confident because its members had the support of each other and the support of the king, and over whom they had absolutely no control. If, as Painter believes, the barons had no confidence in John's promises and that they considered rebellion or the threat of rebellion to be the only way that they could control the king, then the men from the Touraine were indeed to be feared, for as long as they had a widespread control of castles, money, food supplies and armaments, and gave unstinting support to the king, the barons would never be able to curb John's power.[[702]](#footnote-702) The sword was useless to them as few barons could equal their military experience and powers, and the military strength of the royal castles with their garrisons meant that success was stacked in favour of the king.

The situation, however, altered dramatically in 1215 when the baronial rebels were able to force John to enter into negotiations with them. They now had the opportunity of getting rid of the group whom they feared with justification, by using the power of words. The barons may have attempted a similar approach at some earlier stage when they may have asked for them to be removed from the kingdom (to which Wendover referred) but this had failed. However, now in May 1215 they were negotiating from a position of greater strength, and had the opportunity of putting forward a clause which they felt would deal once and for all with this powerful group of men and which this time might gain the king's acceptance as it was less stringent than any previous request, demanding only their removal from office. In the Articles of Barons, the rebels demanded the removal from office of Athée's *parentes* and *totam sequelam* (Chapter 40). At that stage the notion of dismissal was there but the detail was not. It took the administrative skills of the chancery scribes to perfect the demand. Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 calls for the removal of the *parentes* of Athée, naming most of them individually and correctly, but also for the *sequela* of those proscribed as it wanted to prevent future generations of the clan from gaining similar power and influence. Athée was made the lynchpin of the chapter and clause not because of what he had done but because he was responsible for bringing the clan into the country, and because if not his relatives, they were his close friends.

The fact that the barons aimed their demands solely at the relatives and friends of Athée meant that other men like Peter de Maulay were excluded from the proscription. There were many similarities between him and the men from the Touraine - he had also originated from the Touraine, had come to England after the fall of Normandy, had been in charge of a provincial treasury, had guarded royal prisoners and had been entrusted with the care of royal infants. But equally there were many differences - he had forged close friendships with eminent barons who witnessed with him and pledged with him, and finally he had become one of them when he married the heiress to the Fossard fee. He also had closer personal ties with the king who on occasion referred to him as *'tu Petre*' in chancery writs, as well as 'lord', but he had the advantage of being able to retain his independence as he was not entirely dependent on the king's largesse as he had his own large baronial income from the Fossard fee.[[703]](#footnote-703) Norgate believed that he was too important to be removed from office and that Magna Carta 1215 was no time to get rid of an increasingly influential English baron, even if some considered his ties with the king to be alarmingly close. But the main reason why he was not proscribed was because he was not an integral member of Athée's clan from the Touraine - he was not related to them, and he had shown throughout his career that he was not a satellite of the group.

There were other men of foreign birth who could have fallen into the remit of the clause on proscription, for example Peter des Roches, but he was not proscribed in Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 despite coming from the same area of the Touraine. In his case he was not Athée's relative, but more importantly he was too powerful to be taken on - as the wealthy Bishop of Winchester he had the protection of the Church with lifelong tenure, and he also controlled eighty knights fees and four castles. Although the barons had disliked his promotion to justiciarship (just as objections had been made to Richard I's Norman favourite William Longchamp), the barons may have used Magna Carta 1215 in another way to achieve his removal - on 25 June 1215, de Burgh was first given Roches' title of justiciar, perhaps as Painter claims as a condition of peace.[[704]](#footnote-704) Faulkes too escaped proscription (except by Matthew Paris) for this same reason - even though he was infamous amongst his colleagues for his pride and insolence and vilified by chroniclers like the Barnwell annalist who described him as the scourge of the earth and Matthew Paris who called him as a most evil robber, the fact remained that he was not a relative of Athée.

Although John acquiesced in the insertion of Clause 50 into Magna Carta, he knew that he could not maintain his position as king without the assistance of his men from the Touraine. He may never have loved them like he did Algais, nor admired them like he did Turnham, but he knew that he could not do without them. Almost as soon as Magna Carta was distributed, he began to ignore the agreement he had made with the barons, making plans which would result in members of the clan remaining either in their existing castles or placed in new positions of power and authority.

**Part Three:**

**After Magna Carta 1215**

Chapter 9: Initial Moves

After a period of intensive negotiation and concentrated committee work, the drafting of the final chapters of Magna Carta was complete. On 19 June general letters patent were sent to the king's bailiffs in which the king declared that 'we have restored peace between us and our barons'. The recipients of these early writs were Philip FitzJohn, the bishop of Worcester, the clerk of the bishop of York, the mayor of London, and Engelard de Cygogny. The writs ordered each sheriff 'to cause all in his bailiwick to make oath….to the Twenty-Five or their attorneys, and to see to the appointment of twelve knights of the county in full County Court, to declare upon oath all evil practices as well of sheriffs as of their servants, foresters and others'.[[705]](#footnote-705) It was not specified what Engelard was to do with his writ – he was only sent one, even though he controlled two shrievalties (Hereford and Gloucester) as well as Bristol. It is possible that he was one of the first recipients as he had played a more general role in the arrangements for Magna Carta 1215 and its subsequent distribution - his wife and son may have been kept as hostages as they were handed over with their horses and *harnasio* to the presenter of letters the day before Magna Carta 1216 was issued and Clause 50 dropped.[[706]](#footnote-706) By 24 June, further writs had been sent to 21 counties, 2 more were ready that day and a further 12 some time before 22 July. Some of these writs may have included copies of the charter itself, but certainly not all. It was left to Henry de Vere (one of the king's household clerks) to distribute these to Mark's county of Nottingham/Derby, Elias of Dereham (the archbishop's steward) to Martigny and Braybrook at Northampton; and the clerk of the bishop of Bath to Dorset/Somerset.[[707]](#footnote-707) At least both Mark and Geoffrey de Martigny did not personally receive a writ enforcing a settlement which required their own dismissal (and that of their brothers) from office in England – unlike Engelard de Cigogny.

Just as these writs were being distributed, John made an apparent show of his willingness for appeasement – on 24 June the king ordered Geoffrey de Martigny to hand over all the hostages and prisoners of the vill of Northampton to the honest men of Northampton.[[708]](#footnote-708) Martigny was also ordered to return to Braybrook (and his men) all the chattels captured *per te et tuos prout primes treugas captes inter nos et barones nostros*.*[[709]](#footnote-709)* The following day, instead of following this up with the dismissal of Martigny as demanded by Clause 50, John instead informed all those in Northampton that their sheriff, Braybrook, had been removed from office and that the county had been handed to William de Duston and they were now to be intendent to him.[[710]](#footnote-710) John had suspected Braybrook's loyalty for some time (on 14 May he had ordered the seizure of his manors) but his removal would not have been well received by the barons who considered him to be a fellow rebel (in the Spring they had hoped that he would be treacherous enough to let them into Northampton castle without a struggle). John's priority however at this early stage was not to remove his own loyal servant who had protected Northampton, but to remove an active partisan of the rebels. The change at Northampton was not the only one that day - Reginald Cornhill was replaced at Kent by Hubert de Burgh, John FitzRobert at Lincolnshire by John Marshal, and Hugh de Gournay at Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire by Walter de Nevill – and several sheriffs were re-confirmed in office - Matthew de Mantel at Essex and Matthew FitzHerbert at Sussex.

A week later, on 2 July, John moved William de Duston to York – his presence at Northampton had only been a holding measure and the Pipe Rolls for 17 John make no mention of him. On that day a writ was issued which stated that Roger de Neville had letters patent informing all in Northampton that they were to be intendent to him whilst sheriff – the Pipe Rolls for that Michaelmas state that Braybrook accounted as sheriff for half the year, and that Roger de Neville started accounting on 20 July [*sic*] (his accounts are not even found under Northampton but hidden behind those of Rutland).[[711]](#footnote-711) Neville's appointment was to be a more permanent arrangement as like Braybrook he was to benefit from the manor of Thorp whilst he held the castle.[[712]](#footnote-712) A second writ of 2 July reminded Martigny that Neville had also been granted the castle of Northampton and that this was to be handed to him with all its appurtenances[[713]](#footnote-713) The sealed writ in the Letters Close was more precise and significant – it ordered Martigny to come with soldiers and all the former garrison of the castle, bringing the equipment 'and all our and your things', except for crossbows and quarrels which were to be handed over to Neville.[[714]](#footnote-714) Both sides were given a copy of the agreement to prevent any misunderstanding. John was making sure that the garrison was not left behind to assist the new castellan Neville but was to be used to help reinforce his household troops. These arrangements which followed so soon after the issuing of Magna Carta were not in the interests of the rebel faction which had been so confident of its ability to hold the area that it had planned to place one of its own men, Robert FitzWalter, in the county, who would act as the chief administrator and judicial officer, that is he would act in place of John's choice of sheriff.[[715]](#footnote-715)

On 8 July it was announced that Engelard was no longer sheriff of Gloucester. There is no extant writ issued either to Engelard, or to his 'deputy' (as at Bristol and Hereford), instructing him to hand over his shrievalty but instead it was merely announced to the soldiers, freemen and all of the county that they were now to be intendent to Ralph Musard (a local man who held the manor and castle of Miserden and was a Marshal ally).[[716]](#footnote-716) Unusually, as if to make a point, this writ was also addressed to the earls and barons of the county. A day after Gloucester was handed over, the king restored the Gloucester seven hundreds to the abbey of Cirencester, thus healing a running sore which had festered since Athée had appropriated them.[[717]](#footnote-717) John was happy to show willing by handing over Gloucester and its castle so soon after Magna Carta as it was not in his interests to invoke the anger of the powerful magnates of Gloucester and Hereford (the Earl of Gloucester for example had 200 knights to hand, and the Earl of Hereford some 40). He did not wish to worsen an already unstable situation in the area – between 19 and 28 June there had been fifty claims for restitution, many from Geoffrey de Mandeville who was demanding his rights of advowson in the abbeys and religious houses which his predecessors as earls of Gloucester had founded in Gloucester and Somerset. On 23 June John had tried to avert the problems here by ordering his sheriffs in Gloucester and Somerset to make inquiries into Mandeville's claims through local jurors whose names were to be sent to him, but he rapidly realised that he needed an earlier result and on the same day that these orders were issued they were countermanded by a royal writ giving Geoffrey the same seisin as his predecessors.[[718]](#footnote-718) The loss of Engelard was hard but by handing the county to Ralph Musard, the king was returning it to the safe control of the Marshals (before Athée and Engelard, the shire had been in the hands of Mucegros, another Marshal ally).

John may have removed two of those proscribed within three weeks of Magna Carta 1215, but he was still relying heavily on his men from the Touraine for advice. On 13 July John was at Corfe with Peter de Maulay, and on 16 July, he had moved to Freemantle where he was joined by Faulkes and Geoffrey de Martigny.[[719]](#footnote-719) He was due to be at Oxford on 16/17 July as it had been agreed at Runnymede that a meeting would take place to settle all outstanding issues, but he arrived late ostensibly because of illness. It is likely that during the meeting at Oxford (which lasted until the 23rd), the barons raised their concerns that Engelard and Andrew and Peter de Chanceaux still retained their posts at Hereford and at Bristol, in contravention of the terms of Clause 50. In fact, Clause 50 set out no time limit for their dismissal, although it had been generally agreed in the London Treaty that matters should be completed by 15 August - but even that date was still nearly a month away so John was not yet in breach of the charter. An entry in the *Memoranda* Roll for 1217-1218 could indicate that their removal was made *per consilium*, but Holt sees no reason for believing that these changes were made by common agreement.[[720]](#footnote-720) In fact, it is more likely that there was dissension as the Chronicle of Melrose described how the parties departed in great bitterness.[[721]](#footnote-721)

While the general negotiations continued at Oxford, on 19 July Andrew de Chanceaux was ordered to hand over the castle of Hereford 'with its county' to Hubert de Burgh, the new justiciar.[[722]](#footnote-722) Again, to ensure that all in the county were aware that the king was making these changes - in accordance with Clause 50 - the writ told not only the honest men of Hereford to be intendent to him, but also all in Hereford including archbishops, bishops, earls, barons, soldiers and others. The barons may have complained that at Northampton, the king had separated the county from the castle and had redistributed them on different days as this time the two short, consecutive writs emphasized three times that both the county and castle were being handed over to the same man on the same day.

A day later a writ was sent to Andrew de Chanceaux ordering him to give de Burgh or his messenger a similar writ to that sent to Peter de Chanceaux at Bristol about the garniture and supplies there, namely that he was to be given all the garniture both inside and outside. As the king considered Burgh to be a totally loyal servant, unlike at Northampton, there was no need to separate the castle from its crossbows and other goods.[[723]](#footnote-723) The king made a point by not addressing these writs to the sheriff, Engelard, who normally would have been responsible for handing over the county and castle, but instead addressing it to Andrew de Chanceaux who was given no title. This may simply have been because Engelard was elsewhere, and Andrew had to carry out this specific duty for him. Although the writs show that Andrew had been taking on increasing responsibility at Hereford, he had never officially been given the position of sheriff by John and this point cannot have escaped the notice of the barons.

A day after Hereford was handed over, on 20 July, Peter de Chanceaux was told that the castle of Bristol had been committed to Philip d'Aubigny, one of John's loyal servants, and he was to hand it over.[[724]](#footnote-724) This time, unlike at Northampton, there was to be no mistake about what was included in the transfer, as a second writ informed him that he was to free the whole (*omnimodum*) garniture both inside and outside the castle, and this included vines, hogs, wheat and crossbows and other things *totqua et tanta et talia*, adding at the end *ad grates teneamur*.[[725]](#footnote-725) Again the writ should have been sent to Engelard as sheriff but Peter may have been given the duty as Engelard was elsewhere - for example he had been at Gloucester when he was visited by Erdington and de Vere, and he may also have been busy with the arrangements which followed the issuing of Magna Carta 1215 itself. But as with Hereford, it is more likely that by not giving the orders direct to the sheriff as was custom, John was showing that he was not totally subservient to the barons.[[726]](#footnote-726)

At the Oxford meeting, the barons had pressed for the removal of John's men from Bristol and Hereford, but the subject of Philip Mark's retention at Nottingham appears not to have been raised. Even after the London Treaty had expired on 15 August, John still had not made any changes there nor had he implemented the clauses to do with inquiries into local customs.[[727]](#footnote-727) It is possible that by now John knew that war was inevitable and there was now no point in acquiescing with the baronial demands, or he may have been submerged under the more pressing matter of restitution of lands (Clause 52.) It is possible that the barons did not even press John for his removal – they may have viewed Mark as an individual agent who was as much a threat to the king as to them (although Mark's argumentative and tenacious attitude was less apparent before Magna Carta than during the civil war), and John was certainly not going to take the initiative and remove him unless he was forced to. This lack of action by the barons to have him removed is surprising as they had hoped to make one of their own men the sheriff there – according to the Barnwell annalist, after Magna Carta 1215 the barons planned to place John de Lacy there as the chief administrator and judicial officer, that is as sheriff – an arrangement confirmed by Wendover who stated that the four castellans of Nottingham, Northampton, Kenilworth and Scarborough were to swear that they would do what the Twenty-Five commanded about their castles, and that such castellans should be chosen as were trustworthy and would execute this faithfully.[[728]](#footnote-728) Having kept Mark in his post, John then gave him orders to fortify Nottingham – writing to him as constable of Nottingham and a native of Poitou (as well as 'to all his foreign born subjects in whom he most confided') telling him to stock his castle with food, go around the perimeter with ditches, reinforce the castle with serjeants, and prepare crossbows and other weapons, as well as make javelins. He was 'to do this cautiously and without blustering lest the barons should find out'.[[729]](#footnote-729) By Christmas 1215, John felt safe enough at Nottingham to spend Christmas there – although to get safely there he had to come *cum satellitibus suis nefandissimis* or as the Barnwell annalist stated, arriving 'not in the usual fashion but as one on the warpath'.[[730]](#footnote-730)

John found it easiest to dispense with the services of the Chanceaux brothers – Peter and Andrew had been removed from their main positions when Bristol had Hereford had been handed over. They had never officially been given the roles which they carried out before Magna Carta 1215, only slipping into Engelard's positions during his many absences. Although Vincent believes that after leaving Bristol Peter de Chanceaux moved to the household of Peter des Roches, first appearing at Michaelmas 1215 serving as larderer and later as keeper of his seal (although he never held any official title), and the bishop paid for his expenses going from Brightwell to Wallingford, it is more likely that any changes made by John were more temporary and that the Peter de Chanceaux in the bishop's household was not the same Peter de Chanceaux who had been in charge of Bristol castle and its treasury, and who joined the royal garrison at Wallingford during the civil war.[[731]](#footnote-731) After handing over Hereford Andrew de Chanceaux is not found elsewhere in the king's service until 1216, when according to the *Histoire des Ducs*, he was still attached to Engelard and defended Windsor with him when it was besieged by the Count of Nevers.[[732]](#footnote-732) Guy de Chanceaux may have remained at Gloucester, possibly until 8 October when he was ordered to give John Cleric custody of the daughter of Hugh de Boves. However by November, it is likely that he had lost all his posts for the king began to grant him lands and chattels, for example those of Nicholas de Poinz.[[733]](#footnote-733) But even he was back in the king's service by May 1216 assisting Hubert de Burgh in the defence of Dover – they were jointly instructed to free a prisoner who was in their custody and on 24 May 1216, Hubert de Burgh, the justiciar, was ordered to give him 20 marks to sustain him in the king's service.[[734]](#footnote-734)

Geoffrey de Martigny was the only one proscribed to leave the country, but he too remained in the king's service. After loyally defending Northampton and supporting the king in the negotiations for Magna Carta, he appears to have set off to France - in September 1215 the Templars were ordered to pay for ships going abroad with Geoffrey de Martigny. It was not considered to be a lengthy trip as the payments were for only fifteen or eight [*sic*] days. A further writ ordered them to provide two small boats capable of carrying fifteen horses which were going across with Martigny.[[735]](#footnote-735) Some misfortune may have befallen him as an Exchequer account in the Pipe Roll for 17 John states that he had paid nothing to the Exchequer whilst at Northampton and was now dead and without an heir.[[736]](#footnote-736) Matthew de Martigny unlike his brother probably remained in the king's service in England after Magna Carta 1215, as he received many grants of land (seized from Henry Braybrook) in the period between November 1215 and March 1216.[[737]](#footnote-737) As it was Geoffrey who was more likely to have been rewarded with lands, especially those near Northampton, it is possible that Matthew played a more important role at Northampton than the extant writs indicate, or simply that the scribes made a slip of the pen with the name – this was not an uncommon event, for example in May 1215 Geoffrey had to hand over the manor of Horsinton (Bucks) but in December 1215 a writ began 'not withstanding the order made to Matthew de Martigny' about this manor.[[738]](#footnote-738) However, in at least three writs, Matthew is named as the beneficiary of Braybrook's lands, rather than his brother Geoffrey, which would argue against a clerical error.[[739]](#footnote-739)

John also had to deal with the requirements of Clause 51 whose wording was very exact, as it named not only the precise groups who were to leave the country, but, unlike Clause 50, it specified when - *et statim post pacem reformacionem amovebimus omnes alienigenas milites, balistarios, servientes, stipendiarios*. Even so, the wording of the clause still allowed John to give the impression that he was obeying the Charter whilst at the same time allowing him to do what he felt was best for him. On 23 June, whilst still at Runnymede, he ordered Hugh de Boves (one of the commanders of the Flemish mercenaries) not to retain any of the soldiers or serjeants who were at Dover, but to allow them to go without delay into their homeland in peace.[[740]](#footnote-740) The *Histoire des Ducs* confirms that the Flemish knights (who had arrived just after the rebels captured London and who had participated in crushing the rising in the west) were sent home.[[741]](#footnote-741) However John interpreted the rest of the clause as meaning that he only had to remove the most recent arrivals – those *qui venerint cum equis et armis ad nocumentum regni*. He did not feel it incumbent on him to remove those who had come earlier, for example with Savaric de Mauleon, or those who had been sent from Poitou.

Painter argued that John never had the slightest intention of observing Magna Carta to a greater extent than was strictly necessary.[[742]](#footnote-742) John was clearly contemplating war from as early as 22 July when he arranged credits with the Knights Templar in Poitou to pay for the mercenary soldiers he was to summon to England and from early on he was in no mood to acquiesce to the baronial demands without some sort of defiance. The writs show that whilst he was overtly addressing the demands set out in Clauses 50 and 51, he was in fact following his own agenda - acting compliantly whilst at the same time doing exactly what he wanted. He had removed his men from the Touraine from Northampton and Gloucester soon after Magna Carta, but he had made sure, at least at Northampton, that he retained control of the men and weapons. He had removed the partisan rebel sheriff, Braybrook, from Northamptonshire (similarly in August he removed Andrew de Beauchamp from Oxfordshire, the county eventually falling to Faulkes de Breauté on 21 November). He also ensured that where possible the changes he had been forced into would not be entirely to his detriment, putting his loyal servants de Burgh and d'Aubigny in control of Hereford and Bristol respectively. Similarly, although he had removed Engelard from Gloucester, he continued to keep him in in control of money.[[743]](#footnote-743) On 27 July Engelard was still dealing with monetary matters as he was instructed to give Peter de Maulay and Breauté 100 marks out of the 250 which he held (*de denariis nostris*).[[744]](#footnote-744) Likewise, he was slow to remove Peter de Chanceaux from Bristol using him there on 24 June to take 30 marks from the treasure to pay the soldiers and servants in the castle of Bristol (the financial situation was in such disarray that the transaction was unusually not overseen by the burgess commissioners), on the same day to pay Engelard 100 marks from the treasury at Bristol, and on 2 July to buy sacks for white beans which were to be carried from Bristol to Corfe (the account for this was to be submitted at the Exchequer).[[745]](#footnote-745)

Although the replacements to the men from the Touraine were loyal servants of the king, they did not necessarily retain their positions for any length of time - Duston remained as sheriff of Northampton for only a week, and de Burgh held Hereford only between 19 July and 14 August when it was granted to Walter Clifford (the younger).[[746]](#footnote-746) John may have been rushed into these temporary appointments as he wanted to make any changes before the situation deteriorated further and he had less bargaining power, treating his new appointments only as stop-gap measures until he had time to make more measured choices. He made similar temporary appointments elsewhere in the country - Walter de Nevill held Bedfordshire between 25 June and 2 July, John Marshal only held Lincolnshire between 25 June and 2 July, and Duston was again moved quickly from York, remaining there only for six weeks. John may have hoped that he would be strong enough to defy the barons and their proscription of his loyal clan, and to place his men from the Touraine in other counties, or indeed return them after a brief spell to their original posts, rather than remove them from office permanently. Hubert de Burgh, now justiciar, may have been given held several counties as he had the administrative skills and status to keep order until such time as John could settle on permanent replacements. In the event, John was not so rash as to move any of his men from the Touraine into any other shrievalty - he still needed to give the impression that he was concurring with at least some of the baronial demands and that he was a reasonable king who had no intention of revoking the settlement agreed at Runnymede. To further this impression he restored or granted several estates (for example Montsorrel to Saher de Quency, and Buckingham to Richard de Clare ), he released hostages and he removed Roches from his post of justiciar. The barons however were equally two-faced, failing to give the written pledges of fealty which they had promised, and holding on to London, stating that they would not hand it over until all had sworn an oath to the Twenty-Five and John had settled all claims to lands, castles and privileges. They also failed to hand over their castles as promised - instead according to the Barnwell analyst they fortified their castles or built new ones.[[747]](#footnote-747) In view of this, John had no hesitation in producing his trump card - he enlisted the support of the Pope. By 16 August the rebels had been excommunicated and the country placed under an interdict. On 24 August, the pope condemned the charter as illegal and unjust.

Chapter 10: Continuing Responsibilities

*Castles and counties*

By 22 July John had realised that his provocative actions were making civil war inevitable and on that date he arranged for credits with the Knights Templars in Poitou, to be used to pay for mercenary troops to come to England (on 24 June he had ordered the religious houses who were storing his valuables to return them to him as soon as possible).[[748]](#footnote-748) He began to strengthen his castles as the key to the military control of the country lay with these, as well as with his well trained garrisons. He had fortified Nottingham soon after Magna Carta, and on 11 August William de Fors was sent to help at Scarborough (their garrison had been paid), and on 2 October the Earl of Salisbury visited 10 royal castles to select from their garrisons some troops to serve in the field. According to Painter some 209 castles were used during the civil war, 72 of which were royal (50 of which were first-class fortresses) and 14 episcopal. Of the 123 baronial castles 51 were on John's side, 7 were not in revolt, 12 were held by royal castellans, leaving only 53 in the hands of the rebels. On Painter's reckoning therefore John and his men held 149 castles against 60 held by his enemies.[[749]](#footnote-749) The rebels were further disadvantaged as they still did not have a siege train – a situation which led to their failure to capture Northampton castle. John now began to rely more heavily on his foreign lieutenants - on 4 October he put Faulkes de Breauté in charge of military affairs in mid-England and the west, and he strengthened the castle of Nottingham making it the hub of the king's defences in the north and Midlands. He himself remained within the boundaries of Kent from September to mid-December 1215 and very few instructions were issued from the chancery to his northern agents during that period – they were left to take their own decisions. Engelard who had lost his shrievalties and castles after Magna Carta 1215 was now openly brought back into the king's circle. On 12 December 1215 Faulkes was ordered to give him the castle of Middleton Stoney (Oxfordshire), and this was followed in March 1216 by an order to the sheriff of Northampton to let him have the manor of Sutton which pertained to it and which belonged to Camville.[[750]](#footnote-750) Engelard held the castle until he was ordered to destroy it on 29 May and June 1216.[[751]](#footnote-751) Unusually now he is also found carrying writs and witnessing charters – on 28 March, he, Faulkes and the Earl of Salisbury were responsible for carrying an important writ, and on 16 April the king ordered Faulkes and the Earl of Salisbury to discuss how Engelard and his family could be rewarded. On 7 April, he was at court as on that date, unusually, he witnessed a charter along with de Burgh, Albemarle and others.[[752]](#footnote-752)

John held the military initative throughout March but in April he had to muster his land and naval forces and concentrate on meeting the threat of a French invasion. Forced to concentrate now on the south coast, he was dependent on his strong and loyal servants in his castles further north to keep that part of the kingdom under control. Openly flaunting Clause 50 (which in any event he had declared null and void) he placed Engelard officially by chancery writ in several new posts. After relying on him to carry important writs, he began to place him back in control of some of his most crucial castles. On 21 April 1216, just after John had stayed at Odiham and a few days after he had asked the Earl of Salisbury and Faulkes to consider how to reward Engelard and his family, the king ordered Bartholomew de Pechie, the constable, to hand over Odiham castle to Engelard, or anyone Engelard nominated in his stead.[[753]](#footnote-753) Pechie was compensated on 1 May with some lands of Richard de Brackley which Engelard in turn was ordered to hand over.[[754]](#footnote-754) John needed to retain a strong presence at Odiham which was a relatively new castle, built only in 1207 on a new site, and well situated between Winchester and Windsor - according to the *Histoire des Ducs*, it was also well used as a royal resting place as its park was excellent for hunting (and John went there every year except 1208 and 1211).[[755]](#footnote-755) With its surrounding swamps and polygonal design it was almost unassailable, especially after further alterations had been made to it in 1213-14. A week after being granted Odiham, on 28 April Engelard was ordered to hand over the manor of Odiham without damage or injury to John FitzHugh (who had held the manor since at least 1202 when he had been allowed to hold fairs there), the order to him having to be repeated on 31 May. Although there is no question that Engelard retained the castle and its park, the fact that he was ordered twice to hand over the manor could indicate that he had exceeded his authority as castellan. [[756]](#footnote-756) On the other hand, the king may have always intended to make concessions to FitzHugh in order to keep him loyal – a policy which failed as FitzHugh defected to Louis when the castle was attacked in July 1216, with the result that the manor came back into the hands of the king.[[757]](#footnote-757)

On 22 April 1216, a day after receiving Odiham and again in defiance of Clause 50, the king committed the county of Surrey to Engelard – an uneasy grant as William de Warenne, Earl of Surrey, subsequently claimed it.[[758]](#footnote-758) On the same day, the king also granted him the castle of Windsor and its forest**.**[[759]](#footnote-759)This castle, which was well sited to guard the river Thames, benefited from ease of communication with much of England by water and land. It was surrounded by forest, parks and ancient demesne, and as its constable was responsible for collecting many local and fiscal duties, including the payment of the wages of royal servants, Engelard was immediately placed in an unusually close relationship with the king's court and the king himself.

Both Engelard's castles were targeted by Louis. Odiham was the first to be attacked, when on 9 July 1216 Louis and his French troops arrived at its walls. The garrison however had been well trained and equipped by Engelard and they acted with great valour defending the castle for over two weeks. Despite being attacked for three days with siege engines they managed to survive the onslaught, to the extent that at one stage the garrison of three knights and ten serjeants came out, engaged with the enemy and then went back in. However after several more days of siege they surrendered to Louis – when only thirteen in number came out of the castle the French were full of admiration.[[760]](#footnote-760) Their defence was subsequently depicted as 'the most brilliant episode of the war'.[[761]](#footnote-761)

John recognised the need to strengthen his spine of castles, held by his loyal castellans up the centre of England, protecting the chief bases of royal power in the west.[[762]](#footnote-762) This became increasingly pressing when he realized that Louis (along with the Count of Nevers) was intent on controlling the castles of Windsor, Dover and Lincoln as these would enable him to complete his hold on the eastern counties south of the Tees. In August 1216 the king wrote to several of his castellans including Maulay and Mark telling them to listen to what Breauté would tell them to do should Louis attack.[[763]](#footnote-763) In September Nevers duly turned his attention to Windsor castle where Engelard was based.[[764]](#footnote-764) This was the only the second time that the castle's defences had been tested – the first being in 1193 when John had seized it whilst Richard was in prison. Over a period of two months, Engelard, along with Andrew de Chanceaux and sixty knights survived the many assaults which the count made on the walls.[[765]](#footnote-765) Addressing him as Engelard d'Athée, Matthew Paris described him as *vir in opere martio probatissimus* because of his brave defence there. According to Paris, when John heard about the siege of Windsor and Dover, he assembled a large army and overran the lands of earls and barons at harvest time, burning their houses and crops and causing great damage to his enemies.[[766]](#footnote-766) Despite John's show of strength, however, he failed to come to Engelard's assistance, although he came so close with his Welsh bowmen that they were able to shoot arrows at the besiegers. The king may have felt confident that Windsor was in the hands of one of his strongest and most loyal servants, or he may have been making every effort to avoid a pitched battle which could easily turn a victory into a defeat. Instead he returned to Corfe where he was joined by Peter des Roches.[[767]](#footnote-767) Nevers too avoided confrontation, believing either that the castle was too well defended by its castellan Engelard or, as Matthew Paris claims, was corrupted through money, or perhaps he judged it prudent to move on to try and capture the king elsewhere. Engelard was left in control of Windsor and the Count moved on to Dover castle.[[768]](#footnote-768)

John also began to rely heavily on Philip Mark who was given almost total autonomy in Nottingham and left in charge of the castle which, along with Lincoln, Newark, Tickhill and the earldom of Chester was crucial to John as it cut the rebel forces in half.[[769]](#footnote-769) The king had to be careful not to upset the Earls of Chester and Derby who considered that they, not de Lisle, Mark and Oldcotes, should control the area - after all they held the true power as they were major barons who if necessary could access a huge force of Marcher knights with long experience in warfare. As early as 31 August 1214, John had begun to tread carefully with the Earl of Derby and ordered the chattels which Philip Mark had seized to be returned to him, confirming that if Philip Mark did not do this then Peter des Roches would.[[770]](#footnote-770) In October 1215 the Earl of Derby was given all the lands held of his fees by the enemies of the king – lands which spread through Nottingham, Derby, Essex and Staffordshire.[[771]](#footnote-771) Mark however justified the king's confidence in him and he appears to have carried out his duties well, not offending the earl and managing to make inroads into enemy lands. According to Matthew Paris, around this time baronial houses were reduced to ashes and baronial lands put under subjection around Nottingham and Newark (so much so that in July 1216 Gilbert de Gant and Robert de Ropesley were sent by Louis to try and put an end to the devastation).[[772]](#footnote-772) In early 1216, Mark was having such success in Nottinghamshire that barons such as John de Lacy and Montbegan began to return to the king's side – Lacy negotiating favourable terms for his tenant, Eustace de Lowdham, who had been Philip Mark's deputy sheriff in 1214. Several other lesser barons in Nottingham/Derby also made their peace with the king.[[773]](#footnote-773) Despite all the local problems, Nottingham castle under Mark survived the civil war without being attacked, unlike Lincoln castle nearby which in August was attacked by Gilbert de Gant, who was recognised as the Earl of Lincoln by Louis. Surprisingly when the *Histoire des Ducs* listed those castles held by the crown at the time of Henry III's succession it failed to include Nottingham (although it does list, amongst others, Engelard and Andrew Chanceaux at Windsor, Maulay at Corfe, and Gaugy at Newark).

Mark was not only left undisturbed at Nottingham but his authority in the area was increased when he was given a degree of control over the castle of *Dinunton* - on 4 January 1216 he was ordered to release all the men captive there who were in his custody.[[774]](#footnote-774) In the spring he was also given the important castle of Newark to hold. This castle (which belonged to Hugh of Wells, bishop of Lincoln) was one of the key points of the Trent/Humber system but had been taken into the king's hands when the bishop was consecrated in Melun by Langton in exile. Following peace with the Pope, in May 1213 the bishop returned to England and was received back into royal favour. In return he allowed the king to control Newark and Sleaford during the civil war.[[775]](#footnote-775) Mark was a strong castellan but he may have showed his intransigence by refusing to follow orders from the king about the future of Newark: on 14 June 1216 he was told to hand it over to the seneschal of the bishop of Lincoln and on 17 July the king wrote again to the seneschal directing him to receive the castle from Mark, saying that if he did not accept it and problems arose, they could not be imputed to the king.[[776]](#footnote-776) When the steward refused to accept it on these terms, on 17 August, the king ordered Newark castle to be given instead to Robert de Gaugy to hold during the king's pleasure, and Mark was now ordered to hand it to him - but first he had to take an oath that on his death he would only then hand it on to the bishop of Lincoln.[[777]](#footnote-777) On 29 August, although he was reminded that he had been ordered to hand Newark over to Gaugy, Mark was now told that there were new options and he was being given new orders about its fate - he was now advised that despite what he may have been told before, he should not either demolish it or allow it to be demolished. Indeed he was now given the choice of retaining it in his hands or handing it to Gaugy (who was sent a similar writ).[[778]](#footnote-778) On 1 September, Mark received a further reminder to hand it over to Gaugy, but there was still trouble on 1 October when Richard de Gaugy (constable of Robert de Gaugy) was ordered to release Mark's serjeants whom Robert had held captive.[[779]](#footnote-779) This complicated series of writs shows the lack of harmony and rivalry between two men who were both supposedly loyal to John. Mark as castellan had his own views about the castle and in this case he may have wanted to raze Newark as he feared it was going to fall into enemy hands.[[780]](#footnote-780) It was a dangerous time and a clause had to be inserted in the letters patent to show Philip Mark that the instructions he was being given were genuine. The king however in the end decided that he knew better than his castellan and he overrode the recommendation of his military leader. In the end Newark was held safely throughout the war.[[781]](#footnote-781)

At the same time as he was being given conflicting orders over Newark, Mark was also given Sleaford castle to hold. John was stiffening his powers in the area and Mark with his extensive experience at Nottingham was an ideal choice as castellan. On 28 August 1216, a writ ordered Mark to send a messenger whom he trusted to receive Sleaford castle from Ralph de Riddell, but 'if by chance you do not wish to accept this or you cannot' then he should order Gaugy to receive it. On the same day in a parallel writ a writ was sent to Ralph de Riddel telling him that Mark would be sending a messenger to him to receive the castle and he should hand it to him – adding that if Mark by chance did not do this and Gaugy did then he should hand it to Gaugy.[[782]](#footnote-782) These arrangements were made when John was with the brother of the bishop of Lincoln (Jocelyn of Wells) who was looking after the bishopric while his brother Hugh of Wells was at the Lateran council, and were therefore probably made with the consent of the bishop. On this occasion Mark appears to have been consulted and allowed to make his own decisions about the castle – even to whether he accepted it or not - and the decision he made would be respected by the king. It was a difficult time in the area and decisions had to be taken quickly - there was not necessarily time to make reference to the king.[[783]](#footnote-783)

Mark at Nottingham was considered to be so safe and so well equipped in his own castles that he was instructed to assist other castles with weaponry- on 16 July 1216 he was ordered to help Godfrey de Serland at Northampton by sending as many crossbows as he could and on 5 September Mark was not only to provide Serland's nephews with horse coverings and coats of mail, but also to give Serland himself all the help and advice he could about guarding the castle.[[784]](#footnote-784) On 7 August a fine which was to be handed to Mark by Aynsford who was negotiating for his release was to be handed over in the greatest security in front of Mark, and used to pay the king's men at Colchester.[[785]](#footnote-785)

On 18 October 1216 as John lay dying, he defied yet again the terms of Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 by giving a new office to Philip Mark - making him joint sheriff of Lincolnshire with Nichola de la Haye (who also held the castle).[[786]](#footnote-786) The choice of Mark was a curious one, especially as ever since he had been appointed sheriff of Nottingham he had acted with independence and almost intolerance to others. To make this *parvenu* from the Touraine joint sheriff with a female aristocrat was to say the least unusual, especially as it was also almost unprecedented at the time to have a woman sheriff. However Nichola was the widow of Gerard de Camville who had himself been sheriff of Lincolnshire and constable of Lincoln castle, and through him she had certain rights to the position. She also was herself the heiress of the de la Haye barony and a safe choice – if not the only choice as many of the likely alternatives such as Moulton (who had succeeded Camville) were in rebellion, and Haye's own son was sickly (dying in 1217). The Barnwell analyst views the appointment slightly differently, stating that she was given custody of the castle 'in exchange for money'.[[787]](#footnote-787) Mark's strength in the area, his experience as sheriff and castellan, the proximity of the two counties to each other, and the liaising of Mark and Haye over the collection of precepts and fines, made John's concept of a joint office a clever and enlightened one, rather than one of a confused and sick king. It also contradicts Holt's theory that John was experiencing trouble with his northern agents towards the end of his life (or that after his death William Marshal had to concentrate on regaining control over Mark and Oldcotes).[[788]](#footnote-788)

Although Holt did not find any evidence that Mark ever took any active part in the rule of the shire (but rather that he disappeared shortly after his appointment), the Pipe Rolls for 1222 in which Mark's debts were consolidated do include the brief period when he was sheriff there.[[789]](#footnote-789) The experiment, needless to say, was not repeated by Henry , and when Geoffrey de Serland was appointed sheriff in January 1217 he was placed 'under our beloved lady Nichola de la Haye'.[[790]](#footnote-790) On 24 May 1217 the county was handed to the Earl of Salisbury and it was left to Nichola de la Haye to fight for her hereditary rights.

Peter de Maulay, who had escaped proscription, remained in charge of Corfe castle. John ensured that it was well guarded and on 6 September 1215, for example, Maulay had to keep his soldiers content by paying their wages - the sums he spent on them over the following months were considerable and in November 1221, he was made exempt from accounting for monies which he had paid to soldiers, serjeants and crossbowmen 'from the time of King John right up to the arrival of Louis in England and up to the death of King John and in the time when peace was made between the crown and Louis and between the crown and the Earl of Salisbury'. On 22 August 1216 along with Engelard and Mark he was given instructions on what to do if Louis attacked him – he was to be ready with horses and arms and to follow Faulkes' instructions.[[791]](#footnote-791) This concentration of men and weaponry at Corfe supervised by a castellan with unwavering loyalty made it one of the safest places in the realm. John entrusted Maulay not only with the care of Richard (Henry III's brother) but also Eleanor of Brittany, the queen and other members of the royal family, as well as the daughters of the king of Scotland and a large amount of treasure. Coggeshall stated that Peter de Maulay reclaimed the castle of Corfe after John's death in which Henry found *exeniis patris sui, et sororem Arturii*, and the *Histoire des Ducs* states that in the immediate aftermath of Magna Carta the queen and John's eldest son were placed at Corfe for protection.[[792]](#footnote-792) It is also possible that the chancery and household rolls were also left in Maulay's care as well as the bulk of the king's treasure.[[793]](#footnote-793) The king himself also felt safe and comfortable there and withdrew to Corfe castle whilst Louis exerted his strength at London, Winchester and Dover – staying there from 23 June 1216 until 17 July 1216, and again in August (on several occasions joined by Peter des Roches).[[794]](#footnote-794) Only on 26 June 1216, did John finally rewarded Maulay with his first shrievalty – making him sheriff of the county of Somerset/Dorset. He may have felt that up until then he had enough responsibilities as castellan there and as head of the Fossard fee which contained the crucial vill of Doncaster and where several tenants had joined the rebels.

*Money*

The experience which Engelard, Mark and Maulay had gained at their provincial treasuries proved indispensable when after Magna Carta 1215 they were left to protect the little that was left in John's coffers. By August 1215 the *Liberate* and *Computate* Rolls had been discontinued and all the financial organisation which still existed was focused on the main castle treasures, with Maulay at Corfe acting as the custodian of the treasure and exchequer in the south and Mark carrying out a similar role at Nottingham in the north.[[795]](#footnote-795) There was now so little money available that the sheriff of Devon was besieged in his castle by men who claimed that they had already paid their fines, and when Shropshire sought to claim back its wartime expenses, it was told *et computabitur*.[[796]](#footnote-796) Although the king may have been poor he still had greater resources than the rebels as in addition to money, he had access to jewels, tin mines, good armaments, and of course the strong castles held by his loyal men from the Touraine.

Despite Engelard's proscription in Clause 50, he continued to be given responsibility for monetary matters - John was not prepared to forego the experience he had gained at his provincial treasuries. Money therefore remained under Engelard's control and many payments were made through or by him. On 13 December 1215, just after Rochester, Peter de Maulay was ordered to take 10,000 marks from his treasury, retain 1,000, and then send the remaining 9,000 'hastily' through Engelard.[[797]](#footnote-797) On 20 February 1216 Engelard and Gilbert d'Ayre were to take 5,000 marks which came from Philip Mark to wherever they were instructed. This amount does not appear on the sheriff's accounts, although there is no reason to think that it did not arrive.[[798]](#footnote-798) On 28 February Engelard and William de Cantiloupe were to be given 1,000 marks by Mark from the king's money again to take to wherever they were ordered.[[799]](#footnote-799) Even after he took on responsibility at Odiham, Windsor and Surrey, he continued to carry money efficiently and promptly. On 9 July 1216 the king announced that the Master of the Templars had given Engelard 200 marks in part payment, and on 9 August the king confirmed that this had been received through Engelard.[[800]](#footnote-800)

Philip Mark's responsibilities at Nottingham increased as John was forced to spend more and more of his time in the north and East Anglia. Nottingham now became the head of the main treasury north of the Trent, if not the financial capital of the country, and represented the last shred of organised government between the ports and castles on the east coast and the Earl of Chester's palatinate lands. Mark, along with Vieuxpont, Oldcotes and de Lisle in effect 'constituted what royal government as still existed in a dismembered kingdom' and according to Holt, they more than anyone helped ensure John's survival.[[801]](#footnote-801) This was particularly true in the period between September and December 1215, when John, now based in Kent, left matters to his northern agents' discretion. The need for money was so pressing that John had to resort to collecting it from as many sources as he could. On l January 1216, the men of Redford gave the king 100 marks for their financial obligations and Mark was ordered to give them the king's peace after he had taken the necessary security.[[802]](#footnote-802) He was also collecting the farms from the king's demesnes in his shrievalty and guarding them at Nottingham until he received further orders.[[803]](#footnote-803) His responsibilities increased as he began acting as an independent financial agent, receiving not just local fines but fines from as far away as York, Lincoln and Newark. On 30 December 1215 the constable of Newark was ordered to send Mark the 50 marks he had received from the deacon of Lincoln; and when William de Picot fined for the king's grace and benevolence in February 1216 the sheriff of Lincolnshire was ordered to send the fine to Philip Mark.[[804]](#footnote-804) He collected the precepts owed by other counties - on 16 April 1216, for example, Nichola de la Haye was ordered to send Mark £62 which had been given to her for making the precept, as well as all the money from fines, perquisites and *exitibus* for making that precept.[[805]](#footnote-805)

As the king's successes increased and resistance to John began to crumble (Wendover said that while the barons slumbered, the king was not asleep), Philip Mark was made responsible for collecting the fines which many northern rebels made for the king's peace - in the period up to 24 April, the final date for those to come back to the king or forfeit all, money began to fill the coffers at Nottingham.[[806]](#footnote-806) The *Rotuli de Oblatis et Finibus* shows that when some twenty principal rebels submitted to the king in February, their charters and fines were handed to Mark at Nottingham to guard.[[807]](#footnote-807) Proffers for marriage rights also continued to be a good source of income, and on 31 May 1216 Mark was ordered to collect 300 marks from the fine Robert de Ferrers made with the king for marrying the daughter of William Bocland.[[808]](#footnote-808) Fines for maladministration could also still be levied, and Mark was to receive 200 marks of the fine which the abbot of Peterborough owed for disafforestation (although this amount was still outstanding in 1218, and appears as a continuing debt in the Pipe Rolls for 2 Henry III).[[809]](#footnote-809)

Although Mark appears to have had free access to the treasure held at Nottingham, and on occasion was even ordered to act in place of the lapsed Exchequer *sicut dum scaccarium nostrum teneretur*, he was not always given an entirely free rein.[[810]](#footnote-810) He was for example given clear instructions on what arrangements would be agreeable to the king – this was especially true when he was told what he should and should not accept from Ralph de Normanville on 24 February 1216, to the extent that when he was made responsible for guarding Ralph de Normanville's charters for the land he held across England the writ stated that 'the same Philip has letters of the king containing everything said above'.[[811]](#footnote-811)

As the supply of money constantly diminished, it became increasingly important for there to be no room for error in its collection. The *History of William Marshal* stated that for several weeks John had withdrawn the enormous wealth he normally kept and 'that this is the way with such transactions - a man who lays out great sums and gets no return, and who forms a pact with wicked men, is very quickly turned to dross'.[[812]](#footnote-812) Thus when Mark himself was sent the rolls on which debts were recorded, he was instructed on 30 October to arrange for all the debts to be collected – not just the debts owed in the county for the present year but also for the year before, as they would have been when the Exchequer was functioning.[[813]](#footnote-813) What little was coming in was guarded with great secrecy – when Mark was instructed to hand over 200 marks to Geoffrey de Neville in May 1216, the instructions were sent with Gervase de Planche *ut melius credatis huic mandato nostro*, and on 7 August 1216 when Stephen de Haringod was paying soldiers, the transaction was ordered to be done in the greatest security in the presence of Mark.[[814]](#footnote-814) The king was also keeping careful note of the deliveries of money - when the fine which Faulkes d'Oyry made for the king's peace was ordered to be taken to Nottingham, Mark was instructed to let the king know the day on which it arrived, and on 15 April Mark was told to guard Robert de Ferrers' fine well and report in writing that it had been safely received. [[815]](#footnote-815) When Mark's brother Reginald and others were sent to carry the 1,000 marks which had been collected by Mark from the fines of Lincoln, York and Beverley to the king, they had to ensure that everything had been done correctly - they had to signify what statutes had been observed and would be observed in the future. Reginald like his brother had carried out his instructions well as a week later he was rewarded with the lands of Robert de Chaworth on the condition that he was subject to providing three knights in Nottingham castle at his own expense.[[816]](#footnote-816) This did not mean however that Philip Mark always followed his instructions obediently, although this may have been because he did not have the money at Nottingham to distribute. When he was ordered to pay Faulkes de St Martin and two others for the wines which Neville had taken, he was told that if he did not do it, then the king would have to pay from 'our burse'.[[817]](#footnote-817)

As the rebellion intensified in the north, and York and Lincoln were besieged and Alexander of Scotland threatened to invade, it was not the time to increase the treasury at Nottingham and from February 1216 onwards, Mark's treasury was once again drained. In February 1216 he had to give Engelard and Gilbert d'Ayre 5,000 marks, as well as handing over 1,000 pounds to Engelard and William de Cantiloupe. In March he had to send 1,000 marks through his brother Reginald, and in May 200 marks to Geoffrey de Neville (although he still had this to hand when four days later he was told to take £90 from this to pay merchants for the wine which Geoffrey had bought from them).[[818]](#footnote-818) In April some 2,400 marks left his treasury (including money to the bearer of letters for the work of the Earl of Chester and for the money the king owed for a damaged ship).[[819]](#footnote-819) By mid summer his resources were probably nearly exhausted - indeed by January 1217 his coffers were so low that the Earl of Derby had to give Mark £140 from the farm of the wapentake of Wirksworth so that he could pay his men at Nottingham 'lest they deserted'.[[820]](#footnote-820)

As well as collecting and guarding what little money remained, Mark at Nottingham and Oldcotes at Durham were also made responsible for paying the garrisons in the north, including men in Mark's own county. The Exchequer itself may have collapsed but the provincial treasuries were still responsible for keeping John's army in the field, and payments needed to be made punctually in order to avoid rebellion. Although the men from the Touraine as sheriffs made every effort to collect what they could, with the revenue-collecting system almost completely broken down, there was no guarantee that money would be available for specific tasks. Mark had to give Ralph Erlham his expenses for going to William de Briwerre at Winchester in January 1216.[[821]](#footnote-821) Money was in such short supply for the payment of wages that fines had to be allocated to specific payments: in August 1216 William d'Aynsford had to pay his fine to Mark who was to let Stephen de Haringod have it to pay soldiers in Colchester (that same month Mark gave 100 marks of this fine to Vieuxpont).[[822]](#footnote-822) When there was not enough left in Nottingham for wages, money was gathered from elsewhere - on 5 April 1216 Ralph de Riddell at Lincoln was to be given money by Nichola de la Haye which she was holding in safe custody and this was then to be given to Philip Mark to pay the *commodum nostrum*.[[823]](#footnote-823) Wages were not the only expenses which depleted his treasury and Mark also had to make extra-ordinary payments such as compensation to Theodore Skerinton whose ship had been damaged in a storm and who was to be paid its price – at this stage £13 14s still remained from the 1,000 marks which Mark had originally been ordered to pay him. [[824]](#footnote-824)

Peter de Maulay's responsibilities increased at Corfe when after Magna Carta it became the financial centre in the south - the financial organisation in that area was now centred on his castle which held large amounts of money even after Magna Carta 1215. The Barnwell annalist says that Maulay received the castle of Corfe from John *cum maxima thesauri summa*, and the *Histoire des Ducs* described how Maulay was in charge of Corfe where could be found *plus grans partie del tresor le roi*.[[825]](#footnote-825) Just as Mark acted on occasion in place of the lapsed Exchequer, so the money held at Corfe by Maulay in January 1216 was described as being *extra thesaurum nostrum* - in other words Maulay had an allowance outside of the treasury for his many concerns in that part of the country.[[826]](#footnote-826) The money received at Corfe had been collected from around the realm - shortly after Runnymede, in July 1215, Engelard was ordered to give Maulay 100 marks from the 250 he had been guarding – perhaps to add to the 76 sacks containing 9,900 marks which on 6 July had come up to Devizes from Corfe.[[827]](#footnote-827) The available funds were to be used not only at Corfe castle but around the south of England, in particular for the wages of soldiers (and their pressing arrears) as it was feared that if the payments did not take place, the men would desert. On 6 September 1215, Maulay was ordered to send Walter de Clifford junior money to pay the arrears of the serjeants and crossbowmen in Hereford castle – this would be sent through a messenger who would show letters patent showing the amount of arrears.[[828]](#footnote-828) Three days later he was to give money to the chaplain of Robert de Courtney to pay the serjeants and crossbowmen at Exeter and then on 15 September he had to give William de Briwerre (who was organising the defence of Winchester) money to pay serjeants in the castle.[[829]](#footnote-829) On 16 September he was ordered to pay the arrears owed to Walter de Bray and on 15 November 1215, he was ordered to pay the serjeants who had come to him - payments were to include their arrears and payments of five days before they left.[[830]](#footnote-830) With money haemorrhaging from his treasury, his coffers were fast diminishing - in December 1215 he was told that from the 10,000 marks he held, he should keep 1,000 for making the precept, and then send the other 9,000 through Engelard in haste to the king. From the money which remained, he was to take £100 to pay the soldiers and serjeants at Corfe. [[831]](#footnote-831) The king was very concerned about security and the instructions in this instance were countersigned with a ring sent with Peter Russell. Similar security measures were taken in March 1216 when Maulay was ordered to send money through Alan Martel - in this case the secret sign to be used was to be told to him verbally by another Brother.[[832]](#footnote-832) The treasury at Corfe however was never left depleted, unlike at Nottingham, and continued to receive injections of money - on 19 May 1216, John Marshall was ordered to give Maulay all the money he had – but he was to keep enough back to pay the serjeants at Winchester.[[833]](#footnote-833) That is not to say that the king was not constantly concerned about the shortage of money throughout the kingdom and on 6 March 1216 Maulay had to let Alan Martel know how much was left. Maulay was warned that if he did not send the monies then God would cause great damnation and loss.[[834]](#footnote-834) Extra money had to be minted and on 1 May 1216 Maulay had to send a silver ingot to William de Briwerre for this purpose.[[835]](#footnote-835)

*Prisoners*

Whilst civil war raged around them, the men from the Touraine were made responsible for guarding several important prisoners whose retention not only reduced the power and influence of the rebel forces, but also brought in considerable income to the crown as men were forced to fine with the king for their release. The actions of castellans like Mark, Maulay and Engelard did not endear them to the barons who were often forced to leave their sons as hostages in order to obtain their release - when William de Ros fined 500 marks of silver for his release and restoration of his property he had to hand over his sons to Peter de Maulay as surety for his good behaviour. On occasion barons were reduced to borrowing large amounts of money which pushed them into bankruptcy or put them in debt to the Jews.[[836]](#footnote-836)

Many of those held by the clan had been captured in battle, for example several prisoners captured at Skelton (Yorkshire) were sent to Mark at Nottingham by Nichola de la Haye. (On 13 August 1216, after he had received the redemptions from these men captured at Skelton, he was ordered to release them.)[[837]](#footnote-837) After the siege at Rochester in November 1215, Mark was ordered to guard Robert de Chaurn, Richard Gifford and Thomas of Lincoln. The rest of the garrison (which had been spared after the king was dissuaded from hanging them), including William d'Aubigny, William of Lancaster, William d'Avranches, Osbert de Giffard, Robert d'Arsic, Reginald de Cornhill, Robert de Leveland and others were to be guarded by Maulay at Corfe *sic corpus vestrum et honorem nostrum diligitis* - presumably as dead they were of no use to John, but alive they could command large ransoms.[[838]](#footnote-838) Other prisoners were held securely in order to ensure the stability of the realm - Maulay had been placed in charge of Giles and Philip (referred to as the nephews of the Bishop of Hereford), but although he was ordered to release them on 21 October 1215 to Walter de Lacy and Hugh Mortimer, they remained in his custody.[[839]](#footnote-839) In January 1218, many earls including Salisbury, Chester, Arundel and Derby as well as Walter de Lacy and Hugh de Mortimer and others mainpermed in front of the king's council that John, Giles and Philip and Walter, sons of William de Briouse, would faithfully serve the king, and if they did not then the aforesaid counts and barons would distrain them in good faith. It was therefore ordered that the two sons who were still in Peter de Maulay's custody were to be released, as well as the two who were in the custody of Bartholomew de Podio.[[840]](#footnote-840)

The men from the Touraine were also made responsible for men who had been left as hostage until fines were paid. These were not necessarily men left as sureties for barons but for men of lower standing: on 2 March 1216 Oliver de Buteville was told that when he had received Philip Mark's order confirming that he had received the fine of the merchants of Grimsby, then he was to release their hostages.[[841]](#footnote-841) Hostages were also left with Mark in March 1216 by the citizens of Lincoln until they repaid their fines - Robert de Beauchamp for example was to bring two citizens of Lincoln to Nottingham and Mark was to guard them *honorifice*, and on 15 May he was ordered to release the citizens of Lincoln who were in his custody.[[842]](#footnote-842) However, many of the hostages which were guarded had been left as surety for important barons who had asked for the king's peace. In February 1216, Ralph de Normanville had to leave his two sons as hostage with Philip Mark, as did William de Picot, and in the spring of 1216 Walter de Staunton handed over his son and charters, and in return Mark handed back his lands.[[843]](#footnote-843)

Although the fines proferred brought in much needed income to the crown, John was arbitrary in his demands. Sometimes it was not always possible to get all the money which had been demanded for release and some sort of arrangement had to be reached - in May 1216, Mark was told that if could not get more than 100 marks from the men of Newark then he was to settle on that amount. Sometimes the king was happy to forego the ransom for personal reasons: on 8 July when Mark was ordered to release John Hout who had been captured at Rockingham, it was said that the king would have liked to have received more money, but because he was a relative of William de Cantiloupe's wife he should be released all the same.[[844]](#footnote-844) At other times the king was happy to reduce the fine if he thought it was of benefit to him - Ralph de Normanville paid only 525 marks for his release and that of his knights, indicating that John wanted his loyalty more than his money. Sometimes there was no political advantage in holding on to the prisoners - on 4 January 1216 Mark was ordered to allow all the men in the castle of *Dinunton* to go away quit.[[845]](#footnote-845) Fines could vary widely, depending on the king's whim at the time, rather than the value of the prisoner himself. The Pipe Rolls show that whereas William d'Avranches paid £66 13s 4d for his release, William de Ros £216 13s 4d and Robert de Ropesley £66 13s 4d, Reginald de Cornhill, on the other hand, had to find £1,200 and William Lancaster £1,850.[[846]](#footnote-846)

Impediments were often placed in the way of a baron's release. There may have been good reasons for this (for example it kept them from rejoining the rebel faction), but it was just as likely that John was furthering his own aims. In July 1216 when William d'Aubigny was allowed to fine 6,000 marks for his freedom, he was told that if the first instalment of 2,000 marks was not paid within the said term dates, then his lands would be resiezed. (Peter de Maulay pledged for this at Corfe in the royal court in the middle bailey of the castle.)[[847]](#footnote-847) John may have set his fine so high as to show that he was confident of winning the civil war, but alternatively he may have been using Aubigny's imprisonment to his own advantage - in December 1215 Aubigny's men were persuaded to hand over Belvoir castle under threat that Aubigny would be starved to death in prison if they did not. On 8 August Mark was ordered to hand over the lands in his bailiwick to William's wife 'without delay or difficulty' so that she could pay his fine, but as late as 12 September 1216, Mark was still being ordered to give her back some £20 remaining *nec eas amplius exigatis*. Aubigny was only released in November 1216 after the death of John, but his wife Agatha and son were left as hostages.[[848]](#footnote-848) These were harsh actions by the king, especially as it was Aubigny's knight who had had the opportunity to kill John at Rochester, but was told not to do so by Aubigny himself. According to Paris, notwithstanding this, the king did not wish to spare William when prisoner but would have hung him had he been permitted.[[849]](#footnote-849)

It was not only the king who benefited from the imprisonment of his enemies, but the men from the Touraine, acting as important castellans, were also able to benefit from the system and personally gain from their prisoners – it was not until after the death of John that the amounts they received became an issue when their financial affairs were eventually investigated. After John's death it was ruled that ransoms came to the captors and there is no reason to believe that the situation was not the same whilst John was alive - when Nicholas de Stuteville had to pay a ransom to his captor William Marshal, although the Exchequer had to collect some of the monies it was laid down that only captors had any right in the matter.[[850]](#footnote-850) The fact that FitzRenfrew asked de Burgh to persuade Maulay to allow him to pay of the fine for his son's at 300 marks a year, could indicate that Maulay may have expected at least part of the ransom to be paid directly to him and not to the Exchequer.[[851]](#footnote-851) As nothing more was heard of the matter it is likely that William Lancaster escaped his bondage but not the family's financial obligation to Maulay.

There must have been some difficulty however in assessing who in fact was to benefit from a baron's imprisonment as castellans did not necessarily guard a prisoner for the whole time he was incarcerated. Instead prisoners were moved between castles, for example on 4 March 1216 Mark was ordered to send four prisoners to Rockingham, two to Northampton and two to Newark and the constables of Rockingham and Northampton were particularly ordered to be helpful.[[852]](#footnote-852) Nevertheless in 1220-1 when the government began to try and collect the regular revenues due from the time of civil war, it was able to trace various amounts to Philip Mark who tried to argue that as these were incurred in war years that he should not be held to account. In 1222 however it was ruled that £2,500 had passed through his hands in these war years. In 1224 Mark was able to account for all but £140 of these other debts - the £140 being the amount he still owed for ransoms, levies and some other debts dating back to early 1216.[[853]](#footnote-853)

Peter de Maulay was similarly accused of benefiting from the ransom of prisoners, but he himself argued that even if he had kept some ransoms, the money had been spent on the crown's service rather than gone to him personally. In Michaelmas 1221 Maulay's shrieval affairs were finally settled at a meeting of the council, and the money he had accumulated through the collection of ransoms was allowed to him on the grounds that he had spent huge sums of money on the king's behalf and that these had been genuinely accumulating. [[854]](#footnote-854) According to the Pipe Rolls, from sixteen prisoners including five captured at Rochester Maulay received over 6,500 marks but the list of names in the roll does not include all those whom Maulay had held as hostage, nor of all those whose fines had been wholly or partially allocated to him.[[855]](#footnote-855) For example in August 1216 he was granted the right to receive the £500 fine of Roger de Lenham and in Henry's fourth year he was responsible for his pledges but Lenham seems to have paid some of the fine of £500 direct to King John.[[856]](#footnote-856)

There was always a financial incentive for the prisoners to be released and some men were fortunate and quickly gained their freedom. However, there were often good reasons for delay, for example to ensure that the full ransom was paid, or if the ransoms were disputed that the debts were indeed cleared. However sometimes a long imprisonment was due to the intransigence of the castellan – although Gilbert FitzRenfrew in January 1216 offered 12,000 marks to regain royal favour and secure the release of his son (William Lancaster) and two knights, begging that the fine be paid in instalments, William remained in prison until 1217 when the Marshal and Guala pressed Maulay to release him.[[857]](#footnote-857) At the time of John's death some men who had been turned down as potential hostages for Lancaster's misbehaviour at Rochester, but had then been captured as they made their way home through Nottinghamshire, were still in prison – a matter which Lancaster raised again in 1222.[[858]](#footnote-858) Reginald de Cornhill remained in prison even after the Peace of Kingston as it was deemed that he was exempt from its terms as he had been captured at the end of 1215 and not after Louis had landed in England. Although he eventually paid a fine of £1,200, Maulay continued to cause delays with his release.

Some prisoners however were treated with respect - in January 1216 Cecilia d'Avranches was given letters of conduct to go and visit her son who was held at Corfe, stay there and then return.[[859]](#footnote-859) On 8 April 1216 Robert de Leveland's wife was permitted to visit him, and Maulay was ordered to allow him to speak with her provided he was present.[[860]](#footnote-860) Leveland fined with the king on 30 July 1216 for his release, but this did not take place and he died soon after John's death.[[861]](#footnote-861)

The uneven survival of writs however has meant that the relative importance of the men from the Touraine in the guarding of prisoners is difficult to gauge. Engelard, Mark and Maulay were in charge of some of the most secure castles in the land, and the king was happy to entrust members of the royal family to their castellans as well as dangerous barons. However the suriving writs show very few prisoners under Engelard's guard – for example he held Hugh de Polstead at Windsor and on 25 September he was ordered to free him from that prison in exchange for John de Beauchamp, unless he had been redeemed earlier.[[862]](#footnote-862) It is not that John did not entrust his men from the Touraine with the guard of important rebels - the whole garrison captured at Rochester for example were either placed in the hands of Peter de Maulay or Philip Mark – but that the detailed records have not survived. Even the amount allocated for ransoms and accumulated for example by Philip Mark appears low (a mere £140) compared to Maulay who appears to have benefited greatly from prisoners, partly due to the huge fines demanded from – and paid by - those captured at Rochester.

Chapter 11: Rewards

In the period between Magna Carta 1215 and his death, John had ample opportunity to reward his loyal servants well, as large tracts of land had fallen to the crown from those who had joined the enemy or who had come back but had not fulfilled the letter of their charters. The men from the Touraine had been instrumental in seizing or redistributing this extensive stock of ever-changing lands: on 26 December 1216, for example, Mark was ordered to take into the king's hands all the lands of Ralph de Greasley who was with the enemy and in debt, and he also had to redistribute lands to the Earl of Derby and Roger de Montbegon amongst others. Maulay was similarly involved and on 28 September 1216, he was told that if Henry de Walpole went against his charter then the whole of his lands and of his heirs would fall to the king and his heirs. [[863]](#footnote-863) It was a difficult time of rapidly changing allegiances and the men from the Touraine did not always accept their orders without question: on occasion Mark had to be reminded not to be obstructive – for example on 13 February 1216 he and the custodian of the Peak were ordered not to take any *tensurias* from the lands of Philip de Stadlegh, and if they did they had to restore them without delay.[[864]](#footnote-864) Yet John did not use those lands to reward the men from the Touraine generously, instead redistributing them to important barons to secure their allegiance, or to reward the many *parvenus* who surrounded him. In January 1216 John was particularly generous to Vieuxpont, granting him the custody of Cumberland and Carlisle castle, as well as to Oldcotes giving him Morpeth castle and the lands of Roger Bertram, as well as to Aumale who gained most of Robert de Ros's lands. Considering the degree of loyalty shown by the proscribed group and their length of service, it is surprising that the men from the Touraine did not benefit more. After all, they had remained loyal to the king even after Clause 50 ordered them to be deprived of their powerful offices, with its consequent loss not only of power and prestige but also the associated means of amassing money. This was the precisely the time when they would have expected to benefit from the king's largesse.

Although they were not entirely forgotten, the king's generosity was strictly limited. On 17 November 1215 during the siege of Rochester Engelard was given the lands of Henry d'Oyly in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire, but Oyly (who had been one of the king's most determined rebels and father of Gilbert Basset's wife) was in considerable debt to the Jews – he had borrowed over 1,000 marks from Simon the Jew in 1207/8 and his charter of liability was in the kings hand's. If he did not keep to its terms then Simon would get back his charter and Oyly would lose all his money.[[865]](#footnote-865) On 12 December 1215, Engelard had been placed in charge of the castle of Middleton Stoney but he benefited only for a short period as he was subsequently ordered to destroy it on 29 May 1216 and also in June.[[866]](#footnote-866) In March 1216 he was to be given the manor of Middleton (including in particular the manor of Sutton which pertained to it) – but again his gain was short lived as in November 1216 he had to hand over land in Sutton to Theodore Teutonicus.[[867]](#footnote-867) On 16 April 1216, the king wrote to Faulkes and the Earl of Salisbury saying that they should ponder what to pay to Engelard and his family – *cogitetis secundum quod denarios habueritis*. Five days later Engelard was given Odiham, and a day after that control of Windsor castle and the shrievalty of Surrey, but no actual gift of land to retain for himself or his heirs, nor any monetary reward.[[868]](#footnote-868)

Andrew de Chanceaux was given the lands which had belonged to Nicholas d'Annesty in the bailiwick of Hereford and Gloucester, as well as those in Oxford and Surrey in November 1215, and like his brothers and Engelard, he continued to benefit from the manor of Hurstbourne.[[869]](#footnote-869) Guy de Chanceaux was given the lands of Nicholas de Poinz also in November, including Boddington, Auneberg and Trubeville (Somerset).[[870]](#footnote-870) In May 1216, he was given 20 marks from the money which de Burgh had in his custody to sustain him in the king's service and in September 1216, he was to be given further lands in Boddington which had belonged to Stephen de Chilham who was with the enemy.[[871]](#footnote-871) Matthew de Martigny, who according to the extant writs had carried out lesser roles than any of the other members of the clan, appears to have been more generously rewarded than his brother Geoffrey, gaining several lands taken from the disloyal sheriff of Northampton, Henry Braybrook, including lands in Northampton, Bedfordshire, Leicestershire, Buckinghamshire, Lincolnshire and Canterbury (beginning in November 1215 and contining until March 1216). But again John was two-faced in his generosity and did not hesitate to retrieve his largesse – a writ of December 1215 stated 'not withstanding the command which the king made to Matthew de Martigny [about the lands of Henry de Braybrook]…….'[[872]](#footnote-872)

Although Philip Mark did not suffer the deprivation of his office after Magna Carta 1215, he benefited more greatly from the king's largesse. On 25 December 1215 whilst the king was at Nottingham Mark was given the lands of Oliver d'Ayncourt 'as a gift', including all the lands of the king's enemies in that fee.[[873]](#footnote-873) This was a valuable gift as the lands stretched through Nottingham, Derby, Lincolnshire and Buckinghamshire – a large barony owing service on thirty-five fees. However when Ayncourt returned to the king's side in January 1216, Mark was ordered to return some of the lands and it took until May 1217, for the new king to confirm Mark's tenure both in demesne and fee.[[874]](#footnote-874) Mark was also given custody of the heirs and marriage rights of Matthew Hathersage, a relative of Oliver who had died without heirs, and he later married him to his daughter, Annora – an inquisition under Edward I is less complimentary of Mark's actions stating that Mark captured Matthew and held him in his castle and married him to his daughter.[[875]](#footnote-875) He continued to hold some of Bulwell, until the lands were granted to Hubert de Burgh in March 1216. At some stage in John's reign he was also granted lands worth £80 a year, as in 1217 when Henry granted some lands to Philip de Burgus of Derby he recognised that some had originally been given to Philip Mark by his father.[[876]](#footnote-876) Mark's clerk also benefitted from the king's patronage – on 28 April 1216 William, clerk to Philip Mark, had letters of presentation for the church of Clipstone which was vacant and in the hands of the king.[[877]](#footnote-877)

After Magna Carta 1215 the king may have felt that it was unnecessary to reward Peter de Maulay further, as he had already been able to benefit from marriage to the heiress of the Fossard fee. Maulay was given the wheat and cattle at Corsham manor in July 1215, full seisin of his lands at Gumshall with appurtenances and cattle on 7 December 1215, and other lands of the enemy on 15 February 1216.[[878]](#footnote-878) Philip Oldcotes, the chamberlain and others were also that month ordered to restore to Maulay any lands of the enemy belonging to his fee which were in their bailiwick.[[879]](#footnote-879)

Surprisingly Girard d'Athée's son, John, who had come to England as a child with his mother after his father's release, began to receive several grants of land and money after Magna Carta – which would indicate that he was in the king's service, in defiance of Clause 50 which stated that no *parentes* of Athée were to hold office in England. He was given his first tranche of land (in Essex, Bedford, Cambridge and Huntingdon which had belonged to Simon Fitz Richard who had joined the enemy) on 7 January 1216. On 1 March 1216 he was given some of the lands of John FitzRichard and the constable of Norwich was reminded later that month that the wheat which he had taken from FitzRichard’s lands in his shrievalty should be returned to John d’Athée who had been given the land itself. On 22 April, on the same day that Engelard was made sheriff of Surrey, John d'Athée was given the land of Simon FitzSimon.[[880]](#footnote-880)

After Magna Carta 1215, the men from the Touraine continued to serve John seemingly with little resentment even though they could see others receiving more lasting and munificent rewards.[[881]](#footnote-881) They appear not to have pressed for material reward – they seemed to have been satisfied with the power that the control of their castles and treasuries gave them, and they did not feel it necessary to augment their status by the acquisition of land and marriage rights. It was enough for them to know that they were irreplaceable to the king who depended on them for the collection and distribution of money and supplies, as well as the defence of the kingdom. Greed had never been part of their nature, and in the difficult times after Magna Carta 1215 their first allegiance was to the king and their new country, and as far as they were concerned, loyalty did not depend on material reward. It was only after his death, when their unique tie to the king on the throne was broken, that some of the men from the Touraine demanded a greater share of the king's largesse.

Chapter 12: Epilogue - Henry III and the Men from the Touraine

On 19 October 1216 John died, secure in the knowledge that he had successfully defied all of Clause 50 and that all those proscribed (who were still alive) were still in royal service in England. His will was witnessed by a *parvenu* William Briwerre and a Poitevin, Savaric de Mauleon, amongst others, but not by any of the men from the Touraine - they may have been some of John's most loyal servants, but they were never his intimates.[[882]](#footnote-882) Since their arrival in England they had acted as an impenetrable defensive shield around John, and as castellans, heads of provincial treasuries and sheriffs, they had given him the confidence to defy the barons. Throughout the civil war they had acted with no hint of betrayal, and had shown genuine talent, unflappable expertise, and total devotion towards the king's family. Now Peter des Roches, William Marshall and the legate Guala, acting as the young king Henry's advisers, had no hesitation in retaining this close-knit group of men from the Touraine in their important posts. Louis and his French troops, along with many recalcitrant barons were still threatening the authority of the crown, and it was not a good time to get rid of such loyal, experienced and useful men. On 12 November 1216, when a new Magna Carta was issued to enhance the royal cause's popularity, Clauses 50 and 51 were omitted, thus demonstrating to all in England that the abilities in particular of Engelard, Mark and the Chanceaux brothers had been recognised and their positions regularised.

*Responsibilities*

1216-1221: The men from the Touraine were initially kept in their original posts by Henry and his advisers, in the areas they knew best and where they were strongest – Engelard as sheriff of Surrey and in control of both Odiham and Windsor castles; Maulay as sheriff of Somerset/Dorset and castellan of Corfe; Mark as sheriff of Nottingham (with control of the castle) as well as joint sheriff of Lincolnshire. The Chanceaux brothers, according to Vincent, may have moved to serve Peter des Roches but more probably they remained in royal service as men with the same names appear in many royal writs connected in particular to Engelard.

When peace was finally settled at Lambeth in September 1217, many barons began to try to regain what they felt was rightfully theirs, or what had been faithfully promised to them. The positions of several of the men from the Touraine were on occasion threatened, but they were not men to be trifled with – they had escaped proscription and now as legal castellans and invaluable sheriffs they felt strong enough to defend their rights against the claims made by these barons - although they were not always the winners. In 1217 when the Earl of Surrey, William de Warenne, disputed Engelard's title and demanded Surrey back, William le Tus had to be appointed sheriff in February 1218 until the dispute was settled. In November, after he had been given letters of safe conduct to come and discuss the matter, Engelard accepted Bensinton and Henley, some income from some escheats and an annual pension in lieu of the county.[[883]](#footnote-883) Maulay suffered in March 1217, when the Earl of Salisbury demanded that Somerset/Dorset and Sherbourne castle should be handed back to him as he had been promised them if he returned to the young king. Maulay refused, arguing that John had given him and other sheriffs the authority to retain their posts until the new king came of age, even if this promise had only been given verbally (an argument which the Pope in 1220 deemed to be frivolous). Maulay was warned that his refusal would harm the country and he was summoned to the October council to answer for breaches of the truce. By 1218 a deal had been brokered by Peter des Roches in which Maulay got Sherborne castle and the shrievalty, and Salisbury got the promise of £1,000 from the court, £500 from Maulay and a valuable wardship. In May 1217 both de Caux and Mark lost Lincolnshire when the Earl of Salisbury was appointed the bailiff of the city and county of Lincoln – but in Mark's case the loss to him was inconsequential as his position there had always been unsatisfactory and his interest in its shrieval affairs strictly limited. His whole aim was to have complete control of Nottinghamshire which he ran as his personal fiefdom for sixteen years, during which time he continued to show no desire to be part of the inner circle, nor to witness writs regularly, nor to have a personal relationship with the king and his family

1221-32: In 1221 when Hubert de Burgh began to consolidate his position as justiciar, he instituted an inquiry not only into the royal demesnes (which he hoped would bring in money) but also into royal castles (which he hoped would lead to the removal of the men of foreign birth whose presence as castellans he believed threatened royal power).[[884]](#footnote-884) In June 1221 (after he was accused of treason), Maulay was ordered to hand over Corfe castle to Salisbury and Briwerre, and by 20 November he had lost his shrievalty. In January 1222 he lost Sherborne castle and the forests of Somerset/Dorset but he had not fallen out of favour as in 1225 he attested the sealing of Magna Carta and in 1226 was given respite for his debts. In December 1227 he attested his last royal charter for several years and retired to his estates in Yorkshire and the castle he was building at Mulgrave. Engelard was also badly affected and in May 1222 as part of the resumption of royal demesnes he lost Bensinton and Henley as well as Windsor, Cookham and Bray, and Odiham, even though these had been given to him to sustain him in royal service. However by 15 July he had gained them back although he never accounted for them, this duty falling on de Burgh when he took them on. In December 1223 Engelard lost Odiham and Windsor castles as part of the resumption of castles although he was subsequently allowed to retain some of his chattels.[[885]](#footnote-885) Engelard now did not hold any position until May 1233 nor did he attest any charters between 1227 and 1232. Mark lost Derby, Edwinstone, Ragnall and Carlton which he had been granted in December 1217 until the king came of age, but by sheer stubbornness and innate ability Mark was able to hold on to Nottingham and Derbyshire until 27 December 1224 when the county was handed to Ralph FitzNicholas. It is not known why Mark left but problems may have been brewing - although the Pipe Rolls for 1221 state that he accounted at the Exchequer that Michaelmas, the *Memoranda* Roll gives Eustace de Lowdham that responsibility. It is possible that Mark still continued to serve the king after he left Nottingham as in February 1225 the king granted him Melbourne and the farm of Bulwell ' for sustaining him in our service' and in July 1226 he was given letters of protection to last a year, as well as a further grant of land. In the last few years of his life his accounts were regularised and many demands put in respite. The administrative writs show that an Andrew de Chanceaux remained in royal service and was active during this period although he no longer held any position as castellan or sheriff – he may have fought at Bytham in 1221 (although he was chased for its scutage), acted as a royal messenger in 1223, and was close to Engelard in 1225 (when he had to hand him £25) and in 1227 (when he had to give him land).[[886]](#footnote-886) It was very probably he who became Richard of Cornwall's steward in 1229, remaining in that position until the 1240s.[[887]](#footnote-887) Peter de Chanceaux similarly may have continued to serve the king as he was with Engelard at Windsor in 1221, and also received money from him in 1230. Guy de Chanceaux, Vincent believes, might have been the same man as Guy de 'Cancanal' who served as Breauté's castellan at Northampton during this period, but it seems more likely that he was dead, as he no longer appears in the extant writs under the names he was known by under John.

1232-34: In 1231 Roches heroically returned from Crusade and was received back at court. By 1232 he had replaced de Burgh in the affection of the king and was made baron of the Exchequer. By the end of the year Burgh had been dismissed as justiciar and had lost everything including his freedom. Maulay was the first of Roches' 'alien' associates to be brought back to court, although he was not particularly active there and only witnessed four charters between July 1232 and August 1233. However he used his time well, furthering his own friendships and contacts by pledging with major magnates. In July 1233, he briefly held Dartford (before it was returned to Aumale) but it took until January 1234 for him to receive a crown office, when he was made constable of Devizes. In May 1233 with Roches' return to power, Engelard was made sheriff of Oxford gaining also control of the castle and houses and park of Woodstock, even though Crowcombe had been granted the position for life.[[888]](#footnote-888) However because of his age or because of injury, he began to opt out of many of his duties and after six months William de Tywa was deputed to act for him, the excuse given that Henry wished to retain Engelard close by.[[889]](#footnote-889) Andrew and Peter de Chanceaux continued to be connected to Engelard – in 1233 hostages were delivered to him in Andrew's presence and in 1233-4, Peter de Chanceaux accounted as Engelard's deputy in Oxfordshire. Mark did not have the opportunity to benefit from Roches' return as he was dead by March 1234.

1234-1240s: By the spring of 1234, under pressure from bishops and barons, Henry forced Roches to retire to his diocese, whilst at the same time dismissing Roches' 'nephew' Rivallis and his henchmen. His personal rule now began, advised now by a new group of courtiers such as Robert de Passelewe and William de Cantiloupe. His anger towards Roches and Burgh did not, however, extend to their followers as it was appreciated that the country could not afford any further dissension – and the men from the Touraine were able to continue their upward rise. Engelard was made sheriff of Berkshire on 22 May 1234 (although as at Oxford his clerk, Nicholas de Erdington rendered his accounts in April 1235) and on 26 May, some ten years after he had lost the castles of Windsor and Odiham, he was made their constable again, as well as taking on responsibility for several manors and forests. Two days later, however, he had lost the shrievalty of Oxford to the nephew of Geoffrey de Crowcombe, John le Brun – perhaps in order to lighten his work-load.[[890]](#footnote-890) On 2 January 1236, with the support of Richard of Cornwall, who had been brought up in his household, Maulay was brought back to power as sheriff of Northampton.[[891]](#footnote-891)

In late 1236, urged on by his wife and her uncle William of Savoy, Henry began a new series of royal reforms, including the resumption of demesne lands, the exploitation of royal manors, and the removal of many old sheriffs who were replaced by local men who had to swear an oath for good conduct. Engelard and his men duly suffered losses, but no more so than other sheriffs – there were changes in thirteen shrievalties (seventeen counties) during that year. By April 1236 Engelard had lost Berkshire, followed by the loss of Odiham castle (to Henry III's sister Eleanor) and Windsor and Odiham forests, as well as the manors of Windsor, Cookham and Bray, and Odiham - leaving him only with his important role as constable of Windsor. In May 1237 he gained custody of Windsor forest again but in 1240 his health may have been fading as Peter de Chanceaux appeared instead of him in the pleas of the forest for Surrey and in 1241 his clerk William de Cruce accounted instead of him for Windsor forest. Henry began to take care of him, granting him Bensinton and lands near Windsor in 1240, the castle and manor of Odiham for life in 1241, robes in 1243, and wine (especially between 1237 and 1241). It is likely that he was dead by May 1244 as that March he received licence to make his will, and by 4 May the last payment of £50 to him appears on the *Liberate* Rolls. A month after Engelard lost Berkshire, in May 1236 Maulay lost Northampton (he had held it for only four months) - but as in 1222 he had not fallen out of favour and in 1239 he received Edward from the font at his christening. In March 1241 Maulay was given protection without term and went on Crusade with Richard of Cornwall, dying in Jerusalem later that year. Peter de Chanceaux was still in royal service and in 1240 helped Engelard by appearing in front of the itinerant justices for the forests in Surrey. Andrew de Chanceaux by now was fully employed by Richard of Cornwall, and in 1241 was described as his 'steward'.

*Treasuries and castles*

The roles of Mark and Maulay as heads of provincial treasuries diminished just after John's death – there was little money now remaining in any event and Mark had to be given money by the Earl of Derby to pay his soldiers.[[892]](#footnote-892) As the crown's income improved, most of it was now retained at the centralised Exchequer which was functioning efficiently, and with a far less peripatetic king on the throne, the need for treasuries around the kingdom disappeared. However, their roles (and those of Engelard) as castellans and sheriffs continued to be crucial for the kingdom and time-consuming for the men themselves. Mark remained steadfast at Nottingham (although the *Histoire des Ducs* fails to mention him in its list of the main castles and castellans at the time of John's death). He did not have to defend his castle under Henry III, although it was used as a military base for expeditions, for example against Montsorrel and Lincoln. During his tenure surprisingly little money was spent on the castle apart from general repairs (especially in 1223), work on the mills and houses (1220-4), although he may have started an outer bailey in 1221. Work was also to be carried out at Clipstone, although Philip Mark may not have obeyed his orders as a few months later Brian de Lisle was given orders to carry it out. In fact it was not until well after Philip Mark had ceased to be sheriff that major improvements took place at the castle– the new sheriff was kept so busy with these that he had to render the account late.[[893]](#footnote-893) Engelard retained both Odiham and Windsor castles after John's death, but despite his expertise and past experience there, his tenure was interrupted during Henry's reign - losing them in 1223 and not regaining them until 1234. In 1241 he was eventually granted Odiham for life, but this was not a long-term gift as he was probably dying at the time. He did not have to defend his castles again during Henry's reign although he kept them in good condition, carrying out works in 1233-4, 1237, 1238, and in particular in the early 1240s when he oversaw the new kitchen being created at Windsor.[[894]](#footnote-894) Maulay did not neglect Corfe castle, despite having many responsibilities in the Fossard fee, and he spent at least 7,000 marks there between Louis' landing in 1216 and 1221.

*Military expertise*

On several occasions during his reign, Henry and his advisers had to call upon the military talents and the experience of the men from the Touraine. In 1217 Engelard helped Aubigny at Rye and in 1223 he led 21 men mainly from Wallingford to help Roches fight Llewelyn. Andrew de Chanceaux probably fought at Castle Bytham in 1221 and acted as a royal envoy overseas in 1223. Mark was called upon to deal with the marauders from Montsorrel castle who were committing rape and plunder in the area in February 1217, but who, according to the *Historia Anglorum* were defeated by the – unnamed - castellan of Nottingham. In May, according to Matthew Paris, the king, legate and Earl of Chester used Nottingham castle as a base for attacking Montsorrel castle itself, and Mark was one of those who bitterly invaded the castle. On its fall, Mark was given orders to raze it to the ground.[[895]](#footnote-895) Surprisingly although Chester and others moved from Montsorrel to Lincoln for the siege there, there is no mention of Mark following suit, although he may have been included in the *castellanis multis in opere militari expertis* who repositioned themselves there. In March 1218 Mark had to deal with Guagy who despite orders issued to him in November 1217 refused to hand over Newark. Although Mark was ordered to come with an armed battalion, his efforts failed or else the bishop did wish to resort to force, as Gaugy remained there until 4 July when faced by the Marshal himself and a large army camped outside the castle he surrendered. In return he was given £100 for his provisions there – only to be killed by lightning at the end of the year. Mark was also involved at Castle Bytham in 1221 and at Bedford in 1224 – although his loyalty at the former is questioned by the chroniclers.

Until Magna Carta 1215, apart from Maulay, none of the men from the Touraine appear to have travelled abroad in the king's service – they may have feared reprisals there, or their presence was required in England. It is only after Magna Carta 1215 that one of them, Geoffrey de Martigny is found going abroad where he unfortunately died. The situation changed under Henry when in 1221 Engelard was sent to help Pandulph 'keep and defend our land of Poitou'.[[896]](#footnote-896) This was mainly a diplomatic mission and whilst there he transacted business with the mayor and commune of La Rochelle - he was given 50 marks for his expenses. In 1225 he fought in Gascony with the newly knighted Richard of Cornwall, witnessing several of his charters - custody of the lands of Henry de Berkeley were committed to his son, Oliver, whilst he was away. In 1230 Maulay, Engelard and Andrew de Chanceaux may have gone abroad with the king to Brittany (they had to provide soldiers and armour), an expedition which was so uneventful that all had returned by the autumn.[[897]](#footnote-897) Surprisingly none of the men from the Touraine appear to have joined in Henry's expedition in May 1230 which he hoped would lead to the restoration of Normandy.

These military exploits continued to cause unrest amongst the chroniclers who were beginning to report events contemporaneously. The men were now caught up in the general denigration of a new group of arrivals, the Savoyards, who like them had come from abroad and had taken on many important posts. Paris accused Philip Mark of pillage and rape at Newark in 1217. Both Wendover and the Barnwell annalist name him as an abettor at the siege of Bytham in 1221, although the writs in fact show that Mark had remained loyal, and his costs were refunded for the siege engines and miners he had provided (although Aumale did pass through Nottingham as he escaped to the border).[[898]](#footnote-898) The Dunstable annalist also insinuates that Mark was part of the 'alien' conspiracy against the king in the spring of 1221, stating that household knights were left at Nottingham for greater security as the king passed through on his way to his sister's wedding in York.[[899]](#footnote-899) The chroniclers surprisingly did not include him as a rebel at Bedford – for once they were correct as a writ in November 1226 shows that he was made quit of the profits of the county because of his expenses at there. Wendover included Maulay with Mark as an abettor of Aumale at Bytham, although in one version he is referred to as Peter Malo-Leone instead of Peter Malo-Lacu. The Dunstable annalist acknowledges that in 1224 he was summoned to the siege of Bedford along with Roches and the Earl of Chester, but he insinuates that king may have been concerned about their leanings towards Breauté 'as with all their words and works they rendered themselves excluded from the king's inner circle'. However his loyalty is confirmed by the fact that concessions were made to them and afterwards and they were granted writs de *scutagio habendo*. Paris and Wendover claim that along with Breauté, Mark and Maulay, Engelard allied with Aumale in 1221 at Castle Bytham but this is unlikely as prisoners taken there were put under his care.[[900]](#footnote-900) Wendover claimed that Engelard was also a rebel at Bedford in 1224 but this is also unlikely as he retained his chattels at Windsor plus £50 and like Maulay he was given *scutagio habendo*.[[901]](#footnote-901)

*Administrative experience*

Henry also benefited from the administrative experience gained by the men from the Touraine during John's reign. Mark efficiently organised assizes and coroners, and was punctual in the collection of the carucage in 1220. Although there are the usual number of writs referring to his unjust disseisin, he is also on occasion credited with a just approach – in 1218 Briouse was to be given back Colston if Mark with the help of discrete men felt that he should be given it.[[902]](#footnote-902) In a reign marked by peace rather than rebellion, he was also happy on occasion to resort to his own peaceful methods, such as organising his own inquiry into Sherwood forest and mediating in the dispute between Philip Oldcotes and Roger Bertram over the castle of Mitford in 1220 – Oldcotes offering to accept the testimony of Mark.[[903]](#footnote-903) His reputation as sheriff was important to him, and his brother Peter warned him to take action against certain men who could make him the laughing stock in the county. His thorough control of all aspects of his shrievalty, and the support of his two brothers there, enabled him to hold the county steadily until December 1224, a year after the general purge of castellans instigated by Hubert de Burgh. Engelard too proved his value to Henry and his advisers expertly managing the valuable royal forests, in particular around Windsor. His executors benefited from the 'good and honourable service which he gave the king during his life'.

Under John, there was little room for excessive behaviour – as heads of the provincial treasuries the men from the Touraine were dominated by rules and regulations, and as castellans they had to be always on guard because of the threat of war or rebellion. There was little room for personal aggrandisement as they were aware that they retained the support of the king because of the strength they gave him as members of a loyal, close and interactive clan. Thus despite the conclusions of historians and the chroniclers, who believe that they were proscribed because of their excessive behaviour, the writs for John's reign show the clan acting mainly obediently and rarely questioning the orders given them. In contrast, however, as Henry's reign progressed and the country settled into a period of peace, the extant writs show them becoming increasingly the subject of complaint and disapproval. Wealth, power and status now gave them the confidence to further their own ambitions. Mark was accused of holding on to prisoners for far too long (such as the hostages of William Lancaster who had been in prison for seven years) as well as retaining several ransoms. In 1222 when his debts were consolidated he was said to have made some £2,500 from the war, but was later cleared of most of the debt. Under Henry, he also began to turn increasingly to strong-armed tactics, using his men to achieve his ends when he disagreed with policy. On occasions he was reminded not to send his soldiers into an innocent man's land, to guard his prisoner *in pulchra custodia*, and warned that if he did not follow orders he would be made to come in front of the king's council to account for his actions.[[904]](#footnote-904) He also was accused of interfering with the rights of the canons of Southwell and Lenton (although he chose to be buried at the latter), and eventually Pandulph and Burgh were forced to intervene. Well after he died he was found guilty of accepting an annual payment from the burgesses of Nottingham for the maintenance of their liberties (although his successors were still accepting these payments in 1260).[[905]](#footnote-905) He was particularly obdurate in his management of the forests in his shrievalty, and there were frequent flare-ups with Matilda de Caux who felt she had hereditary rights. At one stage he was told in no uncertain terms to remove his men from the forest, but he refused to acquiesce and in 1220 he carried out his own inquiry. Despite the evidence he produced, de Burgh gave custody to de Caux and in December 1222 the position was finally settled – but not in Mark's favour.[[906]](#footnote-906)

Engelard was criticised for his manipulation of justice after the justices in eyre inquired into Gloucestershire in 1221, and he was also accused of exploiting his rights as forester of Windsor. In 1222 the men of Odiham complained of his oppression, as did the men of Bensinton in 1231, to the extent that the sheriff of Oxford was ordered to look into the position.[[907]](#footnote-907) He does not however seem to have had the same ambitions as the other men from the Touraine, preferring to settle into a safe and ordered life as Henry III's reign progressed. He carried out his orders obediently, fussing over the amounts of money he received, and repeatedly reminding the Exchequer of the sums owing to him. He even did not forget the gift of bucks promised to him before he left for Gascony but still not received on his return.[[908]](#footnote-908) Through his clerk he wrote pompous letters refusing entry of the sheriff of Berkshire into Windsor in 1220 to collect the carucage, and in 1237 he demanded that his accounts for Keniton, Windsor and Odiham should be made in the old way.[[909]](#footnote-909)

Maulay, now a major baron as well as servant of the king, did not escape criticism either. In 1217 the papal legate and several magnates had to write to Maulay begging him not to upset the Earl over William of Lancaster. In 1221 he was accused of promising to hand over Eleanor of Brittany to the king of France. In November of that year the local community fined to be rid of him, asking for him to be replaced by Roger de la Forde - who was made sheriff and accounted at the Exchequer. Like Mark, Maulay was accused of holding on to prisoners and benefitting from their fines - in 1221 he was made quit of 6,561 marks which he had received from 16 prisoners captured at Rochester. Maulay's actions however were not considered to be seriously out of order - in 1218 when the government agreed to listen to complaints made by former captives against their captors, Maulay escaped censure.

*Relations with Roches and de Burgh*

The men from the Touraine were considerably aided in their careers under Henry III by the support which Roches continued to give them - as guardian of the young king until 1221 Roches had access to royal patronage which proved to be a powerful tool in the hands of a manipulative, rich and strong bishop. Although Roches had little interaction with Mark, he continued to maintain his close ties with Engelard. He helped broker the deal between Engelard and Warenne and also instigated an inquiry into property which Engelard had held at Southampton but which he claimed had been lost in the war. He may also have acted as Engelard's guarantor when he was sent to Poitou and may also have intervened when Engelard lost Odiham, Windsor, Cookham and Bray, Bensinton and Henley in 1222, enabling him to re-acquire most of them almost immediately.[[910]](#footnote-910) The records show that Engelard probably helped Roches at Bedford, and also against the Welsh in 1223, and in 1225 he fought in Gascony with Richard of Cornwall in an expedition partially funded by the bishop.[[911]](#footnote-911) On Roches' return to England in August 1231 Engelard may have supported Roches in his treachery against de Burgh (as in December 1223 Engelard was one of several powerful men who were given letters of safe conduct to come to London to discuss the matter). However, after having achieved Burgh's removal, Roches did not bring Engelard back to court immediately but only turned to him in 1233 (along with Aumale, Bezille and Ralph de Bray) when he needed all the help he could get against Richard Marshal.[[912]](#footnote-912)

Maulay's close relationship with Roches continued without interruption after the death of John. Having helped with his marriage to the Fossard heiress, Roches now also helped him retain Sherborne castle and the county of Somerset/Dorset after these had been promised to the Earl of Salisbury. In 1221, Maulay remortgaged his lands to go on Crusade with Roches, but in the event remained in England. Maulay was linked with Roches over the plot to hand Eleanor to the king of France, and may have suffered a short period of imprisonment as a result. After the dismissal of de Burgh in July 1232, Maulay was the first of the men from the Touraine to be recalled to court by Roches (when he was bringing back the survivors of the purge of 1223/4 such as Chester and Rivallis), and on 10 August 1232 he and Roches attested their first royal charter at Paincastle. His role was limited and in the period between July 1232 and August 1233 he only witnessed four charters, which although few was more than Engelard but far less than Richard Marshall (28). Roches may later have encouraged him to insist on his rights at Upavon.

Although the men from the Touraine were closest to des Roches (because of their background and history), on the whole they were able to steer a middle path between the two factions of de Burgh and des Roches. They were now so well established that they were less in need of anyone's protection and mediation. Their talents and experience, combined with their loyalty, made them indispensable to whoever was on the throne or whoever was advising them. They were astute enough to make sure that they never put themselves in such an exposed position as Aumale did at Bytham in 1221 or Breauté at Bedford in 1224, which could have resulted in them losing everything that they had slowly gained since their arrival in England. That is not to say that their closeness to Roches did not cause difficulties for them when de Burgh began to consolidate his position as justiciar, but these were not insurmountable. De Burgh viewed Maulay as a troublesome sheriff and it took considerable effort by him to regularise the farm of Dorset/Somerset in 1221/2. De Burgh also instigated the accusations of treachery against Maulay (and Engelard) over Eleanor of Brittany, but although Maulay lost Corfe as a result of the episode, it was to his financial gain as he was given quittance of some £15,867 of debt that year. De Burgh also supported the claims of Basset (who said that he held Upavon by royal charter) against Maulay (who could only show that he held it *de ballio*). In the argument which followed, Maulay claimed that he had been threatened by de Burgh. Engelard (and Maulay) may have pushed for de Burgh's removal as they were part of the group which received letters of safe conduct to go to London to discuss the matter of de Burgh - but they retained the support of Henry as they were able to show that they were doing nothing against the king, but rather just wanted de Burgh's removal.[[913]](#footnote-913)

Their awkward relationship did not mean that they were not spared the inconvenience of the power struggle, and Engelard in particular suffered the nuisance of receiving several different orders, for example for his lands at Bensinton.[[914]](#footnote-914) There were other individual episodes which caused unease but these were also not insurmountable. Engelard did not improve his relationship with de Burgh by arguing with William Warenne, who was a relation of de Burgh's by marriage, or by failing to account at the Exchequer for all the farms for Hereford and Odiham leaving this to de Burgh to do when he took them over. Mark too was one of the first to suffer when de Burgh started investigating old debts and charters and he was also particularly badly affected by the policy instigated by de Burgh of returning demesne lands to the king. He also had to suffer Burgh's criticism of his claims to the forests in his shrievalty. On occasion however the two factions were not adverse to putting aside their differences – Engelard and de Burgh were both signatories to a letter sent to the Pope in 1220 about certain schismatics who were proposing to return to England, and Maulay did not hesitate to ask a favour of him for his neighbour Roger of Acaster. Engelard even felt confident enough to reply insolently to an order given to him by de Burgh in 1220 about the carucage.

The chroniclers preferred to highlight the differences between the factions, taking every opportunity to report on the supposed treachery of the men from the Touraine. Wendover linked Engelard, Mark and Maulay to the events in 1223 when Chester, Gloucester, Aumale and others were said to be plotting against Hubert de Burgh and planning to seize the kingdom. Paris compared Maulay unfavourably with Hubert de Burgh and the Barnwell annalist not only named him as one of the instigators of the plot against Eleanor of Brittany (as did Coggeshall), but Faulkes' *Queremonia* stated that he was put in gaol in chains for the offence, (although the Dunstable annalist says that he was tried and acquitted). The Dunstable annalist, Coggeshall and Faulkes' *Queremonia* linked Engelard with Peter de Maulay over Eleanor of Brittany - Coggeshall going so far as to say that he was imprisoned for this - but in the autumn that year he was sent to Poitou on an important mission and allowed to keep Windsor castle until the general surrender in 1223 (although the Dunstable annalist says he had to give hostages as security for its surrender).[[915]](#footnote-915) It is more likely that these were mere stories, the result either of a local feud between the Maulays and the Mucegros family who held land near Corfe castle and who had failed to pay a fine which fell due at Easter 1221. Alternatively they were rumours put about by de Burgh who was hoping to destabilise Roches by attacking his supporters or who was playing on the supposed treachery of Maulay to regain the crucial castle of Corfe - on 30 May 1221, whilst Roches was abroad, Maulay was summoned to Winchester and stripped of Corfe castle, care of several royal infants and jewels and which had been entrusted to him by John. As these were to be handed to Burgh and Briwerre, it is likely that they were behind the actions. There were however to be no further proceedings until November which could indicate that the evidence against Maulay was very weak.

*Relations with Henry III*

When both Roches and de Burgh fell out of favour with the king who had now reached his majority, it became increasingly important for the men from the Touraine to maintain a good relationship with the king and his new influential advisers whose favour still dominated a man's career. Their relationship with John had been one of mutual respect rather than friendship but under Henry, it became became more open and more relaxed. During the Minority, Maulay had managed to remain on such friendly terms with Henry that he felt able to write to him to ask a personal favour for Roger of Acaster, Richard's tutor, and this friendship became closer as Henry's reign progressed – in 1239 he held Edward after his christening. Engelard had the opportunity of forging a close relationship with Henry when he was placed at Windsor which was used by the king and queen as a private pleasure palace.[[916]](#footnote-916) In 1233 he had become so close to the king that Henry took him away from his shrieval duties to keep him near to him, and gave him a gift of robes at Christmas 1243.

The men from the Touraine continued to care for many members of the royal family - at one stage the entire royal family was in their hands and Roches'. On John's death Maulay was made Richard of Cornwall's guardian, and he continued to be responsible for him for several years, bringing him to Henry III's second coronation in May 1220. He was entrusted at Corfe at times with the Queen, Eleanor, Isabel of Scotland, and John (as well as Richard) until May 1221 when he handed over the castle. In 1220 Mark was probably looking after Isabella, the sister of the king, as he he had to bring her to York.[[917]](#footnote-917) Engelard too had considerable exposure to Edward as he grew up, for example in 1241 he was responsible for Edward who was playing at Windsor with his friends. Both Peter de Maulay and Andrew de Chanceaux remained close to Richard of Cornwall during their careers, the latter probably moving to supervise his estates between 1229 and the 1240s, witnessing many of his charters.

*Rewards*

John had given the men from the Touraine limited grants of land and none in perpetuity but they appear to have made no complaint. However, now that they had survived proscription, the death of John, and had proved themselves to be invaluable castellans during the civil war, and efficient administrators in the peace which followed, they must have expected to be rewarded at least as well as the other men who surrounded the young king. Instead they had to watch others being rewarded more munificently, their own grants often being limited or problematical - in September 1233, for example, Engelard had to hand back the lands of William de Huntercombe *non obstante precepto regis de facienda inde saisina Engelardo de Cygoni*.[[918]](#footnote-918) They now became more grasping and Engelard more than once sought an increase in the amount he was given 'to better sustain him'. Although Michael Ray and Nicholas Vincent believe that Engelard became a rich knight and had a baronial level of income, in fact he received only scattered grants of land, and some of the gifts lasted only a few months - he was granted Bensinton (as well as Cookham, Bray and Henley) in 1218, but lost most of them in 1224, regaining Bensinton again in 1240; the lands of David Limesia granted to him in December 1218 were lost by 1222 although Engelard was given some compensation; the Huntercumbe lands he retained for only a month in 1233.[[919]](#footnote-919) In 1233 he was given Hailes, which as with Maulay and Upavon, involved the dismissal of a previous custodian and the rejection of a royal charter. In the last few years of his life he received several grants of land including the manor of Bensinton, the purpesture of Sanghes, and the custody of the manor and castle of Odiham for life. He received an annual pension in lieu of Surrey which continued until his death (at one stage it was to be paid *primis denariis qui venerint ad scaccarium*), but he never received any land in fee in order to pass on to an heir. His executors were made quit of all arrears and debts which the Exchequer might exact on Engelard's account – an indication of his lack of resources at the time of his death. It is possible that he received enough to make him a rich man, but he may have gambled or drunk it away (his executors were given wine to compensate them for that drunk by the king when at Odiham).[[920]](#footnote-920) He may simply have been a bad property investor -even his own purchases were not successful, for example in 1234 when he bought the custody of the daughter of Reginald Bassett from Bezille, the purchase was deemed invalid as Bassett was deemed to only hold of the king in socage.

The gifts of lands and wardships which Mark was given by the king, or which he himself purchased, were only retained by him with a struggle, and he did not hesitate to take on men, both big and small, in his pursuit of gain. In January 1217 in recognition of his faithful service he was granted lands worth £80 a year which should have included vill of Bulwell and the manor of Melbourne. But while their value was being calculated Melbourne was handed back to the Earl of Derby, and Mark did not recover it until 1223 (at farm) and his tenure was not confirmed until 1225.[[921]](#footnote-921) In November 1217 he also was given the farms of Edwinstowe, Carlton and Darlton but he had either lost these by 1223 or had to account. The lands of Doun Bardolph which he had been given by John were lost to de Burgh in 1217. The gift which Mark coveted the most was Bulwell which had originally been given to him by John. However disputes over his rights appear over and over again in the writs during his period of tenure at Nottingham/Derby and even after he left, although in the end it was the one gift that he and his wife received in survivorship (in 1229), thus enabling his widow to stay near Nottingham until her own death. To reach that point he had to overcome many hurdles including a period in 1223 when he got Bulwell at farm despite the requests of its men that this be given to them. His claims to other lands were equally problematical. Although he got Eyton as security for a loan, his title was challenged not only in 1220 but in 1225 in a case of *novel disseisin* against him. The Pipe Rolls for 1217/18 show that Philip Mark held lands at Croxton Kerrial but it is not known how long he was able to keep these. In August 1219, Mark was given the lands of Greetwell but the same month they were passed to the countess of Eu, Philip Mark only being left with the wheat. In 1226 he received a grant of land in Barton, Yorkshire, to sustain him in the king's service.

It was not however a record of failure, and during his lifetime, Mark was able to hold successfully some lands and wardships. On 24 May 1217 men were reminded that John had granted Mark the lands of Oliver d'Ayencourt, and that the grant was being recognised by the new king.[[922]](#footnote-922) In 1218-1219 when there was a perceptible increase in alien patronage (Engelard received escheats and Maulay respite from Fossard debts), Mark who had acquitted himself well at Montsorrel and Newark was given custody of the heir of Geoffrey Lutterel for marrying his daughter and he benefited throughout most of his life from the Lutterel lands in Ireland, Oxford, Northampton, Yorkshire and Leicestershire. In August 1218 he was given custody of the land and heir of Gervase de Winterton but he allowed Winterton's wife Sarah to have custody of them.[[923]](#footnote-923) In November 1218 he was given the marriage rights over Ralph, the son of Ankerus de Freshville (and heir to the barony of Crich), but problems were expected with the handover as a writ ordered Mark to detain Ivon de Heric so that he handed over the heir. The problem was overcome and in 1227 it was said that Ralph de Freshville held twelve librates of land and is given in marriage by Philip Mark.[[924]](#footnote-924) On 9 September 1222, it was said that the marriage rights of the son and heir of Hubert FitzRalph were in Mark’s hands. This series of gifts could indicate that Mark was increasing his wealth under Henry III, but none of the grants were as valuable as those given for example to Brian de Lisle (Knaresborough at ancient farm) or the Earl of Salisbury (granted the city of Lincoln after Montsorrel). By the end of his life, bar one paltry estate, he had lost all his lands, or else he had to account for them at the Exchequer. Even Bulwell which he and his wife eventually gained in survivorship was only retained for three years after his death – for it was redistributed when his wife died.

Maulay managed to retain Upavon for a period, although this caused huge problems for the crown and he lost it in the end to Basset. He was also given the vill of Barton (Bath) in 1218 but problems arose with the Prior soon afterwards. In 1228 he had to hand over Kettelburgh (Suffolk) which he had held *de ballio* of John. He briefly retained Kenningthorpe in 1233 although he had to return this in 1234. His greatest success was to retained the huge Fossard fee – and never pay the fine demanded for it. Whilst in royal service, Andrew de Chanceaux had custody of Henry Foliot's heir in 1233, as well as some of the lands of William de Poher (and custody of his daughter) which were given to him for a year and a day. He also received other lands, such as the huge manor and hundred of Lifton (which included most of Dartmoor) and lands in Bedford, but these were gifts of Richard of Cornwall.[[925]](#footnote-925)

They may not have have benefited from huge tracts of land, nor indeed received any gift in perpetuity, but because of the skills they had acquired under John, these men were able to avoid the many debts which they had accumulated through fines, ransoms, and other liabilities. In 1220 Engelard and Mark were the only two sheriffs who were able to successfully claim quittance from the Exchequer's demands for profits – Engelard was also allowed £2,666 for work and stock at Bristol and Hereford castles.[[926]](#footnote-926) He received additional quittance in 1222 on the basis that he had spent more than the amount due, and in 1227 and 1229 still further debts were allowed. Even after he died valuable concessions were given to his executors who were not required to render his account at the Exchequer and who were made quit of all arrears and debts which could be exacted because 'of the good and honourable service which he gave the king during his lifetime'.[[927]](#footnote-927) Mark too used his skills to reduce his debts and in the latter part of his life as his relations with Henry grew smoother his debts appear to have been viewed more generously. In 1220/21 when old debts were being chased it was found that over £2,549 had passed through his hands during the war but he was able to account for most of it bar £140. In 1226 he was pardoned of the demands for profits for Nottingham/Derby for the last year of office because of his expenses at Nottingham castle and Bedford, and in 1227 because of the faithful service he had made to John and the present king. In 1229 he was made quit of certain *prests* made in the time of John and in 1230 he received his final pardon of 100s for amercements. Maulay was so financially astute that during 1221/1222 he was excused of at least 15,867 marks of debts, including his fine for the Fossard fee, as well as other debts dating back to the time of John. He started being given relief from his debts and liabilities as early as Spring 1218 and these continued in 1219, 1220, 1221, 1226, 1230 and 1240. His excuses were varied, for example because he had spent considerable amounts on his castles (some dating back to Louis' landing in 1216), on payments to the Earl of Salisbury, on guarding Eleanor, Isabel of Scotland, Richard and John, and on his service to the king, particularly at Corfe and Sherborne. Andrew de Chanceaux also benefited from the quittance of debts in 1226.[[928]](#footnote-928)

*Relations with barons*

Under Henry, the volatile relationships between the men from the Touraine and certain magnates, which had been just simmering during John's reign, now became more threatening as both sides felt strong enough to exert their rights. Maulay, Mark and Engelard had all been challenged in 1217, but as Henry's reign progressed other animosities surfaced - although they were spared one important adversary as Giles de Briouse who had haunted them through their careers under John died on 17 November 1215. Apart from Mark's flare-ups with de Caux, his most prominent dispute was with Roger de Montbegon, one of the Twenty-Five of Magna Carta 1215. This had begun in earnest in January 1216 when he had been ordered to return lands such as Wheatley and Clayworth to him, and continued to January 1220 when Hubert de Burgh forced Mark to hand them over. A well documented court case shows that Mark acted correctly and not only had Montbegon taken stock contrary to the peace of the king and statute but he had refused to return to hear the verdict of the court, preferring to go straight to the king to get his rights restored.[[929]](#footnote-929) Henry, desiring to keep the support of this important baron, restored Oswaldebec and Wheatley to him, retaining Clayworth in royal hands. Mark also fought with the Earl of Derby over Melbourne which had been given to him by King John but which was demanded back by the Earl in 1216 . Several attempts were made to make him hand it over and in 1218 the government said that it did not want to hear any further complaints. Mark did not get it back until 1223 when he farmed the manor, and full tenure was not confirmed until 1225, but in 1227 Melbourne was handed to the bishop of Carlisle, although disputes over the crops continued for many years. Mark also argued with Ralph de Greasley over some lands which Mark had held since 1212. Although the matter had been festering since that date, in April 1219 it erupted when Mark or his deputy were ordered to appear in court as Greasley claimed that the lands had been wasted. Henry told the justices to investigate the matter and report back but the case rumbled on until it eventually went by default in 1221 – although Mark continued to hassle Ralph for arrears and even seized some of his stock. Mark also encountered problems with the Lutterel lands especially those in Ireland and the justiciar there had to look into this.

Maulay pursued his argument with Gilbert Basset over the manor of Upavon for many years – in February 1224 he was ordered to hand it to the sheriff of Wiltshire, and in 1229 he was asked by de Burgh to produce his warrant for the manor. When it was shown that he only held it *de ballio regis*, and therefore it was transferable at the king's will, it was handed back to Basset and his heirs for ever. In 1233 encouraged by Roches who was back in power, Maulay renewed his claim stating that he had given wrong information about the title because of threats by de Burgh who said he would be put in a position where he could not see his hands or feet. The case moved from court to the council and then back to the king, who advised by Peter des Roches restored Upavon to Maulay *per voluntatem suum*. When Bassett received no compensation, even though he held the right charters, he moved into open rebellion and was joined by his close friend Richard Marshal. War erupted in the Marches, the south west and southern Midlands throughout the winter of 1233-4. After Roches and Rivallis were removed from office, Upavon was restored to Bassett, thus making it clear to all that the king was subject to the law of the land and could not arbitrarily deprive a subject of their rights and property.

*Life and legacy*

Despite personal animosities with individual barons, the men from the Touraine on the whole were beginning to move effortlessly amongst leading barons as they became more established, increased in wealth and forged good marriages for their children. Maulay had become a good Englishman well before he died - with his fine castle at Mulgrave and baronial income from the Fossard fee he had no problem in matching the social status and affluence of many of the leading barons of the time, pledging for them and witnessing with them (but not for Magna Carta 1215). By 1225 he was witnessing a new grant of Magna Carta along with eight of the original Twenty-Five of Magna Carta 1215. Maulay's main source of wealth came through his marriage, and he retained it through his financial astuteness and the quittance he regularly received for his many debts, including the fine for the marriage itself. The Fossard fee remained a good source of income throughout his life and he and his wife managed it well and did not hesitate to fight many legal cases in order to preserve their lands. Unlike William de Fors, who lost all bar one of the legal cases he started, Maulay and his wife were successful, even over the monks of Meaux. When his wife died sometime before January 1238, Maulay followed the new fashion and created a chantry in her name at Meaux. In March 1241 he had protection without term to go on Crusade with his former ward Richard of Cornwall, and died in Jerusalem within the year. He had at least two sons, Peter and Robert - Peter was still a minor when his father died, as the Fossard lands were still in the king's gift in 1242. He also had at least two daughters – his elder daughter married the son and heir of Peter de Brus in 1237, the same year as her brother married Brus's daughter.

Despite his many acquisitions during his life, both purchased and from the king, Mark left only one paltry estate, and nothing in perpetuity. However as Bulwell had been left in survivorship his widow was able to remain in the area he had controlled for so long. He may not have retained much land but he married his children well – one daughter Arrora married Matthew de Hathersage and another was betrothed, if not married, to Andrew Lutterel in 1218.[[930]](#footnote-930) He may have had a son, Hugo, who appears as parson of Willington in 1219/20. Mark himself had died by March 1234, leaving his body to Lenton priory, along with a gift of land at Clayworth, hoping to get everlasting salvation. His brother Reginald who had acquired so much money during Henry's reign that he was able to build a house in the forest of Nottingham that caused the king to take note, also acquired land at Kirby Woodhouse, as well as Thrumpton, leaving the latter to the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem in 1244.

Although Engelard like Mark did not benefit socially from a good marriage, with his new responsibilities under Henry III, in particular at Windsor, he had the opportunity to rise up the social ladder. A writ to the men of Rye in February 1217 places him amongst the greatest barons of the realm and if Denholm-Young correctly dates the letter sent to the Pope to the end of 1220 then Engelard had by then successfully allied himself with influential magnates like de Burgh, Breauté, d'Aubigny and others who described themselves as *fideles domini regis Angliae*.[[931]](#footnote-931) However, Engelard appears to have been the least ambitious of the men from the Touraine - he did not adopt any of the trappings of the baronage, nor did he plan or partake in any crusade, favour any local religious house, either in life or in death. Unfortunately what little he acquired under John and Henry could not be passed on as both his wife and son predeceased him, the last mention of his son being in 1225.[[932]](#footnote-932) He may have had an illegitimate son who was made a king's knight in 1260 and a niece who married John of Berkeley.[[933]](#footnote-933) Despite his hard work and effort, he had failed through lack of vision and luck to become a true member of the English gentry and to found a dynastic line. Although his executors were given concessions because of his good and honourable service, these came too late for him and his family to benefit from them.

The Chanceaux family managed to assimilate themselves well into English society, becoming indistinguishable from the old Anglo-Norman gentry as they acquired large tracts of land - when the manor of Lifton was handed to Andrew de Chanceaux he was referred to as 'the lord Andrew de Chanceaux'. He was dead by 1248, the manor passing to his son. His sister, Susannah, was lifted into the baronage by her marriage to the son of Walter de Baskerville and on his death she bestowed land on the religious for the salvation of his soul, and his son was established enough to be buried in front of the high altar at Newenham Abbey in 1248. Guy at one stage had owned the lands of Nicholas Poinz and FitzRobert but there is little information on him after May 1216 when he was still in the king's service.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Neither Girard d'Athée nor any of his men from the Touraine became leaders of the country unlike Hubert de Burgh and Peter des Roches, nor did they become exciting stars like Faulkes de Breauté who became at one stage 'something more than the king in England'.[[934]](#footnote-934) Apart from Maulay they did not seek nor make great marriages, nor like Briwerre were they anxious to acquire a great barony, and their names are known to us not through the lines which they founded but mainly because of their inclusion in Clause 50 of Magna Carta 1215 and the Pleas of the Crown of Gloucester. But they were the type of men who were indispensable to medieval royal rule. They were happy to be the middle men, the spine of the country, faithful to the king on the throne, and loyal in peace or war. The extant writs quite clearly show that they did not deserve the disapproval of the chroniclers nor the half-truths of some modern historians. If they did attract the jealousy of the barons and some ambitious *parvenus* which led to their proscription in Clause 50, it was not because they were evil counsellors, crooked judges or bad administrators but because they were very, very good at their jobs and the barons realised that they would never be able to exert their control over the king as long as the men from the Touraine were there to protect him. Throughout John's reign they carried proudly the name of Girard d'Athée, demonstrating again and again their competence and loyalty. After John's death, they gradually became seduced by power and greed, and their actions became more self-centred as they ceased to act as a tight-knit, interdependent group. They developed new ambitions and new relationships which led to different degrees of assimilation into English society. Yet throughout their respect for royal power remained unwavering, and despite the continuing lack of royal largesse and the continuing animosity of certain influential barons, they managed to demonstrate the value of loyalty in a time rife with treachery and petty jealousies. They continued to serve faithfully not only Henry, but also des Roches, de Burgh, and the many new advisers who surrounded the king.
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