

## Durham E-Theses

---

*Patronage and service: the careers of William Montagu, earl of Salisbury, William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon, Robert Ufford, earl of Suffolk and William Dohun, earl of Northampton*

Jennifer Mary Parker

### How to cite:

---

Parker, Jennifer Mary (1985) Patronage and service: the careers of William Montagu, earl of Salisbury, William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon, Robert Ufford, earl of Suffolk and William Dohun, earl of Northampton. Masters thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

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

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7041/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

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

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

PATRONAGE AND SERVICE: THE CAREERS OF WILLIAM MONTAGU, EARL OF SALISBURY, WILLIAM CLINTON, EARL OF HUNTINGDON, ROBERT UFFORD, EARL OF SUFFOLK AND WILLIAM BOHUN, EARL OF NORTHAMPTON

Jennifer Mary Parker

---

ABSTRACT

The structure of Edward III's household between 1327 and 1341 is examined through the careers of four household bannerets in order to explore the special relationship which existed between the king and his knights and to assess their impact upon all aspects of government.

The first two chapters examine the structure and flavour of the royal household: why and how men entered royal service, their duties and perquisites, and describe something of the daily routine of court life. Evidence from the careers of Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and Bohun is then examined for the role played by Edward's bannerets in warfare, diplomacy and administration. The household bore the brunt of fighting throughout the 1330s. Bannerets' retinues formed the backbone of royal armies, releasing Edward from undertaking costly and ineffective traditional recruitment methods. Their advice and enthusiasm mitigated many of the problems faced by English forces in Scotland and France. The campaigns of 1338 and 1340, however, were disasters. Bannerets also dominated in diplomacy and administration - through the Constabulary of Dover, the Wardenship of the Channel Islands and the Justiciaries of Chester and of the Forests - areas of government increasingly being adopted by the nobility as conferring wealth, status and authority.

The rewards were enormous. The final section analyses the most spectacular of these prizes, the creation of the new earldoms in 1337, thus highlighting the distinction between the careers of the four subjects of this study before and after the date when officially each passed beyond the immediate jurisdiction of the household. All four men continued to act closely with the household in subsequent years. Their careers epitomise those of every one of their fellow household knights, reinforcing the close spirit of community which existed between Edward and his knights and fostering a remarkable harmony between crown and magnates.

---

PATRONAGE AND SERVICE:  
THE CAREERS OF WILLIAM MONTAGU, EARL OF SALISBURY,  
WILLIAM CLINTON, EARL OF HUNTINGDON,  
ROBERT UFFORD, EARL OF SUFFOLK  
AND WILLIAM BOHUN, EARL OF NORTHAMPTON

BY

Jennifer Mary Parker

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

Thesis submitted for the Degree of M.A.

in

The University of Durham

1985



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	
List of Abbreviations	i
1. The Royal Household: Recruitment and Personnel	1
2. Household and Court	50
3. The King's Knights in War	89
4. Diplomatic Missions	140
5. Administrative Duties	186
i. Justice of Chester	186
ii. Constable of Dover, Warden of the Cinque Ports and Admiral	191
iii. Keeper of the Channel Islands	203
iv. Justice of the Forests	206
v. Special Commissions	210
6. The Creation of the Earldoms, March 1337	222
Bibliography	259

---

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

B.I.H.R.	Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research
B.J.R.L.	Bulletin of John Rylands Library
B.L.	British Library
C.Ch.R.	Calendar of Charter Rolls
C.C.R.	Calendar of Close Rolls
C.F.R.	Calendar of Fine Rolls
C.I.P.M.	Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem
C.P.R.	Calendar of Patent Rolls
E.E.T.S.	Early English Text Society
E.H.R.	English Historical Review
<u>Foedera</u>	<u>Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica (ed.) Thomas Rymer</u>
G.E.C.	<u>G.E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct and Dormant</u>
P.R.O.	Public Record Office, London
R.S.	Rolls Series
Rot. Parl.	Rotuli Parliamentorum
<u>Scalacronica</u>	<u>Scalacronica by Sir Thomas Gray of Heton, Knight. A Chronicle of England and Scotland from AD MLXVI - AD MCCCLXII (ed.) Joseph Stevenson</u>
T.R.H.S.	Transactions of the Royal Historical Society
V.C.H.	The Victoria Histories of the Counties of England



DECLARATION

None of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

J.M. Parker  
September 1985

COPYRIGHT

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

## 1. THE ROYAL HOUSEHOLD: RECRUITMENT AND PERSONNEL

The royal household was a large, amorphous body which included not only the wardrobe and chamber, but also the royal chapel, the kitchens, the Great Wardrobe and parts of the civil service. Its personnel formed a large network under the dual headship of the keeper and steward,<sup>1</sup> its fabric interwoven with clerical and secular threads. The former extended down through the secretariat and the chief clerks of the offices - the almoner, confessor, cofferer, keeper of the privy seal and the clerks of the marshalsea, pantry, chandlery, kitchen, larder and scullery - to their subordinate clerical staff and the valets and serjeants of the offices. These formed the administrative elements of the wardrobe and its associate branches. A second web emanated from the steward's office, encompassing the purely secular members of the royal household - the bannerets, knights, squires, serjeants-at-arms and valets who served the king personally in a variety of less clearly defined ways, but were particularly important in a military capacity.

Among the lower household members, the senior officers, the clerks, serjeants and squires were roughly equal in status. The squires formed a mixed bunch of men and boys, some of noble rank, others of humbler birth, involved in mainly domestic and military duties. They formed the backbone of the king's personal retinue and shared the work of their knightly associates. The serjeants performed more menial tasks but were involved in a mixture of administrative and military functions. They were divided into the serjeants of the offices, subordinate to the clerks, and the serjeants at arms of the king's bodyguard who accompanied him at all times. The terms serjeant and squire, though to some extent inter-changeable, had different meanings. Squire was a term of rank, and all serjeants of rank were squires, whereas the term serjeant defined a special duty. Not all squires acted as serjeants and few serjeants received higher wages than the squires. Of the

---

1 T.F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, Vol.IV, (Manchester, 1928), p.160.



lesser servants, usually of the rank of valet, about three hundred men mostly attached to particular offices and a dozen or so chamber valets mainly used in the transportation of household effects and the stabling of horses, the king's messengers, minstrels, huntsmen and Edward's two washerwomen completed the picture. Promotion was possible from one office to another and transference from the administrative branches to the military arm was not uncommon. A few valets of offices might hope to become serjeants and even squires, and many squires were eventually knighted, depending on ability and influence. The knights, bannerets and higher clerks formed a kind of superstratum above the other officials. "Spearheaded by a nucleus of wardrobe clerks and knights that could be expanded when necessary, the king's household provided a reservoir of talent that performed a multitude of tasks, both at home and abroad. The numerous messengers, clerks, serjeants, squires, knights and bannerets formed an administrative web linking local with central administration."<sup>1</sup>

The major stimulus for a changeover in personnel took place at the beginning of each reign. At the death of a monarch his household would be disbanded, his knights, squires, clerks and other servants being forced to seek suitable employment elsewhere either with other magnates or by winning the favour of the new king. Their place would be taken by the private establishment of the heir apparent which then expanded rapidly to take over the government. The deposition of Edward II and his replacement by his son as Edward III in 1326-27 was exceptional in that the establishment of a new royal household was not simply the result of the death of one monarch and the succession of his heir, but was preceded by a period of confusion in which there were two kings, one de facto and the other de iure, and this caused exceptional measures to be adopted.

---

1 Records of the Wardrobe and Household, 1285-6, (ed.) B.F. Byerly & C.R. Byerly, H.M.S.O., (London, 1977), p.lxiv.

A household for Edward of Windsor had been in existence since 1312, though characterised by Tout as small, localised on the earldom of Chester and less intimately associated with him than that of Edward II as prince of Wales.<sup>1</sup> Over the next twelve years this household grew considerably, and by 1325-26 when Edward was sent to France his military establishment alone numbered nearly seventy individuals.<sup>2</sup> When Queen Isabella landed on the Suffolk coast in September 1326 she did so with an estimated force of no more than 1500 men, including 700 Hainaulters and the retainers of the earl of Kent and other contrariant exiles. With the queen and her son were the bulk of their own household troops, a body of men which in 1327 included eight bannerets, their five associates, twenty four knights and thirty squires. This tiny force was quickly joined by the earl of Norfolk, the bishop of Lincoln and the bishop of Hereford. Others joined on route.<sup>3</sup> Edward II, fleeing from London towards Wales was deserted almost wholesale by his supporters who one after another went over to the queen's side. On October 16 he reached Chepstow and took to sea, and it was at this point that the unthinkable happened; his steward Thomas le Blount deserted taking with him the rest of Edward's household knights who submitted to Isabella in a body, leaving the king alone with only the younger Despenser and a few close household supporters. Edward was finally captured near Llantrisant on 16 November.

For a few months the fiction was maintained that Edward II had left the realm and Prince Edward was therefore acting as regent in his father's name. In January 1327, however, the decision was at last taken publically to depose the king and crown Edward III in his place. A deputation of estates announced the

---

1 T.F. Tout, Chapters V, 69. The only accounts to survive prior to 1325-6 is a list of daily household expenditure for 1313.

2 E361/9 rot.1

3 Natalie Fryde, The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II 1321-1326 (Cambridge, 1979), pp.185-190.

news to Edward at Kenilworth. Trussel and Blount led the way, Trussel renouncing the allegiance of all estates. Blount then solemnly breaking his wand of office to symbolise the rejection by his household of the old king.<sup>1</sup> Since the government was in a state of confusion from 26 October 1326 to 24 January 1327, Edward acting as regent for his father then ostensibly returning the government to Edward II, the queen and her son found it convenient for this period to "pool their resources"<sup>2</sup> creating one large household under the keepership of Thomas Woodhouse til March 1327.<sup>3</sup> All the new supporters had to be rewarded for their aid and encompassed within the new regime, many of them or their relations as household men of the queen or Prince Edward. A few of Edward II's household found employment in the households of the queen and Edward III after 1327, the rest faded into relative obscurity.<sup>4</sup> This mixed body was to form the basis of the royal household until 1330. It was not until after October 1330 that Edward re-organised his household to contain men of his personal choice.

The royal household of Edward III's early years was therefore closely akin to that inherited from his father.<sup>5</sup> Numbers reached a peak under Edward III. In 1330 the entire household numbered 529.<sup>6</sup> By 1334 it had risen to 627<sup>7</sup> and during the later 1340s had reached more than 750,<sup>8</sup> of which the secular arm of the household formed about 30% of the total personnel involved, though this could be even higher in years of heavy warfare.

---

1 Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynebroke (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, (Oxford, 1889), p.28.

2 T.F. Tout, Chapters V, 246 .

3 E101/382/9; E101/382/10.

4 Cal. Mem. Rolls p.373.

5 James Conway Davies, The Baronial Opposition to Edward II: Its Character and Policy (reprinted Cambridge, 1967), pp.116-136.

6 E101/398/4.

7 B.L. Nero C.VIII fols.219r-223r, 225r-227r.

8 C.J. Given-Wilson, The Court and Household of Edward III 1360-77, (unpublished PhD thesis, St. Andrews, 1975), p.1.

The military arm of the household under Edward III tended to fluctuate in size from one year to the next. The normal strength of the total military household varied between anything from 50 to 100 horse at any one time in receipt of both robes and fees. Under Mortimer and Isabella the size of the household numbered about 50 to 70 knights and bannerets.<sup>1</sup> During the middle 1330s the number dropped drastically to about thirty in 1334-35 and to only 20 to 23 in 1336-37.<sup>2</sup> The figure rose in 1338 to 47 as Edward prepared for his first campaign in France, and increased by almost as much as half again during the campaign of 1339, when many lesser members of the household were promoted in the field. During the later months of 1339 it rose to 75 men, but dropped slightly during the following year to only 69.<sup>3</sup> During the mid 1340s the number was somewhat lower, about 49-51 horse between 1342 and 1345.<sup>4</sup> This compares favourably with figures during the latter part of the preceding century. Edward I had kept a military force of about 100 men in his household in 1284-5 during the period of consolidation of the Welsh conquest but reduced it almost annually thereafter. In 1306 it was down to about 45 knights.<sup>5</sup> Edward II's force by contrast, was much smaller. Even in years of greatest military activity there were rarely over 50 knights and bannerets in his household.<sup>6</sup>

The knights of the royal household were divided into two groups: the bannerets and the "milites simplices". The most important members of the household were the bannerets. Their pre-eminent position was based purely on rank, recognised by receipt of wages and fees at double the rate offered to knights

---

1 Cal. Mem. Rolls 1326-1327 pp.373, 377.

2 Nero C VIII fols.223r, 225r, 229r-230r.

3 E36/203 fols.118r-124r. This wardrobe book has recently been published as The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell 12 July 1338 - 27 May 1340 (eds) Mary Lyon et al (Brussels, 1983). Reference to the original manuscript folios, however, has been retained throughout this study.

4 E36/204 fol.86r.

5 M.C. Prestwich, War Politics and Finance Under Edward I (London, 1972), pp.46-47.

6 B.L. Add. MS. 9951 fols.25r-25v; Add. MS. 17, 362 fol.55<sup>v</sup>; Stowe 553 fol.65<sup>r</sup>.

knights. Conway Davies believed that as men of baronial rank their function was to gather round the person of the king, lending dignity to him and his court by their presence.<sup>1</sup> It was martial prowess rather than their social rank, however, that gave bannerets their superior status. They formed a military élite within the household, who in times of war commanded battalions of their fellow household knights, and provided larger personal retinues for the king's service. Baronial status was not an automatic passport to court, and not all members of baronial families became bannerets. Even the sons of earls were not necessarily recruited into the household as bannerets, especially if they were under age. The earl of Suffolk's heir Robert joined the royal household in the 1330s as a squire, was made a household knight in 1338, but did not become a banneret until the campaign of 1339.<sup>2</sup> From time to time a few clerks are found receiving their fees and livery among the king's bannerets, but they did so as the leaders of military contingents.<sup>3</sup>

Usually the number of bannerets permanently retained in the royal household was small. The average under Edward II was about three.<sup>4</sup> During the preceding reign the proportion had been much higher. Edward I rarely had less than ten bannerets on his household lists; in 1300 he had as many as thirty.<sup>5</sup> The lower figures for Edward II's reign can perhaps be explained by the relative lack of military opportunity. Under Edward III the figures fluctuated. During the period of political crisis from 1327 to 1330 the numbers were high. It was during this period that all four subjects of this study were drawn into the royal household. Queen Isabella and the Duke of Aquitaine invaded England in the Autumn of 1326 with a following of eleven bannerets, eight in the Duke's household

---

1 J. Conway Davies, The Baronial Opposition to Edward II, p.22. See however, J. Carmi Parsons, The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile, p.40 for a statement about the low social status of her bannerets.

2 Nero C.VIII fol.225v; E36/203 fol.119r.

3 E36/203 fol.119r.

4 J. Conway Davies, Baronial Opposition, p.220.

5 M.C. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p.47.

and three of the queen's own entourage including William Clinton who had shared the queen's self-imposed exile.<sup>1</sup> In 1328 there were 15 bannerets in receipt of robes and fees, predominantly the major supporters of the new regime or those whose powerful backing the government needed to maintain. Two of Mortimer's sons, Edmund and Geoffrey, and Edward Bohun, recently knighted, also appear among the king's bannerets of that year. William Montagu who had been knighted in April 1326 was elevated from the ranks of the "milites simplices".<sup>2</sup>

By the following year the number of bannerets in the household had increased by two, but this figure disguises the high turnover of personnel during the year. The Mortimers had left court, and only two of the original supporters of the regime still remained, many of them replaced by men who were to participate in the attack on Mortimer the following year. Robert Ufford was among those men who joined the household in the winter of 1328 during the months of growing tension between Mortimer and the earl of Lancaster.<sup>3</sup> By 1330 the total of household bannerets had escalated to 26 and again the turnover of personnel was high. Half of the new recruits of the previous year had disappeared. William Bohun appeared for the first time as a banneret, when he would be about 17 or 18 years old.<sup>4</sup>

Sometime after the arrest of Mortimer and his supporters in October 1330 Edward pruned rigorously his military establishment, despite growing commitments in Scotland. By 1334 the total number of bannerets had been reduced to only seven. Bohun, Clinton, Ufford and Montagu headed the list, and only Ralph Neville, Gilbert Talbot and Roger Swinnerton remained of the large establishment maintained four years earlier.<sup>5</sup> This trend was sustained despite almost annual campaigns in

1 E361/9 rot.1.  
 2 Cal. Mem. Rolls p.373.  
 3 E101/384/7.  
 4 Cal. Mem. Rolls p.377.  
 5 B.L. Nero C.VIII fol.223r.

Scotland during the next few years; Swinerton, Neville and Talbot all left the household during the winter of 1335-36. After Edward elevated his four remaining bannerets to the peerage in 1337, the number continued to fall; only John Darcy the Steward and Henry Ferrers the Chamberlain were named in receipt of fees and robes for that year.<sup>1</sup> A reversal of this trend was introduced with Edward's decision to lead an expedition to France in 1338. The number of bannerets in the household swelled immediately to fifteen, with a further five men promoted in the field during the following year.<sup>2</sup> By 1343 the number of household bannerets had dropped slightly to only twelve<sup>3</sup> and the total numbers continued to fluctuate in response to military needs and opportunity for the duration of Edward's active interest in the French wars.

The number of knights permanently resident in the royal household followed fluctuation in the number of bannerets. A steadily increasing body of men under Mortimer's rule swelled the military household from a force of twenty-six knights in 1326-27 to thirty six in 1328, forty by the following year, to forty four by 1330. By 1334 this number of more than halved, to only twenty one knights, and had fallen still further to just seventeen by 1337. During the first campaign of the Hundred Years War the number expanded rapidly to twenty seven in 1338, with a further eighteen knights created in the winter of 1339. In 1343 there were thirty seven knights receiving wages as permanent household retainers.

Recruitment into the royal household was at its heaviest during wartime, and especially just before a major campaign. In 1337-38 seventeen new knights appeared on the household roll in preparation for Edward's expedition to the Low Countries in July 1338. There were twelve additions to the military strength of the household in 1342 for the Brittany campaign of that year. The more successful of these

---

1 Nero C.VIII fol.230v.

2 E36/203 fol.119r.

3 E36/204 fol.86.

did not remain attached to the household for long. Personal success tended to herald the build up of a large private household and to draw attention away from court. Those promoted from the ranks remained associated with the household far longer, since most lacked the inherited knightly wealth and social standing necessary for a successfully independent career.

Lengths of stay at court varied considerably. A significant proportion, about one in six, were retained for no longer than one year, and for over half the king's knights a short term stay of only two or three years was the norm. At the other end of the scale, for those who chose to make a career out of service in the royal household, periods of residence of anything up to twenty years and more were not unusual,<sup>1</sup> especially among the small group of bannerets and knights who gained Edward's particular friendship. Frequently they had begun their association with the royal household in early youth as members of the establishment of Edward as heir apparent, and might have expected promotion to banneret status and to amass great personal wealth as the reward for a long career in government service.

When examining the household careers of Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and William Bohun in the first decade of the reign of Edward III, it is necessary to pick up the story very much earlier, since all four men had connections with the court which considerably antedated their formal retaining by the king. Very little can be stated with confidence about how men were recruited into the household, but, although the records are silent on this point, it is clear that date and place of recruitment which appear with regularity on the records of the wardrobe

---

1 Compare average lengths of service of royal messengers. Mary C. Hill The King's Messengers 1199-1377. A Contribution Towards the History of the Royal Household, (London, 1961), p.19.

in the Liber Quotidianus Garderobe<sup>1</sup> under Edward I, are by no means the beginning of the story. This is complicated further by the fact that although some formal ceremony is likely to have taken place on entry into the king's service, admission appears not to have been accompanied by letters of appointment, but was probably done verbally by a simple swearing-in.<sup>2</sup>

Recruitment into the household took place at all levels. A high proportion of household men began their careers in the household at an early age as royal wards and squires. William Bohun, orphaned at the age of ten, followed his elder brothers into royal service. The presence of the Bohun brothers is readily explained by their upbringing as special hostages following the disgrace and death of their father in 1322.<sup>3</sup> Eight days after Thomas, earl of Lancaster was executed at York, the three eldest sons of the earl of Hereford - John, Edward and Humphrey - were moved into Windsor castle with Edmund and Roger Mortimer, the two eldest sons of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, then imprisoned in the Tower.<sup>4</sup> Their fathers' lands were declared forfeit and swiftly siphoned off into the Chamber. Sheriffs were ordered to levy all possible issues immediately for the king's use.<sup>5</sup> The traitors were condemned by law of chivalry to degradation of knighthood and loss of their right to bear arms.<sup>6</sup> The five boys, aged between

- 
- 1 Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobae (ed.) J. Topham et al., (London, Soc. of Antiquaries, 1787), p.188. These details do not appear on records of Edward III's reign.
  - 2 Mary C. Hill, The King's Messengers, p.116.
  - 3 He was killed by the upward thrust of a pike from beneath the bridge at Boroughbridge, with three of his retinue. He was buried at the church of the Friars Preachers in York and his will is printed in Archaeological Journal II, 346. His son Humphrey later claimed that at the time of his death he was making preparations to journey to Holland in final pursuit of his wife's dower portion. D.L.34/1/25.
  - 4 E101/378/6. For Roger Mortimer's imprisonment and date of eventual escape from the Tower, see E.L.G. Stones "The Date of Roger Mortimer's Escape from the Tower of London", E.H.R. lxvi (1951), pp.97-98.
  - 5 J. Conway Davies "The First Journal of Edward II's Chamber", E.H.R. 30 (1915), pp.665-6.
  - 6 M.H. Keen "Treason Trials under the Law of Arms", T.R.H.S. 5th Series Vol.12 (1962), p.92.

thirteen and eighteen years old,<sup>1</sup> were given a joint establishment numbering ten servants under the aegis of Alan de Hackford, a deputy of the treasurer Walter de Norwich.<sup>2</sup> Their household included two masters for the Bohun brothers and another master who cared for the two Mortimer youths. Though bonds for the good behaviour of their families and supporters they were permitted a degree of personal freedom and comfort. Each boy was provided with new clothing twice a year, as well as livery for their servants and oblations at all the major religious festivals. During the eleven month period Michaelmas 1322 to 20 August 1323, Hackford expended £237 15s 7d including luxuries such as a polished looking glass and a pair of scissors for Edmund Mortimer, and a belt for Humphrey Bohun.<sup>3</sup> The household remained intact until 5 April 1324 when the Mortimers were transferred to safer custody in Odiham castle where their brother John was also being held.<sup>4</sup> On 25 March 1325 the young earl of Hereford and Essex, John Bohun, received a summons to court from the king which marked the beginning of his reinstatement into society though it was not until February 1327 that keepers of the earl's estates were ordered to return to him his father's possessions.<sup>5</sup> Humphrey and Edward remained at Windsor until 7 February 1326, when they were "delivered" from the castle.<sup>6</sup> Edward was with the Queen's party on 1 November 1326 and

- 
- 1 Edmund Mortimer, born 1305, Roger Mortimer, John Bohun, born 1306, Humphrey Bohun, born 1309 and Edward Bohun, born probably 1309. According to Dugdale Monasticon VI pt.1, 135, Edward was the twin of William although there is no positive evidence for this. More likely he was the twin of Humphrey. Hackford's account lists them as John, Edward and Humphrey E101/387/6, E101/379/10, but Lovekyn speaks of "Humphrey and his brother Edward", E101/382/23. The earl of Hereford in his will listed them as Humphrey, Edward and William, Archaeological Journal II, 346. However, cloth bought by Hackford for robes for the boys shows that Edward was smaller than the other boys.
  - 2 In 1325 he was replaced by John Lovekyn, a deputy of the new treasurer, William Melton. In December 1325 Hackford petitioned for payment of £45 1s 3½d outstanding expenses. C.C.R. 1323-27 p.435; Cal. Mem. Rolls p.64.
  - 3 E101/379/10.
  - 4 E101/380/5; E101/381/1.
  - 5 E372/175m16d. Cal. Mem. Rolls pp. 32, 45, 222. The court was then staying at Windsor but it is clear that this marked the end of John's wardship.
  - 6 E101/380/5 m2.

and became a banneret in the royal household in 1327.<sup>1</sup> Humphrey, suffering from a recurrent weakness, never joined the royal household but continue to receive 20s per week for his sustenance from the exchequer until Michaelmas 1331.<sup>2</sup>

Obscurity shrouds the early years of their brothers William and Eneas,<sup>3</sup> who were probably cared for by family retainers either at Pleshy or Brecknock,<sup>4</sup> though Eneas was in contact with his cousin John of Eltham in 1325.<sup>5</sup> William was undoubtedly knighted privately, about the same time as John and Edward were dubbed by the king in January 1327.<sup>6</sup> He did not join the royal household until the winter of 1330, and that perhaps as a result of having assisted his brothers in the

1 E101/382/6.

2 E403/235 m1; E403/259 m5; E372/173 m8; E372/175 m16d. From 20 July to 20 December 1325 he was ill and sent to London to the Mews to find a cure. He was ill again while in London from 19 November 1327 to 28 January 1328. In Foedera II, ii, 1042 he himself explained that he was demising the hereditary Constablership to his brother William "tam ob corporis sui imbecillitatem quam propter infirmitatem diuturnam".

3 Born between 1313 and 1316. This unusual name may be connected with the Bohun's (both Humphrey and his wife Elizabeth) interest in their descent from the Swan Knight, a king's son, the only one of six children not turned into a swan by enchantment. The knight was supposed to have been called Eneas or Helias. His daughter married the count of Boulogne who had three sons including Godfrey, from whom the Bohuns traced their descent. Elizabeth could also claim descent from the Swan Knight through her mother Eleanor of Castile. See Anthony R. Wagner, "The Swan Badge and the Swan Knight", Archaeologia XCVII (1959), pp.120-135.

4 For an account of the keepership of Brecknock castle during this period see C62/104 m1. The castle was seized by Hugh le Despenser in July 1322. Pleshy was committed to Nicholas de la Beche in December 1321, but Beche was answerable only to the Chamber for part of this period and no accounts seem to have been submitted to the Exchequer. C.C.R.1323-27 p.84. In 1312 William was in the care of a Bartholemew de Elmham. DL 36/1/197.

5 E101/381/12. The will of the earl of Hereford, written in 1319, stipulated that Eneas be left to the guardianship of Robert and Margery de Haustede, but both Robert and his son Robert predeceased the earl. In 1319 Robert Swan was named as being with John and his brothers, while Humphrey's master was one Huard de Soyrou. Nothing more is heard of any of these servants.

6 D.L.25/1957, a charter issued by the earl of Hereford in which William is styled knight, dated 25 February 1328.

13

assault on Nottingham castle that October.<sup>1</sup> At the same time Knees entered the household as a squire.<sup>2</sup> Finding permanent positions at court was eased by their royal blood and a family tradition of household service.

It would be natural for a high proportion of royal wards to remain permanently attached to court after attaining their majority, since it was the world in which they had grown up and to which they were accustomed. Young men in the king's wardship, still under age and as yet unknighthed, were classified with the king's squires, receiving wages depending on rank of between 4½d and 9d per day, and dining in the hall like any other household member.<sup>3</sup> Each squire had his companion or master who was responsible for his all-round education while at court. The tutor, himself often a squire or yeoman in the household, was there to teach his young charge courtly behaviour, riding, and to supervise his training in arms. Literary studies were the province of a clerk or schoolmaster, though the master sometimes covered both. In general the master was to instill competence in the good manners prevailing at court, associated with the whole code of courtesy - languages, music, dancing and the martial skills necessary to future knights.<sup>4</sup>

It was in this manner that William Clinton and his elder brother John were recruited into royal service. The Clintons of Maxstoke were a minor Warwickshire

- 
- 1 Joshua Barnes, The History of that Most Victorious Monarch Edward III, (Cambridge, 1688), p.146. Cal. Mem. Rolls pp.377, 378. He is included with the household bannerets, though four years later he appears as a knight bachelor.
  - 2 Eneas died shortly afterwards, probably in 1331.
  - 3 Hilda Johnstone, "The Wardrobe and Household of Henry son of Edward I", Bull.J.R.L. Vol.7 (1922-23), pp.390-91; T.F. Tout, Chapters II, 172. The wardrobe staff of Edward III for this period consistently fail to distinguish the king's wards as a separate class as was common in previous reigns. The only clearly identifiable ward was James Botiller. C.f. E101/381/11 for Edward II's wards in 1325-26.
  - 4 Nicholas Orme, "The Education of the Courtier" in English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages (eds.) V.J. Scattergood and J.W. Sherborne, London, (1983), pp.63, 70-71.

knightly family with few connections with the royal household.<sup>1</sup> The first positive reference to a John Clinton of Maxstoke occurs in June 1291 when he was sent to Scotland in company with Ralph Basset of Drayton, where he continued fighting intermittently for the rest of his life. On only one occasion in 1299 was he summoned to parliament, and two years later he is found acting as an M.P. for Warwickshire. By 1310 he had died leaving both his sons under age.<sup>2</sup> In 1290 John had married a future heiress, Ida, the eldest daughter of William Oddingseles of Maxstoke,<sup>3</sup> himself a household knight of Edward I, and it was to be through their mother that the young Clintons were taken to court. Ida was one of the five ladies of Queen Isabella in 1311-12 and both children, John then aged nine and William five, were with her as squires in the queen's household at least from 1309.<sup>4</sup> They had their own tutor, Elias de Bovill, the son of another of the queen's squires, Edmund de Bovill. A lady Elizabeth de Clinton, wife of Sir Ebulo de Montibus, possibly a sister, perhaps an aunt, was also regularly at court

---

1 Their main political connections were with the earls of Warwick. Earl Guy held the guardianship of John Clinton during his long minority from 1270-1290s. The exception was Geoffrey de Clinton who in the late eleventh century was Treasurer and Chamberlain under Henry I. D. Crouch, "Geoffrey de Clinton and Roger, Earl of Warwick : New Men and Magnates in the Reign of Henry I", B.I.H.R. LV (1982).

2 Liber Quotidianus, p.301. Charles Moor, Knights of Edward I, Vol.I, Harleian Society (London, 1923), p.215.

3 He died in May 1295 followed within three weeks by his only son Edmund. The estate including Maxstoke, Solihull, Merston, Arley and Buddebrock was divided among his four surviving daughters Ida, Ela, Alice and Margaret. C.I.P.M.III no.286.

4 Nero C.VIII fols. 16r, 39r. F.D. Blackley and G. Hermensen, The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England (Edmonton, 1971), pp.74-5, 156-7, 160-1. It may be that they served as attendants on their mother since the queen's ladies unlike her damsels did not receive livery for pages personally attendant on them. Ida married sometime prior to May 1336 an unknown knight called John de Steanuge. Cal. Pap. Regs. Letters II 1315-42, p.530.

during the 1320s.<sup>1</sup>

A childhood passed at court offered John and William opportunities not open to an earlier generation of Clintons. By means of staunch service and keen ambition plus good fortune William Clinton rose from a lowly position to the forefront of English nobility in less than ten years. The handful of glimpses of William prior to 1330 show him as a young man of strong drive and determination, perhaps to be explained by the knowledge that as a younger son he could expect to inherit nothing from his father's estates. Even when he died in 1354 he possessed of his paternal inheritance only a few tenements in Warwickshire which he held jointly with his brother's kin.<sup>2</sup>

Having family associations with the court was the strongest incentive to candidacy for recruitment. Younger sons followed brothers into the royal household, and heirs succeeded fathers. Such a network of personal ties ensured a selection of available talent in government service, and in some way obviated the lack of continuity among personnel. Families with an established place at court found it much easier to provide for cadets. In the exceptional cases like William Clinton, younger children were able to make fortunes for themselves far surpassing those inherited by their elder brothers. Some families might almost be termed household families, since members appear on household lists in generation after generation. It was into such families that William Montagu and Robert Ufford were born.

---

1 Thomas Stapleton, "A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts of the 10th, 11th and 14th Years of King Edward II", Archaeologia XXVI (1836), p.340 when the king paid £2 10s towards her expenses in travelling from Nottingham to Maxstoke. An Ebulo de Montibus was steward to Isabella in 1314, this Ebulo was perhaps his son. The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, (eds.) F.D. Blackley and G. Hermensen (Edmonton, 1971), pp.xii-xiii.

2 A moiety of a messuage, 1 carrucate, six acres of wood, four acres of meadow and 10s rent in Nether Whitacre. A moiety of a messuage in Arminon and a carrucate of land. A messuage and a carrucate in Kinnesbury, all of which he might have acquired after 1310.

As early as the reign of King John there was a William Montagu attached to the royal household, a connection begun apparently when John was count of Mortain. It was a career which ended in dismissal from royal service following his involvement in the rebellion of 1215. Henry III showed no favour to the Montagus, and neither William nor his son William displayed any political ambition thereafter.<sup>1</sup> A William Montagu, the great grandfather of the first earl of Salisbury, however, was a companion of the young Edward I "quando dominus Rex fuit bachelarius" fighting for him at a tournament held at Senlis.<sup>2</sup> His heir Simon was a knight in the household in the late 1280s and a vigorous soldier throughout an active military career which spanned thirty-five years. From 1282 at the latest to 1316 he was involved in holding down Wales. In June 1294 he was one of the few to answer summons to Gascony, where he stayed until 1297. By 1299 he was directing his energies against Scotland, and continued in the north intermittently for the rest of the reign. In 1307 and again in 1310 he was captain of the fleet against the Scots. He was still serving in the north in the winter of 1315, less than one year before he died.<sup>3</sup>

Simon's position at court was one of considerable influence, due in no small measure to his marriage with a member of Queen Eleanor of Castile's extended family kin, as part of the policy of family patronage pursued by the Queen. Simon was contracted in about October 1270 to Hawise, the sister of Almeric de

- 
- 1 R. Douch, The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury ?1301-1344, unpublished M.A. thesis, Southampton, (1950), pp.3-5.
  - 2 Benjamin F. Byerly and Catherine Ridder Byerly (eds.) Records of the Wardrobe and Household 1285-6 no.637. T.F. Tout in "The Communitas Bachelariae Angliae" in Collected Papers II, 282 considers that the bachelariae of England were the king's young household knights, squires and serjeants, distinguished by their energy and ambition.
  - 3 G.E.C. IX, 78-80; Charles Moor, Knights of Edward I, Vol.3, 166-167.

St. Amand, himself married to Marie, a cousin of the queen.<sup>1</sup> A generation later the Montagus were drawn still closer to the queen's family, when Simon granted the marriage of his own heir William to the queen, and she arranged for him to be allied to Elizabeth, a sister of John de Montfort of Normandy who had married another of the queen's distant cousins, Alice de la Plaunche.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, by the 1290s, the Montagus were part of a closely knit, inter-related group which surrounded the king and dominated court politics. William, the future earl of Salisbury's father, rode high in the favour both of Edward I and of Edward II, with whom he was knighted in 1306. Simon's role in government gave his son opportunities for service and contact with the household. It enabled William to be noticed and his abilities recognised.<sup>3</sup>

William, a valet in the royal household in 1299-1300,<sup>4</sup> began his personal service to Edward I in the Scottish wars with his father, serving from 1301 onwards. He seems to have been a perfectly competent soldier in a reign when military talent was not given much scope. Edward relied on him to put down the revolt of Llywelyn Bren in 1316. In 1314-15 he was described as "praefectus militiae Regis", apparently an official commission by right of which he was employed to lead the household troops to reimpose peace in Wales and to survey many royal castles.<sup>5</sup> Yet he was not universally popular. By 1317 he was one of the three men considered worse even than Gaveston. His appointment as steward

---

1 J. Carmi Parsons, The Court and Household of Queen Eleanor of Castile, 1290, (Toronto, 1977), pp.52ff.

2 Ibid., pp.50, 120. G.E.C.IX,82, however, has her as a daughter of Peter de Montfort of Beaudesert in Warwickshire and his wife Maud.

3 This extended to other members of the family. A John Montagu was sheriff of Somerset and Dorset in 1305-6 and a younger son Simon was M.P. in 1314.

4 Liber Quotidianus pp.321, 330.

5 G.E.C.IX,81n(d).

of the household in 1316 brought him close to Edward II's person and afforded many opportunities for both political and financial gain. A comparison of the numbers of gifts which went to Montagu and to the two other royal favourites at this time - Damory and Audley - shows that Montagu was second only to Damory in royal favour.<sup>1</sup> An effort to put a stop to this was organised in 1318 by less favoured members of the court circle, which resulted in Montagu's appointment as Seneschal of Aquitaine.<sup>2</sup> It proved effective, for Montagu died suddenly at Bordeaux in April 1319, leaving his next heir William and at least four children under age.

From the little that can be gathered, it seems that both his elder sons, John, and the future earl of Salisbury, were brought up in court. John, the eldest, was a squire in Queen Isabella's household from 1309 with an associate, probably his master, Edmund de Keynes.<sup>3</sup> His marriage, a sumptuous affair arranged at court by the king as a double wedding, took place at Windsor chapel in May 1317, when John was contracted to Mary, the daughter of Theobald de Verdon, while Hugh Audley, junior married Margaret, the widowed countess of Cornwall.<sup>4</sup> Within only four months, however, he had died and was buried on 14 August in Lincoln Cathedral with what appears to have been a degree of genuine grief on the part of Edward II.<sup>5</sup>

- 
- 1 J.R. Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster 1307-1322. A Study in the Reign of Edward II. (Oxford, 1970), p.194.
  - 2 J.R.S. Phillips, Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke 1307-1324, (Oxford, 1972), pp.136-177.
  - 3 Nero C.VIII fols. 16r, 39r. E101/376/10. F.D. Blackley and G. Hermensen, The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, pp.84-5, 180-1 when he was present 152 days. He would then be aged about twelve.
  - 4 Thomas Stapleton, "A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts of the 10th, 11th and 14th Years of King Edward II", Archaeologia XXVI (1836), p.337.
  - 5 Ibid., p.339. Edward II provided two pieces of raffata and one piece of Lucca cloth which was on the body. The king also paid for forty clerks to sing and thirteen widows to watch round the body, one days' provender for all friars preacher in Lincoln and a number of masses to be said in the cathedral for his soul's repose.

William, future earl of Salisbury, was a squire of Edward II by 1315 with a master William Bacoun.<sup>1</sup>

The Ufford family association with the royal household dated back to the 1240s through the first Robert Ufford's friendship with the lord Edward. In 1270-74 he went on Crusade with Edward and in 1274 he became one of the king's chief administrators and government agents. In 1276 he was appointed Justiciar of Ireland where he carried out his duties with notable efficiency if harshness, which did not endear him to the Irish. He was also Justice of Chester in 1276-77.<sup>2</sup> Naturally he and his family profitted considerably by royal service. In 1275-6 Edward I granted him custody of the town and castle of Orford, which was extended to life tenancy in 1280. Orford was an invaluable addition to his inheritance, being positioned in the centre of his Suffolk estates, and its possession increased his local influence to a position of extreme importance in the county. Edward I employed the Uffords as his chief government agents within Suffolk as successive grants of Orford to Robert's descendants indicate.<sup>3</sup> Robert's heir and the future earl of Suffolk's father remained in favour throughout his short career. In 1309 he was a member of Edward II's household.<sup>4</sup> He fought frequently in Scotland until his premature death in 1316.

The Uffords' service in the royal household brought its own rewards not only in grants of lands and other gifts but also in authority and increased purchasing power. These rewards extended to the marriage market where sometime during the 1290s Robert Ufford II secured the hand of a wealthy heiress and member of an

1 E101/376/7, fols. 15r, 16v.

2 R.J. Sutton, Robert Ufford: Tige des seigneurs de Poswick à la croix engréléé, (Olne, 1968).

3 G.E.C. XII, 150. Charles Moor, Knights of Edward I, 71.

4 Nero C.VIII fol.43r.

influential household family, Cecily de Valoignes. Of this marriage there were at least four children. The future earl of Suffolk was born on 9 August 1298. He was the second son of the family: an elder brother William born about 1297, survived into his mid teens, but predeceased his father sometime between 1312 and 1316.<sup>1</sup> Robert Ufford III was brought up as a ward in Edward II's household<sup>2</sup> and entered the king's service as a household knight sometime between July 1318 and July 1319.<sup>3</sup>

Thus all four men grew up within the court milieu, and by 1325 we find Montagu, Clinton and Ufford pursuing independent careers. As the oldest of the four men, Robert Ufford had established a firmer pattern, and we find him until 1325 almost entirely concerned with his own domestic affairs. His father's death in 1316 left Robert, still under age, the heir of a small but comfortable inheritance in East Anglia based on the manors of Bawdsey and Ufford and the surrounding hamlets at Petistre, Wykeham, Wyles and Benges. A rough estimate of the value of these properties based on the dower portion assigned to Ufford's widow puts Ufford's wealth in landed inheritance in 1316 at about £100-£120 per annum.<sup>4</sup> This he was granted seisin of in May 1318.<sup>5</sup> But it was not until Ufford was granted livery of his mother's more considerable estates on her death in the summer of 1325 that he became powerful enough to pursue a successful career as one

---

1 C.I.P.M. Vol.VI, no.58.

2 Thomas Stapleton, "A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts of the 10th, 11th, and 14th Years of King Edward II", Archaeologia XXVI, 341 with John Ferrers, John Lestrangle and Richard Cogan.

3 B.L. Add. MS. 17, 362, fols. 55v, 60v.

4 C.I.P.M. I, 146.

5 C.C.R.1313-18, p.542.

of the chief magnates of the region. In particular his mother's inheritance, almost equal that received from his father, brought to Ufford the manors of Heckling in Norfolk and Perham and Combes in Suffolk.<sup>1</sup> Robert Ufford was with the king in France in 1320<sup>2</sup> but apparently left court the following year, a move which enabled him to avoid any crisis of loyalties in the revolution of 1326. His first appearance after the revolution which deposed Edward II was in his capacity as local magnate and commissioner of the peace for Norfolk and Suffolk. In 1327 he was appointed one of the commissioners to mediate in the disputes at Bury St. Edmund's between the Abbey and the townsfolk.<sup>3</sup>

In May 1324 he went to Gascony with the earl of Kent, and was abroad until at least August 1325.<sup>4</sup> In August and September 1326 he was involved in raising a fleet in Suffolk, to oppose Isabella's invasion forces. Royal defence measures were entrusted only to those believed totally reliable, a mistaken belief in this as in so many cases.<sup>5</sup> Certainly Ufford could not have remained entirely uninvolved; Isabella chose to land at Walton-on-the-Naze, close to Ufford's own estates, and this may have affected his actions in the winter of 1326-7. There is no evidence to the contrary that Ufford was not completely loyal to Edward II, nor any indication that he was regarded with suspicion by Mortimer and Isabella. But the silence respecting his whereabouts and actions over the next three years points to a need to work to regain political favour before he could return to court.

---

1 C.I.P.M. Edward II, Volume VI, 686.

2 B.L. Add. MS. 17, 362, fol. 55v, 60v.

3 C.P.R. 1327-30, p.425.

4 C.F.R. 1319-1327. Vol.III, 358.

5 Parl. Writs. II, 759 (18); N. Saul, "The Despensers and the Downfall of Edward II", E.H.R. (1984), Vol.XLIX, p.30.

In 1324 Ufford was married to Margaret, the widow of William de Cailly. She was the daughter of Sir Walter Norwich, the treasurer until 1329 and a baron of the exchequer, to whom Ufford's marriage had been granted by Edward II in 1317.<sup>1</sup> This marriage was made with an eye to his inheritance. Thomas Cailly had died in 1324 leaving his widow dower in a third of an estate which included lands in Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Hampshire, Sussex and Norfolk, with its main centre the three Norfolk manors of Hildburghworth, Buckenham and Babbingle. Ufford already had control of these manors through wardship of Adam de Clifton, Cailly's heir, until he proved his age in December 1328.<sup>2</sup> But, more significant for Ufford, Walter Norwich's influence at court under Mortimer's rule was considerable. It was this connection which precipitated Ufford's return to court in the winter of 1328-29 at a time when the mounting fears and suspicions of Mortimer and Isabella were confining attendance at court to an increasingly tighter clique of confidants.

At the time of his brother's death William Montagu was already a member of Edward II's household. When his father died, he was granted custody of his estates during his minority in 1320 and received livery in February 1323.<sup>3</sup> For the next five years domestic concerns occupied his full attention, in an attempt to collect outstanding debts due to his father. At the time of Montagu's departure for Gascony, he was owed large sums from numerous commissions and keeperships undertaken over the preceding decade. £18 due from the time when he acted as farmer of the town of Chichester was still outstanding in December 1318, as was a similar debt of nearly £20 from his period as keeper of Rochester. This account was finally settled in August 1326.<sup>4</sup> As Seneschal of Gascony, Montagu was owed

---

1 Tout, Chapters III, 38 n1, 46; C.P.R. 1313-17, p.620. E101/384/7; E404/2/file 9.

2 C.I.P.M. Edward III Volume III, 166.

3 C.C.R. 1318-1323, p.629.

4 C.C.R. 1318-1323, p.49. Cal. Mem. Rolls pp.188, 839. Joseph Bain (ed.), Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, nos. 400, 458.

a fee of 2000 l.t. with an additional 5000 l.t. for extra costs and expences. Part of this additional 5000 l.t. was paid but the rest remained outstanding even in July 1326.<sup>1</sup> William also encountered difficulty in squaring his father's accounts at the exchequer for the keepership of Berwick in 1314-15. In the process costs and expenses for royal commissions dating from 1314-1318 were brought up as still unsettled.<sup>2</sup> Frequent hitches and postponements dragged on until the fall of Edward II's regime in the Autumn of 1326. It was not until the Summer of 1327 that outstanding debts totalling £149 12s 6¾d were allowed William in his father's accounts and not until 11 July of that year that he finally received quittance of his father's debts.<sup>3</sup>

As a result of these financial difficulties, Montagu's advent at court was delayed and it was not until some four years after his father's death that his name re-appears on household lists. Montagu did not go to France with Edward II in 1320, though he received a protection to go in July of that year.<sup>4</sup> He was at court in 1322 and was issued with a new livery as a squire of Edward II, fighting with the household troops in August and September in Scotland. He remained in the north on household business until the end of September.<sup>5</sup> In September 1325 he received a second protection for going overseas in Edward's retinue but again did not leave England.<sup>6</sup> He was in England in December 1325 when he was described

1 C.C.R. 1323-27, p.587. Cal. Mem. Rolls pp.33, 114, 117.

2 E101/382/19. C.C.R. 1323-27 pp.440-441.

3 C.P.R. 1327-30, p.147. Cal. Mem. Rolls pp.289, 847.

4 B.L. Add. MS. 17, 362. C.P.R. 1317-21 p.452.

5 Stowe 553 fol.58v, 104r, 106v. He does not appear on household lists for the two preceding years.

6 See E101/380/10. F.D. Blackley, "Queen Isabella and the Bishop of Exeter", in Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson (eds.) T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969).

as "king's yeoman".<sup>1</sup> On 19 April 1326 he was knighted in London as a banneret by the hand of William de Langeford, one of his retainers,<sup>2</sup> with eighteen other men. If by a gesture of mass knighting Edward hoped to gain renewed support for his regime at a point of acute political crisis, he did not succeed. When the revolutionary forces landed in September 1326 Montagu was swift to submit to the queen, entering the Duke's service along with four of the new knights of April.<sup>3</sup> By the end of 1326, Montagu had become a member of the young Duke's personal establishment. About this time he was also appointed sheriff of Somerset and Dorset, though he never submitted accounts for his tenure of office and apparently acted through a deputy.<sup>4</sup>

Caution in committing himself to the queen's side in 1325, uncharacteristic of Montagu's known decisiveness, may explain the lack of influence Montagu possessed in government during the next few years. It may be that Montagu was aware from the outset of Isabella's liaison with Mortimer and the direction of the queen's thoughts, and felt unable to commit himself to open rebellion. In which case Montagu's leading role in the plotting against Mortimer in 1330 is more indicative of his thinking. If Montagu was consistently opposed to the queen's actions, though unable in 1326 to do more than go along with the rest of the household knights in deserting to the side of the victors, he nevertheless took the first opportunity to overthrow the new regime four years later. This

---

1 C.C.R. 1323-27 p.440. Mildred Campbell, The English Yeoman under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts (New Haven, 1942), pp. 78, 392-4 discusses the origin of the term yeoman and suggests that, like bachelor, its primary meaning was military and meant simply young man, but that in the fourteenth century it was used to indicate office holding. It was certainly not used exclusively for the lower class of officials. John de Clinton was described as yeoman in 1332 although he was a knight.

2 W.A. Shaw, Knights of England I, 123-24.

3 E361/9 rot.1.

4 N. Saul, "The Despensers and the Downfall of Edward II", E.H.R. LXIX (1984) p.18.

squares with what little is known of Montagu's actions over the period of Edward III's minority. The evidence of patronage, just two small grants in July and December 1327, reveals a young knight serving daily in the royal household with no particular influence in government. He took part in the Stanhope Park campaign in 1327 and remained firmly with the court party in the winter of 1328-29 when the earl of Lancaster went into open opposition, evidently with an eye to winning the support and confidence of the young king. The increasing number of grants to Montagu and his regular appearance as a witness to charters demonstrates that in this he was eminently successful. It is clear that by 1330 Montagu had captured almost a monopoly of Edward's friendship and trust.

As a hated royal favourite, how much wealth had Montagu's father accumulated to pass on to his heir? The value of the ancient family inheritance had been augmented during the years of the Montagus' prominence at court by two lifetimes of service to the crown. To an ancient nucleus of manors in the West Country centred on the powerbase created by Drogo de Montagu at the time of the Conquest in Breddon, Donyate, Thurlebeare, Cricket Malherbe, Sutton Shepton, Thorne, North Cadbury and Adber in Trent<sup>1</sup> had been added several valuable estates. Most notable of these were Chedzoy, Goathill and Yarlington. Chadzoy alone was worth £100 per annum, and these three manors comprised as much as 40% of Montagu's income in 1319.<sup>2</sup> Also in Somerset he had acquired the manor of Loterford and lands and interests in Cokermill, Clayhanger, Bromheld, Woolston and Crawthorn. The family now owned a few manors in the neighbouring counties of Dorset and Devon. Winford and a few knights fees in Clyst Gerard and Fineton in Devon, plus the manor of Loveford, and rents in Puddletown and Lullworth and lands in

---

1 V.C.H. Somerset. Vol.I, 474-483.

2 Robert Douch, The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury ?1301-1344 (unpublished M.A. thesis, Southampton, 1950) pp.91-94.

Swere and Newton Purbeck. They had also acquired certain lands outside the West Country: Aston Clinton (Bucks), Cassington and lands in Oxford (Oxons), Saxlingham (Norfolk), Wendover and Dunridge in Aston (Bucks) and Baumber (Lincs), as well as certain lands in Cumberland forfeited by rebels to Edward II. In all his estates were estimated as worth about £300 per annum. William gained control of his inheritance on 24 January 1321 shortly before he attained his majority, and received issues due from these lands two years later.

Of these a high proportion remained in the hands of his mother, who outlived the earl by ten years. Elizabeth Montagu was granted dower of her husband's estates in two parts in May 1320 and March 1321. The division of lands was carried out with good sense, Elizabeth being conceded mainly those manors outside the West Country - Cassington, Aston Clinton, and tenements in Wendover and Dunridge in Aston with a further £31 3s 5d coming from rents in Lullworth and Chedzoy. The total was made up with Goathill and the ancient manor of Thurlbeare. The rest consisted of knights fees in Somerset and Dorset leased out to various tenants and £24 6s 8d in advowsons. In all the dower portion was worth some £91 7s. The choice of dower portion in Montagu's case was limited by the fact that it excluded all lands which Elizabeth held jointly with his father and all the lands which the couple had received by royal grant. Thus she kept from Montagu Saxlingham, Bamburgh, and land in Oxford, Langley, Dunrig in Aston and all the contrariant estates in Cumberland.

In 1328 Montagu married Katherine Grandisson one of the five daughters of William Grandisson, younger brother of the more famous Otto, friend of Edward I. The marriage was made with little eye to territorial considerations but with concern for local and family connections. William Grandisson had built up a sizeable inheritance in the West Country with the help of his brother Otto. This he augmented by his marriage with the West Country heiress Sybil, daughter

of John de Tregoz of Lydiard, Wilts and Burnham, Somerset. Many of their ten children settled in the West Country. A daughter Agnes married a local knight John de Northwood. A son Otto married into the Malmayns family. John their second son became bishop of Exeter, and another son a canon of Salisbury and Wells. That this connection was important to Montagu is revealed in the close relationship between bishop John and his brother-in-law. The bishop frequently acted as Montagu's attorney in an unofficial capacity. In early 1328, Otto de Grandisson, although aged at least 90, still had powerful friends at court and was willing to advance his nephews and their kin in the world. In addition Katherine's eldest brother Peter had married into the Mortimer family, an important consideration to Montagu, concerned to advance his career at court in the days of Mortimer's ascendancy. This connection may also help explain Montagu's position of relative confidence with Mortimer before 1330. Thus Montagu secured through Katherine powerful connections at court.

Montagu's and Ufford's experiences during the 1320s illustrate how a trusted household retainer whose loyalty was never seriously questioned could transfer his allegiance from one side to another without harming his career. Membership of the royal household was more a matter of mutual convenience than of long-term obligation on either side. The turnover in personnel was rapid and, although many of the king's knights did live permanently at court for many years, and a few chose to devote a lifetime to royal service, there was rarely any necessity to do so. On the contrary, for many knights the connections with court were loose and relaxed. The upper members of the semi-permanent court circle tended to come and go almost at will, and often a period of as much as ten years absence would connect two periods of residence in the royal household.

The career of William Clinton under Mortimer and Isabella, however, exemplifies the rewards to be gained by the ambitious young man who attached himself conspicuously

to the winning side in a crisis. Both Clinton brothers were with the royal troops at Boroughbridge.<sup>1</sup> William was knighted in 1324 and summoned to serve in Gascony in 1325 although he did not go.<sup>2</sup> In March 1325, however, he went overseas in the entourage of Queen Isabella. Unlike other members of her entourage he did not desert the queen in the winter of 1325-6, but remained with her for the next eighteen months sharing her self-imposed exile and working actively for her return.<sup>3</sup> By 1326 William had so far won the queen's trust and gratitude as to be promoted one of her bannerets and promised lands worth £200, while his elder brother was still only a knight bachelor in the duke's household.<sup>4</sup> He was with the forces which landed with Isabella in September 1326 and remained closely at her side throughout their pursuit and eventual capture of Edward II in Wales. In gratitude, the queen immediately made good her promises made overseas, granting him the custodianship of Halton in Cheshire in September 1327 and a life interest in two other manors.<sup>5</sup> For the first two years of the reign Clinton's status as the queen mother's chief banneret gave him a very prominent position at court. He was constantly attendant on the royal household and frequently represented Isabella in pursuit of her private interests or escorted important visitors about the country,<sup>6</sup> a position which he went on swiftly to consolidate by means of a judicious marriage at court.

In August-September 1328 Clinton made one of the catches of the decade when he married Julianade Leyburn, only daughter of sir Thomas de Leyburn, known as the "Infanta of Kent". Julianawas a triple heiress with fortunes due from her

---

1 Parl. Writs. II, 200, 187.

2 Parl. Writs. II i, pp.640, 701.

3 E101/380/10.

4 E361/9 rot. 1. John remained a household knight until his death in 1335.

5 C.P.R. 1324-27 pp.170, 174.

6 C.I.P.M. Edward III Vol. VII, 89. Cal. Mem. Rolls p.187. C.C.R. 1327-30, pp.410, 411.

grandfather William de Leyburn, her grandmother, Juliana de Sandwich and from her mother, Alice de Tony. Her father had died in 1307 when Julian was less than three years old, leaving the child the only heiress to the entire Leyburn inheritance.<sup>1</sup> The Leyburn family had profitted considerably by service in the royal household. William's father, Roger, caught up in the barons revolt, later joined the lord Edward and regained favour under Henry III. For services in helping restore order after 1265 Roger gained twenty two manors in Kent with lands in a further 11 manors plus temporary control of at least another twelve manors scattered throughout the rest of England from Shropshire to Essex and from Cumbria to Sussex, mostly forfeited by rebels.<sup>2</sup> By the early fourteenth century the whole of the Leyburn estates lay in Kent, the heart of which comprised a fairly compact group of manors lying about midway between Maidstone and Canterbury and somewhat to the south, with a further scattering of holdings to the east, along the north coast and within the isle of Thanet. Thus Julian became heiress to a quite sizeable fortune which she eventually inherited in 1310 on the death of her grandfather. She was still then only six years old.

From her grandmother and namesake Juliana inherited further lands in 1328. Juliana de Sandwich was daughter and heiress to sir Henry de Sandwich and also heiress to her grandfather Simon and her uncle Ralph de Sandwich from whom she received Preston and various other manors.<sup>3</sup> In addition to the lands she held jointly with her husband, Juliana received on her grandmother's death the manors of Easling and Godwinston, plots of land in Heriadsham and Dannington in Kent and the manor of Winchfield in Hampshire. Of even greater value was Juliana's inheritance through her mother, Alice de Tony. Within two months of the death of her grandfather, the death of Juliana's uncle, Robert de Tony, without issue,

---

1 G.E.C. Vol.VII, 637.

2 Alun Lewis, "Roger de Leyburn and the Pacification of England 1265-7"  
E.H.R. LIV (1939) p.196.

3 C.P.R. 1258-66 p.465.

brought to his sister ten manors scattered throughout southern England and along the Welsh Marches, together with the strategically important castles of Painscastle and Colvent, part of which came to Juliana in 1325. In all, by the time of Clinton's death in 1354 he had control of twenty seven manors in Kent and Hampshire of Juliana's inheritance.

Juliana's marriage in 1328 to Clinton was not her first. With her Clinton received a substantial dower portion from two other marriages. Juliana was first married at least as early as 1321 to John de Hastings, nephew of her guardian Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke. Hastings was an extremely wealthy young man and co-heir to his childless uncle of Pembroke. He lived only until January 1325, leaving his widow dower in lands that included five manors in Warwickshire, three in Sussex, two in Surrey, Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire and in Suffolk, Norfolk, Wiltshire, Hampshire, Dorset, Shropshire, Leicestershire, Worcestershire, the castles of Abergavenny and Cilgerran with the towns of Cilgerran and Maynard as well as lands and tenements scattered throughout Wales and the length and breadth of England.<sup>1</sup> Within a few months she had remarried. Of her second husband little is known. Thomas le Blount was lord of Tibberton in Gloucestershire and seemingly a client of Henry of Leicester. He was however, steward of the household of Edward II from May 1325 until his formal resignation of the office in January 1327. He was dead by 17 August 1328. So by the time Clinton snapped her up less than one month later she was worth a considerable fortune. To a penniless younger son she brought a large, consolidated powerbase in Kent and a scattering of manors and lands throughout the south of England and Wales. On his death, thirty-eight of a total of forty four manors held in chief had come to him by right of his wife.<sup>2</sup> Clinton was fully aware of the value of his standing of such an inheritance and acknowledged this new position by quitting his native Warwickshire and establishing

---

1 C.I.P.M. Edward II Vol.VI no.612.  
 2 C.I.P.M. Edward III Vol.X no.193.

his household at Sutton Valence and at Upchurch in Kent.<sup>1</sup> His revenues from these lands he was gradually to supplement over the course of his career in government service with fees, grants and offices by virtue of royal grant.

Of equal value to Clinton were the wealthy and influential kin of his wife. Juliana was extremely well connected. Though there were no Leyburns or Tonys with the exception of an uncle Henry de Leyburn who was childless and wielded little personal authority,<sup>2</sup> there were a number of important relatives by marriage. Shortly after the death of her husband Juliana's mother married Guy, earl of Warwick by whom she had three children - Thomas, born 1314, John and Alice. Thus Juliana was half sister to the future earl of Warwick who was to play such a prominent part in Edward III's wars. Guy died in August 1315 and shortly afterwards Alice contracted a third marriage with William la Zouche of Mortimer by whom she had a fifth child, Alan, eventual heir to the le Zousche barony, born in 1317. Juliana, brought up by her grandmother in Kent and very much older than her half brothers and sister, probably did not maintain close relations with them, but with her own son and only child Lawrence Hastings, she was always very close. Born on 20 March 1320, Lawrence was only five at his father's death. He was an important royal ward as heir not only to the Hastings estates but also to half of the earldom of Pembroke, and his wardship was seized first by the younger Despenser and then by Roger Mortimer. In 1333, however, he was sent to live with his mother and Clinton as Edward was unwilling for him to make the hazardous journey north to Scotland with the court and believed that he would be better off with his natural mother.<sup>3</sup> He remained with Clinton until he attained livery of his estates, still under age, in 1339, and even after he had succeeded to the earldom of Pembroke, Lawrence retained close personal connections with his mother and Clinton.

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-1333, pp. 23, 365.  
2 C.I.P.M. Edward II Vol.VII 180.  
3 G.E.C. VI, 351; C.C.R. 1333-37, p.33.

The events of the revolution of 1326-7 were so important to the subsequent careers of Clinton, Ufford, Montagu and Bohun that they will be examined in some detail. The joint household set up between Edward and Isabella in the aftermath of the deposition of Edward II was never stable. The brief unanimity of feeling which had united the country against Edward II in the latter months of 1326 rapidly dissolved. Old rivalries quickly manifested themselves, magnified in the rift which opened between the earls of March and Leicester in 1328. Even within the royal household rivalries and suspicions were apparent in repeated changes in key personnel. Mortimer's supporters placed spies everywhere and Edward later complained that John Wyard had been set about him to spy on his activities. By the autumn of 1329 Edward was so discontented that he arranged with the Pope for a secret sign by which to distinguish his personal wishes with regard to the members of his household from those imposed on him by his mother and Mortimer.

The unhappy state which existed in the royal household in 1327-30 coloured and shaped the attitudes of the king and his followers for the remainder of the reign and taught Edward lessons he was never to forget. The memory of this period formed a strong undercurrent to all future events as his ministers strove to avoid the mistakes of that government and those of their predecessors under Edward II. The bold stroke by which Edward was able to throw off the yoke of Isabella and Mortimer created a bond of loyalty among the participants having roots deeper than the mere pursuit of material advantage, which survived even the bad years of frustrating inactivity between 1338 and 1340. Even during the years of distrust, Edward's special qualities were winning him the loyalty of a small group of his household knights, chief among whom were the four subjects of this study. Finally, in October 1330 in a meeting of Council held at Nottingham they were driven to take action. Discussion on the fate of the duchy of Aquitaine was hampered by feelings of mutual distrust between Mortimer's supporters and the friends of the king. At length Mortimer lost patience and openly accused the

young men of the household of plotting against him. It was Montagu who saved the day. When questioned he replied, boldly challenging Mortimer to find anything in his conduct that was inconsistent with his duty. Immediately the council meeting had broken up he sought out the king and represented to him the urgent need to act or lose the initiative. He told Edward succinctly that it was better to eat dog than be eaten by it.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, on the night of 19 October a considerable body of household retainers rode out of Nottingham at different times intending to meet up at a particular thicket in the park below the castle walls. Unfortunately in the dark many missed the spot and eventually it was a very much depleted force which decided to go ahead with the operation. So Montagu and John Neville, with just twenty four other men including the Bohun brothers, William Latimer, Robert Ufford, William Clinton, John Molyneux, Thomas West and Roger Swinnerton, stealthily crossed the park, entered the castle by a prearranged plan and, led by Edward himself fell on Mortimer and his followers within the royal apartments and seized them.<sup>2</sup>

The major accomplices of the king in this coup were amply rewarded. In the parliament of 1330-31 which met to secure the commons assent to the execution of Mortimer and his adherents, the assembled peers and commons were induced to honour William Montagu "que autres pur lui mielz servir en temps a venir peoient prendre ensample" and agreed that it was fitting he should receive 1000 marks worth of lands which had escheated from Mortimer. So in consideration of his good and loyal behaviour to the king and for future services he was duly rewarded. At the same time Robert Ufford was granted 300 marks per annum, and Edward Bohun and John

---

1 Scalacronica, p.157. Although the events of the night of 19 October 1330 were planned and executed hurriedly within a few hours, evidence that Montagu's concern for Edward to break free of the tutelage of Mortimer and Isabella may be found in a document printed in G.L. Crump, "The Arrest of Roger Mortimer and Queen Isabel" E.H.R. XXVI (1911) pp.331-332.

2 Chronicon Galfridi le Baker, p.28; Joshua Barnes, The History of that Most Victorious Monarch Edward III (Cambridge, 1688) pp.46-48.

Neville 400 marks and 200 marks respectively.<sup>1</sup> The king's household was pruned heavily, many of Mortimer's supporters being dismissed or disgraced, while Edward surrounded himself only by those whose loyalty he could trust implicitly. This loyalty Edward continued to feed over the decade of joint military venture in Scotland and France till he had succeeded in building his household into a large band of knights in arms entirely and absolutely committed to his cause.

The heart of the territories thus conceded to Montagu was the Lordship and Honour of Denbigh, one of the largest and most valuable territorial units of the fourteenth century. A survey made in 1334 for Montagu showed that the net profits for that year totalled over £1000.<sup>2</sup> His rewards thus immediately placed him at the very forefront of English nobility. Thomas Gray ends his account of the coup with the comment:

He moved [Edward] to good and honour and love of arms,  
and so passed the early years until a better time came  
for yet greater deeds.<sup>3</sup>

Because of his extreme youth, William Bohun took little part in the events of 1326-30. His career in the royal household even during the 1330s was muted, overshadowed at least until the winter of 1334-5 by the more spectacular career of his brother Edward who maintained a very close friendship with the king. William's initial appearance on the household lists in 1330 as a banneret was shortlived. Four years later he was listed as a simple knight probably because he found the costs of maintaining banneret status just too great, though he apparently resumed banneret status shortly afterwards with Edward's support.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Rot. Parl. II, 56-57.

2 A Survey of the Honour of Denbigh, 1334 (eds.) P. Vindogradoff and F. Morgan, British Academy (London, 1914).

3 Scalacronica p.158.

4 E403/259 m25. He was not the only banneret who suffered an apparent demotion of rank. John Quatremarcs, a banneret of the duke's household in 1326-7, was listed as a knight bachelor in 1329.

Until 1335 William's financial position was modest. The earl of Hereford had begun to endow his fourth surviving son with lands during William's infancy, until his death in 1322. In 1311 and 1312 the earl made a series of purchases from a William de Merk of Essex in the vicinity of Pleshy which included the manors of Margaret Roding, Berners Roding and Roding Mercy as well as tenements in East Lee. Further lands were added to these over the next ten years. In May 1315 he was given permission to enfeof William with lands held jointly by himself and his wife Elizabeth: the reversion of a messuage with 140 acres of land, 4 acres of meadow and 20s rent in Tillebrock, Dene, Portenhale, the manor of Hardwick (Beds), the manor of Swinshead and the advowson of the church there (Hunts).<sup>1</sup> At his death, William was found to hold in his own right the manors of Knesdale (Notts), Henton (Berks), 5 manors in Oxfordshire, 8 manors and various tenements in Essex, 2 manors in Suffolk, the town of Wycomb in Bucks and the major part of three other manors in Lincolnshire.<sup>2</sup>

Sometime in 1335 Bohun married Elizabeth Badlesmere, the third of the four sisters and co-heiresses of the childless Giles Badlesmere. Through her he was to gain control of a quarter of the vast Badlesmere estates for life. When the division of the estates was made in 1338 on Giles' death, Bohun's share was valued at £237 5s 4d in Wiltshire, Rutland, Shropshire and Kent.<sup>3</sup> Of more immediate interest was the wealth that this heiress brought with her in the form of dower from a previous marriage. Much documentary evidence has survived from this previous union to indicate exactly how her second husband was to profit by it.<sup>4</sup> In May 1316, by arranging her marriage to Edmund Mortimer, Elizabeth's father Bartholemew Badlesmere had united himself with that already powerful

---

1 G. Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England, (Cambridge, 1957) p.19. C.P.R. 1313-17 p.278.

2 C.I.P.M. Edward III Vol.X, 639.

3 C.C.R. 1339-41, pp.282-283. Giles' widow was William Montagu's daughter Elizabeth.

4 G. Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility, pp.121-122.

marcher family - a union which was to have strong political implications when Badlesmere deserted the court party in the summer of 1321 and allied himself with the marcher lords against the king. The marriage was advantageous to both parties, for at the time of its contract Edmund was heir to two large fortunes, and Badlesmere a confidant of the king and a great influence at court. 2000 marks were offered for her portion, to be paid in four equal sums over two years. In return Roger Mortimer arranged to re-eneof all his lands with reversion to Edmund and Elizabeth and to their offspring, a re-arrangement of the tenure intended to secure the Mortimer-Geneville lands to the family and its descendants and to prevent Roger from dissipating them to the detriment of Elizabeth and her husband. Elizabeth was also given a jointure worth 500 marks for life by her father-in-law, 200 marks of which was bound up in the reversion of rents held by Edmund's grandmother, Margaret de Fiennes. The remaining 300 marks consisted of the five manors of Stratfield Mortimer (Berks), Cleobury, Earnwood, Arley, and Bisley. About Christmas 1331, barely more than a year after Roger's execution, Edmund died leaving his young widow a comfortable dower which included the castle, town and cantref of Maelienydd and Commote Deuddwr on the Welsh Border and various manors in England and Wales, as well as her jointure lands. Thus the outstanding 200 marks of the jointure promised by Roger Mortimer never came to the possession of her first husband, for Margaret Fiennes survived her son and grandson, living until 1334. The following year Elizabeth married William Bohun and the money passed straight into the control of her second husband. Elizabeth predeceased Bohun. But even widowhood did not serve to deprive him of large parts of his wife's fortune. On his own death in 1360 he was found still to be in control of over 100 acres of land in Chatham in Kent, rents there and in Hatchsham (Surrey) and the manors of Hameldon (Rutland), lands in Thaxstead in Essex and Gussich in Dorset in right of his wife's dower.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 C.I.P.M. Edward III Vol. X, 639.

Through his wife, William also gathered several more valuable connections. Elizabeth's three sisters all made good marriages: Matilda to the earl of Oxford, Marjery to William Ros, and Margaret to John Tibetot. More important was the Mortimer connection. Elizabeth had two children by her first husband. Roger the heir who was born in 1328 and a second son John who died in infancy.<sup>1</sup> Roger was always to maintain close relations with his mother and her husband. Bohun administered Wigmore castle and its apputenances during Roger's minority, and it was he who petitioned the king that they should be returned to Roger in 1342. After Roger's restoration to his grandfather's earldom in 1354, he continued to work in close harmony with the earl of Northampton, until the latter's death in 1360.

William Bohun was not the only knight to share a career at court with his brothers and kin. The obligation to provide for younger members of the family by the establishment of separate appanages for siblings and children could prove a heavy drain on resources and had to be balanced by the desire to maintain the integrity of the inheritance. A solution to this problem was open to members of the court circle through service in one of the royal households. When Montagu succeeded to his estates in 1319 he was immediately faced with the problem of two younger brothers. Simon, destined by his parents for a career in the church, had received his first benefice in 1317 when he was about fifteen years old.<sup>2</sup> In 1329 he became a king's clerk, and in June of that year Montagu secured for him the archdeaconry of Wells and, a year later a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 G.E.C. Vol.IX p.284.

2 C.P.R. 1317-21 p.15.

3 Foedera II ii p.759; C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.403, 450.

From there his rise in the ecclesiastical world was swift, with another prebend in the Cathedral church at Lincoln in 1332, and the bishopric of Worcester in 1333.<sup>1</sup> In 1337 he was translated to the much richer see of Ely. William did try to secure for him the bishopric of Winchester and failure to do so led to Edward's fierce quarrel with bishop Orleton in 1334.<sup>2</sup>

William's generosity towards Simon proved invaluable. The brothers worked together in government throughout their relatively short careers. Simon proved to be an able administrator, serving royal interests in England while his brother was absent on the continent or in Scotland with the king. Simon also frequently undertook the management of William's private affairs and those of his family. In 1344 he set up a sort of trust fund for their sister Hawise to provide for her maintenance and that of her children when she fled from her husband.<sup>3</sup> By both clergy and people of his dioceses he was regarded with respect and affection.<sup>4</sup>

The youngest brother, Edward, a squire in the household in 1330, eventually rose to become a knight and a banneret in 1337 and fought as a household knight in the campaigns of the 1340s.<sup>5</sup> William's fraternal generosity is less evident than with Simon; Edward's youth and turbulent disposition meant that they had little in common. The course of Edward's career may be charted by a series of violent crimes which made him notorious in East Anglia. Together with an accomplice, William Dunche, Edward Montagu maintained a racket over a number of years which consisted in stealing cattle and then "selling" them back to their owners for heavy bribes, activity which intensified during the 1340s and 1350s after the death of

- 
- 1 B.L. Royal MS. 12D, xi fol.21. Copy of letter to the Pope thanking him for the transfer of Simon from Worcester to Ely.
  - 2 R.M. Haines, The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the first half of the Fourteenth Century (London, 1965) p.81.
  - 3 C.C.R. 1343-1346 pp.456, 506.
  - 4 R. Douch, The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury ?1301-1344, p.153.
  - 5 Cal. Mem. Rolls 1326-1327, 2271(v). G.E.C. IX, 84.

his two elder brothers doubtless removed a restraining influence.<sup>1</sup> Edward's adventures were at best an embarrassment to William, and at worst they threatened his own position.

By the 1330s Montagu also had his own growing family to consider. Not unnaturally the new generation of Montagus were also brought up in court, trained from the beginning for a lifetime of service to the crown. Montagu's eldest son, William was already a recognised member of the court circle in 1332.<sup>2</sup> In 1338 both William and John, the two sons of the earl of Salisbury, figure among the children in the household of the Duke of Cornwall, with whom they were of an age.<sup>3</sup> John was still a member of the prince's household in 1354,<sup>4</sup> and remained closely associated with the prince's household and family even after 1376. He was steward under Richard II between 1381 and 1386, and his son John became one of Richard II's chamber knights.<sup>5</sup>

In Robert Ufford's wake followed five other members of the Ufford family. His two brothers were both recruited into Edward's service, Ralph as a knight, Edmund as a squire.<sup>6</sup> At this stage Ralph's wealth and influence outstripped that of Robert, following his marriage in about 1326 to the ex-countess of Ulster. He was to rise to become a household banneret in 1341 and Justiciar of Ireland 1344-46.<sup>7</sup> Edmund became a knight of the household in 1334 and remained one until 1339. John Ufford, most probably a cousin descended through Thomas, the younger

---

1 G.E.C. Vol.IX, 85; R. Douch, The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury ?1301-1344, p.157.

2 Galba EIII fol.186r.

3 E101/388/12. William was born in 1328 and John in 1330.

4 Tout Chapters V, 344-45n.

5 K.B. McFarlane, Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights (Oxford, 1972), pp.167-68.

6 Cal. Mem. Rolls p.378.

7 E36/204 fol.86r.R. Frame, "The Justiciarship of Ralph Ufford : Warfare and Politics in Fourteenth Century Ireland", Studia Hibernica 13 (1973), pp.7-47.

son of Robert Ufford I, was a knight in the royal household in 1319-20 and a knight of Edward III in 1330.<sup>1</sup> In 1331 he was appointed during pleasure to the custody of Rindown Castle, Ireland for service to the three Edwards.<sup>2</sup> Another John and Robert were squires. The earl of Suffolk's heir, Robert, became a squire in the royal household in 1334 and was knighted in 1338; he rose to become a household banneret in the campaign of 1339.<sup>3</sup> During the period 1338-40 there were six members of the Ufford family in the king's household in the Low Countries at the same time. As well as the earl of Suffolk and his son Robert, John, Ralph, and Edmund were king's knights, and John a clerk was acting as royal proctor at the Curia.

Many other of the lesser magnate families had at least two representatives at court. For the decade between 1330 and 1340 similar examples can be cited among the Zouches, Beauchamps, Ferrers, Ros, Nevilles, Lucys, Daubneys, Talbots and Greys. Family traditions of household service helped foster a sense of loyalty to the crown and a spirit of dedication to government service. Training, begun in early childhood or youth, would be rigorous and thorough. It would produce singleminded and effective royal agents upon whom the king could rely implicitly, providing as Sir John Fortescue in the 1460s considered, the chief academy of the nobility and offering an unparalleled training in "athletics, moral integrity and good manners". Sending offspring away to court for their education broadened their horizons and increased their proficiency in arms and the attributes of noble courtly behaviour.<sup>4</sup>

Ties between members of the "familia Regis" were further strengthened by the drift to court of the women of the more important household families. In

---

1 B.M. Add. MS. 9951; Cal. Mem. Rolls, p.378.

2 C.P.R. 1330-34, p.144.

3 E101/387/9.

4 Nicholas Orme, "The Education of the Courtier" in English Court Culture, pp.65, 72-3.

household ordinances the presence of women in the wake of fathers, husbands and brothers is assumed and rarely mentioned. But though in the 1330s they clearly were not so important to court culture as under Richard II,<sup>1</sup> they must always have played a major role in household affairs. There was distrust of congregations of women at court and numbers were severely restricted. The ordinance of 1318 attempted to legislate against single women and prostitutes following the court,<sup>2</sup> without success. The presence of too many costly women with their trains was to form the basis of a complaint in Haxey's petition in 1397, and as late as the time of Edward IV single women's attendance was restricted and no-one of the household allowed his wife at court unless he held of the king in chief or was personally enrolled on the marshalsea rolls. Others had to seek the king's grace for their wives to stay.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless women of quality at court were essential. A few were retained by the queen as her ladies and damsels, her personal attendants and intimates who travelled around with the queen's household or that of her children, meeting up with their relatives in the king's household whenever the two establishments were lodged together. As has already been noted, Ida de Clinton was one of the ladies in Queen Isabella's household.<sup>4</sup> Idonia de Clinton was one of the ladies of Queen Philippa's chambers in 1328.<sup>5</sup> Katherine, wife of William Montagu, was a leading

- 
- 1 Gervase Mathew, The Court of Richard II (London, 1968), pp.28-29.
  - 2 T.F. Tout, The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History (Manchester, 1914), p.313. See also R.L. Poole, Domesday Book to Magna Carta, p.19 for a serjeantry held by guarding the court strumpets, and J.H. Round, The King's Serjeants, pp.97, 98, the Cateshill serjeantry involved marshalling the 12 girls who followed the court.
  - 3 A.R. Myers, The Household of Edward IV, p.312.
  - 4 F.D. Blackley and G. Hermensen (eds.) The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, pp.156-7.
  - 5 Cal. Mem. Rolls p.373., perhaps a mistake for Ida, Clinton's mother, or an unknown sister. Ida remarried without licence an unknown knight called John de Steanuge by 1336. Cal. Pap. Regs. Letters II, 1305-42, p.530.

lady of Edward III's court and chief lady of Philippa's household, in charge of the royal nurseries. She was frequently in company with the queen and it was she who, in 1333, announced to Edward the birth of his daughter, Jeanne, for which she was rewarded 500 marks.<sup>1</sup>

These women were retained as personnel of the queen's chamber. Unlike the knights and squires of the royal households, they received no wages or fees, though they were entitled to receive twice annual livery of clothing. The queen's damsels had boys to attend on them, while the queen's ladies did not, suggesting strongly that their own relatives and children, who were independently enrolled as squires, may have acted in this capacity. Not all of the women would be attendant on the queen continuously. Their status at court was considerable. Not only were they employed as attendants, but they could also be sent extra curiam on business affecting the queen or king.

Not surprisingly there was a high incidence of intermarriage between the ladies of the queen's entourage and other court women and members of the king's household.<sup>2</sup> The marriage between Clinton and Juliane Blount, where the

---

1 E101/384/18; E101/388/13; E403/282 mm.8,9; C.P.R. 1330-34 p.384 when she was found exerting her influence on behalf of others. Margaret Galway "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter", Birmingham University Journal I (1947-48) p.16; but see T.F. Tout, Chapters V, pp.319-20 where Elizabeth de St. Omer is called Mistress of the King's Children in 1334. See B.L. Galba E III fols. 183r, 189v, 190r for a list of the queen's household in 1332, and B.L. Add. MS. 35, 181, an account of Philippa's Household dated 1332-33.

2 e.g. Nero C.VIII fol.207v. A match took place between Roger Beauchamp, a squire of Edward III and Sybilla de Pateshull one of the queen's domicelli, the wedding being celebrated in the royal chapel at Clipston on 22 May 1337. A.R. Myers, "The Household of Queen Margaret of Anjou 1452-3", Bulletin of John Rylands Library Vol.40 (1957-8), pp.404-5; A.R. Myers, "The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, 1466-67", Bulletin of John Rylands Library Vol.50 (1967-8), pp.450-452; Liber Quotidianus p.XXXIXI.

proximity of inheritance was not a factor in introducing the couple is a prime example. It was presumably at court that Clinton came into contact with Juliana, then married to the steward of Edward II's household, Thomas le Blount. When Blount died on 17 August 1328, Clinton was able to console the widow and further his own interests, for he had married her within the month. In this way the children of household members would naturally be drawn into the household at an early age and grow up in its atmosphere. The congregation of the family at court would tend to intensify the distinct and select nature of the upper personnel of the royal household, emphasising the tradition of household service invested in certain families.

Nevertheless court, it should be stressed, was not a closed society. Access to the king was open to all, and on special occasions noble women outside the small circle of the royal household visited court with their families. Wives, daughters and other female relatives of household members were entitled to attend court on special occasions. We see wives and daughters of many of Edward III's household present at the feast depicted in the Vows of the Heron, the most contemporary description of a court festival.<sup>1</sup> They also played a distinct role in court ceremonial, particularly in tournaments, often disguising themselves with the knights, and acting out lavish 'intermezzi' in easy comradeship with the king's retinue, and in the feasting and dancing which accompanied parliaments and the great festivals.<sup>2</sup> Edward's and Montagu's love of ceremonial, pageantry and lavish display of dress and jewellery admirably suited the inclusion of feminine company. The shared ethics and common ideals of knightly conduct knit country knights, magnates and the court, moulding a new nobility which increasingly looked to court for its inspiration. Great learning was much admired in women,

---

1 "The Vows of the Heron" in Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History Volume I (ed.) Thomas Wright. Rolls Series (London, 1859) pp.1-25.

2 See the 1344 round table when women took part in the jousting. Juliet Vale, Edward III and Chivalry. Chivalric Society and its Context 1270-1350 (Bury St. Edmunds, 1982) p.67.

E101/387/19 when Edward feasted the queen and her ladies at Newcastle on 6 October 1336.

who were expected to be patrons of letters and the arts. Women of influence and standing thus helped to cultivate sensibilities and to make the royal household the foremost centre of knightly education and conduct in the country. The society of a small leaven of women was highly valued for its rarity, embodying and upholding standards in courtly manners. These women had a considerable if intangible influence, helping to mitigate the anticeptic and militaristic nature of Edward's court, together bringing to it a certain informality of manner.

The closeness of relationship among household personnel meant that they constituted a very tightly knit body of men, with very close personal as well as professional ties. There were inter-family relationships through marriage, alliance, wardship and proximity of inheritance. English noble society being so tiny, a degree of blood relationship between the upper members of the household was inevitable. Some connections were, however, stronger than others. William Clinton and the Greys were first cousins through their mothers, and Clinton occasionally acted on their behalf.<sup>1</sup> In 1335 William Montagu purchased from Roger Grey the marriage of Roger's heir, John, for his daughter Agnes for 1000 marks.<sup>2</sup> Many other alliances were sealed through marriage, either before or after entering the royal household. A double connection existed between the Ros family and that of Bohun. Edward Bohun married Margaret, daughter of William Ros, while his brother William married Elizabeth Badlesmere, sister-in-law of another William de Ros.<sup>3</sup> Montagu also for a short period allied his house to those of Badlesmere, Bohun and Ros, by marrying his infant daughter Elizabeth to the Badlesmere heir Giles a squire in the household in 1330.<sup>4</sup> By marriage alliances William Montagu made two further useful connections. His sister Alice married the Daubeney heir Ralph before 1333, and it was through his connection with the

---

1 C.C.R. 1327-30 p.399. Witness to a grant between Henry and Roger de Grey.

2 C.C.R. 1333-37 p.491.

3 G.E.C. VI, 469n (j). XI, 99.

4 Cal. Mem. Rolls p.378.

king's most intimate friend and adviser that Ralph rose to the status of banneret in 1334. In June 1336, Montagu purchased the marriage of Roger Mortimer, a nephew of Giles Badlesmere through Elizabeth Badlesmere's first marriage to Edmund Mortimer. In 1338 Elizabeth was to marry William Bohun.<sup>1</sup> The earl of Hereford's connections with the royal household stemmed back to the reign of Edward I, when earl Humphrey V married Maud de Fiennes a kinswoman of queen Eleanor of Castile. Earl Humphrey VI was brought up at court and was eventually to marry the king's widowed daughter Elizabeth in 1302.<sup>2</sup> Many young men must have drifted to court in the wake of similar advantageous marriages made by members of their families. Court was the place to come to meet influential people in the hope of advancement in life.

Patronage was a particularly important factor in bringing men to court and in regulating relationships between members of the household, though it proves difficult to define ties with accuracy. Movement from private households to court or from one of the subordinate royal establishments to another occurred frequently.<sup>3</sup> Some served both the king and their private lords at the same time. Court was by now the centre of a wide and complex patronage system which necessitated having friends and patrons there.

John Lovel, a household squire, was one of the local gentry resident in Dover castle under Clinton in 1339.<sup>4</sup> The Nevilles were closely associated with

1 C.F.R. IV, 448-9.

2 F.D. Blackley and G. Hermensen (eds.) Court & Household of Queen Eleanor of Castile pp.44ff, 80, 114. Maud's niece Joan was one of the queen's ladies and a Giles Fiennes was a household knight in 1290. He was frequently with John of Brabant's establishment in 1292-3 and with Thomas and Henry of Lancaster. Camden Miscellany II (Camden Society Vol.55, 1983) "Accounts of the expenses of John of Brabant and Thomas and Henry of Lancaster AD 1292-3" (ed.) Joseph Burtt Esq. pp.ix, 1, 8.

3 "Isabella and the Bishop of Exeter" in Essays presented to Bertie Wilkinson. F.D. Blackley, p.229. Thomas and Michael Poynings and Henry Ferrers came to Edward in 1337 from the familia of his brother the earl of Cornwall as did Cusance.

4 C.C.R. 1337-40 p.219.

William Bohun, both Hugh and John going overseas in Northampton's retinue 1338-40.<sup>1</sup> Hugh was with Bohun at the seige of Calais and was granted lands by him in 1356. John addressed Bohun as "son seignur" and kept the earl's castle at Lochmaben.<sup>2</sup> Guy Brien, by 1354 was a tenant of the earl at Plessey.<sup>3</sup>

Montagu seems to have made a determined policy of filling the household with his dependents and of ensuring that he had friends in all the right places. His clerks filled household administrative posts<sup>4</sup> and his knights and squires surrounded the king. Of particular importance were his two chief agents and friends, Nicholas de la Beche and John Molyns. Nicholas de la Beche was master of the Duke of Cornwall's household in 1338-40, maintaining his connections with the duke's household in the 1340s after his retirement from office. He was also constable of the Tower.<sup>5</sup> Molyns joined the household as a squire between 1328 and 1330, and it was during these years that he attached himself to Montagu's retinue, founding a chantry in 1331 for the souls of Montagu and Katherine and acting as his attorney, receiver and agent. With Montagu he took part in the overthrow of Mortimer, which earned him a permanent place at court. Molyn's rise was swift. He is described as Montagu's "valet" in 1332, by 1334 he had become Montagu's knight and by 1337 Edward III had made him a banneret. He was clearly a man of forceful personality and considerable ability as well as being extremely

---

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.530; C.C.R. 1339-40 p.223.  
2 SC1/39/185; DL36/3/38.  
3 SC1/41/105.  
4 E101/384/1. Thomas Barton or Garton, Montagu's chamberlain was controller of the wardrobe from June 1328 and keeper from September 1329 - October 1331 and an old family retainer of his father as steward in 1318. He was promoted as a baron of the Exchequer in 1331. Tout, Chapters V, 76-77. Thomas Weston, a knight of Montagu's retinue, was also one of Edward III's household knights. J. Wingfield was by 1351 steward of the Duke of Cornwall's lands (ibid p.387).  
5 Tout, Chapters V, 318-321. His connection with Montagu started from at least 1332. He received general pardon for trespasses with Montagu and Molyns. He was a frequent witness to Montagu's private deeds and customarily received money on Montagu's behalf.

ambitious, tough and efficient. Particularly useful to Montagu was his appointment as steward of the chamber lands in 1337 at a time when Montagu was forced to resign his appointments at court. In addition he had useful connections in London among important merchants, through whom he was able to supply both Montagu and the king with ready cash on occasions.<sup>1</sup>

Surprisingly, Montagu escaped implication when Molyns fell from grace in 1340. Edward never doubted that Montagu was ignorant of Molyns' treasonable activities in England at a time when the earl was campaigning in France. But Montagu was in collusion with his knight in the months which followed the purges of December 1340. Sent in person to capture Molyns, the earl secured Molyns' arrest and seized his estates. But the following day Montagu reported that Molyns had escaped from his custody. Though Montagu did know of his whereabouts, he never revealed it, and Molyns remained in hiding for the next five years. The earl must have felt the absence of his agent sorely, but by the time that Molyns felt it safe enough to return to court Montagu was already dead.

Another of Edward's household squires, John Brocas, was closely associated with Montagu, receiving money and accounting on his behalf on numerous occasions. The whole Brocas family were connected with the Edwardian court, John, Arnold and Menald as masters of the horse and royal wards when their father was slain in the king's service in Scotland; Arnold as master of the horse of John of Eltham in 1330, Simon as one of the Cambridge scholars and a chamber valet in 1363. John was a valet as early as 1314 and by 1334 was king's serjeant. In 1330 he became master of the horse, chief forrester of Windsor Forest in 1334 and Warden of Nottingham gaol in 1336. He most probably joined in the coup of

---

1 Natalie Fryde, "A Medieval Robber Baron Sir John Molyns of Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire" in Medieval Legal Records Edited in Memory of C.A.F. Meekings (gen. eds.) R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post (London, H.M.S.O. 1978), pp.199-202.

1330, after which royal and seigneurial favours swiftly showered. In 1337 he was appointed to the custody of the Scottish march, in 1338 became custos of the castle, town and park of Guildford. He was knighted at Sluys in 1340 and became a member of the council in England.<sup>1</sup>

Promotion of his own men through the household was something which Montagu continued to do even after he had left the ranks of the king's bannerets. Since Montagu had the king's ear it was easy enough to fulfill his personal duties in advancing his retainers in this way; it also kept him intimately associated with events at court even when he could not himself be present. Though I have not by any means explored all the connections which existed between members of the royal household, the few examples cited here are enough to indicate what a close group they formed in terms of ancestry, patronage and influence. Since personal and familial connections extended throughout the court system, there was an obvious tendency for courtiers to form distinct groupings which could lead to faction and intrigues. Having supporters and patrons at court was an obvious necessity.

The impression gained from a study of the backgrounds and early careers of Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and Bohun is of the complexity of relationships which governed life at court. The king's knights did not exist in isolation, but formed the hubs from which spokes radiated throughout the household system and which connected the personnel of chamber, wardrobe, treasury, chapel, great wardrobe and kitchen and the subordinate royal households by means of kinship and affinity.

Magnate families tended to dominate the royal household. Recruitment and exit were easy, and there could have been few from the greatest earls downwards who neither had personally spent some time on household lists nor had a close

---

1 The Family of Brocas of Beaurepaire and Roche Court, Hereditary Masters of the Royal Buckhounds with some Account of the English Rule of Aquitaine, Montagu Burrows (London 1886) pp.53, 57, 61, 62, 67.

relative or powerful patron in close daily attendance on the king. Nevertheless, the household was equally open to all members of knightly society including the sons of petty knights. Recruitment provided opportunities for mixing on an equal basis with men of similar interests from all ranks of noble society, a situation in marked contrast to the climate which occasionally prevailed elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> One recent author described it as "the area of greatest social mobility outside the church".<sup>2</sup>

A simple distinction emerges between what we may term the courtiers, men who made it their business to be constantly about the king intent on making a career out of life at court, and those of the king's knights who were enrolled on the marshalsea rolls solely to fight for the king whenever he should summon them on his service. Men like Geoffrey le Scrope and Bartholemew Burghersh the Elder exemplify the second category; they spent little time at court, because they were too busily occupied with the king's affairs elsewhere. William Montagu, William Clinton, Robert Ufford and William Bohun by their constant attendance on the king represent the courtier type par excellence. As will be shown in subsequent chapters, though all four men were entrusted with a wide variety of governmental tasks from fighting in France and Scotland or travelling to the continent as the king's ambassadors to carrying out administrative duties in the counties they were rarely absent from court for more than a few weeks at a time and succeeded in making themselves more or less indispensable to the king.

---

1 See the opinions expressed in the parliament of 1241. French Chronicle of London, (ed.) George James Aungier, Camden Society (1844) p.90.

2 Juliet Vale, Edward III and Chivalry, (Bury St. Edmunds, 1982), p.2.

## 2. HOUSEHOLD AND COURT

Promotion within the royal household for those who had begun their attachment to the court as royal wards and squires, was associated with the ceremony of knighting. It also provided another means of recruiting young men into the household. Each year a handful of noble youths would be brought to court seeking the distinction of being knighted by the king himself. Among these were a few household squires, some of whom would be attracted to remain at court permanently.

The occasions when knighthood was performed by the king would be colourful affairs. Usually they were held at the great festivals, especially at Christmas, Easter or St. Edward's day when throngs of magnates, their families and retainers would be present at court. Parliaments were particularly popular times for creating new knights. During the course of the exceptionally long parliament which opened on 7 January 1327, fifty-four men were knighted on various dates between 20 and 31 January.<sup>1</sup> As a move to raise military backing among the supporters of the regime, the recruitment of some 20% of these new knights into the household shows it was not unsuccessful.<sup>2</sup> This was a unique occasion: usually knighting took place "sporadically throughout the year",<sup>3</sup> less than half a dozen new knights actually being dubbed by the king himself in any one year. The other exception to this was again for a special occasion when Edward III was anxious to gain popular support by a display of openhanded largesse to both great and small. At the Westminster parliament of March 1337 twenty new knights were dubbed at the same time as Edward elevated his four household bannerets to earldoms. Other popular occasions for creating new knights were tournaments. Jousting contests were

---

1 E101/382/7.

2 E101/383/4. W.A. Shaw, Knights of England Vol.I, p.125. Foedera II ii, 684. Rot. Parl. 113.

3 N. Denholm Young, History and Heraldry, 1254-1310. A Study in the Historical Value of the Rolls of Arms, (Oxford, 1965), p.26.

closely associated with knighting ceremonies, providing the setting for the new knight to prove his prowess.<sup>1</sup>

Of the four men in this study, only Montagu has left trace of his knighting. From the record evidence of this event, which took place in London in April 1326, it is clear that the charge on the household followed a long-established pattern. The ceremony of knighting must have varied greatly according to circumstances but at the heart of it was the conferring of garments and equipment specially associated with the rank, particularly the sword, belt and spurs. These were probably ceremonial rather than fighting weapons, treasured as proofs of rank.<sup>2</sup>

To each of the wouldbe knights suitable clothing was distributed according to three categories, corresponding to the status of the individual. Robes provided for earls and bannerets being more sumptuous than those given to knights bachelor and more fitting to their social standing. Eight men were knighted as earls between 1327 and 1340, although only two were earls.<sup>3</sup> Robes for knighting as an earl were a means of honouring special favourites or those close to earldoms. It was an indication of Roger Mortimer's overweening ambition that on 20 January 1327 he had his sons Edmund, Roger and Geoffrey knighted as earls although he himself had no claim to such a title.<sup>4</sup> It shows that Mortimer's design for a comital title antedated his creation as earl by nearly two years.

---

1 E361/9 recte John de Cantebrigg, Edward Blount, Peter Thornton, Richard Bayous and Thomas de Luda, and not as printed in W.A. Shaw, Knights of England I, 125; E.L.G. Stones, "Sir Geoffrey le Scrope (c.1285-1340) Chief Justice of the King's Bench", E.H.R. LXIX (1954) p.2, n.10.

2 Robert W. Ackerman, "The Knighting Ceremonies in Medieval English Romances", Speculum XIX (1944) pp.304-5.

3 E101/382/7 John earl of Hereford in January 1327; E101/383/6 William earl of Ulster in June 1328; K. de Lettenhove Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 91 Lawrence Hastings was allowed to assume the title earl of Pembroke on 13 October 1339 and knighted at St. Denis.

4 E101/382/7.

For his personal clothing an earl was provided with two cloths of gold silk, one scarlet fur-lined robe, another in green cloth and two caps, which apparently had symbolic significance. He was also given a bed, a quilt, hangings, a pair of linen sheets and a bed cover of cloth of gold.<sup>1</sup> The banneret similarly received bed and bedding, a length of cloth of gold, two caps and one red and one green robe, though they contained less cloth than those distributed to earls.<sup>2</sup> A knight bachelor could expect a bed, quilt, mattress and linen sheets, and for himself a length of oriental cloth, two robes, one of green and the other of blue cloth, and two fur caps.<sup>3</sup> All received a tunic of brown motley to wear during the vigil which preceded the ceremony.<sup>4</sup> The cloth was probably made up into long ceremonial robes as there is no indication that cloth distribution altered over the next twenty years, despite the emergence of a new style of clothing about 1340 with shorter lengths of garment fitting more closely to the body.<sup>5</sup> Very similar provisions of cloth for knighting at court were being distributed to wouldbe knights over one hundred years earlier.<sup>6</sup>

Horses and armour were not provided, but those knights who were associated with the royal household were granted sums of money or its equivalent in lands and rents to support their new dignity. These represented the annual fees which all the king's knights received at the exchequer. Edward's generosity towards his household attracted many willing knights to his serve. The combination of financial incentive, and impressive ceremony would be sufficient to impress any

- 
- 1 E101/382/7 for the items provided for John Bohun at London in January 1327.
  - 2 E101/383/16 for the items given to Robert Clifford in May 1328 at Northampton.
  - 3 E101/382/7 for the items provided for John de Hothom in January 1327.
  - 4 Robert W. Ackerman, "The Knighting Ceremonies in Medieval English Romances", Speculum XIX (1944) p.309.
  - 5 Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas, "Observations on the Institution of the Most Noble Order of the Garter", Archaeologia XXXI, 54 for the knighthood of Maurice fitz Thomas as Earl of Kildare at Guildford, Christmas 1347; Stella Mary Newton, Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince. A Study in the Years 1340-1365 (Bury St. Edmunds, 1980), p.15.
  - 6 M. Powicke, Military Obligation in Medieval England, p.69.

youth of only 17 or 18 years of age, sometimes even younger, with the attractions of court life. The number of knighthoods conferred at court was undoubtedly on the increase during the first decade of Edward's reign, reflecting Edward's keen practical interest in increasing the pool of military strength within the country by more traditional methods than those experimented with by his father.

The terms by which men were recruited into the royal household as knights, bannerets or squires show that they were serving the king on much the same basis as their contemporaries were serving other magnates. No indenture has come to light to show the detailed terms of service, but the general contents of most agreements are known from other sources. Terms of service varied. Some men promised life service. Others may have contracted to be with the king on a more temporary basis. Not all were permanently resident in the household but could be called up to fight as household troops.

There was no accepted size of military retinue promised in these contracts. It was always the result of independent negotiation between the king and his knights. Twenty men at arms seems to have been the accepted norm for a banneret of baronial rank.<sup>1</sup> William Montagu was serving with a retinue of this size in 1329.<sup>2</sup> No evidence of the size of retinues produced by Ufford, Bohun or Clinton exists, though a body of roughly twenty men was probably maintained by Ufford as head of a small baronial family. We may assume that a retinue of similar size to

---

1 Bartholemew Burghersh and John Darcy both anticipated being able to raise and equip a force of twenty armed men in 1326 or 1327. John earl of Surrey in 1328 contracted to serve the king for life with 100 men at arms for which he was to receive 500 marks per annum in times of peace and 2000 marks when at war. E101/383/14 m4, and not as stated by N. Denholm Young, The Country Gentry in the Fourteenth Century with Special Reference to the Heraldic Rolls of Arms, Oxford (1969) p.138 as 1600 marks. Henry Percy's contract with the king in 1331 for £500 does not specify the service promised, but in 1333 he was serving Edward Balliol in war with a banneret, thirty knights and 100 men at arms for 2000 marks. M.T. Martin, The Percy Chartulary, Surtees Society 117 (1909) pp. 286ff, 447.

2 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.186, 392.

that provided by his brother Edward, seven men at arms,<sup>1</sup> was maintained by William Bohun, perhaps to be explained by their position as younger sons. William Clinton may similarly have provided a retinue of less than ten men in relation to his personal wealth.

A knight's retinue was the nucleus of a force which he was expected to raise and equip in times of war. But it also had a peacetime function. On special occasions when the knight was summoned by the king to attend ceremonial events at court such as the arrival of important overseas visitors, at the five great festivals or when summoned to special councils and parliaments, the retinue accompanied the knight to lend grace and dignity to his attendance on the court. Part of this retinue presumably also constituted the private familia which each knight kept permanently in the household to serve him.

For the provision of this body of men, the knight was granted an annual pension or its equivalent in lands and rents. The value of annuity granted by the king being conceded as part of a calculated rate of remuneration based on rank, experience, personal wealth and royal favour. As a general rule, in the first decade of the reign earls could expect an annual peacetime fee of £500, bannerets usually receiving anything between £100 and £200, and knights much less at about £20 - £40 per annum. A rise occurred in 1337 when fees were doubled and bannerets received anything up to £400, more important knights about £100 and lesser knights about £80.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 C.P.R. 1327-30 p.517.

2 Edward Bohun was promised £100 per annum which he received regularly until his death in 1334. E403/235 m1; C62/104 m9 etc. Ten years later Edward Montagu was promised the same sum as a knight bachelor in the king's service. C62/117 m3; E403/294 m2. The earl of Warwick as a squire in the household in 1328 was in receipt of a fee of £400 per annum for life. E101/383/8 p.2. Roger Mortimer, as chief though unofficial adviser to the king the same year was probably in receipt of an even larger sum though its value is not revealed. E101/384/1 p.11. G.A. Holmes, Estates of the Higher Nobility, p.14 states it was 500 marks. His son Geoffrey was promised £100. E403/292 m.27. Roger Swinnerton as a banneret was receiving £300 per annum in 1332. C.P.R. 1330-34 p.338. Reginald Cobham, Henry Ferrers and Thomas Poynings were all promised £400 in 1337, John Mere and Richard Damory as knights bachelor were each granted £80 per annum. C.P.R.1338-40 pp.412, 441. Robert Ufford "le Cosyn" and Edmund Ufford when knighted in 1337 were promised £20. E403/296 m.30; C62/115 m2.

William Montagu and Robert Ufford both offered service valued at 200 marks per annum. In January 1328 Montagu was assigned the manor of Wark roughly assessed at 200 marks per annum.<sup>1</sup> This was apparently an underestimation for in April 1329 he was also granted Wark Castle, valued at £60 15s 5d in part recompense for this.<sup>2</sup> In addition "for his better maintenance in the king's service" Montagu was granted the manors of Camel, Somerton with its town and hundred, Kingsbury, the warren and pasture of Kingsmere, rents and the assize at Milborne Port and the hundred of Hatherne in Somerset as well as £20 rent owed by the prior of Bath and Barton which had escheated to the crown in March 1330 from Edmund, earl of Kent. In May 1331, however, it was made clear that this latter was only to last for the minority of Edmund's heir.<sup>3</sup> Subsequent grants he received for good service more than compensated for their eventual loss.

Robert Ufford's 200 marks<sup>4</sup> was also originally intended to come from the manors confiscated from the earl of Kent in 1330, but at Ufford's request the government in a fresh grant made over to him the castle and manor of Orford which both his father and grandfather had held from the crown.<sup>5</sup> While overseas in the queen's company in 1325-26, William Clinton was promised £200 annual rents for his service, for which he was partly provided in 1327 with Isabella's manor of Halton in Cheshire. The balance still due was met with a life interest in Somerford Keynes and Henk near Guildford in 1330, valued at £60.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 C.F.R. IV, 116.

2 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp. 386, 392. During the Berwick campaign, for the cost of fitting out Wark for defence, he was granted the castle in fee as the equivalent of one knight's fee, to pass to his younger son John in tail and with remainder to Montagu's right heirs. This was reinforced during the York Parliament of 1334. C.P.R. 1330-34 pp. 462, 463, 520.

3 C.P.R. 1327-30 p.523; C.P.R. 1330-34 pp. 31, 113; C.F.R. IV, 176. The £20 rent from Barton in fact went to William Bohun.

4 E404/2/file 9.

5 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.517, 522; Charles Moor, Knights of Edward I, Vol.5, pp.70-71.

6 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.170, 174; C.P.R. 1330-34 p.379.

The £100 promised William Bohun fell considerably short of the fees offered the other three men and much less than normally expected by young men of Bohun's descent. Initially the sum was partially satisfied for the minority of the earl of Kent in 1331 with £90 rents in Collingham owed by the abbot of Kirkstall, but this was revoked two months later in exchange for the manor of Basingstoke and £20 rents owed by the prior of Barton.<sup>1</sup> It was not enough to maintain the status of banneret. Bohun abandoned the attempt, continuing to style himself knight until Edward was induced to intervene. In March 1332 Edward granted him £60 to repay nominal debts "in auxilium ut ipse in obsequio Regis melius se possit continere...."<sup>2</sup> To this was added in September 1332 lands belonging to the earl of Norfolk of Hunton and Spene (Berks), Horseley, Ascot, Diddington Pyrton and Kirslington (Oxon), Wycomb (Bucks), Long Bennington (Leics), Newnham (Glocs), Wix (Essex) and £42 rents in Bosham (Sussex).<sup>3</sup> It is not stated why this peculiar grant was made with the earl's approval but it was clearly connected with Edward's decision to endow his cousin suitable in his service.

The execution of Edmund of Woodstock in March 1330 proved a useful windfall for the regime, enabling them to pay the fees of many more important household bannerets who were not already provided for. Burghersh, Maltravers, Edward Bohun, Hugh Turplington, John Darcy and the earl of Surrey all profitted considerably by the earl's disgrace.<sup>4</sup>

Agreements for retaining among private individuals seem to have been slightly less structured. The amounts which Thomas of Lancaster under Edward II paid his knightly retainers out of his wardrobe were more arbitrary, ranging from between

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-34 pp. 193, 217.

2 E403/259 m25.

3 G.A. Holmes, Estates of the Higher Nobility, p.22.

4 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.516, 517, 519, 520.

20 marks to £200 for the yearly fees of each of the seven knights of his household.<sup>1</sup> Edward III is not known to have offered anything in the region of £1000 which Lancaster agreed to pay William Latimer in 1319 for 40 armed men.<sup>2</sup> In many such private agreements there must have been equal opportunities for those with an eye to financial profit. Retaining at court did not offer such high fees, but arguably the opportunities to the careerist were greater. Presence at court meant a more direct access to royal patronage, since favour was not dependent on the intermediary powers of one's lord with the king. It also provided the chance to display personal talents in government and to receive swifter recognition of ability and ambitions. The range of activities open to a household knight were greater than those available to other lordly retainers. Furthermore, the members of the royal household had the distinction of considering themselves the "king's knights", his chosen band of personal friends and intimates, who lived in close daily contact with Edward and shared his thoughts.

The granting of fixed annuities in return for promises of a small quota of armed men which the knight undertook to furnish for the duration of his service to the king was something which the crown had adopted in imitation of other magnates, and replaced the system of payment of daily wages in operation under Edward I. As early as 1279 a household ordinance stipulated that the under-steward, Robert fitz John, was to receive no wages because he was well provided for with wardships, though he did take the normal annual fee for his office, the usual robes at the summer and winter festivals and the wages due to one of his estate when out of court.<sup>3</sup> It may be that, as Charles Johnson suggested, even under Edward I wages

1 J.R. Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster, p.46.

2 G.A. Holmes, Estates of the Higher Nobility, pp.122-3 except the £600 paid the count of Julich in 1335-6.

3 Benjamin F. Bylerly and Catherine Ridder Byerly, Records of the Wardrobe and Household 1285-86, p.xxiv, quoting the 1279 ordinance printed in T.F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England II, 158.

allowance was only found when stay at court was short and it was not worthwhile putting names on the marshal's roll.<sup>1</sup> By 1327 the wage system had passed out of use altogether,<sup>2</sup> to be replaced by the provision of annuities. Though a greater financial burden to the crown, as knights might now receive their fees whether or not they were attendant at court, it probably made accounting easier since attendance lists needed no longer be kept with such precision. The changeover to this new system suggests that long before this stage the older structure of payments was totally inadequate. By the end of the reign salaries of this type extended throughout the household system.<sup>3</sup>

The idea of endowment "in support of knighthood" shows considerable resemblance to a trend, growing since 1307, of endowing peerage creations. It is perhaps no coincidence that it was under Edward III that endowment of supporters among the knightly and baronial classes came to be adopted so widely; Edward was well aware of the benefits accruing from openhandedness in the way of support for his policies, though he was careful to ensure that no accusations that he was dismembering crown property could be brought against him.<sup>4</sup>

- 
- 1 Charles Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward I" T.R.H.S. 4th Series VI (1923) p.61. Under Henry VI an ordinance, formulated in 1454, stated that 'Item....every squier havinge XL lie yerly of the kinges yefte, shullen have no dayly wages in his checkeroll'. A.R. Myers, "Some Household Ordinances of Henry VI" B.J.R.L. 36 (1953-4) p.458.
  - 2 T.F. Tout, Chapters II, pp.49-50. The Statute of St. Albans in 1300 'De aula non tenenda in Hospicio Regis' took the steward out of the hall and extended the ban to knights and bannerets of the household. Liber Quotidianus Garderobae pp.92, 200, 207. But knights were still receiving 2s per day at the end of the reign. See E101/359/14 dated 29 Edward I. Possibly 1316-17 was the turning point with Edward II trying to compete with Lancaster's use of fees.
  - 3 Mary C. Hill, The King's Messengers, p.49.
  - 4 M. McKisack, "Edward III and the Historians", History N.S. 48 (1960) pp.7-8. For accusations that Edward was dismembering crown estates see Scalacronica p.167. See also James Tait, "The Date and Authorship of the Speculum Regis", E.H.R. XVI (1901) pp.110-15, who suggests that the need to curb his household was brought to Edward's attention early in his reign.

In addition to fees for life service, all knights were paid an annual fee for attendance in the household, calculated on a fixed scale. Bannerets were paid double the amount received by knights bachelor: eight marks for the half year for bannerets to provide their robes for the summer and winter seasons, and ten marks for their fees, while knights were paid four marks for a half year in robe allowance and a five mark fee every six months. In wartime, however, this was subject to alteration. In 1335 fees were replaced by war wages for all household members.<sup>1</sup> The same thing occurred with all household knights and bannerets in 1338-9.<sup>2</sup> Squires did not receive fees, although they were given robes allowances worth £2 per annum. Robe and shoe allowances were a right of all household retainers common to clerks, grooms and valets, though not the lowest level of cokini, the general household domestic servants. Rank was indicated by the quality of the garment rather than in the quantity of materials.

Payment of fees in the household tended to be a haphazard affair and was one of the first payments to fall into arrears during periods of high wardrobe costs. Payment was supposed to take place twice a year through the wardrobe, where each knight presented his account personally and hoped to receive payment. Absence from court on the day of livery meant deprivation of allowance until a later date, although some men were permitted to account through representatives. Montagu between 1334 and 1337 consistently presented his account through John Molyns. Even then recipients might not necessarily receive cash payments, but be handed exchequer tallies which they would have to present at the Exchequer for payment.

Consequently, payments made by the wardrobe from year to year fluctuated considerably. For the period 1 November 1326 - 20 August 1328, just over twenty-one months, Robert Wodehouse paid out £474 10s 2d "pro feodo militum" and for

---

1 Nero C.VIII fol.223. 'omnes banneretti et milites hospicii Regis sunt ad vadia domini Regis in guerra Scocie tempore feodo hiemalis anno 9 et lib. pro feodo huic - nichil'.

2 E36/203 fol.241.

the period 20 August - 23 September £203 6s 8d. Thomas Garton's account, which covers the period Michaelmas 1329 to October 1331, shows that the payments fell very much lower for the first six months - to only £69 13s 4d - but arrears were made up during the next nine months when payments shot up to £664 4s 7d for the first nine months of 1330. Nothing at all was paid for the period October 1331 - September 1332.<sup>1</sup> During the war years 1333 to 1338 debts mounted rapidly and similarly nothing is recorded for the period 31 July 1334 - August 1338, during which period a total of £5877 11s 7d was owed to members of the king's establishment.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, for a ten month period immediately preceding this, £1534 14s was paid out in robes and fees, although this figure includes payments for shoes and robes to other members of the household.<sup>3</sup> For the period of residence in the Low Countries, July 1338 - May 1340, £1390 was paid out in fees to knights and £2082 15s 4d in livery to a vastly inflated household.<sup>4</sup>

The situation in the preceding reign was even more chaotic. There is some evidence that Edward II's knights were not being paid at all regularly during the last few years of the reign, a reflection of the general disorganisation of administration. Only £27 was recorded as paid "pro feodo militum" during anno 19, and no payments at all were made through the wardrobe in anno 18.<sup>5</sup> This may explain why, when Edward II was in flight in October - November 1326, even his military household deserted him. Though the situation improved under Edward III not even the king's chief bannerets could hope to receive regular and immediate payment especially if they spent long periods out of court.

---

1 E361/2 rots.27-29; E361/2 rots.32, 34, 38.

2 E361/2 rots.32,34, 38; E361/2 rot.36; Mary C. Hill, The King's Messengers, p.27.

3 E361/2 rot.35.

4 E361/2 rot.37d.

5 E101/381/1; E101/381/14. J.H. Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward II" T.R.H.S. 4th Series 12 (1929) p.97.

Montagu received his fees at the wardrobe with punctuality. However, two tallies worth £50 and £6 1s 3d were delivered to him by Hugh Langlond, Sheriff of Somerset at Christmas 1330 for sums outstanding.<sup>1</sup> In August 1336 he was still owed for his fees and robes between 1332 and 1334 and which was partly repaid through the wardrobe that month and the rest delivered to him in two sums through the Society of the Bardi.<sup>2</sup> £32 was in arrears to Robert Ufford in robe allowance for the same period and £60 in fees which he was allowed out of his farm for the manor of Causton.<sup>3</sup> £46 13s 4d remained outstanding in William Bohun's account for fees and robes for 1335 and 1336.<sup>4</sup>

According to Tout,<sup>5</sup> the household ordinance of 1318 indicates that money payments frequently replaced payments in kind after this date. At the same time, the removal of the Great Wardrobe from the control of the keeper of the Wardrobe probably reduced the convenience of this. Robes especially were not always converted into cash payments, but from time to time were delivered as actual lengths of cloth from the great wardrobe. Summer and winter robes were provided in 1329 for knights, bannerets and squires, perhaps so that the whole household could be fitted with a new uniform livery.<sup>6</sup> To each banneret was given four pieces of cloth and three pieces to each knight and squire. The cloth provided to bannerets was also longer than that given to ordinary knights and more than twice the length provided for squires. Purchases made at the annual cloth fairs were normally converted into garments before distribution.

In addition to the yearly issue of robes to members of the household, whether or not produced in kind, individuals received clothing on special occasions.

1 E403/255 m11.

2 B.L. Add. MS. 35, 181 m.12r; E101/387/5; E403/288 m24.

3 E101/387/9; E403/288 m5.

4 Nero C.VIII fol.317v.

5 T.F. Tout, The Place of Edward II in English History (Manchester, 1914) p.272.

6 E101/384/7.

Several fancy embroidered aketons were made for the bishop of Salisbury, the earl of Cornwall, Hugh de Veer, Ufford, Clinton, Thomas Bradestone, John Neville and Maurice Berkeley in November 1330, perhaps for a tournament. Those for Clinton and Ufford took  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ells of velvet each and seven ells of cloth. That made for Ufford was sewn with 7 oz. of gold and 7 oz. of silk thread, that for Clinton with 4 oz. of coloured silk thread, 5 oz. of gold and 2 oz. of silver thread. Thirty tailors worked on the two aketons which took a week to put together.<sup>1</sup> Though the design on these garments is not described, some accounts show just how detailed and elaborate the work could be. A roll of liveries issued in Antwerp in 1338 described the making of tunics of white cendal for the king, the earl of Derby and the earl of Salisbury. Each tunic was trimmed with fur, and worked with the design of a castle in silk and gold thread, surrounded by towers, halls and chambers. Within the walls of the castle were depicted trees embroidered in gold, and on the breast of each garment were embroidered gold figures standing in tents beneath the battlements.<sup>2</sup> A love of fine and elaborate dress, so marked a feature of the court of Richard II, was also evident under Edward III, though during the 1330s circumscribed by the relative poverty of the court.<sup>3</sup>

Permanent household retainers were entitled to "bouche a court" whenever they were in residence. The majority ate in the Hall under the eye of the knights marshal and usher of the Hall and their deputy sergeants.<sup>4</sup> Each member of the household according to his status, from the chief officers down, were entitled to daily issues of wine, bread, firewood, and other things. Though no ordinance for

---

1 E101/384/17.

2 E101/388/8 m5.

3 Gervase Mathew, The Court of Richard II, pp.25-28; Stella Mary Newton, Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince, p.1.

4 Bertie Wilkinson, The Chancery under Edward III (Manchester, 1929), pp.87-94; See T.F. Tout, "The Household of Chancery and its disintegration" in Collected Papers III for a comparison with the organisation with the clerical staff of Chancery.

the reign of Edward III has survived, similar regulations for livery of daily necessities exist for the households of Edward II and of Edward IV<sup>1</sup> which show that the basic requirements for household retainers had remained unaltered for centuries, indeed even as far back as the reign of Henry I household officers were being issued with the same commons.<sup>2</sup> Provision for ordinary knights and squires exist only in the Black Book of Edward IV but may be taken to read as for Edward III. The knights who ate in the Hall were entitled to receive each "for his chambre at none and nyght" one loaf of bread, a quart of wine, a gallon of ale, a pitcher (of wine?), one wax candle and two tallow candles and two paris candles during the winter season, and rushes and litter throughout the year.<sup>3</sup> Squires, who also ate in the Hall, were at night to receive each half a gallon of ale, and during the winter two paris candles, one faggot, or when sick they might expect two loaves, two messes of great meat and a gallon of ale per day, as well as litter all the year round.<sup>4</sup> The bannerets, probably ate not in the Hall, but in the chamber, for the Black Book claims "They are called knyghts of the chambre". They were entitled to daily rations of two loaves, one mess of gross meat, half a pitcher of wine, two gallons of ale plus during the winter one "tortays", one wax pitcher, two wax candles, two paris candles, two tallow candles, two faggots, and rushes and litter throughout the year like any other household official.<sup>5</sup> Food was calculated on a regular scale of allowance, as set out in the Constitutio Domus Regis. Kitchen bills could thus be checked by

1 T.F. Tout, The Place of Edward II in English History, pp.270-314 for the household ordinance of 1318; A.R. Myers, The Household of Edward IV. See above for comments on how closely the Black Book of Edward IV was modelled on a lost ordinance of Edward III.

2 Constitutio Domus Regis in The Red Book of the Exchequer III, Rolls Series (London, 1896) ed. Hubert Hall, pp.808-813.

3 A.R. Myers op.cit., p.108.

4 Ibid., p.128.

5 Ibid., p.106.

calculation of the number of moses required per meal, and the same standard of measure applied to wine, ale, bread and candles.<sup>1</sup>

Distinct from the hall in which the majority of the household resided, and at the very core of the royal household, was the chamber. It was here that the king himself slept, ate and worked, and here that he made known his immediate will. Here the king would surround himself with his highest officials and his closest friends, where government business as well as lighter matters would be discussed in a more intimate atmosphere. Hence the delivery of the great seal often took place in the chamber as on one Saturday in December 1341 when, we are told, the chancellor sent the great seal to be returned to Edward while he was sitting down to dinner with the earl of Salisbury, William Beauchamp and a couple of chancery clerks.<sup>2</sup> It was also in the chamber that the king relaxed with his friends and enjoyed in private the pleasure of their company. Edward was fond of dicing and we have frequent records of the sums he lost to the knights and squires of his household at play, though none of any winnings he may have made which went straight into his privy purse.<sup>3</sup> Often too, Edward enjoyed the music of travelling musicians who visited the court, as for instance, that of Montagu's own minstrel "Whirlewynd" who with the members of his troupe entertained Edward on 29 July 1337.<sup>4</sup> The select few, entitled to dine in the king's chamber, ate with the king himself.

The chamber was both a series of lodgings and a financial organisation. Like the wardrobe, it acted as a store and deposit for the privy wardrobe and a source of supply for the king's personal needs.<sup>5</sup> It had its own revenue and was adminis-

---

1 Charles Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward I", T.R.H.S. Fourth Series, VI, (1923), p.61.

2 C.C.R. 1339-41 pp.655-656. See James Conway Davies, Baronial Opposition, pp.68-70 for other business transacted in the chamber.

3 e.g. Nero C.VIII fols. 209r-216v passim.

4 E101/388/3.

5 James Conway Davies, "The First Journal of Edward II's Chamber", E.H.R. 30 (1915) pp.669, 671.

tered separately from the other household bodies, accounting directly with the exchequer and not through the wardrobe. As an administrative machine, the chamber invested its personnel with enhanced status and authority within the household. Not only did they exercise enormous power in administration and government, but they also had the most direct access to the king and could exert considerable influence over him. The chamber staff are nevertheless among the most illusive members of the royal household, its personnel exerting a "subterranean" influence on administration.<sup>1</sup>

Under Edward II the chamber staff, particularly during the chamberlainship of the younger Hugh Despenser, wielded what was generally felt to be an excessive power over the country, a hold which only Isabella's and Mortimer's invasion had broken. In reaction against Despenser policy, after 1326 chamber lands were transferred to the exchequer, other lands restored to the contrariants or granted to the queen and her supporters.<sup>2</sup> It seems to have been a lesson taken to heart by the young Edward III, for he kept the chamber as a financial organ firmly subordinate to the wardrobe during the early years of the reign, and little evidence emerges for the existence of a large full-time body of chamber knights capable of monopolising royal favour in the 1330s. Access to the king remained for the period equally open to all members of his military establishment. Few chamber knights can be identified with certainty. During the 1360s and 1370s after Edward's household was no longer involved in war, the ordinary household knights, though listed, were not issued robes and fees at the wardrobe, and only chamber knights continued to receive livery through this body.<sup>3</sup> It is unclear whether this was the case in the first decade of the reign. No separate category existed in wardrobe accounts for chamber knights were not distinguished from their fellows

---

1 James Conway Davies, Baronial Opposition, p.70.

2 T.F.Tout, Chapters IV, p.230.

3 C.J. Given-Wilson, The Court and Household of Edward II, 1360-1377, an unpublished Ph.D. thesis, St. Andrews (1975), p.5.

who dined in the hall, if indeed a distinct body of knights attached to the chamber did exist for this period. Only incidental evidence reveals the existence of individuals connected with the chamber. The chamberlains: Gilbert Talbot 1334-36, Henry Ferrars 1336-41 and John Darcy after 1341, were obviously associated with the chamber. John Molyns was described as a knight of the chamber in the 1340s, a connection which stemmed from Molyns' days as a chamber squire and which was maintained after he was knighted sometime between April 1335 and Michaelmas 1336.<sup>1</sup> Others termed "valets of the Chamber" in 1331 and probably promoted as chamber knights are Walter Mauny, John Ufford, Robert Ufford and John Lestrange.<sup>2</sup>

The emergence of a defined body of chamber knights is connected with the revival of the chamber as an administrative body after 1332. From February 1333 onwards, there was a gradual reservation of old chamber lands, augmented temporarily by such feudal rights as fell to the crown. This revival also involved reorganisation of chamber administration, especially the establishment of a new staff to deal with the farming of chamber lands. 1338 marks a turning point. The position of the chamber in administration was recognised in the Walton Ordinances, the chief officers of the chamber then following the king to the continent, creating a split between the members of the chamber following the court and its function as an accounting office. The earliest reference to chamber personnel thus found occurs in 1338 for fees and robes at Michaelmas 1337 and Easter 1338 to Thomas Wake of Bliseworth, Gavain Corder, John de Lisle and Richard Damory "militibus de camera dicti domini regis."<sup>3</sup> By the time Edward and his now greatly inflated household had been established at Antwerp for a considerable time, a party of

---

1 N. Fryde, "A Medieval Robber Baron, Sir John Molyns of Stoke Poges, Bucks" in Medieval Legal Records Edited in Memory of C.A.F. Meekings (gen. eds.) R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post, H.M.S.O. (London, 1978).

2 E101/385/7. This Robert Ufford is not the earl of Suffolk.

3 E101/388/5 m17.

"familiarii" or "secretarii" emerged who shared Edward's furious opposition to the policy of the regency council in England. After the furious row which shook the government in that year, the chamber as an institution expanded rapidly. On 19 June 1341 a series of letters were sent to the chamberlain (Darcy) and to Robert Ferrars, Thomas Holland, John Beauchamp and John Darcy junior "knights of the chamber" at Newcastle.<sup>1</sup> After 1341 the evidence certainly indicates a large and important body of men who were known as chamber knights. At least twelve such men were listed in the household for the period between 19 December 1345 and January 1347.<sup>2</sup> During the last two decades of the reign the king increasingly chose to separate himself from his household altogether, travelling round a select few favourite residences with a small group of courtiers nearly all of whom were chamber officials.<sup>3</sup>

Although it is difficult for this period to speak with conviction about chamber and hall personnel, such a distinction did exist, and was carried into the precedence to be accorded when providing for other needs of household staff. When living at court, the king's knights were also provided with suitable lodgings. This was supposed, as far as possible, to be within the verge of the household, a radius of twelve miles in every direction from wherever the king lay. Each person was to be housed according to rank. Ideally, household officials were to be quartered as close to the king as possible. Each of the classes of household retainers were supposed to receive lodgings together, hence there were supposed to be separate establishments for those whom the king had designated special intimates "qi trenchent devaunt le roy", the various knightly upper officials of

---

1 E101/389/8 m18. The two Darcies and Robert Ferrars were bannerets, but Beauchamp and Holland were simple knights. For a statement that seems to indicate that chamber knights were often the chief bannerets see The Black Book of Edward IV in A.R. Myers, The Household of Edward IV, p.106.

2 Thomas Stapleton, "A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts...." Archaeologia XXXI pp.24-26. They were Walter Mauny, John de Lisle, Hugh Courtney junior, John Grey, Robert and Ralph Ferrars, Richard de la Vache, Philip Despenser, Roger Beauchamp, Miles Stapleton, Robert Mauley and Guy Brien.

3 C.J. Given-Wilson, The Court and Household of Edward III, 1360-1377 p.v.

the household, the king's other knights, and the king's wards, down to the lowest servants.<sup>1</sup>

The household, travelling extremely slowly, often less than twenty miles per day, was known to take residence wherever it happened to find itself at the end of a day's journey. Though the household usually paid for its stay, it sometimes proved necessary to invoke ancient rights of hospitality. Occasionally Edward chose to lodge with members of his household on their private estates. He spent one night in Basingstoke on the way to London on 4 August 1337, a manor then in the hands of the earl of Northampton.<sup>2</sup> On 29 August 1332 he spent one night at Longichinton, a manor belonging to William Clinton and on 6 June 1337 he stayed at Wark castle.<sup>3</sup>

Edward's chief knightly intimates played important roles at court, ruling the military establishment through function of the chief household offices - the stewardship, chamberlainship and marshalship of the household. Of the three offices the most puzzling and least overt is the marshalship, exercised by William Montagu from 1338 through his position as earl marshal.

The relationship between the earl marshalship and the court is a confused one. That the earl marshal originally grew out of a household context is indicated in the Constitutio Domus Regis of Henry I, which speaks of a master marshal as one of the great officers of state equal to the chancellor, treasurer, stewards, butler, chamberlain and constables, and this view was endorsed by the

---

1 The Household Ordinance of York 1318, printed in T.F. Tout, The Place of Edward II, p.311.

2 E101/388/2.

3 E101/388/2. Jean le Bel Chronicon I relates a story of how Edward reputedly raped the earl of Salisbury's wife while staying at Wark castle in the earl's absence in 1342, though it has never been possible to prove that this event actually took place. Antonia Gransden "The Alleged Rape by Edward III of the Countess of Salisbury" E.H.R., LXXXVII (1972) pp.333-344. Salisbury, however was absent in the Low Countries in June 1337, and a definite cooling of relations between Montagu and the king is clearly discernible after Montagu's return in August 1337.

barons of the exchequer in two contemporary enquiries into the office made in 1317 and 1344.<sup>1</sup> The earl marshal had, like the Steward and Chamberlain, moved out of court long before the beginning of the fourteenth century and only claimed the right to exercise his household duties in person at coronations and other peculiar occasions, his functions within the household being exercised through deputies. Any tendency for the office of the earl marshalship and those of his deputies to become separated was checked, however, in the early fourteenth century by claims of the great officers of state to exercise their offices and control household appointments. Thomas of Lancaster as Steward during the 1320s claimed the right to nominate the household steward, and the earls of Oxford had been pressing their claims to use of the chamberlainship repeatedly since 1265. In November - December 1338, Edward III allowed the exchequer to make investigations into this, though their right was not finally conceded until the 1360s.<sup>2</sup> In these circumstances, it is unlikely that either Edward or Montagu would have failed to perceive the potential for extending royal control in the household latent in the office of Earl Marshal, especially if in the hands of a close intimate of the king.

A profusion of claims and opinions were put forward for the post between 1306 when Edward I took the post into his own hands and Montagu's death in 1344. In 1316 the post was officially committed to the king's brother, Thomas, earl of Norfolk, who held it until 1338. It was probably under the tenure of earl Thomas that a document, drawn up possibly in 1327 emanates. In it a variety of extravagant claims were put forward for the earl marshalship within the household. It asserted that it was still his business to maintain order at court by ensuring that unattached women and less desirable persons were removed, arresting evil-

- 
- 1 Hubert Hall (ed.) The Red Book of the Exchequer III, Rolls Series (London, 1896). J.H. Round, The Commune of London and Other Studies, (Westminster, 1899), p.312.
  - 2 T.F. Tout, Chapters IV, p.338.

doers and attaching them before the court of the verge. He still claimed the privilege of one night's free lodging at the expense of the local community wherever he or his ministers stopped to procure lodgings for the court. When at court, the earl marshal seemingly sat at the right side of the steward at table and saw to the feeding of the knights of the hall. In addition, he assumed the right to an extraordinary variety of fees and fines whenever anyone of authority came to court, each payment being calculated on a graduated scale based on the rank of the individual. When he himself was at court, he demanded  $\frac{1}{2}$  sextary of wine, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  sextary of "London" wine, torches and 5 candles, more on feast days, plus all beasts. At Christmas he might have 3 robes of the king's livery, one of scarlet and two of the suit of the king's knights, one to be furred with 10 skins, one with 9 skins and one with coney fur. At Pentecost he expected to receive one robe of scarlet lined with cendal and two others of the suit of the king's knights. Whenever he undertook harbinger duties himself he assumed the right to exact one night's free lodging at the town to which the court was due to visit. Any freeman of knightly or burgess status or above arrested in the presence of the king must pay the earl marshal  $\frac{1}{2}$  mark and send another  $\frac{1}{2}$  mark to the earl's clerk at the exchequer. Armed felons must give up their arms to him, and unwelcome followers of the court, if refused redress of their grievances and ordered to depart, should they continue to follow, were liable to arrest of horse and harness. In addition, the marshal and his knightly lieutenant were supposedly entitled to receive writs free of charge.<sup>1</sup> Had all this really been the practice under Edward III, the earl marshalship would have been a lucrative post. In fact this is unlikely. During the latter years of Edward I's reign the marshal's deputy's rights were on the Scottish campaign of 1301 commuted for a mere £100,<sup>2</sup> suggesting that little real interest was displayed

---

1 Durham Dean and Chapter Muniments Reg.I, 179v-181. See Nicholas Pronay and John Taylor, Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1980) pp.18-22. For comments on claims for the rights and office of the marshal see M.C. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance under Edward I, p.263 n.3.

2 M.C. Prestwich, War, Politics and Finance, p.167.

in reviving the duties of the great officers of state at court.

When earl Thomas died in 1338, Edward committed the earl marshalship to William Montagu. Conceivably, Montagu considered himself Norfolk's heir to the title, at least since his own creation as earl in March of the previous year. At York in February 1333 Montagu had purchased for £20,000 the marriage of Norfolk's younger daughter Alice for his second son, John. Norfolk had agreed to provide his daughter with a maritagium of the lands of Carlow and Allcastle in Ireland, and the manor of Hampstead Marshal in Berkshire, which Montagu or his executors were to enjoy during the interval, with the provision that should John and Alice produce no children, the estates were to revert to Norfolk's right heirs.<sup>1</sup> In turn, Montagu promised to provide a jointure of lands and rents worth 600 marks in England, with reversion to Montagu's right heirs failing issue, in which case the recognisance for £20,000 was to be voided.<sup>2</sup> This was confirmed by Edward on 3 February 1333.<sup>3</sup>

Both children were very young, John only three years old, and a protracted betrothal of fifteen years was anticipated. By right of this fifteen year interest in John and Alice's marriage settlement, and the nonage of both children at the time of Norfolk's death, Salisbury had a strong claim to exercise lordship in that part of Norfolk's inheritance accruing to Alice, at least until 1348. Both Irish manors and particularly Hampstead Marshal were intimately associated with the earl marshalship. The tenure of Hampstead Marshal was as early as 1248 believed to be connected with the post, though an inquisition taken in 1306 stated the manor to be held by knights service.<sup>4</sup> He was also, unlike Norfolk's other

---

1 E328/108/11. For discussion of provision of maritagium and jointure in the fourteenth century see K.B. McFarlane, The Nobility of Later Medieval England, pp.64-5; G. Holmes, Estates of the High Nobility, pp.43-45.

2 E328/108/10.

3 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.402.

4 J.H. Round, The King's Serjeants and Officers of State with their Coronation Services, London, (1911), pp.45, 90; L.W. Vernon Harcourt, His Grace the Steward and Trial by Peers: a novel enquiry into a special branch of constitutional government, etc., (London, 1907), p.181n.

son-in-law John Segrave, an earl.<sup>1</sup>

This agreement was apparently still in effect in March 1337 when Montagu was created earl of Salisbury and his brother Edward knighted, and perhaps at the date when the earl marshalship was granted for life to Montagu.<sup>2</sup> Matters were, however, severely jeopardised by Edward Montagu. Montagu's brother was approaching marriagable age and although the events are obscure, shortly after this date ran off with Alice and married her himself. They were certainly married by December 1338 when he was promised his wife's purparty, and the division of the estates went ahead in March 1339.<sup>3</sup> Whatever Montagu's private anger may have been, he apparently acquiesced in this division of the Norfolk estates. But he did not relinquish the lands designated in the agreement of 1333. Montagu is known to have had control of Carlow in 1337, and he still held on to it even after 1340. Edward Montagu had received the Irish estates by 1348, but found difficulty in obtaining Hampstead Marshal even after this date.<sup>4</sup>

The chief lieutenants of the earl marshal, the marshal of the hall and the marshal harbinger, together with the knight usher were in charge of the day to day regulation of the hall. They had closely prescribed duties to oversee the work of the serjeants, usher and marshal to ensure that the hall was properly served, that no-one ate there unless authorised or entered any of the offices

- 
- 1 J.H. Round, The Commune of London, p.313ff. By at least Richard II the idea of the Marshal of England and the earl marshal had become inextricably associated. In practice Bracton's view that the serjeantries were impartible and should descend to the eldest heirs was ignored.
  - 2 It seems highly unlikely that, had Edward already married, he would have been dubbed a simple knight bachelor. Neither he nor his widow and co-heirs received these manors in the partition.
  - 3 C.F.R. IV, 111. See, however, Edward had protection as with the royal forces in September 1338. He was not, however, with the forces paid in E36/203 fols.131r-137v or in his brother's private retinue.
  - 4 Robin Frame, English Lordship in Ireland 1318-1360 (Oxford, 1982) p.70.

and stores without permission. In addition the knights marshal maintained discipline within the hall and made arrangements for accommodation when the court was travelling.<sup>1</sup> When public order was infringed, the knight marshal exercised authority to arrest disturbers of the peace within the verge, remove such persons who were found at court without due authorisation, and punish offenders by means of fines and amercements levied at the court of the verge which he held jointly with the steward and coroner of the household.<sup>2</sup>

There is some question as to whether these knights marshal were actually appointed by and answerable to the earl marshal or the king. The Constitutio Domus Regis speaks of a master marshal and four marshals who serve the household divided between those "faciunt herbergeriam vel extra curiam in negocio Regis" and the "hostiarii milites", seeming to indicate that these marshals were in some way connected with the earl marshal. Their exact relationship, however, remains obscure. By the reign of Edward II there were only two knights marshal and two serjeants who probably developed out of the four marshals of Henry I's time. It is possible that a distinction was drawn by the early fourteenth century between the two knights marshal only one of whom was considered a deputy of the earl marshal.<sup>4</sup> Tout believed that the hall marshals were answerable solely to the king.<sup>5</sup> It is quite clear in the 1318 ordinances that the earl marshal had a knightly lieutenant involved in making attachments before the court of the marshalsea from which Johnson was able to identify at least the marshal harbinger as a deputy of the earl marshal during the early years of the

---

1 T.F. Tout, Chapters II, pp. 158, 253, 282, 283; T.F. Tout, The Place of Edward II, pp.283-4.

2 Ibid., pp.312-14.

3 The Red Book of the Exchequer III, (ed.) Hubert Hall, p.812.

4 J.H. Johnson, "The King's Wardrobe and Household", English Government at Work I, p.209.

5 T.F. Tout, Chapters II, p.252.

reign,<sup>1</sup> and he believed that the marshal harbinger was also appointed as one of the hall marshals. The relationship between the other knight marshal and the earl are less clear, but claims put forward in 1377 imply that they may be related.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, evidence as to who was acting as hall marshal and marshal harbinger between 1338 and 1344 does not allow us to make any clear identifications of Montagu's tenure of office.

When absent from England, Montagu's authority within the household was exercised through Nicholas de la Beche, his Lieutenant.<sup>3</sup> It was in this capacity that Edward appointed de la Beche to act as one of the Justices of oyer and terminer of trespasses within the verge of the court of the duke of Cornwall, then acting as keeper of the realm "as trespasses within the verge of the household would be heard and determined if he (the king) were present."<sup>4</sup> He replaced John Leuknore as the king's lieutenant at court,<sup>5</sup> indicating that the earl marshal's influence over his deputy within the household made him more than merely one of the king's knights who assumed the title of the earl's lieutenant by a historical anachronism, but was a genuine representative of the earl marshal at court. As lieutenant he was entitled to 4s per day while exercising his office on the earl's behalf, a wage which was reduced to only 2s per day when the earl himself was at court. The earl marshal also appointed a knight, clerk, sub-clerk and serjeant to make attachments and amercements before the court of the verge, and also keep the prisons of the marshalsea, though the

---

1 J.H. Johnson, "The King's Wardrobe and Household", English Government at Work I, p.210.

2 J.H. Round, The Commune of London, p.303.

3 C.P.R. 1338-40 pp.182, 185. Foedera II, ii, 1100.

4 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.185. In fact de la Beche had been constable of the Tower since 1336 and in July 1338 had been appointed guardian of the household of the Duke of Cornwall.

5 C.C.R. 1337-39 p.79.

knights' duties were probably undertaken by one of the hall marshals. In addition the earl maintained another clerk at the exchequer in charge of the earl's account there and to guard all those arrested at the exchequer.<sup>1</sup>

The earl of Salisbury's authority within the marshalsea of the king's bench was exercised by Walter Mauny.<sup>2</sup> Appointed before 1338 by a grant of Thomas Brotherton for life,<sup>3</sup> he was never a personal retainer of the earl of Salisbury, and the office was apparently one of the appendages of the earl marshalship which had become confused during the passage of time. Mauny himself probably exercised the office through deputy, but he could not be displaced for a personal candidate of the earl marshal. When Montagu's successor as earl marshal tried to oust Mauny and appoint his own serjeant to the post he was unsuccessful. Mauny held onto the post firmly until November 1357.<sup>4</sup>

Even had Montagu and the king not regarded the earl marshalship first and foremost as a military post, as seems most likely, it still left Montagu, now no longer officially one of the king's knights, with considerable influence within the household, both among the military forces with the king in the Low Countries after 1338 and also within the administration at home. It ensured a degree of communication and co-operation between the two forces through the influence of Edward's most trusted friend. It also meant that the royal household continued to reflect the same outlook for the next seven years as had characterised it during the 1330s when Montagu was the chief power at court.

1 Durham Dean and Chapter Muniments, Reg.I fol.181.

2 C.C.R. 1339-41 p.458. E36/203 fol.57. "De domino Waltero de Mauny locum tenentem comes Mareschallus in banco Regis" who paid money into the wardrobe "pro evasione trium felonium a custodia sua". See also C.P.R. 1330-34 p.40 a ratification of a life granted by the earl marshal of the serjeantry of the marshalsea of the household to Geoffrey Quincy and a similar confirmation of the office of the clerk of the household to Peter de Grete til Michaelmas 1338.

3 C.P.R. 1343-45 pp.263, 264.

4 G.O. Sayles (ed.) Select Cases of the Court of King's Bench Vol.VI, Edward III, Selden Society Vol.82 (1965) p.xlii; Select Cases of the Court of King's Bench Vol.V, Edward III, Selden Society Vol.76 (1956) p.xxv.

The steward was the chief secular officer of the household, with the keeper dual head of the household, and supreme head of its military branches. His control over the household was absolute, being completely independent of outside interference and directly responsible to the king alone. Consequently he was a person of considerable influence within the realm. He, with his counterpart the chamberlain, were the king's chief personal servants and were rarely absent from court except when with the king. Because they wielded such power both within the household and beyond, the stewardship was an office which under Edward II had frequently gone to royal favourites.<sup>1</sup> Edward II's appointments did not rouse the same popular disgust, but all the stewards during this period were bannerets and powerful barons in their own right. Robert Ufford was appointed steward on 5 March 1336, though his predecessor Neville continued to act up to at least 20 March. Ufford was certainly acting as steward on 16 March, although possibly there were two stewards between 5 and 20 March. He continued to hold office until created Earl of Suffolk in March 1337.<sup>2</sup>

The steward's duties were two-fold. He had administrative responsibilities in drawing up the daily household accounts with the treasurer and controller and seeing that everything which came under his cognisance was properly accounted for.<sup>3</sup> The rendering of accounts took place before him, infringements of rules being punishable by dismissal, suspension or fines. Any member of the household deemed guilty of an offence was handed over to the custody of the steward until brought to trial.<sup>4</sup> More importantly, he had control over the personnel of the household, particularly of those who dined in the hall, their recruitment, appointment, con-

---

1 James Conway Davies, Baronial Opposition, pp.208-209.

2 T.F. Tout, Chapters VI, p.43.

3 James Conway Davies, *op.cit.*, p.213.

4 L.W. Vernon Harcourt, His Grace the Steward and Trial by Peers, pp.337, 424.

duct and dismissal. Together with the keeper, the steward had the right of appointment of staff to the household, no letters of appointment apparently being issued, though officers seem customarily to have received letters under the privy seal.<sup>1</sup> In a mediatory role the steward acted on their behalf, personal requests often being addressed through him, and servants of the king who wished to sue for particular grievances did so before the steward.<sup>2</sup> It was he who represented the authority of the household as a body, symbolised in his wand of office.<sup>3</sup>

The knightly household officials - the steward, chamberlain and marshals - were vital in maintaining the discipline of the household, through the organ of the court of the verge. The court of the verge, which had jurisdiction for twelve miles from where the king was lodged, was the means by which the household exercised authority over its own members and any malefactors who came within its bounds. Such a court, independent of the common law system, specially quick and convenient, was rendered necessary by the peculiar needs of an itinerant household,<sup>4</sup> and encouraged by the claims of members of the king's household to privileged status. The court had two arms, one tried by the clerk or coroner of the household concerned with matters arising out of the market and questions of purveyance, the second with the pleas of the hall and cases of trespass within the verge. Here we are only concerned with the latter.

Pleas of the hall were presided over by the steward in association with such of the secular officers of the household as he chose to employ. The knight marshal

1 J.H. Johnson, "The King's Wardrobe and Household", English Government at Work I p.237.

2 James Conway Davies, Baronial Opposition, p.213.

3 A.R. Myers, The Household of Edward IV. The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478 (Manchester, 1959), p.142 gives the steward's simple ceremony of installation.

4 Fleta Volume II, (eds.) H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles. Selden Society LXXII (1953).

an lieutenant of the earl marshal made attachments, oversaw the performance of any necessary punishments and guarded the marshalsea prisons.<sup>1</sup> No accounts have survived for Ufford's tenure of office. Robert Hovel, the coroner of the household, whose duty it was to assist the marshal and steward in administering the issues of the court of the verge, paid into the wardrobe for the period July 1334 to August 1337 only £45 5s 2d as compared with £104 2s 1½d paid in for the period 24 September 1329 to 16 October 1331, indicating that little of importance came before Ufford during this period.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, the judicial powers invested in the steward and his fellow officers and exercised through the peculiar jurisdiction of the court of the verge, emphasising as it did the "ancient notion of the special sanctity of the king's person" and the special status of the members of the king's own household,<sup>3</sup> increased considerably the authority and influence of the royal household as a body.

The stewards were also among the king's chief councillors. The officers of the household had a special right to be on the royal council, since they represented the whole body of the king's ministers whom Fleta lists as being sworn of the king's of the king's counsel.<sup>4</sup> These officers formed the core of a larger body of fluctuating size and composition, but the chief of which was always the chancellor, treasurer, keeper of the privy seal, chamberlain and steward, and they dealt with the greatest bulk of the routine administrative work of the council.

---

1 G.O. Sayles, Select Cases of the Court of King's Bench V, pp.70-71. There was a marshalsea at Dover Castle under Clinton between 1329 and 1332.

2 Nero C.VIII fol.198v. J.H. Johnson, "The King's Wardrobe and Household", English Government at Work I, p.248. Compare the issues of the market 1329-31 - £420 0s 8d and 1334-37 - £191 11s 8d. The only accounts for the court of the verge prior to 1342 for the reign of Edward III are fragments of the account of John de Wysham in 1328.

3 W.R. Jones, The Court of the Verge : the Jurisdiction of the Steward and Marshal in the Household in the Later Middle Ages, Journal of British Studies 10 (1970) pp.6, 7.

4 Fleta Commentarius lib.ii c.36, quoted <sup>in</sup> James Fosdick Baldwin, The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages (Oxford, reprinted 1969) p.72.

In the absence of payments of daily wages for attendance at council meetings, evidence of Ufford's role in this capacity is drawn almost entirely from charter roll witnessing evidence. Ufford was rarely noted as a witness to royal charters prior to 1334, so it is probable that he was not a member of Edward's council during the early years of the reign. His name appears twice in 1331 and twice more in 1334. By contrast, as steward he attested more than forty in the course of 1336 and every charter issued up to March 1337, even though he may not necessarily have been present when such business was transacted. After his creation as earl of Suffolk in 1337 his name disappears as a witness to royal charters and he did not again begin to witness charters until July 1343.<sup>1</sup>

Like the steward the chamberlain was normally a banneret and one of the magnates in the royal household and he too wielded enormous influence over the king. It is therefore particularly unfortunate that so little material is available concerning chamber personnel, since, though the wardrobe accounts do not make this clear, either Montagu, Clinton or Bohun was undoubtedly acting as chamberlain between August 1334 and March 1337. Clinton is perhaps the least likely candidate. He was ill for a lengthy period during the summer of 1336; he was also the constable of Dover and warden of the Cinque Ports, a post which required his full responsibility and periodic absences from court.

Attestation to charters is a convenient means of assessing the relative importance of individuals at court<sup>2</sup> and the following evidence is taken from an

---

1 For this and subsequent references to charter roll witnesses under Edward III see a handwritten list for use in the search room of the Public Record Office, London.

2 Similar evidence was analysed by Maitland for 1305 and by others for the reign of Henry IV and it seems throughout to correspond fairly closely to attendance rates on the council. These do show that the members of the royal military household were frequently in attendance, if rather irregular in doing so. See F.W. Maitland, Memoranda de Parlamento p.xxxix and J.L. Kirby, "Councils and Councillors of Henry IV, 1399-1413", T.R.H.S. 5th Series, XIV (1964), pp.44-45.

analysis of the Charter Rolls for the years 1334-36. These clearly illustrate the pre-eminence of Montagu as a royal councillor. In 1334 he was witness to every charter issued under the great seal save four. In 1335 his name appears on 40 of the 50 or so charters issued in that year and on 44 of the 65 charters issued in 1336.<sup>1</sup> Gaps correspond exactly to those periods when Montagu is known to have been absent from court on embassy (19 April to 20 May 1335, 20 October 1335 .. 23 February 1336 and 1 July to 27 September 1336). During this same period, Clinton witnessed only six charters in 1334, three in 1335 and ten in 1336. Bohun is not recorded as witnessing a single charter before his creation as earl in 1337.

The presumption is strongly that the chamberlainship was in Montagu's hands from 1334 to 1337, a supposition given additional weight by the emergence of a new seal during 1335 associated with the chamber. The first reference to this is noted by Tout in a letter patent of 7 December 1335 which relates that William Kildsby, Receiver of the chamber, has made letters patent under the new seal described as "the king's secret seal called the griffin" to the keeper of the hanaper in acknowledgement of a payment by him for the king's use.<sup>2</sup> The griffin was certainly adopted by Edward as a chamber seal though difficulties encountered in gaining recognition for it provoked repeated orders to the exchequer to accept it as sufficient warrant for disbursement to chamber officials.<sup>3</sup> By 1339 it was closely associated with the chamber lands office and in 1346 its jurisdiction was extended to include all chamber transactions till abolished with the specially reserved chamber lands in 1356. It seems never to have had exclusive authority but acted in situations where the secret seal was absent with the king.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 The evidence for 1336 is dubious, as many charters appear to have been enrolled by mistake under the wrong year.

2 T.F. Tout, Chapters IV, p.277.

3 Bertie Wilkinson, The Chancery under Edward III, pp.224, 226.

4 T.F. Tout, Chapters IV, p.277.

The griffin was the personal emblem of the Montagus. Simon Montagu wore arms at the battle of Falkirk azure, two griffins or, and at Caerlaverock he was depicted with a blue banner showing a griffin rampant in gold.<sup>1</sup> Montagu's son in 1355 used as his personal seal a griffin's head between two elevated wings.<sup>2</sup> Tout put forward the suggestion that its adoption was a complimentary gesture to the king's best friend, associated with Edward's assumption of Montagu's arms and Montagu's assumption of those of the king in the campaign of 1335.<sup>3</sup> Edward, delighted with Montagu's fervour in his cause during the course of the campaign, presented him with a charger caprisoned with Montagu's arms and, as a chivalric gesture, promised that thenceforth Montagu might bear the king's own eagle crest, for the support of which honour the king conceded him the reversion of two manors in which he was to have the valuable right of return of writ.<sup>4</sup> Montagu is known to have used this crest at least once on his seal in October 1337.<sup>5</sup>

Its origins, however, may be slightly earlier than noted by Tout, suggesting that Montagu as chamberlain simply used his personal seal in transactions associated with his office in the chamber when such need arose. Wilkinson notes an instance on 18 March 1335 of a letter of the council commanding the chancellor to grant licence to the prior and convent of Merton to elevate a new prior which was endorsed "by Council" and sealed with Montagu's seal.<sup>6</sup> Similar writs were issued using Montagu's seal in March 1335 in favour of Sybil de St. Martin and again in 1336 in Scotland to write to the keeper of the privy seal.<sup>7</sup>

- 
- 1 Charles Moor, The Knights of Edward I, Harleian Society Vol.3, 166.
  - 2 Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals, no.24 (eds.) L.C.Loyd and D.W. Stenton (Oxford, 1950).
  - 3 T.F.Tout, Chapters V, p.182.
  - 4 C. Charter Rolls IV 1327-1341 pp.348-9.
  - 5 Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals, no.188.
  - 6 Bertie Wilkinson, The Chancery under Edward III, p.224.
  - 7 R. Douch, The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, pp.81-82. For other examples of Montagu seals see H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England, H.W.S.O. (London, 1926) pp.109-112; C.H. Hunter Blair "A Note upon Medieval Seals with Special Reference to those in Durham Treasury" Archaeologia Aeliana 3rd Series XVII (1920) plate E no.10.

All the king's knights were expected to fulfill a variety of duties associated with the royal household, which might take them "extra curiam" for short periods. Knights might be ordered to arrest malefactors, escort important visitors to or from court, oversee the work of lesser officials particularly in military matters, or carry important messages. As a prominent member of the household, William Clinton in 1328 acted as courier for queen Isabella in her dispute with Margaret Badlesmere over Leeds castle,<sup>1</sup> and in the winter of 1328-29 he was employed as a go-between as disputes between the earls of March and Leicester threatened to culminate in armed conflict.<sup>2</sup> William Bohun and his brother Edward were sent to escort queen Isabella to court for the Christmas festivities from her enforced seclusion at Castle Rising in December 1330.<sup>3</sup> Clinton and Bartholemew Burghersh were sent to Dover in December 1327 to meet Philippa of Hainault and conduct her to York for her wedding.<sup>4</sup>

Absences from court were fairly frequent, either on official business or for private reasons. Ill-health kept Clinton on his estates in Kent for several weeks in the summer of 1336.<sup>5</sup> Magnates would need time to visit their own estates and families periodically. Some members of the household tended to spend longer periods at court than did others, depending on the degree of influence with the king and commitment to private affairs.

When not at court, members kept in touch with one another by a constant stream of messengers and gifts. Montagu remained with the household in Windsor when Edward was in the West Country in November and December 1333,<sup>6</sup> he was in

---

1 C.I.P.M., Edward III, Vol.II., p.89.

2 Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls...City of London 1323-1364 (ed.) A.H. Thomas (Cambridge, 1926), p.78; G.A. Holmes, "The Rebellion of the earl of Lancaster 1328-9", B.I.H.R. 28 (1955) p.85; V.B. Redstone, "Some Mercenaries of Henry of Lancaster 1327-1330", T.R.H.S. 3rd Series, VII, (1913), p.162.

3 C.P.R. 1330-34, p.36.

4 C.P.R. 1327-30, p.190.

5 C.P.R. 1334-38, p.295.

6 E101/387/9.

the West Country himself on 24 September 1328<sup>1</sup> and in Somerset 15-25 October 1329.<sup>2</sup> Letters arriving on 2 May 1338 via Ralph Prestwold brought news from the earl of Salisbury of the seige of Dunbar.<sup>3</sup> Clinton was in Kent on 27 July 1333 when letters were sent to him from Berwick.<sup>4</sup> Montagu and Bohun, who both possessed private studs, were particularly fond of sending Edward horses when they were absent from court.<sup>5</sup> One horse in particular, received from Montagu on 24 January 1332 went by the name of "Houst".<sup>6</sup>

The hall and chamber formed the inner hoops of a set of concentric circles which grouped about the king and his family and comprised the court, a body of fluctuating size and composition.<sup>7</sup> All magnates might expect to attend court on occasion to receive summons to the king at parliaments and on high and holy days, but the full-time, dedicated and professional courtiers were the men of the king's domestic establishment. They formed the nucleus of the court, given special status by their propinquity to the king and their special relationship with him. Montagu, Clinton, Bohun and Ufford epitomise the courtier type of Edward III's reign in terms of wealth and status and in their tastes, outlook and attitudes.

The members of his military establishment were richly rewarded by Edward III with gifts, grants, wardships and marriages and in administrative posts. In addition, there were the fringe benefits in the form of sick pay, care, legal protection, decent burial and, above all, enhanced political importance.<sup>8</sup>

---

1 E101/383/14.

2 E403/279 m1.

3 E101/388/5 m10.

4 E101/386/8; E101/386/10.

5 B.L. Add. MS 46,350 m3; E101/389/8 m19; E36/203 fols. 100v, 104v.

6 E101/385/16.

7 "Aspects of English Court Culture in the Later Fourteenth Century", J.W. Sherborne, in English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages, London (1983) (eds.) V.J. Scattergood and J.W. Sherborne, p.2.

8 For the systemised function of the royal households as charity giving bodies see Hilda Johnstone, "Poor Relief in the Royal Households of Thirteenth Century England", Speculum V (1929), pp.365-389.

New Year's Day was the usual time chosen by the king to demonstrate his special regard for the members of his household through the distribution of gifts. At New Year 1330 these took the form of surcoats and girdles (belts) valued at 26s 8d and 20s respectively for Montagu, and similar garments of equal or lesser value were distributed through the household and to those of queen Philippa and the earl of Chester.<sup>1</sup> On 1 January 1334 Robert Ufford was given a cup and ewer valued at £8 10s and William Bohun a silver gilt cup and ewer worth £6 17s 1½d. The exchange of gifts took place in the king's chamber and was extended through members of the royal family, earls, bishops, bannerets, to chamber valets. While this was taking place, two minstrels of Lombardy played psalms.<sup>2</sup> The total expences of this occasion reached £250 17s 0½d. At other times the king's generosity might take the form of stores, especially wine<sup>3</sup> or money. During the Berwick campaign Edward gave away 6375 marks in sums ranging between 200 marks for earls to 100s for some knights. Robert Ufford received 800 marks and Montagu 900 marks.<sup>4</sup> Even from day to day the king's knights might hope to receive small gifts of money for bringing important messages, discharging the king's debts or in exchange for gifts to the king.<sup>5</sup> The primary obligation of any king was generosity especially towards the members of his household,<sup>6</sup> and Edward was renowned for his generosity, not only with gifts but in grants of offices, wardships, marriages and other forms of patronage.<sup>7</sup> Accumulated over a lifetime of royal service, the fruits of royal bounty could yield quite considerable sums, often, for bannerets, in excess of £2000 to £3000

---

1 E101/384/18.

2 E101/387/9. "Fultoni et Paulo mihisralis de Lombardi saltantibus coram Rege".

3 E36/203 fol.108r. Wine gifts to the earl of Suffolk and various members of the household.

4 C62/110 m2.

5 E36/203 fol.105v.

6 A.R. Larson, The King's Household in England before the Norman Conquest, (London, 1904), p.2.

7 A.R. Myers, The Household of Edward IV, p.85 where it states that Edward III was the first really to exploit the use of office holding as a means of rewarding household members, although this was not really a new departure.

per annum, and lesser knights between £50 to £2000 per annum.<sup>1</sup>

In terms of literary patronage and encouragement of the arts, Edward's court displayed little of the interest evident in that of his grandson.<sup>2</sup> Edward was concerned with upholding the dignity of his kingship and rebuilding the trust between the crown and magnates which had been undermined by his parents, and this was reflected in the flavour adopted by his court. Emphasis was placed on encouraging military prowess and the chivalric attitude with which this was associated.

The interests of Edward's knights in the values of chivalry is apparent from the encouragement given to the production of rolls of arms in this period. Ufford in particular seems to have shown a keen interest. His name has been linked with the roll known as Cotgrave's Ordinary, dated prior to 1340 and seemingly created for him as earl of Suffolk since it is his name which heads the list. Ufford is also connected with a roll of the 1350s which displays a strong East Anglian bias and is dominated by the shields of seven members of the Ufford family. William Clinton is suggested as the probable patron of names connected with the Ashmole Roll, now in the Bodleian, which he may have intended to have commissioned by his own herald as Constable of Dover.<sup>3</sup>

Edward is known to have been fond of music, chess, gaming, hunting, hawking and all forms of lavish display, but even as a child his favourite occupation was feats of arms, an interest presumably shared by the children and young men trained up in his household. The king with his knights formed a close community based on chivalry which reflected an atmosphere at court in which the young men desired to share in honourable enterprises and noble adventures of arms. Above all, it was court pageantry, elaborate ceremonial and a code of behaviour based on the chivalric

---

1 C.J. Given-Wilson, The Court and Household of Edward III, p.19.

2 Gervase Mathew, The Court of Richard II, pp.38-73.

3 N. Denholm Young, Country Gentry, pp.98, 112-13, 119-120, and edited in The Reliquary (1889, 1890). H. Stanford London, "Some Medieval Treatises on English Heraldry", The Antiquaries Journal 33 (1953)

ethos, which was inspired by the court culture of Edward's reign. Edward was fully conscious of the value of exploiting court ceremonial to the full in the pursuit of personal prestige. Increasingly, as he grew older, Edward spent more and more money on enlarging his residences, refurbishing palaces, chapels and other buildings and developing a lavish ceremonial based on the tournament in an attempt to build up his court as a model of chivalric culture among the courts of Europe.

Mrs Vale has listed at least thirty-one tournaments attended by the king or members of his court and household between 1327 and 1341.<sup>1</sup> Of particular note were a set of tournaments held in 1331. The first of these was held by Clinton at Dartford in April to celebrate Edward's return from France. Edward himself fought for the "Hometeam".<sup>2</sup> The second was a "Hasiluda" held in Cheapside by William Montagu. The costs of the event were borne by Montagu who spent lavishly on it, much to the wonder and admiration of many of his contemporaries who declared that its like had never before been seen. An enormous arena was built between the cross and conduit, the jousting area was enclosed by a wooden fence, the arena strewn with sand. Montagu himself took up residence at the palace of the bishop of London where he proceeded to entertain lavishly. On the opening day London was packed out with knights and members of the nobility from all over England. In the procession which preceded the games, the king, Montagu and other elected knights, dressed magnificently and masked to represent Tartars, each led by a silver chain a noble and beautiful lady wearing a tunic of red velvet and white cameline. At vespers the knights rode two by two through Cheapside with their fully caprisoned horses, all dressed in a single uniform, to a loud musical accompaniment. On the following three days the knights formed themselves into teams, sixteen knights on the home team taking on all comers, Edward with Montagu and fourteen of his household knights forming the home team and continuing to wear

---

1 Juliet Vale, Edward III and Chivalry, pp.172-173.

2 Annales Paulini, Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Vol.I (ed.) W. Stubbs, Rolls Series (London, 1882) p.352.

the Tartar costumes.<sup>1</sup> The staging of this event was clearly a carefully thought-out affair. The choice of costumes is interesting. Armenian representatives had been seen in England in search of support against the Turks. Montagu seems to have taken up the idea of the crusade with enthusiasm - he is later in 1343 known to have spent six months on embassy in Spain fighting against the Moors - and the staging of a tournament at this point was perhaps intended to promote the idea of a crusade. The question of a joint Anglo-French expedition was raised by Montagu on embassy to France in 1331<sup>2</sup> and provisionally adopted in the March parliament of 1332, though it was never to take place.

These set pieces, spiced with hazards, cast a sense of glamour over war which was encouraged. They mingled the sense of courage, competitive high spirits and the thrill of adventure offering the chance to win personal renown. Edward was more inclined than his ancestors to encourage enthusiasm for jousting provided it was within the ambit of court ritual, for it tended to emphasise the knightly virtues which he was so anxious to foster. When Edward arranged three days of jousting at Windsor in 1344 at which he intended to set up a round table in imitation of king Arthur, and at which Montagu was killed, invitations were sent out to knights and nobles all over Europe. By this means Edward hoped and did recruit a number of important foreigners to his cause. Such ceremonials, by appealing to the normal interests of the men of his day, helped bind the chief military tenants closer to the crown and fostered in them a love for his cause and a desire to emulate martial excellence.<sup>3</sup> In this Edward was supremely successful. Froissart and Jeanle Bel considered Edward the pattern of the chivalric hero and his knights provided models for lessons in true knightly behaviour. The

---

1 Annales Paulini, p.352.

2 Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans : La Papauté, la France et l'Angleterre 1328-1342, (Paris, 1902), p.81.

3 M. McKisack, The Fourteenth Century, p.251.

knights of the royal household, grouped tightly about the king, following and anticipating his desires in these matters particularly in the military field, all trained to obey his commands to the letter, were the means by which he was able to achieve such enormous prestige.

3. THE KING'S KNIGHTS IN WAR

The king's knights were retained to serve the king in peace and war, and it is their role in war to which this chapter is dedicated. An attempt will be made to examine the military achievement of Clinton, Montagu, Bohun and Ufford, beginning with their personal service in the Scottish wars and moving on to the first phase of the Hundred Years War. It will be necessary to abandon an analytical approach, stressing instead not only what can be learned of participation in particular campaigns through administrative and financial sources, but also their role in the making of policy decisions which effected the course of Edward's wars. Here we are concerned solely with land fighting and therefore Clinton, whose health appears to have been a factor, must be largely ignored. As will be demonstrated in chapter five, his contribution to military affairs stemmed from his role as Constable of Dover and Admiral of the Southern fleets.

The main role of the knightly members of the royal household was military. Men were recruited into the king's entourage on the basis of military function. The part they played in the king's wars was dependent on whether or not they could claim knighthood, and what personal or social distinction they achieved was closely connected with success in the field. The military household gave the king the power of rapid deployment of troops in an emergency,<sup>1</sup> a point of great importance in many of the Scottish campaigns of the 1330s when frequent trouble in Scotland and Edward's personal ambitions in that kingdom required swift mobilisation ability to deal with the situation on the Northern marches. In every one of the campaigns in Scotland and France between the accession of Edward and the truce of Esplechin which ended the first phase of the Hundred Years War, it was the members of the king's household who, by providing their own contingents or fighting as individuals,

---

1 J.E. Morris, Welsh Wars of Edward I : a contribution to Medieval Military History based on Original Documents, (Oxford, 1901), p.84.

constituted the heart of royal armies. All the king's knights, bannerets and many of the household squires with only a very few exceptions were present on each major military offensive. Only very peculiar circumstances permitted of absence - severe illness, occupation with important official business, or special personal circumstances. These men formed a stable body of knights and men at arms whose availability could be relied upon as a constant and stabilising factor in military affairs. About this committed body grouped the other leaders of the armies with their contingents. Many of them would themselves be ex-household retainers with experience of organising war from the centre of government. A knight, if he was to be recruited into the royal household on a permanent basis, would have to show an active interest in military affairs as well as exhibit ability and flair on campaign. Only a "miles strenuus" had the necessary experience and authority to be entrusted with important government affairs.

The king's bannerets were the foremost members of the special body of fighting men in the royal household who formed the nucleus of all armies, especially when the king was present on campaign. Bannerets were expected to display particular martial talent since their special standing in the royal household was dependent on military success. They were the leaders of sizeable contingents on campaigns and must necessarily inspire confidence and instill discipline into their forces.<sup>1</sup> Equally, on campaign their pre-eminence was recognised by a rate of pay which at 4s a day was double that of a knight. Further, they had the proud distinction of being able to carry into battle a rectangular banner which symbolised their ability to levy war.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 A few men were bannerets of status, for instance Anthony Pessagno who appears on a list of wardrobe officials in 1330 while acting as financial agent to the crown, but they did so as leaders of retinues of appropriate size for bannerets.

2 N. Denholm-Young, History and Heraldry 1254-1310. A Study in the Historical Value of the Rolls of Arms, (Oxford, 1969), pp.22-23.

A brief analysis of the following table indicates the correlation between service in the field and promotion in the royal household. A total of fifty-two men were so styled bannerets of the royal household during the period 1327-1341 and most led active careers in the field. Of the thirty-one bannerets retained at court during the ascendancy of Mortimer, all but a few were known as Mortimer's supporters and fell from power with his arrest and execution. Of the remaining few a handful joined the group of dispossessed under Edward Balliol, the rest fought for Edward in the campaigns of 1333 and 1334. By 1334, death and other interests had reduced the bannerets retained in the household to only seven. Those bannerets who did not proffer military service in Scotland in the 1330s did not continue to be fed on household lists.<sup>1</sup> Equally, it was just those eight knights who most frequently accompanied Edward to Scotland with their own contingents in the 1330s who were promoted to banneret status in 1338-39.

The length and frequency of service of this handful of men was exceptional. The government did not call on all its potential captains at any one time and for most war was only an occasional occupation.<sup>2</sup> Proximity to the king was the primary factor in choice of military captains, as is well illustrated in the careers of Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and Bohun.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, knights and bannerets were retained with the promise to provide a fixed quota of military strength for the king's service. Unfortunately detailed statistics are lacking. We know that Montagu was retained in 1329 with 20 men at arms,<sup>3</sup> but can only assume similar figures

---

1 That is, Montagu, Clinton, Ufford, Bohun, Gilbert Talbot, Roger Swinnerton and Ralph Neville. Henry Percy who appears was included as warden of the Northern marches in wardrobe accounts. The only exception found is John de Grey who offered continual service throughout the 1330s but whose name does not appear on household lists. Two different Greys may be confused here.

2 J.W. Sherborne, "Indentured Retinues and English Expeditions to France", *E.H.R.* LXXIX (1964), p.741.

3 *C.P.R.* 1327-30, pp.186, 392.

Banneret	1327	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338	1339	1340
W. Montagu	*	*	?	*	*	*	*	*	*
W. Clinton	*	*	?	*				In England	*
R. Ufford		*	?	*	*	*		*	*
W. Bohun		*	*	*	*	*		*	*
Gilbert Talbot			*	*					
Roger Swinnerton			*	*		*			
J. Darcy						*		*	
J. Maltravers							d.1338		
Richard Grey									
John Grey		*	*	*	*				
Edmund Mortimer	d.pre 21 Jan. 1332								
Geoffrey Mortimer					*				
Edward Bohun			d.1334						
J. Wisham									
J. Ros									
J. Crumbewell				d.1335					
Richard Damory	d.1330								
Ralph Neville			*	*	*	*			
Henry Percy			*	*	*	*			
Geoffrey le Scrope								*	d.1340
Robert de Wateville	d.1330								
Robert Dardern									
Richard Talbot									
Michael de Lynge									
Robert de Fiennes					d.1336				
Robert Hastang									
Herry Ferrers				*	*	*		*	*
Hugh Audley				*		*			
Reginald Cobham			knight knight					*	
Antonio Pessagno									
Maurice Berkeley snr.									
Maurice Berkeley jnr.			knight knight knight					*	*
Thomas Weston									
Thomas Roscelyn					d.1336				
Arnold Duroforto									
Reymund Durant									
Walter Mauny			knight knight knight knight					*	*
J. Beaumont								*	
J. Molyns					knight knight			*	
W. fitz Warin			knight		knight			*	*
J. de Stirling								*	
Edward Monthermer			*	*		*		*	*
Thomas Poynings								d.1339	
J. de Fauconberg								*	*
Thomas Bradeston								*	*
Robert Ferrers								*	*
William Latimer				d.1335					
John Montgomery			knight					*	*
Robert Ufford jnr.					knight			*	*
William Kilsby									
William Norwell									
John Charnels									

Key: \* fought as a banneret

knight fought as a knight bachelor

for Ufford, and about seven in the cases of Bohun and Clinton. All cases for which we know the size of troops specified were sealed prior to 1330 and were arguably the result of exceptional political circumstances. That they did, however, survive the revolution of 1330 is apparent from the fact that the fees agreed continued to be met in subsequent years. All four men received regular payment of fees up until they left the household.<sup>1</sup>

Several features concerning these agreements have received inadequate attention. Immediately obvious is the small size of these promised troops, nothing like the size of contingents known to have been present on campaigns of the 1330s. The 20 men promised by Montagu was only about a quarter or a fifth of the force he normally raised for campaigns. These figures must therefore be taken as a minimum, maintained for the personal service of the knight at royal expense and therefore at royal disposal when required and which accompanied their lord at court. The significant clause here is "retained in peace and war". They were essentially a peacetime force which doubtless formed the nucleus of larger troops levied for war. New contracts would then be negotiated for the size of contingent maintainable for the duration of the fighting. Obviously these promises would tend to be conservative. No rough equation was working of so much per man promised.<sup>2</sup> Figures were perhaps based loosely on a rough doubling of the number of knights fees held, but this is impossible to state with any authority.<sup>3</sup> The most that can be said is that Edward is now recruiting his household along similar lines to those operating among private individuals,

---

1 E403/255 m11; E403/259 m25.

2 Compare Montagu's fee of 200 marks for 20 men at arms and that of Edward Bohun, contracted two years earlier, of 7 men at arms for a similar figure.

3 The Montagus held ten fees of the counts of Mortain in the early 13th century. See also John de Warenne earl of Surrey promised 100 men in a special contract in 1328; his servitium debitum a century earlier was 60 men. I.J. Sanders, English Baronies. A Study of their Origin and Descent 1086-1327 (Oxford, 1969), pp.128-9; I.J. Sanders, Feudal Military Service in England: A Study of the Constitutional and Military Powers of the Barones in Medieval England (Oxford, 1956), pp.149, 154.

that he is retaining a smaller number of men to be of his household who promise to furnish him with a body of their own personal retinues and which form the nuclei of his armies. This meant that each campaign was the result of independent negotiation between crown and magnates, including members of the royal household. For most campaigns the king's household signed ad hoc agreements and were paid "super carto suo pro guerra praedicta".

It will be helpful to look at what advantage lay for Edward in organising his military household on this basis. What Edward was doing within his own household complements national efforts at recruitment. It is clear that the pool of knights available in the 1330s and 1340s was large, thanks to the actions of Edward I and Edward II of experiments in recruitment methods. Concerted efforts for distraints of knighthood, all directed at the class of forty liberate holders during the 1330s and 1340s, produced very nearly a full potential of 2000 knights at crown disposal. Records show that only a handful of men in each county failing to respond to the summonses.<sup>1</sup> By exacting a continuous pressure on wealthier landowners to take up knighthood, the crown was able to provide a reservoir of troops for use by means of contracts, personal summons and commissions of array.<sup>2</sup> In other words, the members of Edward's military establishment, considerably smaller than those maintained by Edward I and Edward II were, during the Scottish wars, expected to contract separately for the troops they provided for Edward's wars. The contingents which they promised when retained in Edward's service, probably already in their employ, would be supplemented in times of war from the reservoir of men of knightly standing created by the crown for this purpose. Consequently,

---

1 Michael Powicke, Military Obligation in Medieval England. A Study in Liberty and Duty, (Oxford, 1962), p.171.

2 Ibid., pp.174-75. For this period there were four distraints authorised: 1333, 1334, 1335 and 1341. C.C.R. 1333-37 pp.93, 144, 362, 418 and C.C.R. 1341-43, p.134. A.E. Prince, "The Army and Navy 1327-1336", English Government at Work I, 352.

Edward need rely on only a handful of confidants to staff his armies without having to utilise older more unreliable and cumbersome methods of recruitment.

The necessity of this was underscored for Edward by the complete failure of the campaign of 1327. The persistent attempts by Edward II to increase arms and free service provoked a severely conservative backlash in the legislation of 1327 and the reign therefore opened with a full feudal levy.<sup>1</sup>

Very little of certainty emerges about the role played by any individual in the campaign of 1327, and interpretation of existing evidence is obscured by confusion over whether magnates were serving under obligation or receiving wages from the royal household.<sup>2</sup> All ecclesiastical tenants in chief and 180 lay magnates were summoned to a muster at Newcastle on 18 May, among whom several of Edward's household received individual summons. Of the four subjects of this study only Montagu was included in this category. He was summoned to serve with only two men, a number consistent with the size of retinue regularly exacted from his father in the previous reign.<sup>3</sup> The records are so incomplete that it would be unwise to attempt any suggestion as to whether he actually did serve at his own cost or to estimate the size of troop he might have maintained for this expedition.

The young earl of Hereford as Constable was with the royal forces, though the size of his contingent is unknown. He did, however, receive a prest on his

1 Michael Powicke, "Edward II and Military Obligation" Speculum XXXI (1956), pp.83-119.

2 N.B. Lewis, "The Summons of the English Feudal Levy, 5 April 1327" in Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson (ed.) T.A.Sandquist and M.R. Powicke, p.237; A.E. Prince, "The Army and Navy" in English Government at Work I p.346; M. McKisack, The Fourteenth Century, p.234; Ranald Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots: the Formative Years of a Military Career 1327-1335, (London, 1965) p.35.

3 R.D.P. IV, 374; I.J. Sanders, Feudal Military Service in England. A Study of the Constitutional and Military Powers of the Barones in Medieval England, (Oxford, 1956), p.149.

wages for £200 at York on 25 June,<sup>1</sup> suggesting that although he was summoned formally at his own expense, he was paid wages through the household. In all likelihood, if either of his brothers Edward or William Bohun were present on this campaign they did so as members of their brother's retinue.<sup>2</sup> The lesser knights of the household did not receive individual summons but served in the contingents of other magnates, or more probably as a body. Wages were paid to Roger Mortimer and at least fourteen household knights and squires, but these figures are very incomplete.<sup>3</sup>

The presence of Clinton on this campaign is revealed only through incidental evidence. Edward's pavillioner and John Montgomery, usher of the chamber, transported tents and victuals to Newcastle in advance of the army, but despite the intention to hold a muster on 18 May, the king and his household travelled north very slowly. On 18 May Edward was at Blyth, where Clinton and Walter Shobydon, the knight usher of the household, received money for a journey towards Scotland ahead of the royal party. The king, queen and the rest of the household reached York on 23rd and took up residence awaiting troops from Hainault. Clinton was appointed to escort John of Hainault and his forces north to meet the royal troops and it was not until 4 July that they were ready to move out in pursuit of the Scots in what was to prove five weeks of vain and frustrating chase in which the English forces suffered the greatest privations.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 E101/383/8 p.10.

2 But see Edward later contracted to serve in Edward's household with 7 men at arms. C.P.R. 1327-30 p.517.

3 For the period covering 1 November 1326 - 20 May 1328, but which principally includes the campaign, £18,299 11s 9¼d was spent on the mounted contingents of the English leaders and a further £19,228 7s 3¼d on the Hainault forces. E361/2 m27; Ranald Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.39. See A.E. Prince, "The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III's Reign", Speculum XIX (1944) where numbers differ.

4 C62/104 m7; R.Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.20; Cal. Mem. Rolls. p.187.

Though totally devoid of fighting, the campaign of 1327 made a deep impression on Edward and probably effected others of his household also. Edward wept tears of vexation at his inability to engage the enemy, while the earl marshal was dissatisfied enough to draw up a list of the rights and privileges pertaining to his office. The royal household was reduced to financial difficulties as a result of the heavy drain on its resources. The campaign and the peace with Scotland which followed it in 1328 stood, for Edward and all those who were to range themselves with him against Mortimer and the regime, as a symbol of disgrace. When Edward took up arms again six years later it was as a means to redeem the dishonour suffered in 1327.

During the decade which followed, Edward tried out a variety of other methods of recruitment. Later summonses were couched in terms of requests to attend with as many horses and arms as needed or in accordance with their oaths of fealty. These had disadvantages long recognised that the crown raised fewer knights by this method. Since finding enough knights seems to have been a universal problem of this period, the king's dependence on the body of his household knights becomes clear. It meant that in periods of heavy war recruitment by the crown was in open competition with other magnates for the services of a suitable complement of knights. Through the private contingents of his knights and bannerets, the king had about himself at all times a body of fully trained and experienced men who could be placed at the heads of smaller troops to act as a stabilising and unifying factor of command.

We see this in the campaign of 1333, though again figures are lacking. Montagu is known to have played a particularly prominent role. Edward's renewed interest in the claims of Balliol were due in no small measure to Montagu's association with the party of the disinherited in 1332. It is not unlikely that a close correlation exists between the disinherited and retaining in the royal

household at this period, given Montagu's influence at court and Edward's known military ambitions. Identification of the disinherited reveals a high proportion of household knights and bannerets in their ranks, many of whom had close ties with Montagu.<sup>1</sup>

The problem of English reaction to events in Scotland was put before several parliaments in the autumn and winter of 1332-3, but though Edward made plain his interests lay with a determination to exert direct overlordship, the peers were reluctant to proffer any firm opinions. The king was therefore obliged to rely heavily on his own household forces and volunteer troops. Instead he turned to a council of "sages gentz" which included Clinton, who eventually gave him the sanction he required. The household had been put on a war footing as early as 24 October 1332;<sup>2</sup> on 30 January writs were issued for levies ostensibly to defend the northern counties, and of the parliamentary grant secured in September 1332, advances of 200 marks each were made to Montagu, Ufford, and other contingent leaders.<sup>3</sup> Licence was given to English adventurers to aid Balliol and a muster date eventually set for Newcastle on 30 May.

Montagu's enthusiasm is illustrated by the leading part he played. While these preparations were in progress, Edward Balliol penetrated into Scotland about the second week in March<sup>4</sup> with Montagu and a group of "des plus priues du conseil le roi", overwhelmed a small force under sir Robert Colville and settled down to besiege Berwick.<sup>5</sup> When Edward reached Tweedmouth on 9 May<sup>6</sup> with the rest of the

---

1 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.109. See The Brut (ed.) F. Brie, Early English Text Society Vol.II p.277 for some names of those who joined with the disinherited, i.e. Roger Swinnerton, Ralph Stafford, Fulk fitz Warin.

2 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.95.

3 C.C.R. 1333-37, pp.7-8.

4 C.C.R. 1333-37, p.23 when victuals were ordered to be sent north from Newcastle for Montagu's retinue.

5 Scalacronica, p.162.

6 E101/386/8. Some of the English forces were left behind at Berwick but Bohun and Ufford were certainly with the king. C.C.R. 1333-37, p.110; E403/279 mm14, 18.

household troops including Bohun, Ufford and Clinton and the shire levies from Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, he found Balliol's forces under the active leadership of Montagu<sup>1</sup> dug in around the town and subjecting it to constant bombardment both by land and sea. The siege proved a slow affair. A relieving force under William Douglas did arrive on 11 July from the English side of the Tweed, burned Tweedmouth, crossed the river and circled round to enter Berwick with supplies. Montagu brought up a small force to contest their passage and forced a short skirmish, though he was unable to prevent them from entering to the relief of the town.<sup>2</sup>

The roles of the others are uncertain. In order to prevent French or Flemish shipping intercepting the English fleets or descending upon the undefended southern coasts, Clinton was appointed Admiral of the Western Fleet and Keeper of Kent with power to array the Cinque Ports defences,<sup>3</sup> though he too was in the north with the royal household.<sup>4</sup> The indentures which witnessed the agreement of the garrison to surrender if Edward's forces were not repulsed by 20 July, sealed on 15 and 16 July, were witnessed by Montagu, Ufford and Bohun and all other major contingent leaders.<sup>5</sup>

Edward's debt of gratitude to the bannerets of his household was expressed in the rich rewards offered. Clinton was presented with a gift of 200 marks "pro bono servicio ... in obsessione Berewici"<sup>6</sup> of which he received £93 6s 8d on

---

1 "Robertus de Avesbury De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii" (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls Series (London, 1889), p.297. "domino Willielmo de Monte Acuto strenuo milite eorum duce".

2 "Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvon of a Canon of Bridlington" in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II Vol.2 (ed.) W.Stubbs, Rolls Series (London, 1883), pp.112-13.

3 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.119.

4 E403/267 m3. "pro bono servicio quod idem Willielmus sibi in obsessione Berewici sibi (sic) impendit".

5 Foedera II ii, 865, 866.

6 E403/267 m3.

30 July and £40 in August and Bohun received a similar amount. Montagu, whose contribution had been so outstanding, was showered by Edward with marks of favour and gratitude. In addition to a gift of £100 for his expenses at Berwick,<sup>1</sup> Edward quitclaimed to him for ever his lordship in the Isle of Man, which he had leased to Montagu in June<sup>2</sup> and on 2 August permitted Montagu to demise in fee to his younger son John the manor of Wark on Tweed, granting to him the right to hold a weekly market and annual fair on the manor.<sup>3</sup> Edward, like so many of his contemporaries, believed that through the valour of his friends the victory of Halidon Hill had crushed the Scots' will to resist and finally ended the Scottish wars.<sup>4</sup>

Extreme difficulties presented themselves in trying to raise such large forces for a winter campaign in 1334. A vast number of writs of summonses were sent out to knights and bannerets of the northern shires, at least fifty of whom failed to attend the Newcastle muster. On 15 November Edward set a second muster date at York for the second week in January. This had the effect of persuading a score or more to join the king, but by the 24 December Edward was writing in fury of their inaction as "desobeissant a nos ditz mandementz at en arerissement de lesloit de nos ditz busoignes et grant deshonor et vilenie de nous memes" and threatening severe penalties.<sup>5</sup> To widen support, summons were sent out to some 188 knights in 22 southern and midland counties to join him at Roxburgh, to replace those whose contracts were due to expire in February.<sup>6</sup> As Edward explained in the writs, he believed that only a vast army could repel the Scots.

---

1 E101/387/9.

2 A.W. Moore, History of the Isle of Man I, (London, 1900), p.187.

3 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.462. Cal. Cha. Rolls IV, 1327-37 p.302.

4 Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum. (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls Series (London, 1889), p.68.

5 R.D.P. IV, 430-431.

6 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.184.

Parallel with this decision to extend the levy into the southern counties, efforts were made to widen the scope of potential military support, especially in the north of England. Writs of distraint of knighthood were sent out on 20 December 1334 and individual summons were issued to a further 107 military tenants requesting their presence for fifteen days at their own cost.<sup>1</sup> Three weeks later the net was cast still wider to include fourteen of the king's chief Welsh tenants in Caernarvon, Anglesey and Merioneth. Despite the urgency of requests, support was limited. By 22 January, two months into the campaign, Edward wrote from Roxburgh with extreme annoyance, that nearly 100 of those summoned in this way had failed to appear at all.<sup>2</sup>

The brunt of the fighting in the first few weeks of the campaign had thus to be borne by the members of the king's own household. A force of some 6200 men at arms in the retinue of six earls and sixteen bannerets as well as the king's own forces eventually set out for Roxburgh on 14 November. Prominent among them was a solid body of 28 knights of the royal household who between them provided 93 men at arms in their personal retinues. This comprised all the knights in receipt of robes and fees for that quarter, with the exception of two men unable to attend.<sup>3</sup> A few of Edward's esquires also brought their own retinues, and a further 72 squires, serjeants and other household servants fought in a body. In total the household contribution to the army was about a sixth of the entire force of men at arms before reinforcements began to come in from England about the middle of December.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 R.D.P. IV, 435; Nigel Saul, Knights and Esquires, p.39.

2 R.D.P. IV, 438-9.

3 Nero C.VIII, fols. 233, 235v. A.E. Prince, "The Strength of English Armies in the Reign of Edward III", E.H.R. XLVI (1931), p.354. cf. R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.181 who quotes figures of 4000 men including archers, messengers and other servants.

4 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.181.



Only Bohun is definitely known to have taken part in this campaign, serving like the other leaders for the quarter 14 November to 11 February 1335, though even the full extent of his contribution is not clear. He did, however, bring a substantial force of archers, indicating that his personal contribution was something in the region of sixty men at arms, for which he received at least £100 in January 1335.<sup>1</sup> This compares favourably with the contingents provided by the comital leaders: 80 men at arms in the troops of the earl of Arundel, 60 each under the earl of Warwick and Henry of Lancaster, the king's brother brought 100 men and the earl of Oxford 28 men.<sup>2</sup>

The first campaign for which statistics exist is that of 1335. Retinues of household members were comparatively smaller than those provided by other contingent leaders, reflecting the crown's efforts to recruit an army on a national scale. Commissions of array were in operation from the first week in March, for a muster set at Newcastle for 11 June. Writs of summons were sent out to ten earls and 126 magnates, and shire levies demanded from 36 English and Welsh counties.<sup>3</sup> Those individually summoned included Montagu, Clinton, Bohun and Ufford.<sup>4</sup>

All four household bannerets thus summoned are known to have served with the king, and were paid through the wardrobe. As in the previous years, contingent leaders were paid a lump sum of £100 per "vintena" of men per quarter, for a period which lasted from 23 June to 23 September,<sup>5</sup> and which Ufford and Clinton drew on the wardrobe at York shortly before the household forces set out for

---

1 E403/281 m18; Nero C.VIII fols.181v, 253r would indicate a force of at least 20 men at arms under agreement to pay £100 per vintain of 20 men. A.E. Prince, "The Strength of English Armies in the Reign of Edward III", E.H.R. XLVI (1931) p.355 has calculated that the recognised proportion of men at arms to archers in this campaign was roughly equal.

2 Nero C.VIII fol.233v-234r.

3 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, pp.194, 198.

4 R.D.P. IV, 442; Rot. Scot. I, 332-3.

5 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.199.

Newcastle.<sup>1</sup> Bohun was paid £150 at Carlisle prior to Edward's advance over the border<sup>2</sup> and Montagu, whose evident enthusiasm for the expedition sent him well ahead of the rest of the king's forces waited to receive payment until the end of August.<sup>3</sup> At the height of the campaigning season, the four bannerets were between them fielding 256 men at arms. This comprised 43 men each in the retinues of Bohun and Ufford, including five knights serving under Bohun and ten knights and 32 squires in Ufford's troop. Clinton was able to recruit a body of sixty-six men at arms for two months, which he reduced slightly when, at the beginning of September, he accompanied Edward on a plundering raid across the Forth. Montagu provided a huge force of 180 men including one other banneret and twenty-four knights which he impatiently held in readiness at Newcastle from 11 June awaiting the arrival of the rest of the army.<sup>4</sup> This is easily comparable with anything levied by any of the earls present with the expedition, five of whom brought over 100 men as did Henry of Lancaster and Hugh Audley. The Count of Julich, the earls of Buchan and Warwick had each 92 men at arms. Ralph Neville had 85 while the two remaining household bannerets Talbot and Swinnerton raised only 32 men and 20 men respectively. It was to be the last time any of them served in Scotland as household bannerets, all three left the household during 1335. When the royal household, expanded for war, arrived at Newcastle at the end of June it comprised a body of 44 knights, including all the king's knights except two, 372 men at arms and 253 mounted and 60 foot archers, which brought the number of men at arms up to about 2500 men. The total force thus awaiting at Newcastle exceeded 13,000 men.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 E403/282 m11; Nero C.VIII fol.182v.

2 E403/282 m17; Nero C.VIII fol.182v.

3 E403/282 m27; Nero C.VIII fol.183r.

4 Nero C.VIII fols. 236r-237v.

5 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.199.

One noteworthy foray was led by Montagu into the region around Caerlaverock, where he was able to make a useful haul of cattle for the army. Edward, delighted with Montagu's fervour in his cause, presented him with a charger caprisoned with Montagu's arms and, as a chivalric gesture, promised that henceforth Montagu might bear the king's own eagle crest, for the support of which honour Edward conceded him the reversion of two manors at Woodston and Marshwoodvale in which he was to have the valuable right of return of writ.<sup>1</sup> The chief leaders of the expedition were lavishly rewarded, but the lion's share went to Montagu who by this time was being described as "regis Angliae tunc principali consiliario".<sup>2</sup> On 10 October Edward granted to him the forests of Selkirk and Ettrick at a farm of £30 and also the county of Peebles, thus forming a virtual marcher lordship between the Bohun lordship of Annandale and Percy in Berwickshire.<sup>3</sup> There can be no doubt that Edward intended these lordships to act as effective buffers for the policing of the Northern marches, nor that he regarded the preceding expedition as having effected the crushing of dangerous Scottish resistance requiring his personal presence at the head of large-scale armies. As the English forces departed south in triumph, Montagu was left behind to guard the marcher region and to implement his personal rule in his new lordship with a policing force of 40 men at arms which he maintained in the North until 24 January 1336.<sup>4</sup>

The size of the army fielded in Scotland the following year was very much smaller and the contribution of the household bannerets comparatively larger. County levies were raised in the English border shires for a muster at Berwick on 21 April and individual contingents of men at arms and archers came under the

---

1 R. Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.205; Cal. Cha. Rolls IV 1327-37, pp.348-9.

2 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon Vol.II (Edinburgh, 1759) p.321; H.J. Hewitt, The Organisation of War under Edward III (Manchester, 1966), p.109.

3 Rot. Scot I, 380. See SC8/62/3060 a petition by his widow for dower in these lands.

4 Nero C.VIII f.237v.

leadership of 11 major magnates who, under the command of Henry of Lancaster and Bohun, were appointed to police the Northern marches.<sup>1</sup> Bohun provided a personal contingent of 56 men at arms but he was also appointed to head the shire levies of Cumberland and Westmoreland. Edward, although apparently occupied with affairs in the south, kept in constant touch with the forces in Scotland. He was at Newcastle on 11 June, where news reached him that a large Scottish army was mustering to attack his troops near Perth, followed by a letter from the Countess of Atholl requesting aid for Lochindorb.<sup>2</sup> Arrangements had been in hand since 20 May for the collection of a force of 400 county levies. On 12 June 100 hobelars were ordered to be arrayed in Norfolk, and requests sent out to 29 towns for aid.<sup>3</sup> For further arrangements a council had been called for 25 June at Northampton. Then suddenly, and taking an enormous risk, Edward decided personally to join his forces at Perth. A messenger was despatched to collect Montagu,<sup>4</sup> and leaving his household for custody of the marches, to follow north in July, Edward with a tiny following left Newcastle on 14th and by 19th had entered Perth.<sup>5</sup> So unexpectedly did he appear that his arrival was cause for widespread wonderment. Rough estimates put the force which accompanied the king at between 50 and 100 men at arms but the actual size of force was some 70 men, although it had risen to 82 by the time they reached Perth, with 186 mounted archers and Welsh foot in Montagu's personal retinue. Both Montagu and Ufford accompanied the king on this dash north: Ufford taking with him only two of his retinue; Montagu accompanied initially by five men at arms, though eight others managed to catch up with them two days later, and four more found them at

---

1 Nero C.VIII fols. 240v-241r; Rot. Scot. I, 418.

2 E101/387/19; Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon Vol.II (Edinburgh, 1759). p.321; Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, p.75.

3 Rot. Scot. I, 425-6, 431-2.

4 E403/288 m14; suggesting that Montagu was not the author of this idea.

5 Nero C.VIII fols. 213r, 241v; E101/387/19.

Perth on the 19th. Four household knights and a few others between them with a body of chamber squires provided the remaining troops. Although later shire levies were ordered to Berwick to follow in the company of the earl of Cornwall and Anthony Lucy, and other private contingent leaders slowly joined the king at Perth during August, this tiny band comprised the entire royal bodyguard from June.

At Perth the king's forces were gradually augmented by small retinues which rode into the town in twos and threes. Ufford's force was thus augmented to a total of seven knights and 35 squires, and at the height of the campaigning season Montagu was fielding 58 men at arms, including ten knights. Few other contingent leaders were able to provide forces of more than twenty men at arms, although the other earls were fielding forces of roughly 70 to 85 men at arms. No concerted military effort was envisaged (so the forces were comparatively much smaller than in the previous year). Their primary role was seen as to strengthen garrisons in key castles, especially Stirling and Bothwell. At Stirling Montagu was placed in charge of operations. Labouring work began on a new peel on 25 August under Robert de St. Albans, a master carpenter brought by Edward from England and three bands of 89 carpenters including a group under a Scotsman John Kelburn. 85 workmen were also put to work on ditching. The main work was over by 19 October when 17 of the carpenters and a gang of 74 ditchers moved onto Bothwell under the direction of Ufford.<sup>1</sup> Other magnates were placed in charge of similar operations at Perth, St Andrews, Edinburgh and Roxburgh.

One final enterprise in Scotland occupied Edward's attention before he turned fully to continental war. Late in March 1337, sanction had been given to a scheme to raise troops for a small voluntary force under the leadership of the earl of Warwick, which was due to gather at Newcastle on 7 May. This body with

---

1 Nero C.VIII fols. 199r, 215v, 249v.

a few notable exceptions was present in the north from the set date and, but for the short interlude of royal intervention, was allowed to deal alone with the situation in Scotland until the following October, though Edward was clearly dissatisfied with the performance of this entirely voluntary force and reverted to a degree of compulsion in later campaigns.<sup>1</sup>

When the news of the siege of Stirling reached London at the end of May, Edward himself with a small body of household troops, by forced marches came north to Newcastle, taking with him the earl of Northampton and possibly also his cousin Edward Monthermer.<sup>2</sup> Bohun's contingent of 59 men was, with the sole exception of Warwick's, the largest force then in the field. Ufford apparently remained in the south, though his kin including his heir, his two brothers and two cousins were engaged in munitioning Perth and received wages for the period mid-May to the end of July.<sup>3</sup> Salisbury's contribution to this effort consisted of five, probably Welsh, miners sent to the king from the Low Countries towards the end of July.<sup>4</sup> The failure of the royal forces to storm Stirling Castle seems to have persuaded Edward that his presence was more urgently required in the south of England, and on 18 June he was back at Newcastle leaving Northampton to guard the march until the end of July.

What is notable in all these campaigns in Scotland is the comparative size of troops which individuals were fielding. It was normal for an earl to expect to raise a force of roughly 75-100 men at arms, more during the bigger campaigns. Already we see that Henry of Lancaster, Hugh Audley, and Edward's four bannerets are proving by the size of contingents under their command that their wealth and standing is at least equal to that of any of the earls, and that in the case of

---

1 N.B. Lewis, "The Recruitment and Organisation of a Contract Army, May to November 1337", B.I.H.R. XXXVII (1964) pp. 11, 14.

2 Nero C.VIII fols. 246v, 261r.

3 E403/294 mm9,10; Nero C.VIII fols. 189r, 190v.

4 Nero C.VIII fol.191r.

Montagu, his authority far outstripped most of his contemporaries. Also striking is Edward's heavy reliance on his household troops to bear the brunt of all the fighting in Scotland over this period. In every case the traditional elements, those contracted under the major magnates and leaders, proved inadequate or too cumbersome for Edward's purposes and the king was compelled to fall back on his domestic forces. Response on the whole was good. High quotas thus raised served willingly and for lengthy periods without desertion. By 1337-38, the crown was able to drop experiments to tap resources of gentry service for itself and leave recruitment at county level to the magnates.

Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and Bohun recruited equally large forces for the continental campaigns of 1338-41 after they had left the household. For the period July 1338 to May 1340, Bohun maintained a force of 89 men at arms in Edward's pay, while Montagu's troop totalled at its height 123 men. Ufford for the same period supported a force of 55 men at arms.<sup>1</sup> For the projected but cancelled campaign of 1341, each of the earls were offering between 50 to 100 men at arms, the same number of archers and 30 to 100 armati, with the exception of Northampton. His offering was a force of 250 (280) men at arms, 200 (250) archers and 100 (200) armati, the largest contingent envisaged for the campaign. Huntingdon contracted to provide 80 men at arms, 80 armati and 200 archers, and Robert Ufford junior, representing his father, promised 60 men at arms, 60 archers and 20 armed men.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 E36/203 fol. 128v, 129r.

2 Michael Prestwich, "English Armies in the Early Stages of the Hundred Years War : A Scheme in 1341", B.I.H.R. LVI (1983) p.112.

The responsibility for military recruitment was thus pushed further down the scale. The eventual size of contingents provided was dependent on the ability of the individual to attract the services of others, and on his personal reputation as a commander. It is clear that the initiative lay with those who had Edward's confidence. Throughout this period the king's bannerets were able to field far larger forces than most of their contemporaries, including some of the earls.

For the early campaigns retinue lists have not survived to indicate how these large troops were being recruited. Only one name from a troop of unknown size serving under Montagu in 1333 has come to light. Giles Beauchamp of Somerset was serving with Montagu on the march in April, and it is apparent that Beauchamp saw in Montagu, both in Somerset and at court, a powerful patron and friend.<sup>1</sup> A similar bond between Montagu and a West Country magnate can be found in Roger Damory in 1337-8, a leading member of the personal force that Montagu took to the siege of Dunbar. It is probable that this was not the first occasion on which Damory had fought in Scotland with Montagu. We have the names of six men who fought under Bohun in 1336. The chief of these was the banneret and close neighbour in many southern counties, John de Verdon.<sup>2</sup> The other men were all connected with Bohun's household. Walter de Selby was a member of a family whose connections with the Bohun earls of Hereford and Essex covered at least two generations. Thomas de Bures, Thomas de Brunneby, William de Rodom and Thomas de Swasing were all tenants and personal servants of Bohun.<sup>3</sup>

Fuller lists survive for the years after 1337. It is just possible to reconstruct tentative lists for the campaigns of 1339-40 for the earls of Salisbury,

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.420.

2 Nero C.VIII fol.241r.

3 C81/1735/15; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.530.

Suffolk and Northampton. Fairly full accounts of the size and composition of the earl of Northampton's retinue exist. In the autumn of 1337, the earl had taken abroad with him on embassy to the Low Countries a company of forty men at arms and 27 archers. He remained on the continent with his personal entourage from 28 November until towards the end of the following April when he sailed home from Dordrecht with his men. Within three months he was back in the Netherlands with an even larger retinue. From protection lists it is clear that he kept his original retinue almost intact, but greatly augmented. By the time he sailed from England again on the 28 July it had more than doubled its size by the addition of a banneret, another six knights and a further 31 men at arms.<sup>1</sup> He also augmented his original troop of archers to a body of nearly 70 men.<sup>2</sup> Protection lists also survive for the retinue of the earl of Suffolk on the same embassy, indicating that the force with which he served during 1339 was built up in the same way as that of the earl of Northampton. Suffolk sailed from Sandwich with a company of eight knights, one banneret and 28 men at arms, which accompanied him about the Low Countries during 1337. The force was kept more or less intact when the earl began recruiting for his passage overseas with Edward in the summer of 1338, and when he sailed in July it was with a force of one banneret, 12 knights and 42 men at arms, nearly double the size of his original retinue. The same is true of Salisbury's entourage in the Low Countries during the spring and summer of 1337. It expanded easily from a body of approximately 50 men at arms<sup>3</sup> to the force of 130 men with which he appeared at the Newcastle muster the following December,<sup>4</sup> and it was this force, slightly depleted but with its core still intact which accompanied the earl south in June to sail with the king to Antwerp.

---

1 E101/311/31 pp.5, 6. This would make a total of 63 squires and not 73 as stated in Norwell's account. E36/203 fol.128v.

2 Ibid., p.8.

3 E101/311/28.

4 E101/20/25.

From 22 July 1338 he maintained a banneret, 21 knights and 92 esquires which he was able slowly to augment as recruits came from England.<sup>1</sup>

The heart of these contingents were the knight's permanent retainers. The only surviving indenture is one sealed by Northampton with William Talmache who was serving in the earl's retinue for the Buironfosse campaign. The indenture<sup>2</sup> is dated 17 June 1340, but Talmache had been associated with Bohun since at least the autumn of 1337 as one of the retinue which accompanied the earl on embassy that year, and his relationship with the earl was to be long and close. Others like Peter Favelore and William de Irland were members of the earl's household.<sup>3</sup> Thomas West, John de Burton, Robert de Barton and Master John Coco who served with the earl of Salisbury in 1339 were all household retainers.<sup>4</sup> Others were tenants and relatives. Otto de Grandisson, nephew of the countess of Salisbury, served under the earl in 1339, as did Peter de Montfort, a relative of Montagu's mother. Peter de Grandisson fought with Montagu in Scotland in 1336. The earl of Suffolk's brother, Edmund, his son Robert and a cousin, Edmund were serving with the earl on the 1339 campaign.

Casual recruits are more elusive. Because of their completeness the retinues of the earl of Northampton in 1337-8 and 1339 will be studied in detail.<sup>5</sup> A list of 34 names suggest themselves as unconnected with Bohun on any previous occasion, but few give any indication of their relationship with the earl. Hugh Treganon, a valet of the king's chamber, may have been persuaded to enter the earl's service permanently. Richard de Totesham was also to become a permanent Bohun retainer. John de Neville and Peter de Veilston were relatives of men

---

1 E36/203 fol.128v.  
2 DL25/32.  
3 DL36/1/86; Essex, Feet of Fines III, 83.  
4 E101/384/1; C.P.R. 1327-30 p.443.  
5 E101/311/31 p.5; E36/203 fol.122r.

already serving in the earl's entourage. Others display patronymics of sufficiently plebian origin to indicate that they were in all probability pardoned criminals. Thomas de Bosehale and Edmund de Bonyngton were serving in this capacity. Noteworthy is the presence with the earl on this occasion of Robert de Folville, member of the notorious Folville gang which terrorised parts of Leicestershire in the late 1320s and 1330s. This was not the earl's first dealings with Folville. In November 1332 he is found mainperning for him with Montagu for his services on the Scottish march.<sup>1</sup> For some campaigns both crown and magnates relied heavily on criminals to swell the ranks of men at arms. Montagu recruited one William Warrenner of Wark in January 1333 to serve him in Scotland, for a campaign whose success was said to be largely due to a troop of outlaws.<sup>2</sup> Northampton was granted licence to use the great seal to grant pardons to felons in May 1341 when recruiting for the campaign intended for that year.<sup>3</sup> In 1342 proclamation was made that those willing to serve in Brittany under Northampton at their own costs for three months have blanket pardon for all felonies and trespasses prior to the beginning of June. The names of six such men are known to have accompanied the earl to Brittany.<sup>4</sup>

By 1327, the tradition of consultation about war was established. Magnates through parliament treated for the defence of the realm almost annually with increasing commons participation and negotiations for contracts of service was brought under parliamentary supervision. The role of the council was also becoming increasingly clear. The king's household played a large role on these advisory bodies in conveying the king's intentions to the leaders of the armies

- 
- 1 C.P.R. 1330-34 pp.367-8; E.L.G. Stones, "The Folvilles of Ashby Folville, Leics.", T.R.H.S. 5th Series I (1957), p.129.
  - 2 C.P.R. 1330-34, p.397.
  - 3 C.C.R. 1341-43, pp.530, 658, 673.
  - 4 SC1/39/144-148; C.P.R. 1340-43, p.495.

and in offering advice.<sup>1</sup> Clinton's role in advising Edward to go ahead with renewing war in Scotland in 1332 is clear. Montagu's influence, though less overt, is also apparent. His enthusiasm in part at least also mitigated many of the problems faced by the English forces in Scotland in 1335. In 1338, Montagu's angry attitude severely hampered Edward's movements and it was specifically on the advice of Northampton and Suffolk that he opposed Montagu and ordered the levying of troops to fight against France.<sup>2</sup>

For the period 1338-40, a war council was set up in Antwerp to aid in making policy decisions concerning the war and to plan the course of the campaigns. This body consisted of all the chief military and ecclesiastical leaders in residence on the continent and included Salisbury, Northampton and Suffolk. All major decisions were submitted to the council which were weighed and passed by a majority or unanimity of those present on the occasion, and all treaties and charters were formally ratified by it. Thus the whole command structure of the army was involved in and fully committed to any decisions taken. In this way Edward could expect full co-operation from his troops and greater confidence from his allies. Edward, surrounded by powerful personalities and brilliant military leaders, was working out military and political policy in extremely hampered circumstances. How was all the frenzied activity in the 18 months of enforced idleness in the Low Countries worked out in the ensuing campaign? Edward's council adopted in the early stages of the Hundred Years War what has been termed a "provincial strategy" designed to win over regions under French rule to English sovereignty by appealing to localised grievances, thus gradually extending piecemeal the area of recognition while seemingly achieving very little in terms of conquest.<sup>3</sup> The choice of the Cambresis region in the years 1338-41

- 
- 1 M. Powicke, Military Obligation in Medieval England (Oxford, 1962) pp.227-234; James Fosdick Baldwin, The King's Council in England During the Middle Ages, (Oxford, reprinted 1969), pp.87-88.
  - 2 E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War, 1236-40" in Historical Studies of the English Parliament I (ed.) E.B. Fryde & Edward Miller (Cambridge, 1970)p.246.
  - 3 John Le Patourel, "Edward III and the Kingdom of France", History N.S. XLIII (1958) p.188.

was the first step in this direction and was undertaken with the aims of the allies in mind and with the full co-operation of Edward's commanders. But it was at the cost of flexibility of action in the field. Many military opportunities were either lost because of disagreement among the allies or hesitation on the part of the command to risk action.

The strategy adopted by the allies consisted in burning and devastating the countryside fairly systematically in arcs radiating out from the main passageway of the armies. Each day's rampaging was put under the command of one or more army leaders who each travelled out in a different direction, returning to the main forces at the end of a foray. The route chosen lay close to Peronne along the river Oise as close as possible to Origny-Ste-Benoite and other settlements taking such castles as were found undefended and much loot in the rich countryside. On one such plundering raid Suffolk successfully captured Balmays castle.<sup>1</sup> Separate forces under Salisbury, Suffolk, Derby and Northampton were sent out as far as Laon. On 16th they crossed the Oise, and on the 18th they entered Oigny-Ste-Benoite. The following day Salisbury and Suffolk set out with John of Hainault and a force of 500 armed men, burned the environs of Marles, its surrounding countryside. The allied armies still hoped for a pitched battle to decide the issue and pressured Philip vigorously to precipitate one. Similar tactics were adopted for the phantom battle of Buironfosse. The earls were given separate commands. The household bannerets were placed in the vanguard with its right wing commanded by Suffolk with the earl of Derby, while to the left he placed Salisbury, Northampton and Pembroke. In the mid-guard were positioned the major allies, while the duke of Brabant formed the rearguard.<sup>2</sup>

As leaders of troops under the crown and military advisers, Montagu, Ufford

---

1 K. de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 85.

2 Ibid., XVIII, 92.

and Bohun were very successful, both as household retainers and as earls in providing the necessary loyalty and military knowledge to bring unity and drive to the leadership of royal armies. Under the supreme command of the crown they were the chief tools by which Edward worked out and realised his policies for Scotland and France. Praise has also been lavished on Edward's military leaders for their ability as generals commanding huge forces in France by their sole authority in the absence of the king, particularly Derby and Northampton.<sup>1</sup> The English successes which crowned the later stages of the Hundred Years War have been attributed almost entirely to the skill of Edward's garter friends in leading successful expeditions without the restraining influence of the king. With men of lesser ability the outcome might have been very different. The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to a full analysis of two campaigns which have received little detailed attention because the king was not personally involved at the head of his armies. Both were in different degrees disasters and throw much light not only on the careers of Montagu and Ufford but also the relationship between Edward and his military leaders.

The earl of Salisbury received his first independent command in the latter months of 1337, and was appointed "capitaneus et ductor" jointly with the earl of Arundel to lead an army to Scotland in place of the serving commander Thomas, earl of Warwick.<sup>2</sup> Despite the presence of a sizeable household force in southern Scotland during the summer months at the relief of Stirling Castle, the Scots continued to recover most of the major castles and fortresses north of the Forth.

---

1 Kenneth Fowler, The King's Lieutenant : Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster 1310-1361 (London, 1969) pp.218-20; J.W. Sherborne, "Indentured Retinues and English Expeditions to France, 1369-1381", E.H.R. LXXIX (1964) p.740; M. McKisack "Edward III and the Historians", History N.S. 45 (1960) pp.7, 11.

2 The earls of Arundel had a traditional interest in Scottish affairs as stewards of Scotland. On 28 November 1336 Arundel quitclaimed his right to the title to Edward III in exchange for 1000 marks. Nevertheless Arundel retained his interests in Scotland. Bain III,1300.

In August Moray raided Cumberland, and Northumberland at the end of September. In mid October he burned a manor belonging to the bishop of Carlisle and encircled the town. The countryside around Carlisle was devastated, and Scottish forces rested three days at Galloshield. Towards the end of the year he attempted to regain Edinburgh although unsuccessfully. By the end of 1337 only Cupar and Perth still remained in English hands.<sup>1</sup> The 400 knights and men at arms under Warwick were not enough to control the growing Scottish resistance movement, especially after the earl of Northampton departed south for parliament at the end of July with nearly 60 men at arms.<sup>2</sup> Edward therefore was willing to risk something more decisive under Montagu.

The army which was thus attempting vainly to hold down Scotland in 1337 under the earl of Warwick, was the result of a new experiment in recruitment methods. For the first time Edward had done away completely with compulsory service and relied solely on offers of voluntary commitment negotiated privately with individual leaders and supplemented by shire levies. But the government never succeeded in raising the total numbers estimated despite numerous assemblies designed to explain the urgency of the king's need. As a result it was generally believed that the army had achieved little of worth, and Edward did not again attempt to raise troops in this way for a number of years.<sup>3</sup> Instead, Edward III reverted to a more traditional method of recruitment in October 1337.

The new leaders were appointed officially on 6 October.<sup>4</sup> Plans for a new thrust into Scotland, however, had been mooted some months earlier. William Montagu

---

1 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon Vol.II p.324; E.W.M. Balfour-Melville, Edward III and David II (London, 1954) p.11; Scalacronica p.167.

2 Nero C.VIII fol.245-247. A mixed body of 42 knights and men at arms, however, joined Warwick from 17 August to 26 September.

3 N.B. Lewis, "The Recruitment and Organisation of a Contract Army, May to November 1337", B.I.H.R. 37 (1964) pp.13-14.

4 Rot. Scot. I, 503, 504. On 3 November the earl of Gloucester was appointed with them.

returned to London on 17 August from the Low Countries.<sup>1</sup> Writs for a parliament to be held at Westminster on 26 September were sent out the following day to discuss arrangements made for the defence of the realm and ordinances for its governance in the projected absence of the king abroad; a decision which had been reached in an earlier council meeting held in late July.<sup>2</sup> The decision was eventually taken to besiege Dunbar castle as a focus for the expedition. Dunbar, on the south-eastern coast of southern Scotland, commanded the approach to the Firth of Forth and could seriously hamper English supply fleets from reaching Edinburgh. Rebuilt at Edward III's expense in 1333, as the only independent territory in a block of lands ceded to England, it was a thorn in the side of the English administration. It had a particular interest for Salisbury whose own stake in Scotland - the lordships of Selkirk, Ettrick and Peebles - was threatened by the continuing presence of the hostile garrison at Dunbar. Concentrating resources on this one fortress was calculated to give the impression of a resumed offensive and was at the same time the most sensible way to employ what was in effect a small field army in support of existing English garrisons. With Dunbar in English hands, the re-conquest of northern Scotland might be attempted.<sup>3</sup> The unfortunate presence of the Scottish garrison in Dunbar had been brought to the attention of Edward some months earlier in June by a letter from the countess of March to her brother, the earl of Moray, then imprisoned in the Tower.<sup>4</sup> It may have been suspected that the earl of March was planning a major offensive against the English which centred on Dunbar. Salisbury seems to have been the major force behind the decision. He made it clearly known when he returned from

---

1 E101/311/29.

2 R.D.P. IV, 479-482; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.244. Writs 'de expensis' were dated 4 October. E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War", Historical Studies of the English Parliament, I, 245.

3 R. Nicholson, Scotland in the Later Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1974) p.136; Edward III and the Scots, pp.142, 225.

4 Joseph Bain, Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland III, 1233; Foedera II ii 973. The constable of the Tower to whom Edward addressed his suspicions was Montagu's Lieutenant Nicholas de la Beche absent with him on embassy until 22 June; E101/311/28.

the continent in August that he was opposed to the king's reliance on foreign alliances to prosecute war against France, and "se trey devers Escose pur soy excuser de cest consail."<sup>1</sup>

Arrangements for the collection of forces to serve under the two earls began on 5 October. Those archers from the counties, elected a short while previously for a muster at Canterbury, were redirected to Newcastle. In all 2360 archers were ordered to assemble by 1 December.<sup>2</sup> Summons were issued to a select group of military tenants requesting their presence at Newcastle by the muster date with a specified number of men at arms and hobelars.<sup>3</sup> The actual size of the forces thus provided was anticipated at 506 men at arms and 150 archers. In addition Arundel promised 60 men at arms and 120 archers and Montagu, in his enthusiasm, promised 100 men at arms, 60 hobelars and 100 archers. Despite Lewis' view that the government had fallen back on traditional methods of recruitment for this expedition, there was no element of compulsion in the means employed to recruit these forces. Each contingent leader is listed with the estimated size of his troop, giving every indication that this writ was the result of independent negotiation between individual leaders and the council. At the same time, the bishop of Durham, Ralph Neville and Geoffrey le Scrope were appointed to treat with other magnates in the north of England for further support.<sup>4</sup> The surprising feature about the names of those summoned in October 1337 is the strong southern bias. Many were young men who had personal connections with the earl of Salisbury by marriage or through proximity of inheritance. Among

---

1 Scalacronica p.168.

2 Rot. Scot. I, 501, 502, 504, 506, 512. See SC1/38/102 a petition by Geoffrey de Mulceby one of the triers in county Richmond, of complaints of disturbances which prevented him from fulfilling his commission. Dated 26 March 1338.

3 R.D.P. IV p.458. Rot. Scot. I, 507, 508. The earl of Gloucester and 41 other magnates were to provide a force of 139 men at arms, 130 hobelars and 110 archers.

4 Rot. Scot. I, 503.

there were Giles Badlesmore and Hugh le Despenser, successive husbands to Montagu's daughter Katherine and possibly also John de Grey of Ruthyn, who in June 1335 was married to Montagu's daughter Agnes.<sup>1</sup> Thomas de Monthermer was a close neighbour of the Montagus in Somerset, his daughter and eventual heiress Margaret was to be married to Montagu's son John in 1343. Hugh Courtney was also a close neighbour in the West country. At least ten men were furthermore members of the royal household, a much higher proportion than is normally found on lists of summons for military service.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore most likely that the forces which began to assemble in Newcastle towards the end of November were the result of a number of subcontracts negotiated by the leaders of the army.

In line with the organisation set up the previous spring, the army was placed under a separate financial administration with an independent paymaster-general Walter de Weston, appointed on 1 November,<sup>3</sup> who had worked closely with Montagu in the past. Weston was answerable to the exchequer for the forces under his control. As later enshrined in the Walton Ordinances, the paymaster was expected to act closely with the leaders of the army in controlling disbursements to the forces under him. He was not to make any payments without warranty by the Captains to the treasurer at Berwick.<sup>4</sup> In this way the government hoped to create a unified financial control while fighting on two fronts at the same time.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 G.E.C. Vol.I, 373; Vol.VI, 154.

2 Maurice de Berkeley, Norman Darcy, John Darcy, Thomas Poynings, John Beaumont, John de Segrave, Henry Percy, Ralph Neville, Richard Talbot, John de Grey, Lawrence Hastings. Perhaps some of these were recruited into the royal household as a result of this expedition.

3 Rot. Scot. I, 513. He replaced John de St. Albans, paymaster to the earl of Warwick since 28 July.

4 Tout, Chapters III p.149.

5 N.B. Lewis, "The Recruitment and Organisation of a Contract Army, May to November, 1337", B.I.H.R. XXXVII (1964) p.3.

Neither Salisbury nor Arundel were prepared to travel north with speed.

On 9 October the king wrote to them requesting they be at Newcastle by 6 December and advising Arundel of the necessity of appointing a lieutenant in Newcastle if mass desertions were to be avoided. The earl of Warwick was still in command on 19 November.<sup>1</sup> Both earls made their leisurely way up from London in the latter months of 1337. They were together at Oxford on 4 and on 8 November.<sup>2</sup> Montagu was at Hatfield on 5 December when he witnessed a grant to John de Molyns.<sup>3</sup> He did not reach Newcastle until 7 December.<sup>4</sup>

At Newcastle the forces were divided for administrative convenience.

Salisbury and Weston took charge of the shire levies and other compulsory elements in the army. Altogether, Weston accounted for some 1860 horse archers from the counties, 350 Welsh foot,<sup>5</sup> plus about 315 men at arms who brought their own contingents. At the height of the fighting, Montagu was fielding a force of about 400 men at arms and nearly 2000 mounted archers. Arundel and Gloucester took command of the remaining private contingents, including all the household troops which fought. These forces naturally accounted to the wardrobe under Edmund de la Beche. A force of 2 earls, 9 bannerets, 60 knights, 370 men at arms and 100 archers (20 hobelars and 200 southern Welsh foot) were being paid by the wardrobe under the nominal command of the earls of Gloucester and Arundel at the siege, prior to the arrival of household reinforcements in January 1338.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 N.B. Lewis, "The Recruitment and Organisation of a Contract Army, May to November, 1337, B.I.H.R. XXXVII (1964) p.4.

2 Where he witnessed a number of grants. C.C.R. 1333-37 pp.271, 273.

3 C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.286-7.

4 E101/20/25.

5 Including 50 Welsh foot in Salisbury's personal retinue.

6 A.E. Prince, "The Strength of English Armies in the Reign of Edward III", E.H.R. LXVI (1931) pp.358-360.

A dozen separate contingents fighting under the earl of Salisbury accounted to Weston. Only seven of these had been summoned individually and all were men with close ties with Salisbury. Among Salisbury's retinue fulfillment of obligation was good, though of the total force summoned two-thirds did not fight. All brought the requisite quotas of men at arms, except William Bawd who had been requested to bring four men and only sent two men in his place. Berkeley, Badlesmere, Despenser and the earl of Gloucester all brought contingents larger than anticipated. The earl of Gloucester had with him 93 men at arms, considerably more than the 60 anticipated.<sup>1</sup> Hugh le Despenser, who had been requested to bring just 10 men at arms, brought 20 as well as eight mounted archers. The representatives of Giles Badlesmere,<sup>2</sup> requested to bring 20 men, sent 23. Berkeley's quota, estimated at six men at arms, actually reached 16. There appears to have been no reluctance as earlier in the year to fulfill obligation. What is remarkable is the short-term enthusiasm which Montagu excited for the expedition among his friends and associates. One contingent even accounted independently to the exchequer under John Lisle.<sup>3</sup>

Prince has worked out in some detail how this expedition was financed. Most of the leaders were paid the greater part of their wages at the beginning of the expedition from the exchequer or in assignments on the parliamentary grant of that year. Weston was given £410 on 6 December and a further £1533 6s 8d was brought to him by John Bray nine days later.<sup>4</sup> Salisbury himself received an advance of £50 from the exchequer in London at the end of November, and an extra 10 marks shortly after his arrival in Newcastle,<sup>5</sup> where 1000 marks was delivered

---

1 E101/20/25; R.D.P. IV p.488. They deserted at Christmas.

2 He died between June and September 1337.

3 E101/20/24.

4 A.E. Prince, "The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III's Reign", Speculum XIX (1944) p.143.

5 E403/297 m18; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.209. On 15 November the exchequer was ordered to advance £1000.

to the leaders.<sup>1</sup> £400 of Weston's total resources was transported in the wake of the army to the siege. The rest -- £1700 drawn from the exchequer and from the wardrobe by Weston in imprests<sup>2</sup> -- was all the paymaster received for the forces under his control before the siege of Dunbar was well under way. Except for £2000<sup>3</sup> which arrived at Dunbar on 24 February, this was all the money that Weston was able to command to pay the county levies, 2000 mounted archers and 400 Welsh foot, and the engineers, masons, carpenters, mariners and casual labourers employed on the siege of Dunbar for the next seven months. It was not enough. In all, Weston paid out £9745 14s 0½d. This left debts totalling £1400 8s 9d.<sup>4</sup> Many of the contingent leaders found difficulty in obtaining money from Weston to pay their troops. Complaints were voiced by Salisbury and Arundel in a letter on 7 June, that Weston was refusing to account with the magnates and others<sup>5</sup> despite a privy seal warrant on 22 April ordering him to do just this.<sup>6</sup> Weston was apparently confused because most of the magnate and knightly contingents were assigned to the household payroll and were receiving their wages through the wardrobe.

The combined forces of Arundel and Salisbury left Newcastle about 4 January<sup>7</sup> and advanced to Berwick, then set out for Dunbar, marching via Wooler, Tynningham

---

- 1 A.E. Prince, "The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III's Reign", Speculum XIX (1944) p.143.
- 2 Allowed to Weston on 21 and 23 June 1341 -- including £200 from the wardrobe and £466 13s 4d from Kilsby, money from John de Denton at Newcastle plus £400 from London, £200 from York and 500 marks from St Botolph totalling £5866 13s 4d of which he carried with him £4433 6s 8d to the siege. E101/20/25 m19.
- 3 The Bardi provided £1000 of £1033 6s 8d given to Kellesey and provided a total of £3074 7s 1½d -- £220 for ships and the rest in wages.
- 4 E101/20/33.
- 5 E372/188 rot.33d.
- 6 A.E. Prince, "The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III's Reign", Speculum XIX (1944) p.144.
- 7 E101/20/25 when a new account was begun by Salisbury. A series of concessions in favour of the inhabitants of Berwick are dated 6 January. Rot. Scot. I 518-519.

and Haddington.<sup>1</sup> At Newcastle the new recruits had joined forces with the troops which had been serving on the march since the beginning of May.<sup>2</sup> During December 1337 the custody of the march had been held by the bishop of Carlisle, Henry Percy and Ralph Neville with a combined force of 16 knights, 106 men at arms and 24 archers. Percy and Neville remained to patrol the march while the new army moved north.<sup>3</sup> 19 men at arms from the contingents of lords Wake and Mowbray, however, chose to join Salisbury at the seige. Other contingents joined them en route. Five men at arms arrived with John de Lisle on 7 January, another five men at arms and six mounted archers appeared with Monthermer on 25 January.<sup>4</sup> Richard Damory had reached Dunbar by the end of the month.<sup>5</sup> The Hospitallers sent a voluntary force of 10 men at arms for six months at their own expense.<sup>6</sup>

Victuals for the forces at the siege were sent by sea under naval escort. Ships from ports all along the eastern coast had been gathered together at Newcastle at the end of November under the northern Admiral Robert Holm. Robert Tong, Keeper of the supplies at Newcastle and Berwick, in charge of 2907 quarters of wheat, sent 220 quarters to Newcastle for the arrival of the forces at the muster point. The bulk was delivered to the household troops in January, or used

---

1 E101/20/25 m19.

2 Four of the northern magnates had been serving on the march until 30 August : Henry Percy with 50 men at arms, the earl of Angus with 10 men at arms, Ralph Neville with 48 men at arms and Ranulph Dacre with 15 men at arms. Nero C.VIII fol. 245r-245v.

3 E101/388/5.

4 E101/20/24.

5 E101/20/25.

6 Joseph Bain, Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Record Office, London, Volume III, 1307-1357 (Edinburgh, 1884), no1255.

for the munition of other castles.<sup>1</sup> The rest, supplied ad hoc as required from sheriffs of the northern counties, was sent to the siege under escort by Admiral Mauny in February<sup>2</sup> and from John Denton, ex mayor of Newcastle.<sup>3</sup> Some was seized from private merchants,<sup>4</sup> and other enterprising individuals sold freely to the troops at Dunbar.<sup>5</sup> Merchants were encouraged actively to trade in Scotland to ensure a steady supply of necessities.<sup>6</sup> Ships laden with supplies set off, possibly in relays, under escort between 7 and 11 January.<sup>7</sup> The siege opened on 13 January.<sup>8</sup>

Edward was less than happy about the expedition. Montagu's absence from council meetings at a crucial point in the negotiations with his allies was clearly putting the king's plans in jeopardy and Edward was not willing to proceed without him. Alternatively Montagu had made it quite clear that he did not wish to be associated with them. At the beginning of December two cardinals arrived in England from the Pope seeking a truce.<sup>9</sup> It was a decision which Edward refused to take without the full support and advice of his magnates. Summons were sent out on 20 December for a parliament to be held at Westminster on 3 February.<sup>10</sup> Four days later the cardinals were notified of a temporary truce instituted from 22 December to last until 1 March.

---

1 E101/20/32; Rot. Scot. 517, 531. On 4 January Tong was replaced by Robert Tugale, but Tong declined to hand over his post and he was still in charge in mid-May.

2 Rot. Scot. 522, 523, 526, 527, 534, 535.

3 E372/183 rot.60d.

4 Joseph Bain, Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland III, 1298.

5 H.Mss.Comm. Appendix 3rd Report. Mss of Sir Thomas Hare Bart, at Stow Hall, Norfolk III, 251.

6 C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.204, 216.

7 E101/20/25 m8.

8 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon Vol.II, 324.

9 E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War", Historical Studies of the English Parliament I, 247 (eds.) E.B. Fryde and Edward Miller.

10 R.D.P. IV, 488-91; C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.388, 389. "Le Roi li consailler de grant trewe sanz avisement des grants et communites de la tere, a ce summons en parlement... fist dire qil feroit sumonde sen parlement a lende(main) de la purification et de la moen temps...."

Meanwhile Edward was not still. He maintained constant communication with Salisbury at Newcastle and at Berwick throughout December.<sup>1</sup> John Lesturmy, usher of the household, was despatched from Guildford, where the king kept Christmas, on 27 December to collect arms and pavillions from the Tower and convey them north in advance of the king to Whitkirk Abbey where Edward chose to lodge.<sup>2</sup> About 16 January the king arrived, with a substantial force of 15 of his household knights and bannerets, 36 household squires, 200 south Welsh and about 130 lesser individuals, serjeants and valets. Of these troops a force of 82 men at arms and 172 others remained behind at the siege and on the march under the joint leadership of Poynings and Cobham.<sup>3</sup> The forces which gathered before Dunbar in January 1338 thus numbered about 4000 men, including 1060 men at arms.<sup>4</sup> Between Edward and Montagu there was something of a confrontation at Whitkirk. Edward wanted to know why the siege could not be suspended. Montagu, however, was not of the same mind.<sup>5</sup> When Edward left for England on 26 January it was without the earl of Salisbury.<sup>6</sup> Two days later Montagu began to lay siege to Dunbar castle in earnest.<sup>7</sup>

Montagu threw all his energies into forcing the garrison to capitulate. Fordun described how he tried every device of the art of war in a siege that lasted 19 weeks,<sup>8</sup> and was conducted in something of a festive style. Deep pits were dug about the castle to prevent a sortie, then wooden houses constructed

- 
- 1 E101/388/5 m6.
  - 2 E101/388/5 m14; Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, p.81.
  - 3 E101/388/5 mm22-24. Paymaster Kilsby and some forces arrived on 11 January, but the bulk arrived with the king on the 16th.
  - 4 A.E. Prince, "The Strength of English Armies in the Reign of Edward III", E.H.R. XLVI (1931) p.360.
  - 5 Scalacronica p.168.
  - 6 E101/388/5 m23.
  - 7 Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh (ed.) Hans Claude Hamilton, Vol.II, (London, 1849) p.315. (Montagu's third accounting period begins on that date.)
  - 8 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon Vol.II, 325.

before the gates and pavillions and tents erected for the nobles of the army.<sup>1</sup> Even while still at Newcastle, labourers had been set to work constructing hurdles in preparation for the siege. A host of carpenters were set to work outside Dunbar building siege engines under the direction of three engineers which hurled missiles against the walls of the castle entirely without effect.<sup>2</sup> The garrison under the bold command of Black Agnes "par resoun scho was blak skinnit" remained firm and confident.<sup>3</sup> Even the plight of her captive brother the earl of Moray could not shake her resolution. Moray was sent from the Tower to Newcastle on 18 February; on 29 February he received summons from Edward himself then at Durham, interviewed in private then escorted back to Newcastle on the following day and turned over to the custody of the sheriff of Northumberland.<sup>4</sup> He may well have been escorted to Dunbar where the earl of Salisbury is supposed to have threatened to kill him if the countess did not surrender the castle. Her cool reply was that she would be the gainer thereby as she stood to inherit his earldom.<sup>5</sup>

Early in the siege the English forces tried an assault on the castle, but they clashed with a small band of Scots led by Lawrence de Preston. Richard Talbot bringing up a troop to reinforce the English besiegers was captured.<sup>6</sup> Besides depleting the English forces, the loss of Talbot was a boost to the morale of the beleaguered garrison: of the magnates who had supported Balliol at Dupplin Moor only Ralph Stafford and Balliol himself still remained at large. Montagu had no choice but to renew the assault with even greater vigour.

---

1 Chronicon de Lanercost 1201-1346 (ed.) J. Stevenson. Bannantyne Club 65 (Edinburgh, 1839) p.295.

2 E101/20/25 m17. They were supplied from the Tower by Beche and transported north in mid-November. Rot. Scot. I, 518.

3 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon p.325 relates how she mocked the besiegers by wiping the walls with a white veil where the boulders battered them.

4 E372/186 m51; E372/184 m49; E403/298 m35; E101/388/9 m26r. Chronicon de Lanercost p.297 places the episode after Easter. Joseph Bain, Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, III, 1280.

5 E.W.M. Balfour-Melville, Edward III and David II, p.11.

6 No evidence of Talbot's captivity exists. His account ends on 1 February, but on that date he was appointed custodian of Berwick. E101/388/5 m22.

At Berwick he had picked up the pirate John Crabbe and placed him in charge of siege operations. During December and January 7 engines were under construction at Newcastle by a team of master craftsmen. These were delivered to Crabbe at Dunbar on 19 January and put into use during the second week in February.<sup>1</sup> On 17 February, Crabbe began work on a "sow" which was wheeled forward, providing protection for a number of armed men under cover of which they intended to sap the castle walls.<sup>2</sup> It proved a death trap, for the garrison was able to hail down great stones onto the sow, completely smashing it and killing or maiming those within.<sup>3</sup> Still Montagu would not give up. More carpenters were set to work at the beginning of March, though this time a military guard was set over their work.<sup>4</sup> On 15 May, and for the next six days, 200 stone masons began to fill in the ditch of the castle, and about this time Salisbury sent to London to bring the master carpenter William de Hurlee to Dunbar to seek his advice and a new siege engine.<sup>5</sup> Enthusiasm for the assault remained high and a number of household troops, particularly under John Mowbray and Ralph Ferrers joined the forces at Dunbar between 7 February and 9 April, though on 5 March Walee's troop departed and on 13 and 17 April so too did Vavasour's and those serving for Mowbray and Kyme.<sup>6</sup> There is no indication of desertion on a large scale. Montagu was still able to maintain enthusiasm.

In mid-March, a diversion caused by the siege of Edinburgh castle and then the capture by William Douglas of its governor, John de Stirling, drew Montagu's

---

- 1 E101/21/28. E.W.M. Balfour Melville, "Two John Crabbes", S.H.R. 39 (1960) pp.31-34.
- 2 E101/388/5 m12; Rot. Scot. I, 521.
- 3 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon p.325. Buik of the Chroniclis of Scotland, (ed.) William B. Turnbull, Vol.III, Rolls Series (London, 1858) p.342.
- 4 E101/20/25 m18.
- 5 E101/388/9 m5v; E101/20/25 mm18,19. R.A. Brown, H.M. Colvin and A.J. Taylor, History of the King's Works I, 219. He was master carpenter of St Stephens chapel and the Tower and surveyor of all castles south of Trent, including maintenance of royal siege engines in the Tower. On 15 February 1338 with 4 other carpenters and 3 smiths he set out with a "great engine" from London to Dunbar, and was 11 weeks on the road and assembling the engine.
- 6 E101/388/5 mm20-23; E101/20/25.

attention momentarily away from the siege. On hearing the news, Montagu gathered a small force and despatched it to replace the garrison before returning his attention to Dunbar.<sup>1</sup> By now the garrison was running short of supplies, despite the gallant nocturnal activities of one Alexander de Ramsey, who in a fast ship with a band of forty armed men succeeded in slipping out from Bass one quiet night, evading the naval blockade which Montagu was maintaining with the use of Genoese galleys,<sup>2</sup> and taking supplies through the castle.<sup>3</sup> About the middle of June Salisbury tried what proved to be the final assault on the castle, in which he was almost captured, but for the services of John de Coupland, who bodily propelled the earl to safety at cost to his own liberty.

It was events in England which eventually determined the outcome of the siege. The envoys in the Netherlands began to return to England between the end of April and 8 May.<sup>4</sup> The magnates and community representatives at a recent parliament held in early February had entirely endorsed the views expressed by the envoys from the Netherlands that Edward had done everything possible to avoid war with France consonant with honour and profit, but that Edward should maintain his cause. The communities therefore had promised him financial aid and urged him to speed his expedition overseas as quickly as possible.<sup>5</sup> Under this guarantee the envoys had undertaken to make first payments to the king's major allies in the Low Countries and Germany.

No further parliamentary discussion over the validity of levying war against France was held between the dismissal of the commons on 14 February<sup>6</sup> and the departure of Edward for Antwerp on 16 July. From thenceforth the government concentrated

---

1 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon, pp.325, 326.

2 E101/388/9 fol.5r.

3 Joannes de Fordun Scotichronicon, pp.325, 326.

4 E101/311/31. The earl of Northampton returned 26 April, the bishop of Lincoln 8 May.

5 Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.418.

6 R.D.P. IV, 488-9; C.C.R.1337-39 pp.338-9.

on gathering and equipping the forces which were to sail with him. Having gained national approval for the enterprise closest to his heart, Edward would not countenance opposition. It was widely rumoured that of all his household only Guilliot de la Chaumbre was allowed near the king because of his outspoken warmongering. It was also said that "qy endestourbast le passage le roy en accomplissement de lour trectice qils serrount vnqor tenuz traiters".<sup>1</sup> This attitude Edward communicated to Montagu in Scotland. On 24 April Edward wrote in haste to Dunbar to the chief leaders appraising them of the situation and removed command from Salisbury.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, Salisbury delayed before Dunbar hoping that the garrison would finally surrender. Whatever reply that Montagu sent that reached Edward on 2 May,<sup>3</sup> it was not the expected one. He lingered on in Scotland throughout May and June countermanding Edward's express wishes. Eventually, his hand was forced. The Scots opened preliminary negotiations with Edward about 25 April through the earl of Arundel.<sup>4</sup>

On 12 June a deputation of Scottish knights escorted the Scottish nuncios to a meeting with Edward III in England and letters, presumably informing Montagu of these negotiations, were despatched north on the 20th.<sup>5</sup> A truce was agreed, to last until Michaelmas. In the circumstances there was nothing for Montagu to do but agree with the garrison for a cessation of hostilities. Presumably by this time Salisbury had had time to reconsider his own attitude to the French war. After five months the castle had still not capitulated and action in France must have seemed a far better prospect than further weeks of waiting before the walls of Dunbar. Rather than be called a traitor, Montagu opened negotiations with the

---

1 Scalacronica p.168.

2 Rot. Scot. I, 524.

3 E101/388/5 m10. He also delayed sending levies from his Denbigh Estates to the Ipswich muster. Foedera II ii, 1016.

4 Rot. Scot I, 524.

5 E101/388/5 mm12, 13.

garrison for a truce.<sup>1</sup> Agreement was quickly reached and on 13 June<sup>2</sup> Montagu returned to Newcastle.

Although begun in a burst of enthusiasm, the campaign of 1337-8 attracted much adverse criticism. Salisbury had concentrated his attention on capturing Dunbar to the exclusion of all else. His attitude had aroused the anger of Edward III and the disapproval of many of his contemporaries.<sup>3</sup> From at least May 1337 war with France had been a strong probability, and to concentrate so much energy on Scotland at this crucial juncture was considered not only foolish but dangerous. Montagu, leaving without gain when, as was believed, the garrison was on the very point of surrender,<sup>4</sup> was a further cause for hostility. He had only succeeded in strengthening Scottish resistance and dishonouring the English. As "Hemingburgh" remarked with asperity:

Quae quidem dimissio et treuga majoribus Angliae et etiam multitudine congregatis plurimum displicuit, quia absidio ipsa fuerunt Anglicis dispendiosa nec honorifica nec segura, sed Scotis utilis atque grata.<sup>5</sup>

Montagu's second command occurred in 1340. In February, Edward left Flanders and returned to England to impress on the home government the urgency of his military and financial needs. Since Salisbury and Suffolk were under constraint for Edward's debts at Ypres he constituted them Lieutenants with full power to act in his name.<sup>6</sup> In line with an agreement of the previous autumn to which Salisbury had been a party, the Lieutenants engaged themselves to win back the towns of

- 
- 1 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon p.326; Scalacronica p.168. Possibly Edward also offered money. See C.P.R. 1338-40 p.394 payments made to Salisbury to join Edward in the Low Countries and E36/203 fol.104v. Truce to last til Michaelmas 1339. Rot. Scot. I 540.
  - 2 E101/29/25. Not 16 June as stated in Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon p.326.
  - 3 Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh II, 315.
  - 4 Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon p.326; Scalacronica p.168.
  - 5 Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh II, 315.
  - 6 E36/203 fol.104v. Salisbury was given £3115 4s 8d on 17 February from the wardrobe, plus £1000 owed from 1338.

Lille and Douai and other territories encroached by the French.<sup>1</sup>

The chroniclers claim that the earls were left with a company of about 100 men at arms.<sup>2</sup> In reality they had only about half this number for which they were conceded a wage of 5 marks a day. In addition they recruited the aid of several volunteers -- Guy of Flanders, lord John de Lenedale and a dozen or so minor magnates and merchants who provided a small body of armed men.<sup>3</sup> Robert of Artois was possibly also there. The earl of Julich maintained contact with the allies, paying for spies to be sent into France for them.<sup>4</sup>

Initially the earls seem to have intended an expedition against Calais, but the garrisons of Lille and Armentieres were subjecting the borders of Flanders to considerable pressure and this drew the attention of their new allies. Therefore, Suffolk and Salisbury, aided by the count of Hainault, who despite his loyalty to Philip VI equally suffered from French encroachments on his county, his brother John, the lord of Cuijk and representatives of the duke of Brabant, marched from Ypres with the local militia into Thierache, captured and burned Armentieres and the surrounding region and, joining forces from Ghent, established themselves at Quesnoy in preparation for laying siege to Lille at the beginning of April.<sup>5</sup>

The chroniclers are divided in their opinion as to exactly what happened. On 11 April both earls fell into an ambush just outside the town while on a

1 Bethune, Orchies, Tournai and other castelries and rights understood to include the county of Artois. H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, pp.355-56.

2 Chronique de Jean le Bel. (eds) Jules Viard et Eugene Deprez. La Societe de l'Histoire de France, (Paris, 1904) p.168.

3 E36/203 fol.128v.

4 E36/203 fol.105v.

5 Chronique de Jean le Bel., p.168.

reconnaissance trip to discover which side of Lille would be most susceptible to assault.<sup>1</sup> "Hemingburgh" describes it as a "loci incolis" where they were surrounded and trapped.<sup>2</sup> Murimuth was of the opinion that they were inadequately accompanied and had laid themselves open to capture through their own foolhardy bravery.<sup>3</sup> Both earls were taken to the centre of town and held in the market place, while messengers were sent to Philip announcing their capture. The steward of Rouergue, William Rolland, was despatched to collect the earls and accompany them to Paris where they could be more safely housed. Despite claims by the chroniclers that they were bundled into carts like common criminals, they were treated comparatively well. The journey to Paris was unhurried, Rolland and his party taking 12 days to reach the capital.<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, contrary to appearances, Philip did not intend to treat them lightly. Montagu especially was in danger. The French king was fully aware of his measure, they had already met on at least four previous occasions when Montagu was acting as Edward's diplomatic agent in France and Philip clearly saw him as a dangerous opponent. To have put him to death would have in one stroke deprived Edward of his most trusted counsellor and at the same time seriously hamper Edward's ability to prosecute the war. According to the chroniclers, however, Philip was reacting more through rage than cool calculation. The French Chronicler of London reports a speech which is no doubt imaginary, but which he may have heard from a reliable source. The French king is supposed to have threatened to hang his prisoners in reprisal for damages inflicted by English armies in France.

---

1 E36/203 fols.128v,129r after which date the earls were not paid wages.

2 Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh Vol.2, p.360.

3 Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls Series (1889) p.105. It is not therefore surprising that the story was given of a rash assault on the town as the cause of their capture. See Chronicon Galfridi de Baker p.67.

4 Simeon Luce (ed.) Froissart II, 5 n8.

To which Salisbury replied, typically, "sortis, sire, vous avez le tort et nostre roy le verite, et ceo voille jeo prover vers qi le contredirra, cum leal chivaler ferra en estraunge tere". The queen's reaction to this defiance was to declare that she would never again rest easy until Montagu had been vilely put to death. Only the intervention of the king of Bohemia saved the earls' lives, by pointing out that Philip would do better to try to exchange them for French prisoners in English hands.<sup>1</sup> Spared, Philip had Montagu sent to the castle of Montargai and Ufford was placed in a separate fortress where they remained throughout the summer. The earl of Warwick travelled to France at an unspecified time prior to June 1341 at Edward's personal request to try to obtain the release of both earls, without success.<sup>2</sup> It was not until the truce of Esplechin, concluded in the autumn of 1340 and sealed on 25 September, that the earls were released on parole, on agreement that provided peace was maintained all prisoners on both sides should be freed, but that if the truce was broken each prisoner should immediately surrender himself to his captors. Suffolk promised to act as surety and to surrender himself if any prisoner refused to give himself up in the event of a breakage of the truce.<sup>3</sup> The earls rejoined Edward and his household at Ghent.<sup>4</sup>

In line with the conditions of the truce, Montagu and Ufford were to be released in exchange for French prisoners. After protracted negotiations, it

- 
- 1 French Chronicle of London, Camden Society, pp. 73, 74. See "The Vows of the Heron" in Thomas Wright (ed.) Political Poems and Songs, Volume I, R.S. (London, 1859) pp.1-25 whose author associates the earl of Suffolk in particular with the king of Bohemia.
  - 2 C.P.R. 1340-43 p.223; C.C.R. 1341-43 p.343. He was made Lieutenant in their places and was in prison in Malines between 16 October 1340 and 16 April 1341.
  - 3 French Chronicle of London, pp.81-2; The text of the truce is printed in Chronicon Henrici Knighton, pp.19-20.
  - 4 French Chronicle of London, p.82. They were there by 21 November when a gold cup worth nearly £36 was given to Salisbury "veniento domino Regi de partibus Franciae usque Gaunt". E101/389/8 m3. Possibly he was there for the tournament held by Edward in Ghent in October. E101/388/11.

was eventually agreed that Suffolk was to be released for Charles de Montmorency.<sup>1</sup> There was little difficulty in carrying out the exchange. Montagu was a more valuable prize and consequently became the centre of a complicated set of tri-cornered political negotiations. Initially, it was agreed that Montagu be exchanged for Herman, lord of Laon in Brittany, then a prisoner of Walter Mauny. But Philip would not relinquish Salisbury lightly and was still determined that Edward be made to recognise the inclusion of the Scots in all movements to obtain peace. Eventually Edward agreed to part with his most important Scottish prisoner, the earl of Moray, in aid of Montagu's release.<sup>2</sup>

The choice of Moray as a pawn in the dispute was not without significance. Salisbury clearly took a special interest in the earl, perhaps considering him his own prisoner as Moray was captured in 1335 by a retainer of Montagu. Since Montagu's last meeting with the earl at Dunbar two years earlier, Moray had been put at the disposal of Percy and Neville in continuing negotiations for peace with the Scots in November 1339. Negotiations were nearly completed by 1 August 1340 when the earl of March and four others agreed to stand hostages to arrange the ransom for his release. They were still involved in this when on 25 October he was removed from the custody of Neville and Percy and sent south to Windsor Castle.<sup>3</sup> Matters got under way very slowly. On 8 February 1341, he was granted protection to go to France until mid-June to arrange his ransom.<sup>4</sup> He was back in England by 20 May on his way to Scotland<sup>5</sup> and three and a half weeks later he and his bodyguard were passing safely over the Scottish border, while Salisbury and Suffolk were

- 
- 1 Foedera II ii, 1130. The chroniclers are confused. *Scalacronica* says that Ufford was released for the son of Charles de Montmorency (p.171). *Chronique Normande* says that both earls were released for Charles de Montmorency, his brother and Billebaut de Irie.
- 2 Chronique de Jean le Bel p.168. On 7 May 1340 Edward granted Mauny £8000 for Guy of Flanders and other prisoners. Foedera II ii, 1123.
- 3 E372/187 m42; Foedera II ii, 1130, 1132, 1138, 1140; Bain, 1337, 1342, 1343.
- 4 Foedera II ii, 1147; Bain 1350.
- 5 Foedera II ii, 1160; Bain 1359.

themselves preparing to visit France.<sup>1</sup> These efforts failed to come to anything. A second trip to Scotland was attempted at the beginning of July, with equal lack of success. On 20 July Salisbury informed the king that Moray was ready to deliver himself up to prison and was anxious for safe conduct for himself, Sir William de Levingstone and their escort.<sup>2</sup> By this stage Moray was beginning to despair.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, negotiations continued. In late February 1342, Moray was again granted permission to go to France for three months, and was this time successful in obtaining his release.<sup>4</sup>

This did not, however, mean the immediate enlargement of the earl of Salisbury, whom Philip VI was reluctant to relinquish knowing full well that Salisbury would immediately throw himself into the war effort with renewed vigour. It was not until 20 May that Montagu eventually sought the king's permission to swear never to fight against France again as he could obtain his release by no other means. Edward agreed to this by no means unusual oath,<sup>5</sup> although with the reservation that Montagu be prepared to fight

extra dictum regnum Franciae, in quibuscumque locis pro nobis et nostris se amare teneatur et alia quacumque facere quae praestiti nobis homagii et fidelitatis suae debitum exigit et requirit.<sup>6</sup>

On 2 June at Bois de Vincennes, in the presence of Philip VI, Salisbury sealed a final agreement for his release in exchange for both Moray and Laon. Montagu was

1 C.P.R. 1340-43 p.229.

2 Foedera II ii, 1166, 1169; C.P.R. 1340-43 p.245.

3 Regesta Regum Scottorum VI. The Acts of David II, King of Scots 1329-1371 (Edinburgh, 1982) ed. Bruce Webster. A confirmation of a charter granting lands in Sarquhar to John Urwell in case he died without heirs, dated 22 September 1341.

4 Foedera II ii, 1188; Joseph Bain, Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland III 1376, 1386. He is one of the authors of a letter to Edward III dated 29 April 1342 referring to a treaty by Edward with France which included David Bruce.

5 The count of Namur was forced to swear a similar oath to the Scots in 1335. Ranald Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.213.

6 Foedera II ii, 1195.

personally to conduct Moray to Roxburgh Castle or a similar safe place in Scotland, while Laon was to be handed over to Philip himself or to the Duke of Brittany by 22 July. Should these agreements be broken, Montagu was bound to return to prison in France within a month of failure to release the earl of Moray.<sup>1</sup>

Agreement on exchange of prisoners was not the end of the affair. Montagu and Suffolk had both languished in confinement for six months before they were released on parole.<sup>2</sup> In common with all prisoners of war, to obtain liberty within which to negotiate the terms of their eventual release, they had had to 'sumettre a finance' by offering a substantial sum to the French crown.<sup>3</sup> The freedom they were seeking was expensive. Despite the agreement for mutual exchange of prisoners, both earls had had to seek parole at a cost of £3000 each. From the autumn of 1340 until Salisbury obtained full release in June 1342, they or their agents were constantly passing between England and the continent in pursuit of the affair.

Edward, despite his obvious concern at losing two of his earls,<sup>4</sup> made little effort to speed their release in the intervening period. In response to a petition on Suffolk's behalf, at the beginning of June 1340 he granted authority for the earl's attorneys to receive and make acquittances under their own seals for assignments and other debts due to the earl, carrying the same weight as the

1 B.L. Caligula D.III fol.24.

2 It possibly damaged Montagu's health, for about a month after his release he felt compelled to request Edward's promise that in the event of his untimely death, his executors might have the custody of and marriage of his heir and complete financial control of his estates. C.P.R. 1340-43 p.57. Edward's grant of this mentions 'eant regard al graunt meschief qil ad soffert de ceo en son corps...' C81/270/13495.

3 Pierre-Clement Timbal, La Guerre de Cent Ans Vue a Travers les Registres de Parlement (1337-1369) (Paris, 1961) p.333.

4 Chronicon Henrici Knighton vel Cnitton Leycenstrensis (ed.) Joseph Rawson Lumby, R.S. (London, 1889) p.17 speaks of the earls as 'abducti in magnam desolationem regis Angliae'.

earl's own seal.<sup>1</sup> Edward also promised speedy payment of their war wages from the tax in kind granted in parliament that March.<sup>2</sup> At this stage the earl of Salisbury's pay was in arrears for nearly £10,000 and the earl of Suffolk was owed nearly £4,000.<sup>3</sup> But it was not until mid-October that Edward began to make specific offers of aid to the earls, indemnifying Montagu for trespasses and debts and granting acquittance for all outstanding accounts.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile the earls began to set about collecting their ransom money.

Edward stepped in to aid Suffolk. In 1340 he granted the earl 500 marks from the proceeds of the 1/9 and 1/15 tax in Norfolk as an advance towards his ransom.<sup>5</sup> The first portion of £250 was not forthcoming, however, until April 1344 and the rest of the account was not settled until two years later.<sup>6</sup> Ufford was therefore forced to raise the cash elsewhere. Montagu offered to negotiate loans on their mutual behalf. As a result, Montagu advanced Ufford the £3000 for his release and which Ufford and his heir bound themselves to repay in three equal instalments between 3 October 1341 and Christmas 1342 either in England in sterling or abroad in florins of Florence or florins d'escu of France.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 C.P.R. 1338-40 p.531.

2 C.P.R. 1340-43 pp.1, 2, 65, 171.

3 E36/203 fols. 128v, 129r.

4 C.P.R. 1340-43 p.56.

5 C81/278/14244.

6 'Recepimus...ducentas et quinquaginta marcas de denariis domini regi detentus de eidem nono in dicto comitatu (Norfolk) in auxilium redempcionis nostre nobis per dictum dominum regem illustriam nuper concessas in partem solucionis cuiusdem summa quinquagentarum marcarum nobis per dictum dominum regem assignatorum in auxilium redempcionis nostre... E43/444. He was later promised the issues of the proceedings of oyer and terminer and £500 war wages on 25 July 1341 'considering the future service of the earl if he is released from prison'.  
C.C.R. 1341-43 p.203.

7 C.C.R. 1341-43 p.277.

Within three weeks of his release, John de Pulteney, the London financier, was exporting on Montagu's behalf to Bruges 160 sacks of wool.<sup>1</sup> A week later he was granted permission to export another 240 sacks through London.<sup>2</sup> Transportation of the wool proved slow, hampered by problems in England of collecting the tax of 1/9 on which the grant was based and because of delays caused by overzealous customs officials. By the end of January 1341 only 174 sacks 28 cloves had been transported overseas. A further 65 sacks and 24 cloves still remained to be gathered. At the beginning of February Montagu, hoping to speed affairs, requested permission to gather the wool in the north and transport the bulk of it, 44 sacks, through the port of Kingston, taking only the residue of 21 sacks and 24 cloves through London where it was held up on the outskirts of the city.<sup>3</sup>

Presuming that the wool came from Essex (and Suffolk if Montagu was dealing with Ufford's ransom as well) 240 sacks, after payment of full subsidy and custom, would yield some £880.<sup>4</sup> Later in the year, however, Montagu tried a different method of raising the cash and sold directly to the king 120 sacks for a total of £1008 6s 8d. For this he was granted repayment out of the fines levied in Suffolk on the ministerial purge. If this was not enough, Salisbury was to receive the £200 by which his own retainer, Ralph de Middleneye made fine for his activities as sheriff of Somerset.<sup>5</sup> This money proved equally unforthcoming in the confused political climate of 1341. The earl appointed his attorney, John de Wingfield, with an associate, John de Aspale and one Thomas de Batesford to collect the money owing from this in February 1342, but in May the earl was complaining at the slow collection of the money. By October still almost nothing

---

1 C.C.R. 1339-41 p.553; Foedera II ii, 1139, 1147.

2 C.C.R. 1339-41 p.564.

3 C.C.R. 1339-41 p.612; C.C.R. 1341-43 p.12.

4 C.P.R. 1340-43 p.265.

5 C.C.R. 1341-43 p.226.

had come to him.<sup>1</sup> Even in January 1343 Aspale had not got hold of the extracts of fines so was unable to begin raising the money.<sup>2</sup> The earls' ability to collect their own ransom money had been seriously hampered by the government's failure to pay all that was due for war wages from 1339. Montagu, promised £5000 from 1340 and nearly as much again in 1341 from the wool levy in Yorkshire and Lancashire, had received nothing by the end of November 1340, and eventual payment was slow and intermittent. The officials in charge of collecting the proceeds of the sale of wool were understandably uncertain as to how to proceed in the light of frequent and often conflicting orders from central government.<sup>3</sup> Both Salisbury and Suffolk made separate complaints that they were not being paid as promised.<sup>4</sup>

Salisbury therefore negotiated with the Gascon magnate, Bernard Etzi of Lebret,<sup>5</sup> one of the dual captains of Aquitaine and chief royal representative in imposing the conditions of the truce of Esplechin within the duchy. Lebret advanced Montagu £2400. The earl failed to meet the deadline for repayment before his accidental death in January 1344, and six months later Lebret was petitioning before the council for distraint of Montagu's executors.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 C.C.R. pp.386-7, 537, 601.

2 C.C.R. 1343-46 p.4.

3 C.C.R. 1339-41 pp.576, 173; C.C.R. 1341-43 pp.24, 62, 98. On 8 March Elleker was ordered to pay certain Newcastle merchants and Salisbury and Suffolk by equal terms, notwithstanding orders to the contrary. By 20 May, due to Montagu's complaint against this, Elleker was ordered to pay the earl only, but this order had to be reiterated in mid-June.

4 C.C.R. 1341-43 pp.24, 62, 203. Although Edward had ordered repayment of the earl of Suffolk's debts on the clerical 1/10 in the north in January, it was not paid.

5 Foedera II ii, 1145, 1174, 1178, 1179. He had been retained on the king's council since 1327.

6 C.C.R. 1343-46 p.461.

#### 4. DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS

The role of the lay diplomat has tended to be unjustly neglected, perhaps because contemporary treatises on the subject have tended to be written with a clerk's eye view of the problem.<sup>1</sup> He has often been dismissed with scorn as of only secondary importance. Most missions were composed of a mixed group of diplomats forming a good cross-section of talents - usually a bishop with administrative skills, a minor government clerk, possibly a lay magnate and someone skilled in the intricacies of canon or civil law. Tout's view<sup>2</sup> was that these were guaranteed to cover all contingencies. The wealth and authority of the magnates would be calculated to impress, while the clerks supplied the technical knowledge. Magnates and other members of the laity were placed on missions as make-weights, men of authority, wealth and political standing, but uneducated and incapable of handling the delicate and often extremely complicated negotiations which inevitably preceded any creation of international understanding. The magnitude of their dignity being matched only by the meanness of their intelligence, they have been dismissed as incapable of carrying out such important work which was therefore left to the ecclesiastical dignitaries and lesser officials to transact. Their role was merely to add lustre and dignity to what was in reality a subtle and often dangerous game of political chess carried out by cloak and dagger tactics under cover of polite festivities. There is probably a deal of truth in this, for much of the time the business necessarily involved technical disputes of a legal and specialised nature. It was obviously sensible to utilise the knowledge and administrative expertise of lesser clerks where possible for

---

1 G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration (Oxford, 1940) pp.19-20. De Legatis et Legationibus tractatibus varii (ed.) Vladimir E. Hrabar, (Dorpat, 1905); B. Behrens Treatises on the Ambassador Written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth centuries, E.H.R. LI (1963) p.619.

2 T.F. Tout, "The English Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century", Collected Papers III, 203.

the multifarious duties which faced any diplomat. They formed an ambassadorial council responsible for preparing the ground for the main negotiations.<sup>1</sup> Technical matters formed the basis for negotiations of a more general nature in which the great magnates would certainly take the lead, particularly during the banquets and displays of pageantry which formed so striking a part of the larger embassies. To deny the lay magnate a real role is hardly credible in comparison with the enormous burden of governmental and administrative duties which fell to their lot. Those chosen to go on diplomatic missions were among the most highly experienced and competent workers in the government of their day. These men could never accept a role as a mere figurehead. They had real knowledge of many of the subjects for discussion with clients, especially on military matters. This is particularly striking in the negotiations between England and the Low Countries and Germany in 1337 when the earl of Salisbury volunteered himself as a hostage for the king's policies, indicating a remarkable degree of involvement in and commitment to the negotiations taking place in his name.<sup>2</sup>

A few reasons for using some lay magnates present themselves. Clinton was Constable of Dover from 1330 to 1343 when he went on his earlier missions to France, involved in dealing with disputes between merchants and sailors of England, Gascony and France over whom he had special jurisdiction. It is also no coincidence that, for the same reason, envoys were often employed as admirals of the fleets, concerned with maritime and mercantile disputes. Clinton was in charge of the Western fleet when he went to France in 1334 and again with a short break from 1340-42. Montagu was admiral of the same fleet while in the Low Countries in 1337. Ufford at the height of his diplomatic activities in the mid-1340s commanded the Northern fleet, as did Bohun from 1351-1355.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 K. Fowler, "Truces" in The Hundred Years War p.186, and see K. Fowler, The King's Lieutenant, passim.

2 Foedera II ii, 972.

3 G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, p.96.

Another, more telling, factor was closeness to the person of the principal. "Send suche ambaxadours that be mooste nygh thy noble person... in whom thou most trusteth" wrote Christine of Pisan in The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chivalrye in 1408-9.<sup>1</sup> All major diplomats, both clerical and lay, were household men and it is only to be expected that Edward's bannerets had a major role to play, particularly as steward and chamberlain. Ufford's sole appointment as envoy prior to 1337 occurred in 1335 under his stewardship. Other household members who enjoyed Edward's special trust were frequently employed. This is brought out very clearly in the early missions of Montagu. In June 1329 he had already won Edward's confidence, and incidentally of Mortimer also since his integrity was never questioned. The king was likely to pick only those close to his person on whom he could rely implicitly to represent his views while not offending important allies. Members of the king's household, in daily contact with the minutiae of state affairs were the obvious choice.<sup>2</sup>

This quality was of the highest importance for a diplomat. Barbarus, who himself served on many missions, points out in his treatise the importance of an ambassador having the ability to assume a reputation for guileless honesty while adopting Machiavellian tactics.<sup>3</sup> Montagu was a master of the art of dissimulation. Clearly trust was born of ability. No-one would be employed on diplomatic embassies without the necessary talents. The quick brain, a readiness of tongue, a strong nerve, just some of the essential qualities required in a diplomat,<sup>4</sup> Montagu at least possessed in abundance.

---

1 Quoted J. Ferguson, English Diplomacy 1422-1452, p.157.

2 Pierre Chaplais, "English Diplomatic Documents to the end of Edward III's Reign", The Study of Medieval Records. Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major, (eds.) D.A. Bullock and R.L. Storey, (Oxford, 1971), p.34.

3 "De Officio Legati" in De Legatis et Legationibus tractatibus varii (ed.) Vladimir E. Hrabar, pp.65-70.

4 "Conradus Brunus "De Legationibus"" printed 1548, in De Legatis et Legationibus tractatibus varii (ed.) Vladimir E. Hrabar, p.90.

Montagu went on at least eleven missions between 1329 and his death in January 1344, which spanned almost every area of English political influence from Scotland in the north to France, the Low Countries, Germany and even Spain. Clinton was hardly less active during this early period: he was involved on at least seven missions between 1332 and 1341. Bohun and Ufford came to prominence somewhat later. Neither was employed in Europe prior to 1337, although Bohun was in Scotland in 1336 and Ufford a few months previously. From the opening of the Hundred Years War until they died they were continuously busy.

Each seems to have developed his own particular sphere of influence. Clinton was most often appointed on missions to negotiate with France, especially over problems relating to the duchy of Aquitaine. He was never sent to Scotland, nor indeed took part in much fighting there. Suffolk found his own sphere of influence during the 1340s and 1350s in negotiating for numerous peace treaties and truces with France. He was also appointed on several occasions to treat with the Flemings: in 1337-8, September-October 1348 and February 1362. Bohun worked mainly in Scotland. Together they served on sixteen separate missions over a fifteen year period. Few other lay magnates were employed with such regularity. Few could expect to be called on to serve in this capacity more than twice.

A measure of the relative importance of Edward's bannerets in the diplomatic sphere may be found in an analysis of the terms and powers accorded to them. Should those sent on diplomatic missions be termed diplomats, envoys or ambassadors? This indicates the main problem which faces the student of medieval diplomatic history, that is to determine exactly how much authority was accorded to those who were despatched to negotiate with foreign powers. Did royal envoys presume to act under their own discretion, were they afforded full power to treat

in Edward's name, or were they merely an extended mouthpiece of the king with no authority of their own? How full was their briefing and how far were they held accountable for what transpired? Nor is it simply a problem which concerns modern historians. For contemporaries as well it proved to be of overriding concern as its full treatment in early treatises on the subject proves.

Many of our problems in defining the type of powers accorded to medieval diplomats spring from a confusion of contemporary terminology. All accounts for journeys made on diplomatic missions of any kind were lumped together under the heading nuncii. These nuncii might range from simple messengers despatched to carry letters from the king and his council to royal vassals, to clerks sent to the Curia to beg favours of the Pope or powerful magnates sent to negotiate with the representatives of the other European monarchs.

Grants of ambassadorial powers are hardly more precise. G.P. Cuttino, covering the period from 1259 to 1339 noted that the word ambassador was used only once in 1315-16 when an envoy was despatched to deal with certain business at Avignon. The term legatus was occasionally employed, but again was nearly always used in connection with affairs pending at the Curia.<sup>1</sup>

The commonest forms of title accorded were nuncius and procurator. The two terms appear to have had some distinction, although what exactly this was remains unclear. A procurator or proctor was generally a semi-permanent legal representative in court especially attached to the Curia or French Parlement. He would not be of high social status but he would be well versed in the types of procedure and problems involved at the court to which he was attached. A proctor would gain a very specialised knowledge in many of the technical quibbles which form the basis of diplomacy. Envoys of higher status, however, who were

---

1 G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, p.85.

appointed to discuss truces and peace treaties were designated proctors because they were required to discuss in detail the terms to be agreed.<sup>1</sup>

By and large, however, diplomats were simply called nuncii or sometimes nuncii speciales if the mission on which they were sent was particularly important. The earls of Salisbury and Huntingdon in April 1337 were designated Speciales... procuratores et nuncii in the search for allies in the Low Countries. This style of address was invariably adopted for magnates. The only exceptions were the embassies of 1339 and 1341. In November 1339 Montagu with Henry Ferrars, Geoffrey le Scope and Maurice Berkeley were termed the king's Secretariis, prominent members of his council in the Low Countries and guaranteed to the Flemish authorities as close to Edward's heart.<sup>2</sup> In 1341 Clinton was appointed as one of the procuratores seu commissarios to negotiate with representatives of Edward's allies and of France over the position of Gascony during the interval of the truce of Esplechin.<sup>3</sup> Edward was probably using the embassy as a cover for military preparations.<sup>4</sup>

Clearly there was a distinction between solemn ambassadors and those who were messengers as the writers of the fifteenth century were at pains to point out. Only rulers of independent states, it was claimed, could send ambassadors. Private individuals, unless the Pope made an exception, could only employ nuncii or proctors.<sup>5</sup> It is doubtful, however, whether, at least in the fourteenth century, the difference was quite so clear. The views of the treatise writers

---

1 Cuttino, op.cit., p.85.

2 Foedera II ii, 1097.

3 C76/16 m12; Foedera II ii, 1168; Eugène Deprez, Les Préliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, pp.369, 384.

4 M.C. Prestwich, "English Armies in the Early Stages of the Hundred Years War : A Scheme in 1341" B.I.H.R. LVI (1983) p.104.

5 B. Behrens, "Treatises on the Ambassador Written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries" E.H.R. LI (1963) p.616; Donald E. Queller, "Thirteenth Century Diplomatic Envoys : Nuncii et Procuratores" Speculum XXXV (1960), pp.196-213.

were based on procedures at the Papal court where procedure and theory were more highly developed. It is obvious that the realities of diplomacy between the various rulers of Europe made many such distinctions untenable in practice.

So a study of the terminology employed is not always very helpful in distinguishing the role of the lay diplomat from his clerical colleagues, or the magnates from lesser officials. Contemporaries were aware of a difference in status between a proctor, a nuncius and an ambassador and this was eventually to develop into a sort of diplomatic hierarchy, with each member of a mission performing a distinct and separate function. But it is not possible to draw a clear distinction between the theory of the fifteenth century and the practice of diplomacy under Edward III, where procedures only developed under the pressure of necessity.

Choice of diplomats lay with the council, which drew up procurations, naming the envoys and the type of business to be transacted. Different letters patent were made for each business involved. Often alternatives or even sealed blanks were issued for the envoys' benefit. These procurations were then exchanged with the diplomats' foreign counterparts as preliminary to their talks. Credentials were drawn up before the council with the aid of specialised advisors. The council either included the exact words to be used or a memorandum which was to be adapted as necessary. This took the form of a bipartite indenture and was a contract between the king and the envoy to which each was bound. Letters of credence were occasionally requested by monarchs, although there was resistance to giving them. Secrecy of business necessitated that the minimum should be trusted to writing.<sup>1</sup> Occasionally envoys were empowered to speak "de leur teste

---

1 Pierre Chaplais, "English Diplomatic Documents". The Study of Medieval Records : Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major, pp.35, 36. cf. Pierre Chaplais, English Medieval Diplomatic Practice Vol.II, 18a, a letter of credence issued to The Emperor Louis of Bavaria on behalf of Bohun and Geoffrey le Scrope.

demeigne", an expression of personal opinion not binding on the king.<sup>1</sup> Normally, however, agreements being binding on the king necessitated limits being placed as guidelines for the envoys usually in the form of detailed instructions drawn up by the council. Since solemn envoys were rarely sent without important ground-work being first done by nuncii simplices unless the business was very urgent, much business in council before departure was spent in instructing envoys along outlines already sketched. The role of the lay ambassador was therefore probably clearly defined even before departure. Three examples will serve to illustrate this point.

In September 1331, parliament gathered in Westminster to discuss the question of Gascony. The session was opened by the bishop of Winchester and it was clear by the questions put by the bishop that negotiations had so far broken down that Edward III was contemplating war as a way out of an intractable situation. The magnates, however, preferred to resort to further negotiations, although they left the choice of diplomats to the king. A selection of bishops, earls, magnates and legal advisers were nominated to work out a means of gaining restitution of the Agenais.<sup>2</sup> On 28 November Edward chose Montagu with the bishop of Winchester, Henry Beaumont, John Shordich and Anthony Pessagno to re-open negotiations with Philip VI.

For the benefit of the ambassadors, a series of seven points was drawn up to obtain remission of all penalties pending in the French courts. They were instructed to procure copies of letters issued by Philip VI to Edward II in 1312-13 which would serve as models for the type of straightforward promises demanded by the English. Where Philip was pushing for judgement in cases then pending, they were to negotiate for delays so that Gascon ministers and other individuals might be

---

1 Chaplais, op.cit., p.37.

2 Rot. Parl. II, 61; G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, 1259-1339, p.103; G.P. Cuttino, "The Process of Agen", Speculum XIX (1944) p.164.

able to gather together an adequate defence. As to demands for profits by reason of defaults in the previous two parlements, they were to refer to certain reasons which had been prepared for getting the cases repealed. The instructions also set forth alternatives if the ambassadors should be unable to get repeals or if they could not obtain full pardons for Gascon ministers. For ministers notoriously suspect, they were to negotiate safe conducts for the ministers to come before the judges. On this point the ambassadors were referred to the form of a suit drawn up under Edward I for reform of similar matters pending at the French court.<sup>1</sup> Negotiations took place at Bois de Vincennes about the middle of December. The specific nature of the ambassadors' instructions enabled both sides to deal with an enormous bulk of technical problems and as a result the Process of Agen opened on 3 January.<sup>2</sup>

A new factor entered international relations in 1332, when Philip adopted the idea of a joint Anglo-French crusade and invited Edward to join him two years thence. The proposed date was set before the March parliament at Westminster in 1332 and though the general opinion was that this date was too imminent, a suggestion of Lent 1335 was tentatively offered and a new embassy appointed.<sup>3</sup> Further suggestions were placed before the council during the second week in April - a roll of the proceedings of the commissioners for the mutual restitution of lands in Gascony from the Process of Agen, together with statements of sums claimed for damages in the duchy under judgement of the seneschal of Perigord and a number of memoranda drawn up by Henry of Canterbury representing dangers to be avoided in potential legal disputes. These were discussed and their contents made available for the envoys.<sup>4</sup> Two new sets of commissions were made out

---

1 C47/30/2/6.

2 E372/177 rot.40; Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.81.

3 Rot. Parl. II, 64.

4 C47/30/2 nos.1,18-21;G.P.Cuttino, "The Process of Agen", Speculum (1944) p.169.

on 24 and 26 April. The first of these consisting of Clinton with Bartholemew Burghesh, the steward of Ponthieu, John de St. Philibert and William Trussel, Richard Chaddesley, professor of Canon Law, John Offord, professor of Civil Law, John Travers and John de Hildesley, forming a panel of legists and knights to force a public discussion of matters still in dispute over the duchy in the light of the processes of Perigord, Monstrieul and Agen. The commissioners were to meet and talk with their French counterparts appointed to carry out the 1331 treaty, raising such problems as they encountered day by day in its implementation.<sup>1</sup> Clinton's role was to join the commissioners already engaged in work in the duchy, possibly to receive homages.<sup>2</sup> The work of the commissioners was to form the context for negotiations with the French king for which a second embassy consisting of Clinton, the bishops of Winchester and Worcester and John de Shordich were appointed. The envoys were empowered to revive the processes and Monstrieul and Perigord, perhaps to put pressure on Philip when discussing the possibility of Edward joining the projected crusade. The question of a meeting between the two kings and a marriage alliance between the earl of Chester and Philip's daughter Jeanne was also to be raised.<sup>3</sup> The appointment of bishop Orleton of Worcester, Papal chaplain and auditor of causes in the Sacred Palace, together with Trussel and Chaddesley suggests that the advice and support of the Papacy was encouraged. Talks were held with Philip's representative at Bois de Vincennes about 12 May with the aid of documents brought out to them by the custos of the Processes, between 19 and 23 May.<sup>4</sup> At a meeting of council on 6 June at Woodstock, the returning ambassadors were able to report a degree of success.<sup>5</sup> Philip had promised

---

1 C47/30/2 no.12.

2 Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, pp.83-4. Hildesley & Travers were both in Gascony with Burghesh, Trussel was ambassador at the Curia and St. Philibert was probably also overseas.

3 C47/28/2/28; C.P.R. 1330-34 pp.273, 277. Foedera II ii 837.

4 G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, p.154.

5 E372/177 m40.

to put before parlement means for smoothing relations over Gascony and to fix a suitable date for the crusade. He had also assured the ambassadors that he was more than willing to arrange a meeting with Edward to discuss these matters personally.<sup>1</sup>

A third example of the care with which ambassadors were prepared in council comes from a series of instructions for Clinton and his fellow ambassadors in March and June 1334. In March the council advised a renewal of the Processes of Monstrieul and Perigord and suggested the appointment of four knights and four clerks to deal with this. In the event two knights, two bishops and two clerks were appointed but only Clinton, Montagu, Archbishop Stratford, Le Scrope and Shordich were on 30 March selected to go.<sup>2</sup> The ambassadors were at Senlis on 8 May, when Scrope with Stratford received the homage of the new duke of Brittany and it was there that talks opened.

The envoys had been instructed to return to the question of renewal of the Processes of Monstrieul and Perigord in which Clinton assumed a leading role, continuing from the agreements reached the previous year, acting on the advice of the current ambassador at the Curia.<sup>3</sup> All the perennial alternative solutions for finding amicable agreement were presented, but negotiations came to pieces on the rocks of the Scottish question. The English declared that restoration of Gascon castles and a declaration of French neutrality in Scotland were essential

---

1 Eugène Deprez, Les Préliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, pp.84, 86.

2 C47/28/3/5; C.P.R. 1330-34 p.532. Both Montagu and Clinton received advances on their costs from the exchequer on 9 March with the other envoys, though a month later Montagu restored this because he did not go. Why this was so is not known, his whereabouts during this period remain a mystery. E403/273 m5. The entry in B.L. Add. MS. 46, 350 m13 is clearly a mistake for Clinton - see its counterpart E101/387/9 where Clinton is correctly named.

3 C47/28/3/46.

preliminaries before earnest discussion of the crusade could begin. Philip for his part declared that Edward must first guarantee to end intervention in Scotland and only then would he be prepared to talk about damages in Aquitaine. He had in fact invited David Bruce to take up residence at Chateau Gaillard in mid-May and was secretly encouraging Scottish resistance under the earl of Moray.<sup>1</sup> Tentative agreements were reached at the beginning of May,<sup>2</sup> but Clinton seemingly took little part in these later discussions and he returned to England on 27 May a good four weeks before the other envoys.<sup>3</sup>

The returning envoys found the council at Doncaster on 5 July. Philip had made it clear that should Edward persist in intervening in Scotland, he could expect suitable reprisals to be taken against him in Aquitaine. This Edward had no intention of heeding. The earl of Moray made great inroads into the peace established by Balliol during the winter of 1333-34 and particularly in the lands ceded to England in June 1334. Balliol's few supporters were unable to deal with the situation unaided, and by the time parliament assembled on 19 September at Westminster its priorities were devoted to meeting this new emergency with military force. French relations were therefore once more relegated to secondary importance.

Shortly after Clinton's return, therefore, the council drew up instructions appointing Hildesley and the Constable of Bordeaux to try to delay action by Philip against Aquitaine until the arrival of new envoys to represent the English case before the Paris Parlement.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly on 30 September Clinton, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Abbot of Dore were invested with power to end dissensions between the two kingdoms and once more to raise the question of the crusade

---

1 Eugène Deprez, Les Préliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.97; Ranald Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.157.

2 C.P.R. 1333-37 pp.321-2.

3 E101/387/9.

4 C47/28/3/11.

and a meeting between Edward and Philip.<sup>1</sup> The ambassadors were issued with a set of fresh instructions enabling them to authorise action to go ahead in their behalf in anticipation of their eventual arrival. The envoys were issued with copies of two letters touching the isle of Oleron, an indenture between the French commissioners and Hildesley and the Constable of Bordeaux and a roll containing the advice of Gascon vassals. This advice they were to take before the king's council in Paris with the aid of Hildesley. In the interval between this date and their expected arrival in Paris, the ambassadors were instructed to ordain commissions for Hildesley and the Constable which were to be delivered, as specified, by a clerk expert in the law and a 'sage' knight. It was hoped by this means to delay any action on the part of the French king until their arrival.<sup>2</sup>

Clinton joined the other envoys in Paris at the beginning of November. On 22 November John Piers arrived from Avignon and a series of tri-cornered meetings took place between the Papal nuncios, French and English envoys, entirely without success.<sup>3</sup> New commissioners of the Process of Agen met from 29 September but disputes existed from the outset. The English refused to hand over certain territories and were disgusted over squabbles as to whether restitutions applied solely to the Agenais or to the whole duchy. In October, even before the envoys set out it was reported to Edward that the French were ready to seize county Ponthieu until the English handed over the castlries.<sup>4</sup>

The council had already come to the conclusion that it was advisable to secure Papal support if Philip refused to appoint commissioners to deal with the Gascon situation. Draft proposals for the appointment of proctors by the commons

---

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.30.

2 C47/28/3/11.

3 E101/311/10; Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.101.

4 G.P. Cuttino, "The Process of Agen", Speculum XIX (1944) p.169.

of London and York were drawn up in readiness to be sent if needed to Philip and if they elicited no favourable response, to lay the matter before the Pope, pointing out the constant opposition of the French and reminding the Pontiff of the dictum of Boniface in 1302 when the French were laid under interdict for similar causes.<sup>1</sup> These instructions were carried out to the ambassadors in Paris in December.<sup>2</sup> It was news of the death of Pope John XXII that eventually persuaded the ambassadors of the need to return home.<sup>3</sup>

The care with which ambassadors were instructed in how to proceed was necessitated by the very technical nature of diplomacy at the French and Papal Curias. The diplomat had to be cognisant with questions of homage, personal and national rights, the execution of treaty clauses, and ancient customs and usages, further complicated by the vast bulk of information gathered in the course of dealings over the Processes of Perigord, Monstrieul and, after 1332, of Agen. Preliminary paperwork was the province of the exchequer, chancery and wardrobe personnel. A lot of groundwork fell to the keeper of the Processes, who was expected to advise the council on all matters connected with material in his possession, a job so specialised that few were willing to undertake it.<sup>4</sup> Certain aids for diplomats did exist, including a book produced in 1315 which set out the principal results to be sought in negotiations and arrangements approved as suitable ways to achieve these results.<sup>5</sup> All of this information could be made available to the ambassador at need. Nevertheless, such aids could only go so far. A lot depended on the ability of the diplomat to read situations as they arose and react accordingly. Pragmatism, subtlety and flexibility were major requirements, allied to an ability to speak with confidence

---

1 C47/28/3/19, 21, 22; G.P. Cuttino, "The Process of Agen", Speculum XIX (1944) p.169.

2 Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.102.

3 Ibid., p.408.

4 G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, p.28.

5 Ibid., p.34.

and authority. In each of the examples cited above, the lay diplomat held a key position on the embassy, taking the lead in negotiations with foreign counterparts of equally high rank and undertaking to make the major decisions required. Their presence on embassy was often of considerably shorter duration than that of fellow ambassadors, although even so absence from home could be anything up to six months or more, with lay ambassadors frequently leaving England only after weeks of important groundwork had been laid by others and returning to report to the council well in advance of the rest of the ambassadorial party. Nevertheless their role was a real and vital part of every embassy.

However secret or urgent the business in hand, it was unlikely that a magnate would go overseas on official business without at least a small escort. Even in 1329 when Montagu went with Burg<sup>h</sup>ersh to the Curia, the party did not travel entirely inconspicuously. For the first part of the journey they travelled in company with the earl of Lancaster. Each envoy was escorted by a retinue of two knights for which they were permitted to claim in their expenses accounts and other servants at their own costs. Montagu secured protection for seven men, while the earl of Lancaster had a company of at least twenty-one retainers.<sup>1</sup> During the early 1330s Clinton normally travelled accompanied by a personal following of between fifty and sixty men: 54 men and 42 horses in 1332<sup>2</sup> and October 1334 with 60 men and 40 horses.<sup>3</sup> In 1341 he had with him a body of 80 men and 48 horses.<sup>4</sup>

The expeditions of 1337 and 1337-8 were by comparison even larger. Montagu's household in 1337 required 100 horses and probably totalled something like 150 men including three bannerets and seven knights all equipped at royal expense.

---

1 E403/249 m20; E403/253 mm1, 3; Foedera II ii, 772.

2 E101/310/29.

3 E101/311/10.

4 E101/311/40.

Clinton's company numbered 68 men and 46 horses.<sup>1</sup> Each of their fellow ambassadors had proportionally large retinues. The bishop obtained letters of protection for 57 of his company, even Beche travelled with a retinue of 27 men including 11 knights and valletti.<sup>2</sup> In October 1337 Northampton had with him a force of eight knights, 32 squires and 27 mounted archers and Suffolk's force included one banneret, eight knights, and 28 men at arms. Each of the other members of the embassy brought sizeable retinues with them making a total force of 159 men at arms and 117 mounted archers which embarked for Dordrecht, a pledge of Edward's military commitment to his allies.<sup>3</sup>

On these voyages each of their fellow ambassadors would also have proportionally large retinues. On the whole bishops took even larger companies than lay magnates.<sup>4</sup> Size of retinue was dependent partially on personal preference and the status of the envoy, and partially on the importance of the mission. It was nothing extraordinary to find parties of anything up to 200 persons travelling on embassy from England even though they did not always travel together.

Correspondingly large retinues do not seem to have been employed on missions in time of war. During the Scottish campaign of 1335, Montagu, Ufford and John Neville set out from Doddington with 20 men at arms and 16 archers for a meeting with the Scots at Bathgate, though Sir Andrew Moray, leader of the Scottish delegation, secured protection from Edward for an escort of up to 40 men.<sup>5</sup> A limit was placed on the size of force permitted to travel unmolested through a

1 E372/185 nt.42; E101/311/30; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.416.

2 Foedera II ii, 967; E101/311/28.

3 E101/311/31.

4 R.M. Haines, The Diocese of Worcester in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century, p.28; H.S. Lucas, "The Machinery of Diplomatic Intercourse" in English Government at Work I, 321.

5 Nero C.VIII fol.238; Foedera II ii, 925; Ranald Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots, p.228.

foreign state in time of war, occasioned by the need to secure safe conducts and avoid inviting attack.

The retainers fulfilled a host of different functions. Knights and squires acted as messengers, passing between the envoy and his clients, keeping the envoys in touch with one another, and relaying news to the king or treaties for ratification.<sup>1</sup> Some uses for messengers can be illustrated from the account of John de Woume, attendant on Montagu and Clinton in 1337. This included one vallet sent from Brele to Bruges to the Peruzzi to provide money against their arrival, one vallet to provide stabling for a horse, another sent from Bruges to Dordrecht to the earls concerning provision of shipping for them at Yarmouth, three valets sent at various times as spies on the French fleets at Calais and Boulogne, and another valet sent to the earls with a reply given by the Duke of Brabant to messengers from France and letters from Bruges.<sup>2</sup> Montagu claimed expenses for sending messengers to Edward III from France in February and March 1331,<sup>3</sup> and in November 1335.<sup>4</sup> John de Wauton was sent to England by the earl of Northampton between 7 February and 26 March 1338 and again to speak with the king on 28 March.<sup>5</sup>

They also acted as personal servants. The size of personal establishment maintained by a magnate travelling necessitated a small army of domestic servants to cope with it. The cavalcade would include an enormous baggage train bearing pantry, wardrobe, private chapel, food supplies and "harness" like plate, jewels and furniture required for lavish display, with sumpter and other horses to carry

---

1 Mary C. Hill, The King's Messengers, pp.88-89.

2 K. de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 50-56.

3 E101/311/22.

4 Nero C.VIII fol.269v.

5 E101/311/31.

them.<sup>1</sup> The steward, treasurer, chamberlain and chaplains would be required to oversee arrangements and deal with money requirements, while a host of servants and guards were also needed. Northampton in 1337-38 had with him at least three clerks of whom one was designated his personal chaplain. Peter Favelore received money on his behalf at Sandwich, and on his return a minimal household of one man at arms, five officers and one clerk remained overseas between 26 April and July with 148 garciones to guard 160 horses.<sup>2</sup> A great magnate took it for granted that this was how he travelled. Where wealth was lacking, or at the special discretion of the crown, costs of fitting out a retinue might be met by the exchequer or wardrobe. Montagu was fitted out by John de Pulteney in 1337 with clothes and horseshoes for himself and ten men of his company.<sup>3</sup> In 1329 he received expenses for two knights from the exchequer,<sup>4</sup> and in 1337 six men were maintained at crown expense in his company. But at least by employing wealthy magnates the crown avoided the costs involved in fitting out such expeditions as that of John Waweyn and John Montgomery who in 1339 received £39 'pro diversis armaturis et vestibis pro se et familia sua emptis et provisus ut decencius in negociis Regis so valerunt et statum et honorem Regis mauntere.'<sup>5</sup>

Probably the greater number of men who accompanied a magnate on embassy were permanent retainers. Others were probably recruited especially for the expedition very much as the magnate's retinue would be swollen in times of war by new agreements of service for a fixed period. Their sheer size seems to

- 
- 1 Grace Stretton "Some Aspects of Medieval Travel", T.R.H.S. 4th Series VII (1924) pp.81, 82.
  - 2 E101/311/31.
  - 3 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.416.
  - 4 E403/249 m20.
  - 5 E36/203 fol. 91r.

indicate this.<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to imagine any community, even one the size of the city of Paris, could contemplate well over 100 persons of a foreign power descending on them in a body without anticipating trouble. It was an intricate problem, for equally the escort would be necessary to protect the envoy from any feeling of ill-will and to guard him from the perils of such a journey. Later treatise writers addressed themselves very little to the question of decorum, though Johannes Bertachinus, c.1481 offered the suggestion that should a mounted retinue be taken on embassy it should consist of one foot guard between two mounted men.<sup>2</sup>

The chief purpose of the retinue was to entertain and to be entertained. A proper response to hospitality by rising to the occasion with equal magnificence was the clearest way a retinue could be shown to reflect the dignity and status of its lord. One of the major preoccupations of the magnate on embassy was to partake of the costly ceremonial and entertainment laid on in his behalf.

Froissart describes the reception that awaited Montagu and Clinton at Valenciennes in April 1337. After they had found their lodgings the envoys changed into their best clothes and went to pay their respects to the count:

En entrerent chil signeur d'Engleterre en la cambre dou conte li quels estoit pour celle heure levés, vestirs et parés moult ricement, et seoit sus un chaière moult bien aornée, car il ne se pooit soustenir sus ses piés. Si rechut ces signeurs d'Engleterre l'un apriès l'aultre moult humlement. Et aussi tout l'enclinèrent et li fissent la reverse, et à la contesse aussi et à mesire Jehan de Hainnau; et puis moustrerent les lettres de creance que ils avoient aporté li contes les fist lire devant li par un sien clerc; et qant il et oy la creance il fist toutes gens widier hors de la cambre reservé son frère et les Englès. Et qant ils furent à lor requoi, il lor dist: "or sus dites ce dont vous estes cargiés, et vous serés oy",<sup>3</sup>

---

1 K.B. McFarlane, "Bastard Feudalism", B.I.H.R. 20 (1945) p.165.

2 De Legatis et Legationibus Tractatus Varii (ed.) Vladimir E. Hrabar (Dorpat, 1902) pp.72-73.

3 Chroniques de J. Froissart, (ed.) Simeon Luce, Vol.II, 363.

Scenes such as this were deliberately calculated to impress the envoys and to increase the bargaining power of the host. The more important the envoys, the harder the task. This placed greater pressure on the hosts and strengthened the position of the envoys. The ambassador must rise to the occasion on behalf of his principal, responding in kind. Most often this consisted of feasts at which it was possible to show excessive respect for the guests and at the same time create an impression of wealth and generosity. The regulations concerning feasting from this period show a highly developed code of etiquette generally recognised by all members of society.<sup>1</sup> It reflected contemporary views of the hierarchical structure of society and as such were the ideal arena for conducting diplomatic preliminaries. In 1337, Montagu and Clinton each, according to Froissart, carried 100,000 fl. to keep his court and the embassy was believed to command unlimited resources.<sup>2</sup> William of Hainault honoured his guests by entertaining them to lavish feasts to which he invited all the most influential persons he could. These feasts continued throughout each day the envoys remained in the town. Public exchange of gifts took place at these formal occasions.<sup>3</sup> In 1337 this function was undertaken by Salisbury. Certainly by 29 April he had spent or assigned all the 5000 marks with which he had set off.<sup>4</sup>

Apart from the exceptional case of October 1337, the maintenance of the lordly retinue while on embassy came out of the envoy's own pocket, though he was able to claim in his account for customs, dues and other costs involved in their passage across the Channel. They must, however, have been a heavy burden on the envoy's resources. Payment of the envoy was made in two stages. Part of the

---

1 Caxton's Book of Curtesye (ed.) Fred. J. Furnivall, E.E.T.S. 3 (1868); A Fifteenth Century Courtesy Book (ed.) R.W. Chambers, E.E.T.S. 148 (1914); Donald E. Queller, The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages (Princeton, 1967), pp.10, 11, 20.

2 Chroniques de J. Froissart (ed.) Simeon Luce, Vol.II, 363.

3 G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, p.125.

4 Foedera II ii, 968.

costs of the journey was made in advance from the exchequer or wardrobe, or by some an individual on behalf of the government. For Clinton's journey in November 1334 he was paid by the Bardi, who advanced him £100 in London, followed by a further £70 in Paris.<sup>1</sup> For the expedition of 1337, Montagu and Clinton also utilised the resources of the Italian banking house of the Peruzzi. They advanced £100 to Montagu and £300 to Clinton.<sup>2</sup> It was obviously convenient to utilise the Italian banking houses with their ability to command vast resources, transfer sums abroad and control exchange rates. Other sources tapped for the same expedition were £205 15s in 1313 gold florins from Paulo de Montefiore and £168 15s in 800 gold florins from John Waweyn. In 1341 Clinton was paid £93 6s 8d by William Edington out of the money collected from the grant of the ninth on sheaves.<sup>3</sup> Clinton in 1332 was paid £40 from the treasury of money collected by the Abbot of St. Mary's from the tax of 1/10 and 1/15.<sup>4</sup>

Payments were usually in the region of two-thirds the total costs of the expedition. In 1337, Montagu was out of pocket by £768 19s 11d but this was extraordinary and included the costs of a band of archers at the king's convenience.<sup>5</sup> Larson states that envoys were very rarely overdrawn,<sup>6</sup> but Clinton and Montagu usually covered themselves well. In February 1331, Montagu drew £100 on the exchequer for a journey which only cost £85 7s 3d. The amount owing was put against the costs of the expedition in November 1331 and the remainder allowed as a gift.<sup>7</sup> Clinton in 1332 drew out £49 15s in cash and tallies of which he

---

1 E101/311/10.

2 E101/311/29.

3 E101/311/40.

4 C62/109 m2; E372/177 rot.40.

5 E101/311/29.

6 A. Larson, "The Payment of Fourteenth Century English Envoys", E.H.R. (1939) p.406.

7 E101/310/22; E372/175 rot.27d; E403/255 m19; E403/259 m7.

spent only £30 5s.<sup>1</sup> In October 1334 he drew £170 for an expedition which cost £138 4s. The £31. 12s owed he was allowed in his account as Constable of Dover.<sup>2</sup>

The gap between advances and costs was covered out of the envoy's own pocket. Not surprisingly, therefore, before departure we find a rise in financial and commercial activity among the envoys. Just prior to the departure of the envoys in March 1337, Montagu entered a series of dealings with his fellow ambassadors. On 10 April he granted estates to William Trussel<sup>3</sup> and a few days later he is found requesting on behalf of the bishop of Lincoln for restoration of his rights in the liberty of Windsor Forest.<sup>4</sup> Following their return in August 1337, Clinton granted to Moleyns the manor of Henley and the deed was witnessed by at least three of Montagu's retainers. Moleyns was Montagu's attorney and this may represent a response to a private loan contracted for this expedition. The value of recognisances as evidence for the contraction of loans and which may represent some form of credit extended to the maker has also been noted.<sup>5</sup> Arrangements of this type are evidenced in a debt owed by Montagu and Mauduit to Moleyns in November 1331.

The role of the attorney was vital. Usually a friend or relative, his role was to ensure the continuation of seigneurial administration despite the absence of the magnate on diplomacy or war. They would be appointed to collect monies owing, discharge duties in the envoy's absence and sometimes present the final accounts. In 1329, Montagu appointed his brother Simon.<sup>6</sup> In 1337 he chose two

---

1 C62/109 m2; E403/262 m8.

2 E372/182 rot. 39.

3 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.424, 428, 430. This may be related to an order to the exchequer to stop harrying the escheator Trussel for the issues of Camel, Somerton and other manors given to Montagu as earl of Salisbury. C.C.R. 1337-39 p.225.

4 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.435.

5 Richard H. Bowers, "From Rolls to Riches: King's Clerks as Moneylenders in Thirteenth Century England", Speculum 58 (1983) p.68.

6 C.P.R. 1327-1330 p.444.

old family retainers, his steward John de Mere and William de Langley. With them he associated Moleyns. Often the magnate's steward acted in this capacity.<sup>1</sup> Usually at least one attorney was a clerk. In 1337, Clinton appointed his personal clerk Simon de Gaynesborough with a knightly neighbour John de Peyto.<sup>2</sup> Bohun in October 1337 appointed John D'Engayne and Robert de Tye.<sup>3</sup> Ufford chose to associate a clerk with a lay servant for the same expedition.<sup>4</sup>

Occasionally special favours were granted to magnates in their absence, particularly easy terms at the exchequer. Montagu in April 1337 was granted a release of all accounts due for money received by him for stock, munition of castles, towns or fleets and was pardoned all debts both at the exchequer and in the king's courts.<sup>5</sup> Clinton for the same expedition was allowed to repay a debt owed Henry de Leyburn by easy instalments.<sup>6</sup>

On return the envoy was obliged to render account for customs, dues and other costs involved in this passage across the Channel which were covered in the envoy's daily wages. These at first sight appear generous, but they were paid according to a fixed scale and no provision was made to accommodate large companies of followers. Knights were entitled to receive between 1 mark and £2 per day rising to £5 for earls.<sup>7</sup> Out of this the envoy was expected to maintain as large a company as was felt suitable to his dignity. In the early 1330s Montagu and Clinton must have found it a burden as the companies they took were not much smaller than those maintained after their elevation to the peerage.

---

1 C76/14 m7; C76/16 m12; N. Denholm Young, Seignorial Administration in England, (Oxford, 1937) p.74.

2 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.428.

3 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.530-1.

4 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.537.

5 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.423-4.

6 C.C.R. 1337-39 p.42.

7 A. Larson, "The Payment of Fourteenth Century English Envoys", E.H.R. (1939) p.406.

The expedition of October 1337 was clearly of a very different type from earlier embassies. Each envoy was paid normal daily wages at 100s for the bishop, 66s 8d for the two earls and 20s and 1 mark for the knights and clerks while in England, but wages rose on arrival in Dordrecht "propter magna caristia victualia", Suffolk receiving 100s per day, Northampton was paid 10 marks a day and Darcy 66s 8d according to an agreement made between the bishop and Darcy on arrival.<sup>1</sup> Unlike other embassies, however, the envoys were paid wages as for a military expedition and their horses valued in a similar manner. Each member of their retinues was paid daily wages at the rate of 2s per knight, 12d for a squire and 4d for mounted archers.<sup>2</sup> This included 8s a day for each of the earls. Over and above this, for each quarter's absence the bishop received for the embassy as a whole £500 plus a lump sum of 2000 marks to tide them over the first three months, though in fact he only received half of this sum at the time. Money to cover their initial expenses arrived with Charnels at the end of October, £200 for the bishop, £500 for Northampton and £334 6s 8d for Darcy.<sup>3</sup>

Wages met transportation costs across the Channel, usually from Dover to Wissant, occasionally Calais, and for the costs of sending messengers, drawing up legal documents, the payment of notaries, making special gifts and the loss of horses as well as payments made abroad on the king's behalf. Costs could be astronomical. The sums paid out or promised to the nine major allies alone by Montagu and Clinton in 1337 approached £124,000.<sup>4</sup> Forms and speed of payment were dependent on the status of the envoy. Full satisfaction within six months

---

1 E101/311/31.

2 Archers' wages were raised to 6d per day from 12 March 1338 and back dated to 4 October 1337. Compare this with the situation in the Italian states. Donald E. Queller, The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages, pp.169, 171.

3 E101/311/31.

4 Montagu personally expended on Edward's behalf in excess of £1000. C.P.R. 1338-40 p.104. E.B. Fryde, "Financial Resources of Edward III in the Netherlands 1337-40" Pt.II, Revue Belge (1967) p.1146.

to two years was normal.<sup>1</sup> Edward's bannerets had little trouble in receiving satisfaction until the enormous financial commitments of the government after 1337 made all payments slow and difficult.

How and when negotiations took place is more difficult to determine, apart from the formalised assemblies at which final agreements were publicised. The events of 1337-38 are well documented, but will bear repetition for the light they throw on the hard work undertaken by Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and Bohun.

What is clear is the burden of responsibility placed on the two earls. Among the influential individuals gathered at Valenciennes, were Reginald count of Guelders, representatives of the Duke of Brabant, the Archbishop of Cologne, Adolf, count of Marck, the counts of Limburg and Laon, and the Margrave of Julich on behalf of the Emperor for whom William of Hainault and Reginald of Guelders acted as spokesmen.<sup>2</sup> Discussions made slow headway. There was an influential party, anxious if at all possible, to secure peace between the English and French, and firm advances were subjected to a delay while the countess of Hainault and her brother-in-law travelled in vain into France to speak with Philip. It was also reported to the Emperor in May that even the counts of Hainault and Guelders were concerned over Edward's harbouring of Robert d'Artois and that this was dominating discussions.<sup>3</sup> During this time the envoys occupied themselves in visiting a number of important Louvain, Brussels, Antwerp and Brabançon merchants.<sup>4</sup>

---

A. Larson, "The Payment of Fourteenth Century English Envoys", E.H.R. (1939) p.410. According to J.E. Neale, "The Diplomatic Envoy", History N.S. XIII (1928-29) p.218, envoys were underpaid even in the sixteenth century.

H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.206.

K. de Lettenhove (ed.) Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 31-32.

Foedera II ii, 971; Cal. Treaty Rolls pp.16-17.

The first results of the mission were not obtained until nearly a month after their arrival. On 12 May Henry de Geldonia, a canon of Cambrai and a legal expert agreed to promote Edward's cause for a fee of 100 florins, and three days later the first minor ally, Adolf, count of Berg became Edward's "militum et socium .... specialem" for a life annuity of 120 florins of Florence, for which he would serve in all wars excepting those against the Emperor, with 100 galeatis for a lump sum of 12000 florins and 1500 florins per month in wages. A number of lesser men also entered Edward's service.<sup>1</sup> The real achievements of the expedition came on 24 May when the allies sealed an agreement with the counts of Hainault, Guelders and the Margrave of Julich to levy for the defence of the Empire against French accroachments, 1000 armed men at 15 florins a month with a further 1000 men in reserve also at English expense. William, titular count of Zeeland, endorsed his father's agreement and was promised that as soon as Edward or his allies secured Crevecoeur, Arleux, or St. Supplet they would be ceded to the count.<sup>2</sup> For any Hainault lands confiscated by Philip in the event of war, the envoys assigned count William 6000 l.t. annual income. Further agreements followed over the next three days, by the time the envoys left Valenciennes they had secured promises of support from Adolf count of Marles, Everhard son of the count of Limburg and a sizeable number of minor knights and officials.<sup>3</sup>

On 27 May, the envoys had moved on to Mons in Hainault, where the Margrave of Julich's zeal on Edward's behalf was recognised in a grant of £5000 in which Montagu took a reading role:

Et par especial nous conte de Salebirs dessutdit du conseil  
 et consentement des dessusditz evesque et conte de Huntyngdon  
 nous sumes obligez et obligeoms envers le dit marchis ses  
 heirs ou son comment ou a la garde de ces lettres pur le  
 primer paiement du primer tiercz des cinq mille livres

---

Foedera II ii, 969, 970.

H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, pp.208-209.

Foedera II ii, 971, 972; Cal. Treaty Rolls p.17.

desterlyngs dessusditz par ainsi que nous purchaserons et tout bone foi qe le primer tiercz de la dite somme soit paie come dit est. Et si il y avoit defaute, que ja navergne, nous ne passeroms jammes la meer que avant ne soit assez fait au dit marchis ou a ses heirs ou a lour commant ou a la garde de ses lettres du primer paiement dessusdit en tout bone foi sanz fraude et sans malengyn.<sup>1</sup>

It was the first in a long series of bodily pledges with which the continental system of alliances was to be fortified, and it was to have disastrous consequences both for Montagu and for the English government.

On 28th the envoys were at Binche collecting minor allies and on 1 June back in Valenciennes where the envoys promised to compensate Julich to the value of £1400 in the event of confiscation by the king of France. On 7 June they were at Brussels, after which their movements become obscured.<sup>2</sup>

But though the envoys had secured an impressive array of alliances in the six weeks of their stay, a number of powerful individuals still remained uncommitted, and there still remained the Emperor with whom to confirm agreement. In particular the envoys were concerned to win the allegiance of John Duke of Brabant who was wavering because of his commitment to France and his strategical vulnerability. Provisional promises of support were elicited in Brussels with the aid of William van Duivenvoorde. A force of 1200 men at arms, equipped at Edward's expense, was promised at such time as Edward himself should lead his forces over the French border. To encourage the Duke's support, he was promised £60,000 within four years.<sup>3</sup>

By June the envoys had already decided to visit the Emperor. From 17 June Brandeston was in Germany awaiting the arrival of the envoys from Flanders. On 30 June the envoys secured the allegiance of Rupert count of the Rhine, for a

---

Foedera II ii, 972.

Foedera II ii, 973.

H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.215.

payment of 16,000 gold florins. The count engaged to find a force of 150 men at arms for 15,000 florins and 15 florins per month per man,<sup>1</sup> and the services of a number of important counsellors were bought over the next few days. The Emperor himself greeted the ambassadors with warmth, assured them of his keen sympathy for Edward's cause, and undertook to provide 2000 men at arms by the end of November. To lend a degree of justification to the attachment of the allies to Edward, Lewis promised to make Edward his vicar, and even mooted making him successor to the imperial crown.<sup>2</sup>

Once the Emperor had made firm commitment to the cause, the task of winning over lesser vassals was made very much simpler. Thrandeston was busy among the Flemish communities and in Brussels, Holland and Zeeland from 1 July; on 7 July the envoys appeared in Brussels where Rupert count of Virnenburg and a number of minor knights promised military support. They appeared in Cologne on 10 July where an additional promise of 2700 florins to Rupert of the Rhine secured his services in 'counteracting the activities of French agents in the Empire'. They were in Roermond on 13 July, back in Brussels on 17 July, all the time collecting promises of support.<sup>3</sup> On 19 July they were at Goruchin in Holland and more or less ready to return home. That day they invested the Margrave of Julich with powers to raise on their behalf up to 400 armed men in Lorraine and Luxemburg, then made a last trip to Frankfurt where final arrangements were made with the Emperor. On 23 July the envoys pledged to pay the Emperor 300,000 florins of Florence by 20 September 1338; Lewis, elector of Brandenburg, the Emperor's son pledged to provide a force of 100 men within a month of summons. It was agreed that Edward would undertake to be at La Basse in Germany by the issue of August and to be between Cambrai and La Chastel in

---

1 Foedera II ii, 979, 980.

2 H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, pp.216, 217.

3 K. de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 51, 159; Foedera II ii, 982, 983, 985; H.S. Offler, "England and Germany at the Beginning of the Hundred Years War", E.H.R. (1939) p.613.

the Cambresis by 17 September. On this understanding Lewis began the mobilisation of his forces.<sup>1</sup> On 31 July final agreement was sealed with Rupert of the Rhine.<sup>2</sup> The payment of subsidies was left to the services of John de Woume and other financial agents in the Low Countries, while the envoys prepared to return to England.

The day following their return, writs were issued for a great council meeting on 26 September at Westminster to discuss the work of the envoys, while Clinton and a group of fellow magnates were appointed to explain its eventual results.<sup>3</sup> Throughout the duration of the embassy the council had maintained a close interest in events in the Low Countries, backing up their work and sealing agreement with merchants for the provision of wool to finance the alliances.<sup>4</sup> On 26 September Edward solemnly ratified all the agreements which the envoys had brought back with them.<sup>5</sup> But though the envoys had achieved much, the opinion of Salisbury was pessimistic. He had very serious misgivings about the value of the alliances. In his view the whole enterprise was a costly piece of folly which did not warrant the money and labour expended on it. He was concerned that none of the allies would in the event of actual hostilities prove reliable and that Edward would be better advised to manage without them. The earl begged the king to excuse him from further part in the negotiations and made it clear that he considered it more advisable to concentrate on Scotland,<sup>6</sup> a position probably dictated by concern at the agreements he had been forced to negotiate pledging his own body as a guarantee for the fulfillment of Edward's obligations. He was not alone.

- 
- 1 Cal. Treaty Rolls p.5; H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.219.
- 2 C.P.R. 1338-40 pp.371-2.
- 3 R.D.P. IV, 479-482; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.502.
- 4 E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War" in Historical Studies of the English Parliament I, p.245.
- 5 Foedera II ii, 991-993; Cal. Treaty Rolls pp.7-9, 12, 20, 25-27.
- 6 Scalacronica p.168.

During June the Pope had decided to send two nuncios to France and England in search of peace, and had written urging Edward to hold back from formal alliance with the Emperor whilst Lewis remained unreconciled with the Papacy. Similar letters were addressed to the chief diplomats and, though the alliance went ahead, it was amid widespread misgivings. The date for the departure of Edward's fleet had been set provisionally for 30 September; in the light of the envoys' reports, however, and following council deliberation, it was set back to 1338 while Edward waited on external events. Meanwhile it was decided to send a second embassy and await the arrival of the cardinals.<sup>1</sup>

The work of the dealings of the envoys in the spring and summer of 1337 were only realised in the follow-up work by Bohun and Ufford in the latter months of 1337-8. Their timetable was heavy and arduous, their responsibilities enormous. The council kept in regular contact with the envoys, but accepted their advice as cognisant with the situation on the continent. It was on the basis of reports made by Bohun in particular that the alliance system was preserved.

The situation which the envoys discovered on arrival was not entirely happy. Although many princes and lords had sealed agreements promising to support Edward III, much work still needed to be done to win their full confidence and settle major differences. Payments to some allies were already overdue. In particular, the 100,000 florins pledged to Reginald of Guelders, due at Michaelmas, had not been paid. Also, the envoys felt far from certain of the allegiance of the Duke of Brabant and the count of Hainault. Therefore they dedicated the first few weeks in Hainault to seeking to conciliate their allies. On 30 November they persuaded count Reginald to postpone the date of payment until the following Lent.<sup>2</sup> About 4 December the allies spent a week in Michelen in conference with the count of

<sup>1</sup> Eugène Deprez, Les Préliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, pp.148-50.

<sup>2</sup> H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.245.

Guelders, the duke of Brabant and possibly the count of Julich. At the end of the week they crowned the negotiations by inducting the young count of Hainault to endorse his father's alliance with Edward III. For the sake of pacifying the disquiet of the allies, they officially pronounced that Robert of Artois was no longer resident in England and that his whereabouts were unknown, an expedient lie for the sake of saving the alliance.<sup>1</sup> On 13 December they were in Hainault holding discussions with the representatives of Ghent and with William of Hainault, the duke of Brabant, Reginald of Guelders and the count of Julich which centred on the current economic situation in Flanders.<sup>2</sup> These talks met with a degree of success, allowing the envoys to go ahead with the planned wool scheme.

On 19 December the envoys went to Gertruidenburg in Holland to complete negotiations with the contract merchants for the sale of the wool. The conference did not pass smoothly. The merchants and ambassadors could not agree over restrictions on the sale of the wool or the sums to be raised. The envoys had calculated that they required £276,000 by Lent 1338 to pay their allies. The merchants complained that the ban on the sale of the wool to the Flemings had seriously impaired its true value and they could not hope to raise so much money. In the end the envoys were forced to seize the wool and arrange to revalue it.<sup>3</sup> The results of the sale the following spring, which disappointingly only raised about £41,000, made the task of the envoys very much more difficult.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, pp.256-7. See E101/19/29 an order on 6 December 1337 to the constable of Windsor Castle to guard Robert d'Artois "en la plus secrete et plus honorable manere qe vous purrez".

2 H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.262.

3 E.B. Fryde, "Edward III's Wool Monopoly of 1337 : A Fourteenth Century Royal Trading Venture", History N.S. XXVII (1952) pp.18-20.

4 E.B. Fryde, "Edward III's Wool Monopoly of 1337 : A Fourteenth Century Royal Trading Venture", History N.S. XXVII (1952) p.22.

Following the conference at Gertruidenburg, attention switched to Flanders, where the internal situation was giving cause for considerable interest to the English. About 2 January 1338 John de Woume found the envoys at Nijmegen, bringing news of a demonstration in the market place at Ghent on 28 December in favour of adopting neutrality in the struggle between Edward and Philip VI.<sup>1</sup> This news gave hope that the allies might eventually win the Flemish to their side. The allies therefore decided on 7 January to appoint Reginald of Guelders to negotiate with the Flemish on their behalf. The results of these talks were communicated to the allies at a lengthy set of conferences at Louvain in mid-January. About 9 February, representatives from Ghent joined the talks to indicate the drift of public opinion in the communities in the light of the economic situation and the possible reaction of the French. Encouraged, the envoys came to an agreement to take some of the economic pressure off Flanders.<sup>2</sup>

Although the activities of the envoys were slowly beginning to show results, in England the government was very concerned at the international situation. Papal envoys had arrived in England about 2 December 1337, requesting the implementation of a truce with Philip VI. This was not entirely welcome to Edward III who had committed himself so deeply to war, and their presence placed him in a difficult position. Council advised temporisation, to agree to six months truce in which to try to reach the remedies secured by Edward I and Pope Boniface, by appeal to the Curia. In those six months respite they might hope to win the cardinals' goodwill and induce at least one of them to remain in England until such time as the Pope was persuaded to apply once again interdict against Philip and his allies.<sup>3</sup> Edward therefore informed the cardinals that the assent of the English nation was necessary before he could come to any peace agreement, but

---

1 K. de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 54.

2 H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.251.

3 C47/30/6/13.

meanwhile implementing a temporary truce from 22 December 1337 to 1 March 1338 in the interval before the assembly of parliament for 3 February.<sup>1</sup> Before it opened, urgent communication was required with the envoys. On 8 January William fitz Warin and John de Langeley sailed to the Low Countries with a message setting out the consequences in England of the nuncios' arrival and begging them to advise him how to proceed and how the allies would react to a postponement of Edward's arrival until Michaelmas 1338 should he indeed grant the truce. In particular he requested that at least one of the earls and John Darcy should come over to England in time for the parliamentary session armed with information so that the council could act accordingly.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, however, the chief envoys declined to return, claiming that the bishop, both earls and Darcy were still needed where they were. Instead they sent Montgomery and Waweyn and two knights, representatives of the earl of Suffolk and Darcy - Peter Tye and John de Marcham. The party arrived at parliament on 4 February. They advised on behalf of the envoys that the time was not auspicious for the agreement of a truce, but that the allies needed encouragement if they were to fight.<sup>3</sup> A few days later John de Wauton, a knight of the earl of Northampton also arrived in England bringing further information to back up this assertion.<sup>4</sup> This advice was accepted by Edward and endorsed in parliament.<sup>5</sup> On 14 February he agreed to a short extension of the truce, and promised that he would not invade France before 24 June.<sup>6</sup> That became the new date set for the invasion.<sup>7</sup> Marcham was sent back to the envoys with assurances that despite the

---

E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War", in Historical Studies of the English Parliament I, 246.

C47/32/18; E101/311/10; E101/388/5.

C47/32/18.

E101/311/31. He was in England from 7 February until 26 March.

E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War", in Historical Studies of the English Parliament I, 246.

Foedera II ii, 1014.

Cal. Treaty Rolls no.149.

truce Edward would come at the first convenient opportunity and that no-one would suffer by the delay. They were to go ahead with preparations for his arrival and were also ordered to calm the fears of the merchants over the wool scheme.<sup>1</sup>

This was far from easy. Parliament in February granted Edward the outstanding 20,000 sacks of wool, and Edward intended to have the next shipment of wool ready to sail by mid-April. But collection was extremely slow and collectors found difficulties in gathering enough ships of requisite burden to carry what they did collect. On 15 April the sailing of the fleet was postponed until 12 May. Instead Edward offered 4000 sacks of wool on security of which he borrowed £35,000 from the Italians to cover the more immediate debts.<sup>2</sup>

On 28 March the earl of Northampton sent John de Wauton to England to confer with the council, and to make arrangements to his own return.<sup>3</sup> On 26 April the earl sailed from Dordrecht in three ships freighted on his behalf by Melchburn in company with John Waweyn to escort two German knights to talk with the king.<sup>4</sup> His place was taken by Reginald Cobham.<sup>5</sup>

Discussions with the council were over by 6 May,<sup>6</sup> and safe conducts issued to one of the Germans and Thrandeston on 13th.<sup>7</sup> On 30 April the envoys were empowered

1 C47/32/18. Montgomery was ready to return on 16 March. Cal. Treaty Rolls no.166.

2 Foedera II ii, 1027; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.441; E.B. Fryde, Edward III's War Financing 1337-41. Transactions in Wool and Credit Operations, pp.113-14.

3 E101/311/31.

4 E372/186 rot.44d; E101/388/9 fol.8r.

5 E101/311/31; Cal. Treaty Rolls no.175; Foedera II ii, 1029. In expectation of returning in June he brought back the whole of his retinue, but left his stable at Dordrecht under the supervision of a few officers.

6 E101/388/9 fol.8r.

7 Cal. Treaty Rolls No.209; Foedera II ii, 1037.

to treat with Ralph 'Condomino' de Hauteville for entering the king's service and Hauteville was delegated to negotiate for the services of six Gascon lords.<sup>1</sup> On 12 May the envoys were further empowered to seek a marriage alliance with the wavering duke of Brabant.<sup>2</sup> Northampton's return was being planned from 31 May.<sup>3</sup>

In the absence of the earl, the other envoys pursued negotiations with Flanders, keeping a close watch on internal events in the country through the count of Guelders. At the end of January Philip VI, afraid of their leanings towards the English, opened negotiations with the Flemish, and of necessity was forced to accept the agreement with the English which was ratified at Bruges on 5 February. Further negotiations between Flemish representatives and the English through the count of Guelders took place in February, and wool was beginning to arrive in Flanders from the beginning of March. These arrangements made with the English at Louvain, were discussed with John king of Bohemia, Philip's representative in mid-March. On 4 April Philip had had the pro-English partizan, Sohir de Coutrai executed, the people of Ghent were excommunicated by the bishop of Senlis and the Abbot of St. Denis at Tournai, and the city threatened with having its walls razed. At Easter pro-French supporters gathered outside the walls of Ghent threatening town security, and they were only repulsed on 24 April after two days of bitter fighting. The ruptures with the French representatives provided the opportunity for the envoys to treat for greater agreement with the Flemings. Initial meetings were held in early June between Reginald of Guelders and count Louis and the Flemish representatives. On 10 June agreement was reached at Antwerp permitting the Flemish cities to buy English wool and to enter England without molestation. Any damages suffered by the Flemish were to be made good by the English. The Flemish for their part promised not to aid the Scots or French

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Treaty Rolls no.203; Foedera II ii, 1032.

<sup>2</sup> Foedera II ii, 1035, 1036.

<sup>3</sup> Cal. Treaty Rolls no.511.

against Edward III. It was an agreement which Philip was forced to accept.<sup>1</sup>

In the absence of the earl of Northampton, the envoys had gone on to Germany, whence letters had arrived in England on 12 June<sup>2</sup> passing on information about the situation in England. On 28 June Edward himself wrote to the Emperor, acknowledging receipt of letters dated 10 April and assuring him of the active raising of a fleet to come to Germany.<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, he wrote, he was sending Northampton and Geoffrey le Scrope to deliver verbal information on the king's plans. They landed at Antwerp on 5 July then went to Coblenz where they held talks with the Emperor from about 12-18 July, preparatory to Edward's symbolic meeting with the Emperor a few weeks later. Bohun had completed this task by 20 July and had joined Edward on his arrival at Antwerp on 22 July.<sup>4</sup>

The question remains to be asked, what was the result of all this diplomatic activity, both in terms of national decisions and in personal experience? Montagu's misgivings as to the value of the alliances policy were clearly vindicated in the three years following, with drastic results for the English government. By July 1338, the English king's financial position was in fact dire. The envoys had calculated a need for £276,000 by mid-Lent to meet commitments to the allies, which was to be raised out of the proceeds of the sale of 30,000 sacks of wool on the continent. Though speedy collection of this wool was required by 1338 to remedy Edward's damaged credit position in the Netherlands, very little of this actually got through to Dordrecht on time. The first consignment of 10,000 sacks had to be sold at a substantial loss in profit; of the remainder raised by parliamentary levy in February 1338, only a tiny proportion actually reached its

---

1 Foedera II ii, 1042; H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, pp.271-275, 278.

2 E101/388/5 m12.

3 Cal. Treaty Rolls no.517.

4 E372/183 rot. 51; E101/311/31. Bohun was paid £238 10s for one month. E403/299 m12.

destination. By the spring of 1338, it was estimated that Edward owed at least £124,000 to his nine leading allies alone. Edward was genuinely shocked by the situation he discovered in July 1338; but despite the urgency of royal requests to the regency council in England, the slow trickle of wool failed to alleviate the king's financial position. To meet these debts he was forced to borrow heavily on all sides and in particular from the Italian banking houses of the Bardi and the Peruzzi.<sup>1</sup>

During these anxious months Bohun, Ufford and Montagu remained active in Edward's service. Towards the end of August, the earl of Northampton was sent to the Flemish towns of Bruges and Ghent with Bartholemew Burghersh, John Darcy and William fitz Warin to negotiate the payment of compensation for damages done by English sailors and men at arms to property belonging to Flemish citizens, and to smooth relations with the English. The business was slow and complicated, for Bohun was still there on 12 September, three weeks later.<sup>2</sup> Shortly after this, he was sent back to England to appraise council of Edward's real financial position and to discover why the wool levy was delayed. He was almost certainly in England by 31 October, perhaps as early as 20 October when the delivery of 1000 sacks of wool to the Bardi was ordered as a result of his arrival.<sup>3</sup> He then delayed some months in England awaiting a safe crossing and finally sailed from Ipswich on 30 December rejoining Edward at Antwerp by 24 January 1339.<sup>4</sup>

But though a small amount of wool was thus released from the English ports, it was not enough to raise the necessary money to pay the allies and Edward was

---

E.B. Fryde, "Financial Resources of Edward III in the Netherlands 1337-40" Pt. II Revue Belge (1967) pp.1160-62; E.B. Fryde, "Edward III's Wool Monopoly of 1337: A Fourteenth Century Royal Trading Venture", History XXVII (1952) pp.8-24. E36/203 fol.106v-197r.

E.B. Fryde, "The Dismissal of Robert de Wodehouse from the Office of Treasurer, December 1338", E.H.R. LXVI (1952) p.76; Cal. Treaty Rolls no.662. The earl of Suffolk was then also in England. E36/203 fol.108v.

E372/186 rot.51; E36/203 fols.108r,109r.

forced to the expedient of pledging his magnates for greater security on loans. In the winter of 1338-39 Edward contracted with the merchant William Dunort of Brussels for a £3000 loan, using the bishop of Lincoln and the earls of Salisbury and Derby as security. Both Salisbury and Derby spent the winter in Brussels from at least 14 December,<sup>1</sup> and Montefiori in December or January was ordered at all costs to raise loans at Brussels for their speedy delivery. The Bardi and Peruzzi advanced large sums for the release of the two earls, from which Montefiori purchased on credit 832½ sacks of wool to the value of £7255 8s 8d and for which the Italians obliged themselves, though this was later sold at a loss of about £1300 and further loans were necessary.<sup>2</sup> They were presumably both enlarged by 9 March 1339 when Dunort was promised delivery of what was still outstanding from 500 sacks of wool from Ipswich.<sup>3</sup> Salisbury was certainly at Ghent on 1 March when he negotiated a prest on the wages of one of the king's mariners.<sup>4</sup>

Suffolk spent the winter with Edward at Antwerp.<sup>5</sup> Towards the end of February, he was sent to England with Nicholas Cantilupe to deliver before council certain articles and to raise additional levies for a planned invasion of France within two weeks of Easter.<sup>6</sup> He was in England by 26 February, and still there on 15 March probably returning with Cantilupe during the second week in April. About the same time the earl of Northampton was also anticipating a second trip to England.<sup>7</sup> But though at the time of Suffolk's visit, Edward was

---

1 E36/203 fol.109r.

2 E.B. Fryde "Financial Resources of Edward II in the Netherlands 1337-40" Pt.II *Revue Belge* (1967) pp.1157-1158.

3 C.C.R. 1339-41 p.28.

4 E36/203 fol.171r.

5 He was there on 28 January when an altercation between the earl and Walter Mauny arose over a private quarrel in Suffolk. E36/203 fol.102v.

6 C49/46/8; C76/14 m12d; E36/203 fols. 109v, 110r.

7 C76/14 m5.

still intending to hold a muster on 11 April financial resources from England were not equally forthcoming. Edward's commitments were now increased beyond endurance and the bulk of his assets were mortgaged to his creditors. Under continuing expectation of wool arriving, he postponed the expedition until July.<sup>1</sup> By this stage Edward was in dire financial distress and throughout the summer months contracted a series of ruinous loans for which his earls were the chief securities.

On 4 April Edward secured a loan for 340,000 florins of Florence with the Jew Vivelin of Strasburg, which was to be repaid by Michaelmas at Cologne.<sup>2</sup> This was done and none of the earls were required to submit to confinement. Far more onerous were two loans made in July; one to three merchants of Malines for 54,000 Florentine florins, the other of £3500 at Louvain for which he promised 700 sacks of wool valued at £5 each.<sup>3</sup> It was to have serious consequences for Bohun and his fellow earls. The costs of the subsequent campaign in payments owed the allies totalled £300,000;<sup>4</sup> before Edward could return to England to raise the necessary cash, he had to pledge the earls of Salisbury and Derby as hostages for his return before the end of June.<sup>5</sup> In the interim, loans were to be raised by means of the king's magnates. Salisbury secured a loan of £600 on 23 January 1340, Northampton raised £800 at the end of the same month. The Malines and Louvain debts raised during the summer already gave cause for concern. Cuijk and the duke of Guelders were arrested in December and released for £1920 compensation; £2928 was paid out on 18 February to the merchants of Malines.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 E.B. Fryde "Financial Resources of Edward III in the Netherlands 1337-40" Pt.II, Revue Belge (1967) pp.1158, 1166.

2 C.P.R. 1338-40 p.371.

3 C.P.R. 1338-40 p.372.

4 E.B. Fryde "Financial Resources of Edward III in the Netherlands 1337-40" Pt. II Revue Belge (1967) p.1175.

5 C.P.R. 1338-40 p.374.

6 E.B. Fryde "Financial Resources of Edward III in the Netherlands 1337-40" Pt.II Revue Belge (1967) pp.1177, 1188, 1202.

Salisbury further committed himself for a debt of £10,000 to be repaid within two months of Edward's return to England.<sup>1</sup> The one solid achievement of this period was the Anglo-Flemish alliance in which Salisbury, Suffolk and Northampton were all involved. Edward finally returned to England on 20 February, Salisbury and Suffolk remained behind on the continent as informal hostages for the king's debts.<sup>2</sup>

By the close of the siege of Tournai, Edward's affairs were in a state of total chaos. Edward returned to the Low Countries in June 1340 under the full expectation of the imminent arrival of sufficient money to meet his immediate needs. At this stage Edward owed his household alone some £45,000 for which 25% of the ninth granted in February/March 1340 was assigned.<sup>3</sup> In addition, his most pressing debts included those owed in Louvain and Malines. The movements of the earl of Northampton, who was bond for the outstanding Louvain debt, are unclear. The men of Louvain contented themselves with holding John de Potenhale and three other representatives of the earl, who entered custody at Louvain on 1 August and remained there until 16 April 1341, together with four of the earl of Derby's representatives.<sup>4</sup> The king was extremely concerned for their safety and on 12 August wrote begging the council to assign the wool levy for their release.<sup>5</sup> The daily expenses of the hostages were covered by the wardrobe at 4s 6d each, and 5 marks for the earl of Derby. For repayment of these debts, Edward turned to the Bardi and Peruzzi. On 8 August their representatives agreed to advance £9450 necessary for the release of the earl of Derby, and on 9 October to deliver money for the release of Northampton's knights, for which the 480 sacks of wool

---

1 C.P.R. 1338-40 p.376.

2 E36/203 fol.149v.

3 E.B. Fryde, Edward III's War Finance 1337-41. Transactions in Wool and Credit Operations (unpublished D.Phil., Oxford, 1949) p.575.

4 E101/389/8 m7.

5 C81/269/13351.

till outstanding were valued at £3480. To cover their costs Edward assigned the Italians on 18 August 2000 of the 20,000 sacks of wool granted in 1338, which were to be delivered to the earls' personal attorneys for export to the Low Countries where it could be sold.<sup>1</sup> To cushion his cousins from excessive damages the council had orders to pay them outstanding debts, especially on war wages. Northampton's attorney d'Engayne received at least £638 10s of this in October from the Prior of Daventry.<sup>2</sup>

The Italians received little of the promised wool over the following month and found repayment difficult. The earl of Derby was back in Malines on 25 September and the earl of Northampton was possibly also detained.<sup>3</sup> On 19 October the council in the Low Countries sealed another indenture with the Bardi and Peruzzi for the release of the earls. The merchants promised within fifteen days of receiving a delivery of 500 sacks of wool from England, to ensure their release for a debt of 42,000 florins in Malines plus damages as agreed, and for the value of the outstanding 580 sacks owed in Louvain. Should the merchants succeed in procuring their release, they were to receive a further 500 sacks of wool within two months to be delivered in England and shipped at their own expense. Should this not be enough, the council guaranteed to recompense them suitably. If, however, the second 500 sacks proved unforthcoming, the earls were to agree to return to confinement. The Bardi undertook to shoulder two-thirds of the total, and the Peruzzi the remainder.<sup>4</sup> Two days later new magnate collectors of the wool levy were appointed including Peter Favelore and Oliver de Bohun, attorneys of Northampton, and two attorneys of the earl of Derby, to procure their release by speedy delivery of the wool to the merchants.<sup>5</sup> It was never executed and only 15 sacks

---

E.B. Fryde, Edward III's War Finance 1337-41, p.580.

C81/269/13,359.

E43/248/97; C81/269/13304; C81/269/13369.

C81/270/13463, dated 9 October.

C.C.R. 1339-41 pp.639-40.

were delivered.<sup>1</sup> Although Northampton was with the king at Ghent on 27 November when Edward returned to England three days later the earl of Derby was at Malines and the earl of Warwick was at Louvain in place of Northampton.<sup>2</sup> In the second half of December the Bardi received £1000 from the collectors of the 1/9th to release the earl of Derby, but the agreement was not put into effect, and early in January the burden passed to the Leopardi, a company centred in Malines and well placed to undertake the necessary negotiations. On 5 January 1341, an indenture was sealed promising the Leopardi 1200 sacks of wool or their value in cash provided they delivered the earls within fifteen days of receiving 400 sacks at Sluys. Their release was, however, still delayed. The Leopardi only advanced £3346. Eventually the earl of Derby negotiated for the release of himself and the earl of Warwick on 23 May by raising a loan of 34,000 florins de scuto, with the proviso that if the 8000 florins de scuto remaining outstanding was not repaid by 8 July they were to return. Derby also faced damages for non-repayment. This had certainly been paid by 20 September when the earl received acquittance.<sup>3</sup> Nothing of the Louvain debt was repaid until March 1341. On 6 March the Bardi and Peruzzi made an indenture promising to deliver the 580 sacks plus an extra 300 sacks damages, valued at £10,500 13s 4d and they had repaid this by 14 June from assignments on the proceeds of the enquiry into government officials.<sup>4</sup>

Diplomatic missions, far from being pleasant excursions on which the magnate enjoyed himself feasting while the humbler members of the embassy party did all the hard work, were actually very arduous affairs. They were also fraught with additional hazards. It was only in the previous reign that the earl of Pembroke was set upon, kidnapped and held to ransom on his way back to England after a

---

E.B. Fryde, Edward III's War Finance 1337-41, p.598.

Warwick was there 183 days until 16 April.

Kenneth Fowler, The King's Lieutenant, pp.36-7.

E.B. Fryde, Edward III's War Finance 1337-41, p.605.

mission for Edward II to the Curia.<sup>1</sup> In February 1339, Robert de Littlebury, returning from Avignon with letters from the Pope was abducted to Beaucaire by the chatelain, Robert de Pomay, many believed at the instigation of Philip VI.<sup>2</sup> In April 1340 a similar fate overtook Nicholo de Fieschi abducted from his lodgings at Avignon, once again Philip was believed to be implicated.<sup>3</sup> Nor were the roads the only places of danger. The seas were infested with pirates and enemy shipping, and on many occasions English diplomats were threatened by French raiders lurking in the harbours of Normandy to intercept their passage.

Under normal circumstances, the liability lay with the ambassador. In 1337, however, Edward maintained a lively interest in the affairs of his ambassadors to the Low Countries, sending not only provisions out to them at the beginning of June,<sup>4</sup> but also providing fully for their safe return. Their return was being awaited eagerly from the beginning of June. Thomas and William de Melchburn were instructed to take two large ships and the king's own galley "la Philippe" and cruise off the French coast for their protection until such time as they were ready to leave. John Ros, Admiral of the northern fleet, was ordered to meet and escort them through the lines of enemy shipping. On 22 June with twenty war ships bristling with armed men, he set off from Great Yarmouth to Dordrecht, where he was forced to wait seven weeks for their arrival.<sup>5</sup> Throughout the ambassadors' stay, the seas about the Dutch coast swarmed with pirates and French warships. Knowledge of the envoys' imminent departure was known to the French who sent galleys to intercept their passage at the beginning of August. This news was passed to the envoys at Brele and Scheidam.<sup>6</sup> Neverthe-

---

1 J.R.S. Phillips, Aymer de Valence, pp.111-15.

2 Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.214.

3 G. Mollat, The Popes at Avignon 1305-1378 (Edinburgh, 1963) p.281; Eugène Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, pp.305-312.

4 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.456-7.

5 E372/182 rot.42d.

6 K. de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 52.

less, the envoys with John Montgomery embarked at Dordrecht on 13 August, and despite a growing storm sailed the same day. They reached Sandwich on 14 August, but bad weather prevented their landing for three days and at least one ship was wrecked at sea.<sup>1</sup>

Fears of interception by enemy shipping hampered the sailing of the wool fleets on which the envoys were due to sail in the autumn of 1337. By agreement made in 1336, wool coming from all parts of England had to pass through seven staple ports, being loaded at strategic ports on the east coast, the ships to gather in two fleets, one off Sandwich, the other off Orwell where the two fleets under Admiral Mauny would join to begin the crossing.<sup>2</sup> On 10 November Edward paid eighty mariners acting as spies against the Flemish and French fleets, but the envoys were still stuck in England a week later.<sup>3</sup> The fleet which gathered at Sandwich was a large one: Ufford's force alone travelled in eight ships, and Darcy chartered four ships for his personal company, though it may not have numbered the 440 vessels claimed by some contemporaries.<sup>4</sup> A fleet of such size had the desired effect and thoroughly frightened the French galleys who had been watching their approach with interest, thus allowing the envoys with their cargo to pass safely to Middleburg where some of the wool was unloaded. Meanwhile their passage was obscured by a spectacular raid by the Admiral on the island of Cadsand. The destruction caused there by the English forces caused momentary panic among the Flemish communities and the wool reached its destination safely with the envoys.<sup>5</sup>

Theorists fulminated at length against ill-treatment of envoys. For them, the ambassador's person was sacred since he had been taken under special Papal

1 E372/182 rot.42d.

2 E.B. Fryde, "Edward III's Wool Monopoly of 1337: A Fourteenth Century Royal Trading Venture", History XXVII (1952) p.15.

3 E101/388/5 m6.

4 E101/311/31 p.8; cf. K. de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart XVIII, 58.

5 H.S. Lucas, The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, p.442.

protection. Therefore those who attacked them were guilty of sacrilege and should be both excommunicated and suffer the requisite civil penalties.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless the ambassador remained in an awkward position vis-a-vis the ruler to whom he was sent. His position as representative in his person of his principal's dignity required respectful and honourable reception. On the other hand, the envoy often represented a threat to the interests of his hosts. Philip VI clearly regarded the activities of Montagu and Clinton in the Low Countries in 1337 in this light and took what he felt were appropriate measures to deal with the problem. Even some of the theorists agreed that a ruler could justifiably kill a foreign ambassador if the insult to his dignity warranted it, on the grounds that the envoy could be held to have forfeited his immunity through abuse of the power granted to him. It would seem that an adequate code of conduct concerning envoys was never properly devised to define the position. Missions remained irregular and extraordinary affairs at the whim of rulers who could not always be guaranteed to act with consistency or the strictest of justice. It required the advent of the permanently accredited ambassador during the sixteenth century to provide the impetus for clarification.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the dangers, there was no lack of willingness to act as envoys. Although liable to be beset by problems on the road, and likely to face delays in accounting, there are many features of a diplomatic embassy which could be guaranteed to appeal to a lay magnate. Montagu is known to have met and enticed into his service in England, the man who was to become his chief financial agent, while on embassy in France in 1329.<sup>3</sup> At foreign courts the magnate was treated with lavish respect and great warmth. He was there to cut a figure in the eyes

---

1 B. Behrens, "Treatises on the Ambassador written in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries", E.H.R. (1936) p.623.

2 J.E. Neale, "The Diplomatic Envoy", History N.S. XIII (1928-29) p.218; Garnett Mattingly, "The First Resident Embassies: Medieval Italian Origins of Modern Diplomacy", Speculum XII (1937) pp.423-439.

3 C.P.R. 1327-30 p.416.

of the world and such behaviour appealed deeply to his sense of personal importance. Surrounded by a large retinue of his own followers, he enjoyed the entertainments laid on specially for his benefit, took part in the feasting and ceremonial, dressed in his finest clothes, talked, hunted, jousted and ate his way into the confidence of great men. Once he had returned safely, he was expected to attend council. On his advice the government acted.

Several conclusions can be drawn from a study of the role of Edward's bannerets in diplomacy. Firstly, more members of the laity were being employed to head missions in relation to the vast majority of clergy who had served in the past, men who had been household clerks who had served their apprenticeships in the administrative background to diplomacy and continued to be employed in later life as bishops. Lay magnates had always played a part in the more important embassies,<sup>1</sup> but diplomacy formed only a tiny proportion of their public careers.

Secondly and more significantly, those involved were of an increasingly higher social station. By the reign of Edward III there is evidence of a changing attitude among the nobility towards this kind of service; during the fifteenth century, the more important the mission, the more likely it was to have magnate representatives. Such service was acquiring a kind of lustre. Magnates by acting as diplomats, became men of influence, at the heart of the government. It brought its own rewards both in money and in honour and chances for promotion.

---

1 Pierre Chaplais, "English Diplomatic Documents to the End of Edward III's Reign", The Study of Medieval Records. Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major, (Oxford, 1971), (eds.) D.A. Bullough and R.L. Storey, p.27; Mary C.L. Salt, "English Embassies to France in the Reign of Edward I: their Personnel, Powers, Equipment and Objects", B.I.H.R. VI (1929), p.29.

## 5. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

### i) Justice of Chester

The Justiciarship of Chester was one of the more onerous administrative posts frequently entrusted to the bannerets of the royal household. The post was committed to William Clinton in the Nottingham parliament of 1330, with effect from 23 October, as Oliver Ingham, Justice since February 1328, fell under the same cloud of disgrace as Mortimer. Clinton retained the Justiciarship until March 1333 when Prince Edward was created earl of Chester.<sup>1</sup> Since Prince Edward was described as earl of Chester as early as 1331, and was receiving Palatinate revenues from the age of three months, it would appear that Clinton's appointment was from the outset intended only as a temporary measure until such time as the new earl's officers were ready to assume control.<sup>2</sup> From September 1327, when Queen Isabella had granted him her rights in the lordship, he had held the honour of Halton, the only independent authority within the Palatinate, so the choice of Clinton as Justice ensured the most effective extension of royal government throughout the county, bringing the whole area more fully in line with the rest of the kingdom now that its previous earl was king.<sup>3</sup>

As the king's lieutenant, the Justice was endowed with general oversight of all matters of government within the county: financial, administrative, judicial and military. He was responsible in particular for defence and the custody of castles, and it was he who was supposed to maintain public order. He also acted as president of the county court. He supervised the work of the chamberlain, who controlled all fiscal matters, in some degree assuming a role close to that of

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.13; C.C.R. 1333-37 p.183.

2 T.F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England V, p.290.

3 C.P.R. 1327-30 p.170. The king later bought back the castle and manor from Clinton in 1349 for £120. SC1/41/109.

chancellor. In addition, he undertook the duties of escheator within the county. In his custody was not only the county of Chester, but also that of Flint, with the power of leasing out all demesne lands and offices.<sup>1</sup>

Most important among the Justice's responsibilities were the military duties. Cheshire, strategically situated on or near the frontiers of Wales, Scotland, Ireland and the Isle of Man, provided an obvious jumping off point for military operations. During the Welsh wars of Edward I successive Justices combined the post with commands in the army. The lordship continued to be of importance in the struggle against Scotland, and under Edward II.<sup>2</sup> Clinton took over the county during a period of relative calm following the treaty of Northampton, and he resigned his post before the Berwick campaign started. Nevertheless, his period of office coincided with the projected expedition to Ireland and military concerns could not be entirely neglected.

Four major castles at Chester, Flint, Rhuddlan and Beeston came under the Justice's jurisdiction. He was responsible for the maintenance of the fabric and for their adequate garrisoning.<sup>3</sup> Clinton commenced his terms of office with a general enquiry into the state of the castles together with that of the royal manors of Frodesham and Shotwick, and appointed a carpenter to make necessary repairs.<sup>4</sup> Within the castle of Chester the Justice also had the care of any political hostages or prisoners of war whom the king chose to house there. By 1330 there was only one, Traherne ap Howel, a relic of Edward I's Welsh wars, who had been continuously resident there since 1301.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 P.H.W. Booth, The Financial Administration of the Lordship and County of Chester 1272-1377, Chetham Society, Third Series 28 (Manchester, 1981) p.50.

2 P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration, pp.56, 59.

3 B.E. Harris, "The Palatinate 1301-1547", V.C.H. Cheshire Volume II, 11.

4 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.13.

5 Ronald Stewart-Brown, Accounts of the Chamberlains and other officials of the County of Chester 1301-1360. The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire LIX (Manchester, 1910) 11-113 passim. Traherne survived until at least 1335-36.

The only call on the military resources of the Palatinate during Clinton's term of office proved to be a body of 300 archers despatched at Edward's request to join Edward Balliol in his bid to re-establish his claim to Scotland in September 1332.<sup>1</sup>

The chamberlain undertook the real burden of financial duties, accounting to Westminster for all issues of royal manors and feudal incidents, as well as rents and other proceeds, except on occasions when the Justice was appointed to farm his office. The chamberlain also had custody of the great seal of the earldom and so was instrumental in issuing all charters and writs. The Justice had oversight of the chamberlain's affairs, often being present at audits of his account, and was expected to keep apprised of everything which the chamberlain undertook. The Justice and the chamberlain thus of necessity worked closely and depended upon mutual co-operation. A clean sweep in the top administrative personnel was made with Clinton's appointment in October 1330, and Clinton was able to obtain the simultaneous appointment as chamberlain of Simon Ruggeley, a personal retainer.<sup>2</sup> In December, however, barely two months later, Ruggeley was displaced by the king for a more experienced man, John Paynel, who had already held office between December 1326 and March 1328, and was to assume it for a third time in 1335.<sup>3</sup> Paynel continued to work under Clinton for the next two years; but Clinton was still anxious to see his own nominee in the post and eventually had Ruggeley re-appointed as chamberlain in September 1332.<sup>4</sup> There is no indication that Ruggeley lacked competence, for he continued to work under Clinton's successor until September 1335. Unfortunately Ruggeley's last account

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.359.

2 C.F.R. 1327-1337 p.193.

3 Ibid., p.297; P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration, pp.148-49.

4 Ibid., p.326.

is missing, but three other chamberlain's accounts survive covering Clinton's tenure of office, to give some indication of the state of administration in the county while he was Justice.<sup>1</sup> Few extraordinary charges were made on the county during this three year period. Of particular note is the six-fold rise in the issues received from fines and amercements between Ingham's account for 1328 and that of Paynel in 1334.<sup>2</sup> The receipts for the year 25 December 1330 to 1331 were £1085 11s 8d, and those for the following year £689 15s 10½d, only slightly more than the 1000m per annum raised by Ingham when he held the same office at farm from November 1328.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless the Justice's farm was rising steadily over a period of seventy years; under the efficient exploitation of the Black Prince it was to raise sums in excess of £3000.<sup>4</sup>

The administrative machinery of the county was based on Chester castle where the chief officers resided: the Justice or his deputy, the chamberlain, the sheriff and the escheator. Minor officials and clerks were distributed about the county. The Justice had control of most appointments. The role of shrievalty was very much subordinate to those of the Justice and chamberlain. William de Prayer was appointed sheriff at Christmas 1330 for a period of four years, a post which he was expected to farm for £240 per annum.<sup>5</sup> Soon after assuming office Clinton wrote to Westminster protesting that the making of such appointments should belong to the Justice and chamberlain because of their superior knowledge of local needs and conditions.<sup>6</sup> He assumed the authority to appoint David de Eyerton in August 1332, which Edward confirmed for a period of three years at the

- 
- 1 E372/176 rot.50 (Ruggeley); E372/177 rot.41 (Paynel); R.Stewart-Brown, Accounts of the Chamberlains, pp.109-110.
  - 2 R. Stewart-Brown, Accounts of the Chamberlains, pp.108-109. Probably due to an inquisition of oyer and terminer held in 1333.
  - 3 P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration, p.149.
  - 4 Ibid., p.55.
  - 5 C.C.R. 1330-33 pp.509-510.
  - 6 SC1/37/81.

same farm as his predecessor.<sup>1</sup> The patronage of the escheator's office, however, remained under royal control.

The Justice as the king's representative in the county was expected to preside over the county court, and also over other courts dealing with common pleas. As the fourteenth century progressed, other duties of the Justice declined in importance, leaving him little more than a peculiar royal Justice.<sup>2</sup> The Chester county court met usually eight or nine times a year at irregular intervals, and always on a Tuesday.<sup>3</sup> Much interest has been devoted to its composition, and especially the nature of the doormen and suitors to the court.<sup>4</sup> Some variants in the terms of writs made the Cheshire county court slightly out of line with those in the rest of England, and the king kept a permanent serjeant at arms, Adam de Swynneshead, in the county to prosecute his interests there. Swynneshead had his fees charged to the chamberlain's account and remained the responsibility of the Justice.<sup>5</sup> Clinton's special position as royal administrator, Justice and private landowner gave him particular advantage in pleas involving his personal interests and of which he was not slow to take advantage. While Justice of Chester he was able to implede the Prior of St. Mary's, Norton for a messuage and twenty acres of land in More near Halton. Clinton claimed that the lands were part and parcel of Halton and successfully delayed proceedings until the prior secured the king's intervention in June 1336.<sup>6</sup>

The burden of evidence indicates that Clinton did not take a particularly close interest in the affairs of the county, and that his duties were not very

C.F.R. 1327-37 p.327.

B.E. Harris, The Palatinate, p.15; Cheetham Miscellany II, Cheetham Society 37 (1856).

R. Stewart-Brown, Accounts of the Chamberlains, p.12.

P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration, p.8.

C.C.R. 1330-33, p.249; R. Stewart-Brown, Accounts of the Chamberlains, pp.110-111.

C.C.R. 1333-37 pp.592-3.

strenuous. Unlike his predecessor he did not hold the office at farm, but received a fee of £100 per annum of the chamberlain.<sup>1</sup> It is unlikely that he discharged his duties in person, for he was at the same time Constable of Dover and almost continuously resident in Dover castle. In Chester he acted principally through his steward at Halton, Gilbert de Twisse, and his receiver there, Simon del Hirst.<sup>2</sup>

ii) Constable of Dover, Warden of the Cinque Ports and Admiral

Concurrent with his appointment as Justice of Chester, Clinton held the post of Constable of Dover and Warden of the Cinque Ports, and seems to have concentrated almost entirely on fulfilling this office, which he continued to hold until 1343. Clinton took over the position in Dover at a time when perhaps the reputation of the Cinque Ports sailors for their ferocity and audacity was at its height amongst the seafaring communities throughout northern Europe. Their propensity to acts of savage piracy amounted virtually to private warfare with rival merchants of Bayonne, Normandy, Poole and Great Yarmouth, and which from time to time manifested itself in renewed outbreaks of violence.<sup>3</sup> In a period of growing concern for national public order the administration of the liberties of the Cinque Ports posed a considerable challenge to the government. Continued threats of foreign invasion in the thirteenth century had rendered advisable granting the portsmen an almost free hand in guarding the Channel crossing. The political events of the previous reign, however, had amply demonstrated the power which the sailors of the Cinque Ports could wield in times of crisis. It was not unknown for sailors

---

1 R. Stewart-Brown, Accounts of the Chamberlains, p.110.

2 The Coucher Book of Walley Abbey III, (ed.) W.A. Hulston, Chetham Society XVI, (1848) pp.815,818; and possibly also through Geoffrey de Warberton, Adam de Swynneshead, and the Prior of Norton.

3 F.W. Brookes, "The Cinque Ports' Feud with Little Yarmouth in the Thirteenth Century", Mariners Mirror (January 1933) pp.27-51.

to threaten desertion to the enemy. With constant needs of government for ship service from the ports in aid of the war against Scotland, and later with Philip VI, this was regarded with particularly grave concern. From the beginning of the fourteenth century kings sought to check piracy and lawlessness and to gain control and the Channel defences through the appointment of powerful and wealthy wardens, and, increasingly, by combining this post with that of Admiral of the eastern ports in order to bring the Cinque Ports closer in line with defence measures in the rest of the country.<sup>1</sup>

Clinton's position by marriage in Kent made him an ideal choice for the post, although his appointment meant depriving Batholemeu Burghersh who had been Constable since 1327 and despite a grant to Burghersh only six months earlier of the wardenship for life by way of reward for his recent services to Mortimer and Isabella.<sup>2</sup> Appointed on 14 December 1330, he was paid an annual fee of £300, to cover his own wages, those of the permanent staff in Dover castle and for other unspecified expenses.<sup>3</sup> 130 marks of this was paid directly from the exchequer, but the rest was to come from the issues of his bailiwick - £146 from the castle guard and 100 marks from the issue of the port and customs proceeds from the passage of Dover.<sup>4</sup> The remaining issues from various sources under his jurisdiction were to be transmitted to the exchequer. These annual charges comprised the remaining issues from the customs of passage, issues of the port, and the perquisites of the Constable's court held at Dover Castle. In addition the proceeds of the market were traditionally part of the Constable's farm, but a third part of this, together with half the proceeds from the customs of passage, were in the hands of the prior of St. Martin's, Dover.<sup>5</sup> Out of this the Constable was required to pay the fees of royal

---

1 K.M.E. Murray, The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports (Manchester, 1935) p.30.

2 C.F.R. 1327-37 p.183. He was promoted to the stewardship of Ponthieu and Montreuil the following year, and in 1343 was to be reappointed as Constable of Dover.

3 E101/19/5.

4 C.F.R. 1327-37 p.204; C62/108 m5; E403/267 m1. He received custody from Burghersh on 24 December 1330.

5 E372/179 rot. 43d.

appointees - then William Constable, who received £100 per annum from the issues of the port customs - and to meet additional expenses such as the pillory constructed in the town of Dover in 1334.<sup>1</sup> The monks of St. Martin's, Dover, in addition to the percentages they received from customs receipts and the issues of the market, also demanded alms as of ancient royal grant to the value of £22 10s per annum. Consequently, the total issues which the Constable was able to remit to the exchequer fluctuated considerably from year to year, though they never exceeded £75 and could be as low as the £9 3s 1d raised during the course of 1339-1340.<sup>2</sup> The whole period of Clinton's wardenship was marked by steadily falling totals, exacerbated considerably by closure of the port in 1340, which removed the most lucrative source of revenue for the crown, and by the disruption caused to almost every aspect of the Cinque Ports' life when hostilities with the French commenced in 1337.<sup>3</sup>

The establishment in Dover Castle which Clinton took over at Christmas 1330 consisted of the personnel of the royal chapel, the watchmen and serjeants of the castle guard and one carpenter, whose duty was to tour the fortifications of the castle and the outbuildings once a week in company with the Constable, the marshal of the castle and a clerk from the castle treasury to check on the condition of the buildings and to carry out necessary repairs.<sup>4</sup> The castle was basically that which had been rebuilt in stone during the reign of Henry II and completed under King John, though it was extensively strengthened and updated during the 1220s. It was then that the Constable's residence was built into the new gateway and existing outbuildings added.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 E372/179 rot.34d; E372/183 rot.51d; E372/188 rot.53.

2 E372/185 rot.42.

3 E101/19/5.

4 E403/262 m1; R.A. Brown, H.M. Colvin and A.J. Taylor, The History of the King's Works II, p.638.

5 Ibid., pp.630-637.

One of the first tasks of the new Constable was to look to the garrisoning of the castle and to make necessary repairs. Over the course of the thirteenth century the castle had suffered a gradual deterioration in its condition which was revealed in two enquiries made in 1324 and 1328.<sup>1</sup> 100 marks were delivered to Clinton for this purpose in May 1331, and a further £40 was expended in the latter half of 1334.<sup>2</sup> Repair of defects to the castle became more pressingly urgent after May 1337, when regular sums were sent to the Constable for this purpose over the next eighteen months.<sup>3</sup> During the decade of his wardenship Clinton expended some £300 on works to the castle, which included renewing the windows of the high tower, building a new wall behind the church of St. Mary and redecorating the church itself. He may also have been responsible for a new tower near the cliff, which was to have collapsed into the sea by 1345.<sup>4</sup>

The Constable himself was required to be semi-permanently resident at the castle in command of the garrison,<sup>5</sup> a precaution rendered necessary during the course of the campaign of 1338-40 when England was repeatedly threatened with invasion by French fleets. By the spring of 1339 it became necessary to ordain measures for the defence of Dover and the Kentish coast, and to reinforce the pre-existing garrison formed from local tenants serving under obligation, with a specially recruited force.<sup>6</sup> In March Clinton was ordered by the council to muster a guard of twenty men at arms, forty armed men and forty archers, and this force remained in residence at Dover until mid-October 1340.<sup>7</sup> £100 towards

---

1 C145/92/9 and C145/113/13.

2 E403/256 m8; C.C.R. 1333-37 p.242.

3 E403/302 m13; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.423.

4 R.A. Brown, H.M. Colvin and A.J. Taylor, The History of the King's Works II, p.639.

5 He is known to have been resident on only a few occasions at Dover, e.g. the first week in August 1332. E403/262 m17. It did not prevent frequent extended absences on embassy.

6 C.C.R. 1339-41 p.219.

7 C.C.R. 1339-41 pp.69, 150, 174, 208, 285, 368; E101/22/15; E101/22/16; E372/184 rot.45.

the cost of this was delivered to the Constable in February 1339; the rest remained outstanding until the king's return at the end of 1340.<sup>1</sup> Victuals for the garrison were supplied to Richard Hacklut, the receiver at Dover, and his successor John de Soles by purchase or by purveyance.<sup>2</sup> Clinton's lieutenant at Dover was Alexander Hertyn of Dover.<sup>3</sup>

But the warden was much more than governor of the garrison in Dover Castle. The town of Dover itself was the gateway between England and Northern Europe, giving the warden control over imports and exports and oversight of all ships, men, money and merchandise entering or leaving through the ports of his bailiwick. All persons wishing to leave the country were required to show a royal licence to the port officials. This restriction included all monks wishing to go overseas to attend meetings of general chapter at the mother house, foreign merchants returning to their native lands, overseas envoys and other visitors, even English pilgrims, whose departure from the realm might prove prejudicial to the crown.<sup>4</sup> From time to time stringent prohibitions were imposed on travel outside England and Wales for reasons of national security. A scare, possibly related to the flight overseas of those held responsible for the death of Edward II in 1330, provoked an injunction issued to the Constable in February 1331 to prohibit any earl, baron, knight, or man at arms from leaving England or sending overseas destriers and armour.<sup>5</sup> Political suspects did pass overseas without difficulty, but the council could at least keep track of their activities. Geoffrey Mortimer, imprisoned for a month in the Tower when his father was arrested, secured licence to travel abroad in March 1331, where he probably remained quietly for some years

---

1 E403/307 mm5, 8, 16; C.C.R. 1339-41 pp.11, 22.

2 C.F.R. 1327-37 p.507; C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.4, 372, 556, 557, 568; C.P.R. 1338-40 p.174; C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.303, 305, 362, 503.

3 Foedera II ii, 939.

4 C.C.R. 1330-33 pp.319, 331, 335; C.C.R. 1330-33 pp.288, 402, 417, 535; C.C.R. 1333-37 pp.303, 518, 526; C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.230, 280, 390, 409.

5 C.C.R. 1330-33 pp.289, 397.

while Edward's rancour cooled.<sup>1</sup> Others like Agnes, wife of John Maltravers, adopted a cloak of religious piety. She sought permission to visit Santiago, but once overseas openly assumed contact with her husband, working on his behalf for reconciliation with the government.<sup>2</sup> Theoretically the port officials kept a record of all personnel entering or leaving the country, since by law every individual was obliged to pay for his passage through Dover at the rate of two shillings for a mounted man and 6d for a man on foot.<sup>3</sup> The Constable of Dover was thus in a unique position to keep the council informed of all movements of special interest in and out of the country. When foreign envoys arrived, it was the Constable's role to spy on their activities and send information of their movements to the chancellor as quickly as possible, or alternatively to meet them and provide adequate escort to their destinations. When the time came for envoys to depart, it was the Constable's task to ensure that suitable ships were found to get them safely and quickly out of the country without trouble.<sup>4</sup> Since most English envoys travelled for choice from Dover, the Constable also provided transport for them and their retinues. When the king's sister Eleanor was sent to join her husband in 1332, Clinton procured ships for her advance escort and a suitable fleet for Eleanor's own journey a few weeks later.<sup>5</sup> Travellers were permitted to take overseas with them 'reasonable expenses' : 100s in the case of the Abbot of Lavenden,<sup>6</sup> £40 in that of Henry Beaumont and the Abbot of Langedon, royal envoys in August 1331.<sup>7</sup> The Abbot of Dore was permitted to export the silver vessels used by his household in July 1335,<sup>8</sup> under restrictions imposed

---

1 E403/253 m12; C.C.R. 1330-33 p.297.

2 C.C.R. 1330-34 p.584.

3 Statutes at Large I (ed.) J. Cay (London, 1758) p.218.

4 C.C.R. 1333-37 p.578; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.514.

5 B.L. Add. MS. 38,006, fol.11r; C.C.R. 1330-33 pp.553, 559.

6 C.C.R. 1330-33 p.335.

7 Ibid., p.333.

8 C.C.R. 1333-37 p.506.

to prevent undue amounts of bullion being taken out of the country at cost to the economy.<sup>1</sup>

In order to prohibit the export of sterling, tables were set up in Dover and other major ports for the exchange of currency. Native fishermen bringing in their catch were permitted to receive English coin, but all foreign merchants were to exchange any sterling in their possession at the tables before departure.<sup>2</sup> A new currency scare in June 1335 that counterfeiters were working overseas minting bad coin for circulation in England, formed the subject of legislation in the York parliament of 1335. New exchange tables were set up and hostellers empowered to search guests under their roof for possession of bad or "black" coin. In addition it was ordained that thenceforth pilgrims should be restricted to taking passage only from Dover.<sup>3</sup>

The warden supervised export of merchandise according to the staple ordinance of May 1327. Within the warden's bailiwick a staple was ordained at Sandwich, so that it was the duty of the warden to ensure that no wool fells or hides left any other of the Cinque Ports or their members.<sup>4</sup> At Sandwich his responsibility extended to appointing suitable officials to run the staple and to ensure that the king was not cheated through fraud or negligence. In 1333 a new staple was ordained in the hope that native merchants might be induced to make loans in aid of a campaign in Scotland. A levy of ½ mark per sack of wool (10s for alien merchants) was imposed on exports through the staple ports for the retrospective period 22 February 1332 - 2 February 1333. The government's intention was to collect the levy by means of lists supplied by the warden and other port officials, of merchants who had exported wool between those dates. In June 1333 it was, how-

---

1 Rot. Parl. II, 237.

2 C.C.R. 1330-33 p.342.

3 Statutes at Large I, 218.

4 C.C.R. 1330-33 p.318.

ever, cancelled and replaced by a blanket levy of 10s per sack on all wool exports for the period 14 May 1333 - 14 May 1334.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless when war with France became imminent two years later, similar measures were adopted, imposing renewed supervisory duties on the warden. The liberties of the Cinque Ports, unlike elsewhere, prohibited the council from appointing royal officials to ensure that the prohibition on exports of wool, enacted in August 1336, was respected, so the task fell to the warden himself, or at least his deputy;<sup>2</sup> any inquisitions or enquiries into the activities of officials within the liberties of the ports could only be undertaken under the aegis of the warden.

Not unnaturally, given the state of war existing after 1337, and the known piratical tendencies of the portsmen, disputes between inhabitants of the Cinque Ports liberties and foreign or other English merchants frequently came to the attention of the warden, who was empowered to deal with such cases by inquisition. Normally such enquiries were instituted by petition of the offended party to the chancellor, who then ordered the warden to hold a commission of oyer and terminer with the assistance of men like John de Hampton, who acted with Clinton in a typical case in 1337, when some merchants of Winchester complained that John and Thomas Loveryk, inhabitants of Sandwich, had seized two of their ships near Sandwich and stolen 14 sarplars of wool worth £200.<sup>3</sup> The obvious organ for dealing with disputes touching men of the Cinque Ports lay at hand in the court of Shepway, a royal court presided over by the warden, but one in which the judgments pronounced by him were in fact those decreed by the portsmen themselves

---

1 George Unwin (ed.) Finance and Trade under Edward III (Manchester, 1918) p.141; C.C.R. 1333-37 p.302.

2 C.C.R. 1341-43 pp.137, 659.

3 SC1/37/64; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.442; Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty, I AD 1390-1404 and 1527-1545, (ed.) Reginald G. Marsden, Selden Society VI (1892) p.xvi.

through their representatives.<sup>1</sup> As Constable the warden himself was expected to see that defendents were arrested and brought to trial, following an ordinance to that effect in parliament during 1336. The Constable was further empowered from time to time to institute special enquiries of arbitration whenever renewed outbreaks of the perennial disputes between the portsmen and their fiercest rivals occurred. Clinton provided the necessary information for William Trussel and a French commissioner for a negotiated agreement between the men of Dover and those of Wissant and Calais in June 1336,<sup>2</sup> and generally assisted them by making authorised arrests and trying identified offenders. In December 1337 he was empowered to prevent clashes between sailors of the Cinque Ports and Yarmouth, which threatened to delay a royal fleet due to sail for Aquitaine.<sup>3</sup> When the local authorities, called upon to act in such cases, proved reluctant or dilatory, the Constable could arrest or distrain them.<sup>4</sup> In November 1337 the earl was commanded to see that the men of Sandwich paid the £330 which they had recently agreed with an aggrieved Aragonese merchant they would reimburse towards £500 goods stolen from him by their fellow townsmen.<sup>5</sup> Usually this meant stepping in where the portsmen were claiming their liberties to conceal goods and malefactors. If necessary the warden might distrain the barons of the ports to compel their compliance.

As the only common officer to all the Cinque Ports, and as crown representative the warden possessed a unique authority which was strengthened by the wide range of his jurisdiction. As supreme crown agent for the maintenance of order both on land and at sea within his bailiwick, he combined in his person the shrievalty, the keepership of a stretch of coast from the isle of Thanet to Seaford

---

1 K.M.E. Murray, Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports, pp.60,61.

2 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.376, 513.

3 C.C.R. 1337-39 p.283.

4 SC1/56/89; Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty, I AD 1390-1401 and 1527-1545, (ed.) Reginald G. Marsden, Selden Society VI (1892) p.xviii.

5 C.C.R. 1337-39 p.214.

in Sussex, and command over the fleets which the ports of the liberty were required by custom to provide. In times of war when defence was of paramount importance, this peculiar strength and versatility was a great asset. It is not surprising that Clinton should have been appointed as a chief member of the regency council in 1338, with responsibility for ensuring that lines of communication were kept open between England and the council in the Low Countries, and that adequate supplies, money and troops should reach the English forces at regular intervals.

In addition to dealing with illegal acts by merchants of the ports within the liberty, the warden was regularly requested to summon the ship service due from the ports and to arrest extra vessels where necessary for a variety of purposes, from the fleet gathered in 1332 for Edward's projected visit to Ireland, to the ships provided to escort the shipments of wool which were to finance the campaigns of 1338-40.<sup>1</sup> In collecting ships from the ports of his liberty the warden was restricted by the ancient quotas which fixed the contribution of the ports at twenty-one ships from Dover and Hastings, and five each from the other major ports.<sup>2</sup> To raise the requisite size of fleet he was obliged to act in co-operation with the Admiral, between them exercising that authority to compel extra service or deal with deserters which later was to belong to the court of Admiralty. Occasionally the warden was further requested to go to sea in person to sweep a clear passage for English supply ships.<sup>3</sup> In July 1333<sup>4</sup> and again in February 1340 Clinton was himself made Admiral of part of the fleet, thus con-

---

1 C.C.R. 1330-33 p.580; C.C.R. 1339-41 p.371; K.M.E. Murray Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports p.123.

2 K.M.E. Murray Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports p.143.

3 C76/14 m18; C76/15 mm7d, 10d.

4 C76/15 m31; 16 July 1333 - 2 January 1335 Admiral of the western fleet; 20 February 1340 Admiral of the fleet from the mouth of the Thomas to Portsmouth; 12 June 1341 - 3 April 1342 Admiral of the western fleet.

veniently combing the two posts in the interests of administrative efficiency.

From December 1339 a fleet was being assembled in London ready to sail at the beginning of January in defence of the southern coast, and it was to command of this fleet that Huntingdon with the earl of Arundel was appointed Admiral. During the parliament of January 1340 the members of the Cinque Ports promised on their own behalf to fit out a fleet, bearing half the cost of this themselves,<sup>1</sup> to sail from Winchelsea by mid-Lent under the two southern Admirals. In fact numerous delays prevented its sailing before the summer. At the beginning of March it was postponed until Palm Sunday (9 April) when it was anticipated that the king would be returning to Flanders, then, as the king still tarried in England throughout April and May, new orders were issued to the Admirals to have the fleets assembled off Sandwich for the 12 June.<sup>2</sup> Clinton remained active at Dover throughout July building up a new fleet to combat French retaliatory attacks. Rumours that a hastily reconstituted fleet salvaged from Sluys and reinforced with Spanish and Norman ships was planning raids on Southampton and the Isle of Wight began to cause considerable alarm in August, and this news was confirmed by 24 August. Immediately Clinton was instructed to have his fleet ready at Les Dunnes off Sandwich to repel this force.<sup>3</sup>

During the following year Edward was ostensibly at peace with his enemies, since the truce of Esplechin on 25 September 1340 was supposed to last until 24 June. Edward, however, was impatient to redeem his honour in the field, and an army was being gathered long before the truce was due to expire. From the third week in June Clinton was actively engaged in assembling a fleet, which he was under orders to hold in readiness while the outcome of negotiations to renew the truce was awaited. This fleet was to sail in mid-August; however, news of a

---

1 C76/15 m30.

2 C76/15 m28.

3 C76/15 mm6, 7, 10d.

short extension of the truce caused the government to postpone departure until 9 September. Then, only a week before it was due to sail, Edward abandoned his plans, and on 27 September announced that the truce had been extended until the following summer.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile the Admiral himself had sailed for France on 1 August in a small fleet provided by the sheriff of Surrey and Sussex on embassy.<sup>2</sup>

It is clear that despite Clinton's appointment as Admiral naval matters were only of secondary concern to the warden, and were most probably executed through his deputies. The warden was more essentially concerned with fulfilling the mandates of central government within his bailiwick and with other administrative tasks. Responsibility for defence of the coast from the landward side was necessarily an integral part of this. Increasingly the burden for organising the shore defences of both the Kent and Sussex coasts fell to his concern.<sup>3</sup> In November 1338 this was officially recognised, and the warden was appointed with the earls of Arundel and Surrey, John Mowbray and John Hampton, to oversee the arrays of the southern counties, to survey defence measures there, and to ensure that local tenants remained to fulfil their obligations in an attempt to eradicate negligency.<sup>4</sup> As such he ordered the levy of the coastal defences in September 1339.<sup>5</sup> In his own way the warden was the equivalent on the south coast of the warden of the Scottish March, though unlike the northern warden, the warden of the Cinque Ports lacked a permanent landed powerbase.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 C76/16 mm2d, 10d, 15, 19, 20; Foedera II ii, 1175, 1177.

2 E101/311/40; E372/186 rot.45d.

3 K.M.E. Murray Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports p.81.

4 C.P.R. 1338-40 pp.134, 149, 363; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.542.

5 Ibid., pp.359-40.

6 R.R. Reid, "The Office of the Warden of the Marches, its origin and Early History", E.H.R. XXXII (1917) pp.487-489; K.M.E. Murray Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports, pp.88, 89.

(iii) Keeper of the Channel Islands

The one administrative post with which Edward III chose to burden his friend William Montagu, was one which at the same time was lucrative and did not involve any enforced absence from court in fulfillment of the duties involved. The grant of the joint keepership of the Channel Islands made to Montagu and Henry Ferrers on 3 March 1334 for an initial period of five years was intended from the outset as a profit venture for Montagu. The two men were to enjoy "as fully as possible", for a fee of 500m per annum, all emoluments, with the blanket guarantee that "if through war they be hindered from getting the profits they shall have compensation in their farm."<sup>1</sup> From the accounts rendered by William Cheney who acted as keeper for the short period 30 August to 8 October 1331, Montagu and Ferrers might easily have expected a clear profit of some £600 per annum or more.<sup>2</sup> Within four months Montagu and Ferrers had appointed a deputy, Walter de Weston, ex-clerk of the works at Westminster and a man of considerable experience in the Channel Islands as deputy to Thomas Wake from September 1331,<sup>3</sup> and it was Weston who carried out all their duties. Montagu himself never visited the islands and treated them solely as a further source of revenue.

The appointment of joint keepers was something of an innovation, though it was to be repeated for a short period in the summer of 1348 with Thomas Clifford and Robert Wyvill.<sup>4</sup> It also represented a real reduction in the profits at the disposal of Henry Ferrers, who had been holding the Islands as sole warden since April 1333. Ferrers was not a dependent of Montagu, and it is the only known instance of close association between the two men.

---

1 C.F.R. 1327-37 p.390.

2 E372/186 rot.44d £130 9s 9d profit to the crown of which the largest proportion came from the farms of the islands which realised £112 1s 11d. The farm under the previous keeper had been £500. J.H. Le Patourel, The Medieval Administration of the Channel Islands, 1199-1399 (London, 1937) p.126.

3 J.H. Le Patourel, The Medieval Administration of the Channel Islands, p.126.

4 C81/215/7969.

The biggest charge on the keepers was for defence, particularly in the munitioning and garrisoning of the major castles. Even in peacetime the strategic position of the islands made them vulnerable to piratical raids on the main sailing routes between England and Gascony. In wartime they became of supreme military concern as a convenient place from which to spy on enemy shipping and as a jumping off point for English fleets.

Organisation of defence was based on Castle Cornet and Gorey Castle in the main islands of Jersey and Guernsey.<sup>1</sup> During the last years of the long rule of Otto Grandisson (1275-1328) the castles had fallen into considerable disrepair and extensive repair work begun under his successor John de Roches continued for the next decade. Under Montagu's and Ferrers' administration a master William de la Rue was employed at royal expense to repair the castles. In July 1335 he was commissioned to make alterations up to the value of 100m.<sup>2</sup> The following month John de Roches was sent out to pay de la Rue, and was empowered to expend a further £20 in ordering the defences of the islands against an anticipated foreign invasion.<sup>3</sup> Amid mounting fear of French attacks it was decided, despite the islanders' traditional exemption from military duties, to raise general levies and force the islanders themselves to defend the islands.<sup>4</sup> There was renewed concern the following year, when on 3 June the king despatched Simon de Coldingham and John de Hoo to oversee the munition of the castles.<sup>5</sup> At the same time Weston was ordered to chose fifty men at arms and send them out to the Channel Islands to form a permanent English garrison.<sup>6</sup> By the end of 1336 fear

---

1 J.H. Le Patourel, The Medieval Administration of the Channel Islands, p.68.

2 Ibid., p.61.

3 C.C.R. 1333-37 pp.417, 426.

4 Ibid., pp.434, 525; J.H. Le Patourel, The Medieval Administration of the Channel Islands, p.73.

5 Ibid., pp.586, 587; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.220.

6 C.C.R. 1337-39 p.221.

was so great that Montagu himself was induced to send out one of his own ships "la cogge Montagu" from Southampton with local levies for a period of at least six months.<sup>1</sup> At the same time John de Roches was once more appointed to take appropriate steps to repel invaders and to raise local levies. All these measures proved entirely without lasting effect. Though the islanders repeatedly petitioned council for aid in their defence,<sup>2</sup> when war actually broke out in 1337 the defences proved completely inadequate. In 1338 Admiral Behuchet invaded the islands and seized control of the castles, which the French successfully held on to until 1340. Jersey was ravaged, and the invaders could not be dislodged from Castle Cornet until 1345.<sup>3</sup>

But by this time Montagu had been superceded in his keepership, despite still having another two years of his five year grant to run, and replaced by Ferrers' brother Thomas,<sup>4</sup> who was invested with power to levy such armed men and infantry forces as he felt necessary for the defence of the islands. This grant, made manifestly to the detriment of Montagu while he was absent in the Low Countries and Germany, was issued secretly and hurriedly, the chancellor being instructed to issue letters to Thomas Ferrers "secrete ita quod pauci scient" since the reigning custodians were likely to be far from pleased.<sup>5</sup> Though during March Montagu had been given an earldom, and Henry Ferrers made a banneret, neither was properly compensated, and this may well have been a contributory factor to the bad feeling between Edward and Montagu in the latter months of 1337.

---

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.208, 337.

2 C49/45/27.

3 J.H. Le Patourel, The Medieval Administration of the Channel Islands, p.62.

4 C.F.R. 1327-37 p.15.

5 SC1/39/54.

iv) Justice of the Forests

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the forests and forest administration were of special importance in government because of their contribution to royal finances. During the following century this declined considerably as governments were able to mobilise far greater resources through direct taxation. 1327 marks the date from which this decline began as that in which the bounds of the forests were confirmed. Edward III fixed forest bounds to those of the perambulations made in the later years of his grandfather's reign, disafforesting such areas which had been returned to forest over the previous twenty-five years. In places the forest charter of 1327 was followed by considerable disafforestation, in other areas, where forest bounds were maintained, administrative efficiency suffered a decline, though the basic administrative structure of an earlier age was nominally retained.<sup>1</sup>

Robert Ufford's keepership of the forests south of Trent marks a transitional phase in this period of decline. Like Clinton in Chester and Dover, Ufford was appointed on 16 December 1330 and held the post for nearly six years.<sup>2</sup> For this he received an annual fee of £100 from the exchequer, chargeable against his farm. His counterpart north of Trent, Ralph Neville, was in receipt of a fee of only 100 marks.<sup>3</sup> By the 1330s the office of Justice was rapidly developing into an hereditary post, providing a profitable income but largely exercised through deputy, though it was no sinecure. Ufford had a lieutenant, Robert de Bousser, and a subordinate official, John de Loudham, whose duties involved keeping the rolls of forest pleas and similar memoranda of the forest administration. Under the Justice and his personally appointed deputies were a large staff of administrative personnel,

---

Charles R. Young, The Royal Forests of Medieval England (Leicester, 1979) pp.147, 151.

E403/259 m1; C62/108 m1; C.F.R. 1327-37 pp.206, 461.

C62/108 m1; C62/111 mm2, 3; C63/112 mm2, 6; E403/259 m5; Select Pleas of the Forest (ed.) G.J. Turner, Selden Society XIII (1899) p.xvi.

ranging from the keepers of individual forests or groups of forests, often men of high standing for whom the appointment was a mark of royal favour, to the woodwards, regarders, agisters and rangers whose duties were to maintain the forest laws and protect the vert and forest beasts within their bailiwicks.<sup>1</sup>

The Justice had general oversight of the exploitation of forest resources. This included gathering the issues raised by rented or assarted lands, the sale of underwood and the fines for minor forest offences. Where disputes over forest boundaries arose, it was the Justice's duty to make suitable enquiries into the respective rights of the crown and crown tenants.

A dispute of this nature concerning the forests in Surrey arose in 1333. The county had been formally disafforested completely in 1327, yet six years later reports that rapid disafforestation was taking place as a result of the king's promise to maintain the perambulations of Edward I, caused the government to order Ufford to preserve the existing boundaries pending enquiry.<sup>2</sup> Where property within the forest bounds was judged to threaten livestock through defect of enclosure, the Justice was empowered to seize and hold lands until such time as its owner could be persuaded to make it safe.<sup>3</sup> Like the Justice of Chester, the Warden of the Forests also acted as escheator with the power to distrain for homage<sup>4</sup> and hold the inquisitions into the extent of private estates within the forest jurisdiction. In April 1332 Ufford granted the Abbey of Waverley permission to assart forty acres of woodland in Drockensfield (Hants) which they had purchased during the previous reign.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Select Pleas of the Forest (ed.) G.J. Turner, Selden Society XIII (1899) p.xv; Nellie Neilson "The Forests" in English Government at Work I, 405.

2 C.C.R. 1333-37 p.72.

3 Ibid., pp.113, 181, 303.

4 C.C.R. 1330-33 p.209; C.C.R. 1333-37 p.172.

5 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.274.

Control of the wood resources of the forest and their effective exploitation for the crown was a major duty of the forest justices. They received royal writs directing the sale of wood, and issued orders to the forest keepers to superintend cutting.<sup>1</sup> Ufford's keepership was marked in July 1332 by a general survey of the available underwood within his bailiwick, with orders to sell such as was available without detriment to the forest, and to enclose cuttings as coppices. Forty acres of hay in Finkley (Hants) were coppiced in November 1332, for which he purchased roughly eighty half acre holdings. Out of this Ufford received £11 profit which he was able to remit to the exchequer.<sup>2</sup> This was followed by a similar survey of the available timber resources in September 1332 from dead trees with orders to sell £200 worth for the crown.<sup>3</sup> One hundred such oaks were cut at his instigation in Woolmer and Alice Holt forests by Edmund Thurstan and Peter atte Merche.<sup>4</sup> Walter Cok and Gilbert Cripps sold twelve acres of underwood in White-wood forest, raising £7 16s, though £1 1s 4d of this was expended on making a coppice of the area so cut.<sup>5</sup> Further coppices were created by sale of underwood in Chute and Woolmer Forests that year, and timber sold in Buckholt in 1333.<sup>6</sup>

Any disputes were set aside for the coming of the forest justices in eyre, theoretically every few years. Before sessions opened, regards were held within each forest to gather reports on assarts made, purprestures, wastes, on the state of mines and forges and on the general condition of the forests.<sup>7</sup> Proceedings of these inquiries were usually held before the justice or his lieutenant, before

---

1 Nellie Neilson, "The Forests", p.405.

2 Ibid., p.430; C.F.R. 1327-37 p.319.

3 Ibid., p.428; C.F.R. 1327-37 pp.319, 327.

4 SC1/51/1.

5 E372/177 rot.37.

6 See E101/139/9; E101/139/17; E101/139/21.

7 Nellie Neilson, "The Forests", p.413.

the eyre began. They proved a convenient means of attaching forest offenders and ensuring their attendance at the eyre. Anyone caught in the act of poaching was imprisoned until the arrival of the next forest eyre unless released on bail by the Justice. Twenty-three such letters of bail issued by Ufford were enrolled for the period of his justiciarship.<sup>1</sup>

Within Ufford's bailiwick eyres were held in Hampshire, Wiltshire and Berkshire in 1330-1331. Ufford himself was appointed as chief justice of the eyre in Hampshire and Wiltshire to replace his predecessor John Maltravers in January and February 1331,<sup>2</sup> with Hugh de Hampslade, Robert de Aspale, and Robert de Robertsbridge. The Hampshire eyre sat until 21 May 1331, that of Wiltshire continued until 1334. Personnel were changed as they died or were otherwise incapacitated from working. Hugh de Hampslade had died by mid-January 1332 when he was replaced by John de Macclesfield; Robert de Aspale was replaced by John de Tichbourne. Later in October 1331 Ufford's lieutenant, Robert Bousser, was associated with these for a period of three months.<sup>3</sup> Macclesfield acted as keeper of the rolls and writs of the eyre, receiving £10 for his expenses.<sup>4</sup> Even by the 1330s however, the eyres were so irregular as to be of little use for efficient forest administration. During the Hampshire eyre of 1330 one case was found to have been pending since 1289, and ninety-six of those indicted had died since the previous eyre in the county.<sup>5</sup> Some cases were dealt with outside the eyres by commission of oyer and terminer. One such commission headed by Ufford was appointed in January 1331 to deal with a complaint by a William de Horewood that Sir Robert de Popham had illegally taken hares from his free warren

---

1 C.C.R. 1330-33; C.C.R. 1333-37 passim.

2 C.P.R. 1330-34 pp.66, 69.

3 Ibid., pp.62, 186, 231, 246, 329.

4 C.C.R. 1330-34 p.444.

5 Charles R. Young, The Royal Forests of Medieval England, p.154.

in Preston Candover (Hants).<sup>1</sup> Three years later a dispute between Henry de Sturmy, warden of Savernak forest, and one of his foresters was dealt with in the same manner. The suit originally appeared before Ufford at the Wiltshire eyre in 1334, where it was decreed that the case should be tried in parliament. When the case came to be heard, however, a petition was presented urging a return to the eyre under Ufford. As a result Edward appointed Ufford to hear the case by special commission of oyer and terminer.<sup>2</sup> Since the forest eyres were so unreliable for the normal course of administration, perhaps not unnaturally there are indications that forest officials were beginning to adopt quasi-judicial powers to compensate for the absence of a regular court of justice, and that from time to time forest offences came before the common law courts. Protests against undue extortions by forest officials found their way before the York parliament of 1334. In reply the king had to order the justices to ensure that foresters were not permitted to be unduly extortionate in seizing livestock which had wandered across forest bounds, or to prevent the king's ministers from carrying out their offices.<sup>3</sup>

(v) Special Commissions

The remaining areas in which the king's knights and magnates were called upon to render public services were of a judicial nature - a miscellany of ad hoc commissions of oyer and terminer, special inquiries, and, in respect of public order, occasional duties as keepers of the peace. It seems most convenient to deal with all these together using such distinctions as existed to illustrate their significance for the careers of Montagu, Bohun, Clinton and Ufford.

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-34 pp.62, 63.

2 Ibid., p.572; Rot. Parl. II, 78, 79. H.C. Bruntnall "Savernak Forest in the Middle Ages" Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 48 (1937-39) pp.382-385; Charles R. Young, The Royal Forests, pp.161-2.

3 C.C.R. 1333-37 pp.307, 308; Charles R. Young, The Royal Forests, p.157; Nellie Neilson, "The Forests", p.421.

The pattern of employment was markedly different for each man, a difference which immediately distinguishes the courtier from the professional public administrator. William Clinton was clearly a man of considerable administrative ability. He was appointed to ten separate commissions of oyer and terminer during the period 1327-1341, all except one in Kent, and to four special commissions ranging from overseeing the array of archers for the projected Irish expedition of 1332, to acting as one of the men chosen to survey the state of Ponthieu during 1334, as well as being required to act as a keeper of the peace on three further occasions.

Robert Ufford was likewise active in local administration. He was appointed three times as a commissioner of the peace in Norfolk and Suffolk, and acted as a special commissioner on five other occasions during the same period, mainly on military matters, and as a justice of oyer and terminer on four separate occasions in various counties. By contrast, William Bohun was only once employed in an administrative capacity before 1342, and that in January 1341 as one of the few magnates still retaining the king's full confidence. He was appointed in the counties of Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire to receive indictments and take action against ministers of the late regency government.<sup>1</sup> William Montagu was employed as a justice of oyer and terminer on only three occasions and only once appointed as a keeper of the peace. He was also once commissioned to oversee the array in Somerset. The infrequency with which they were employed in this capacity indicates that neither Montagu nor Bohun spent much time on their estates and that they were less concerned with local politics than with national affairs.

Despite the obvious differences, service on judicial commission would not take up more than a tiny proportion of the time and interests of any of these men.

---

1 C.C.R. 1341-43 p.20.

A closer study of keepers of the peace during the period 1327-1341 serves to illustrate in what light such commissions were regarded by them. Few magnates were employed on commissions of this nature with any regularity. The greater magnates and the more important justices rarely acted in this capacity. There is a clear distinction with Montagu, Clinton, Bohun and Ufford before and after 1337 when they became earls, and none of them was appointed to peace commission after the end of 1336. Appointments to judicial commissions and commissions of the peace in particular reflect contemporary attitudes to the keepers of the peace who during this important decade 1327-1336 came under a series of attacks aimed at weakening their authority and narrowing the keeper's area of competence solely to that of making inquisitions, receiving indictments and acting as a focus for royal judicial authority within the communities. The power to arrest on notorious suspicion and to determine cases, in practice widely used during the previous reign, was denied them by statute in 1327 and rarely admitted during the decade following.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the judicial expertise of the justice and the political weight of the great magnates were rarely required for what were little more than policing duties. Commissions of appointment were usually issued to local landowners from among the small group who were employed almost by rota for the multitude of administrative tasks within the counties ranging from tax assessment to the shrievalty.<sup>2</sup> Without power of determination and with no financial role, the office of keeper of the peace was considered of little national importance and was rarely subject to political rivalries, except perhaps briefly during the ascendancy of Mortimer.<sup>3</sup>

- 
- 1 Bertha Haven Putnam, "Shire Officials: Keepers of the Peace and Justices of the Peace", English Government at Work III, 185, 186.
  - 2 Bertha Haven Putnam, Proceedings Before the Justices of the Peace in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, Ames Foundation, (London, 1930, p.lxxx; Bertha Haven Putnam, "The Transformation of the Keepers of the Peace into the Justices of the Peace 1327-1380", T.R.H.S. 4th Series XII (1929) pp.19-48.
  - 3 Nigel Saul, Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century (Oxford, 1981) p.131.

Magnate authority was particularly associated with the keepers as heads of the commissions of the peace which were issued in the spring of 1332, and it is during this period that Montagu's only appointment and both of Clinton's other commissions were issued. The problem of maintaining the peace had grown by the autumn of 1331 and was one of the main concerns of the parliament which met at Westminster that September. The following February new commissions were issued endowing keepers with the power of determining as well as the authority to arrest on suspicion.<sup>1</sup> Separate commissions for most of the counties of England were issued on 12 February to include three earls and many powerful magnates. As well as Clinton who headed the commission in Kent, eight of the king's knights and bannerets were involved.<sup>2</sup> In fact these commissions barely lasted a month. Geoffrey le Scrope who had shown himself consistently opposed to granting such extensive powers to ordinary keepers of the peace, took a leading part in the March parliament at Westminster in transferring powers of arrest and determination to 'de pluz grantz'. Commissions of the peace were therefore reissued on 21 and 23 March in effect enlarging many of the commissions and replacing some heads by even more powerful individuals.<sup>3</sup> Montagu replaced the chief commissioner in Somerset.<sup>4</sup>

These commissions were exceptional. More usually lesser magnates and knights, who dominated shire politics but rarely attended court, predominated.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps typical were the early commissions of the peace to which Robert Ufford was appointed. As early as November 1327 he was made keeper of the peace in Norfolk, but as subordinate to the earl of Norfolk.<sup>6</sup> Again during the summer months of 1331 he was

---

1 Bertha Haven Putnam "Shire Officials" p.191.

2 C.P.R. 1330-34 pp.285-288.

3 Bertha Haven Putnam "Shire Officials" pp.192, 193.

4 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.294.

5 Nigel Saul Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century, p.156.

6 C.P.R. 1327-30 p.214.

appointed to two commissions in his native counties, as one of a group of minor magnates, friends and retainers with influence in East Englia.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, though many magnate names were occasionally applied to judicial commissions, these men rarely acted. There is no evidence that Montagu, Bohun, Clinton or Ufford ever acted on any of the commissions of the peace to which they were appointed, and this may well have been the case with commissions of oyer and terminer and other special commissions. Ufford almost certainly did not act on either of the commissions to which he was appointed in 1331. By a previous commission of 8 May 1331 John Stonor and John Canterbrigge were appointed within Norfolk and Suffolk, and though superceded by later commissions, they held sessions alone throughout June and July.<sup>2</sup> No similar rolls have come to light for the commissions of 1332 to which Clinton and Montagu were appointed, but they are unlikely to have sat. Clinton was appointed as envoy to France during the same parliament in March 1332 as that in which he was made a commissioner of the peace, and he left England on 22 April not to return until the beginning of June.<sup>3</sup> Similarly in October 1336 Clinton was appointed to head another commission in Kent with Ralph Savage, Thomas de Aledon, John de Hampton and William Reculvre, the latter four are known from the surviving roll to have acted while Clinton did not, perhaps due to an illness he had suffered during the summer.<sup>4</sup> He was certainly unable to act during the spring of 1337 while he was working in the Low Countries. Failure by magnates to fulfill commissions was a subject for frequent complaints in the century, the commons protesting that the burden fell on those without sufficient wealth to support it.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.144.

2 Bertha Haven Putnam "Shire Officials" p.200.

3 E372/177 rot. 40.

4 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.370; Bertha Haven Putnam "Shire Officials" p.201.

5 Bertha Haven Putnam Proceedings p.lxxix.

Public service, while it did not consume an inordinate amount of time, was nevertheless fairly arduous and did not offer the compensation of financial profit. Judicial duties in local government, like most other posts, were unpaid, and though the opportunities for corruption might be enormous, ordinary perquisites were small. During the latter part of Edward III's reign a number of petitions by the commons for regular payment of keepers of the peace testifies to a strong desire by the local communities to establish the keepers on a firmer basis in the counties,<sup>1</sup> but there is little evidence of keepers being paid until after re-organisation of the system by Sharesull in 1349-1351.<sup>2</sup> Until the right of Justices to determine cases themselves was established in 1338, this was not possible. Interestingly, the only commission to which Bohun was appointed was a paid one. It was believed that only by payment of justices could the king expect a full and rigorous enquiry into the maladministration of the regency council in 1341, and a special salary scale was worked out which promised 2 marks per day to each magnate on the commissions, 1l to barons, 1 mark to each banneret, ½ mark to knights and 5s to sergeants.<sup>3</sup>

But the appointment of men like Clinton and Ufford to judicial commissions was clearly not simply a dead letter. Clinton in the course of the autumn of 1331 and during 1332 sat on a series of oyer and terminer commissions in Kent. Money for this was delivered to him from the exchequer, and six years later remitted him completely in consideration of his expenses in carrying out the commissions.<sup>4</sup>

Where they did not act in person, magnates still remained closely in contact with the other commissioners. During the 1330s commissions were issued in a

1 Rot. Parl. II 141, 201, 376; Bertha Haven Putnam, Proceedings p.lxxix.

2 Bertha Haven Putnam, The Place in Legal History of Sir William Sharesull, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, 1350-1361 (Cambridge, 1950).

3 C.C.R. 1341-43 p.20.

4 C.P.R. 1330-34 pp.219, 243, 330, 426; C.C.R. 1330-33, pp.425, 532; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.237.

manner sporadic enough to suggest that they were probably due to external pressure, either from the communities or by powerful individuals. Not infrequently two or more commissions overlapped and not even the officers of the council by whom keepers and justices were appointed always knew exactly who was acting.<sup>1</sup> The inclusion of Clinton on a peace commission in Kent was as likely to stem from popular clamour as from policy by the government. The decade 1327-1336 was one of continuing dialogue between government and local communities not only over the nature of commissions of the peace, but also over the right of appointment, a point which was conceded to the local communities partially in 1338, though in effect the real choice still remained with the government.<sup>2</sup>

Association with commissions was nevertheless a chance not to be missed. Where they did not act themselves they undoubtedly did so indirectly through their retainers. Thereby the magnate might not only save himself the trouble of a tedious job, but gain substantially by providing patronage for his men. Where deputies were appointed to act in the names of their lords little evidence remains. Just as frequently, however, retainers acted in conjunction with lords or were appointed in their own right as commissioners. Many names of obscure men appointed as commissioners of the peace may be explained by recourse to their political affiliations. The strength of the social web created by the ties between lords and their retainers within each county was such that it would be surprising if there were not a high proportion of keepers and other commissioners who were retainers of one or other of their fellow commissioners. In Suffolk in 1338 the web spun by Thomas, earl of Norfolk, Robert Ufford and his two sons-in-laws, Robert Scales and John de St. Philibert were so strong that justices complained that they were unable even to empanel a jury which was not heavily biased

---

1 Bertha Haven Putnam "Shire Officials" p.202.

2 Bertha Haven Putnam "The Transformation of the Keepers of the Peace into the Justices of the Peace, 1327-1380", T.R.H.S. 4th Series XII (1929) pp.35-6.

to the existing political balance within the county.<sup>1</sup> Many names of unknown men prove to be stewards of more powerful magnates. John de Mere, Montagu's steward, acted as one of the commissioners of oyer and terminer in the West Country in 1334.<sup>2</sup>

The first point of note when making general remarks about the role of the king's bannerets in local administration is the limited range of posts to which men like Clinton and his fellow bannerets were appointed. Where they were inserted into the structure of local government, it was primarily to positions of a military nature. It was principally as constable of the castles of Chester, Rhuddlan, Flint and Beeston, with power to levy troops from the Palatinate, that Clinton was appointed Justice of Chester, though in the event there was little call on the military resources of the county during the period of his Justiciarship. More obviously, the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports consisted first and foremost the Constabulary of Dover, including charge of the castle garrison and responsibility for the defence of a large stretch of the south eastern coastline. His military authority within the southern counties was reinforced in 1338 when the constable was also made a commissioner of array and further strengthened in 1340 when he was appointed Admiral of the Fleet. Similarly, William Montagu's keepership of the Channel Islands between 1334 and 1337 rested chiefly on his undertaking to guard the islands from foreign invasion and to ensure that the castles were properly garrisoned.

---

1 George A. Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility, p.82.

2 C.P.R. 1330-34 p.140; C.P.R. 1345-48 p.140.

The custody of royal castles in areas of strategic importance was one of the most regular functions of the king's knights and bannerets, though it was a duty which was most frequently carried out by deputy in the case of the most powerful knights. Mention has already been made of Montagu's custody of Wark on Tweed.<sup>1</sup> During the course of 1330 the castles of Corfe and Sherbourne in Dorset and Caerphilly in Wales were also committed to Montagu. For Caerphilly he received an annual fee of 100 marks from the issues of the castle and the land of Senghenyth. Corfe became the focus for a number of invasion threats by the French after 1337, particularly in March 1339. After Salisbury had been captured in 1340 it was taken out of his hands and committed to one of the king's yeomen, Thomas Cary, the sheriff of Somerset and Dorset.<sup>2</sup>

Of secondary importance was the judicial role of the king's bannerets, representing the king's authority within areas of peculiar jurisdiction outside the normal competence of the common law: within the royal forests, the Palatinate county of Chester and the Cinque Ports' liberties. From time to time they also acted as special justices of oyer and terminer or as keepers of the peace, at least in name. These commissions were infrequent, and magnates appointed usually chose to act through their retainers rather than appear in person. A position at court would keep them too fully occupied to act personally in such a capacity.

Another feature which stands out is the small circle of men who at any one time would be chosen to fill such posts. William Clinton's immediate predecessor at Dover was Bartholemew Burghersh. In 1331 Burghersh was appointed Steward of Montreuil, which he held for the next four years. In October 1335 he replaced Robert Ufford as keeper of the forests south of Trent, and in 1343 exchanged this

---

1 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.386, 392.

2 C.F.R. 1327-37 pp.164, 211; C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.528, 568; C.P.R. 1338-40 p.521; C.C.R. 1339-42 p.56.

post once more for the wardenship of the Cinque Ports.<sup>1</sup> At the same time the earl of Huntingdon assumed his position as Justice of the forests.<sup>2</sup> One of Montagu's predecessors in the Channel Islands, Thomas Wake, held the islands from 1331 following a period of eighteen months as keeper of the forests south of Trent. Henry Ferrers passed from the Channel Islands to the Judiciary of Chester in 1336 and held the post until his death in 1343, when he was succeeded at Chester by his brother Thomas, also promoted from the Channel Islands.<sup>3</sup> Ralph Neville and his close associate lord Henry Percy tended to dominate local administration in the north, serving on many commissions of the peace in Yorkshire, while Neville himself held the keepership of the forests north of Trent from July 1331.<sup>4</sup> The post of Justice of Chester in particular was dominated by household bannerets from Guncelin Badlesmere in 1277; Richard Damory as steward of the household held the position in 1325, as did Henry Ferrers as chamberlain between 1337 and 1340.<sup>5</sup> With such attendance on court few of these men would have undertaken their duties in person.

Many of the comments made in respect of diplomatic agents are pertinent to other areas of administration. Firstly, the fourteenth century saw an increase in the number of powerful magnates willing to participate in a wider range of administrative posts, and as a consequence the eventual decline of the higher commissions into little more than lucrative sinecures. The younger Bartholemew Burghersh was treating the Justiciary of Chester and the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports in this manner in the 1350s.<sup>6</sup> William Montagu and Henry Ferrers viewed the

1 C.F.R. 1327-37 pp.291, 434, 461; C.C.R. 1330-34 p.402.

2 Nellie Neilson, "The Forests", p.405; G.J. Turner, "The Justices of the Forest South of Trent", E.H.R. XVIII (1903) p.114.

3 P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration pp.61-62; C.F.R. 1327-37 p.15.

4 Bertha Haven Putnam (ed.) "Yorkshire Sessions of the Peace, 1361-1364", The Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, Vol.C (1939) p.xliiii; Nellie Neilson, "The Forests", p.404.

5 P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration, pp.56, 59, 61.

6 K.M.E. Murray, The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports, p.89; P.H.W. Booth, Financial Administration, p.65.

Channel Islands in the same light in the 1330s. Posts of this nature were regarded as conferring status either in terms of the resources which they enabled the holder to utilise, or because representing the king's government increased their own personal authority, making them men of special influence in the country. Constant service brought its own rewards, in terms of wealth, honour and opportunities for promotion.

Greed for personal advance spurred on some, others were motivated by enthusiasm and energy. This latter attitude was recognised and fostered among the close community of the king's military household. Zeal in pursuit of the royal service was encouraged and rewarded. In October to December 1330 this becomes especially noticeable. After the coup at Nottingham in which the earl of March was arrested, Edward made a clean sweep of the earl's chief supporters, depriving Oliver Ingham of the Justiciary of Chester and arresting him, though later he was pardoned and released. John Maltravers was displaced from the keepership of the southern forests and fled into exile. It was out of a sense of gratitude for their participation in this revolution that Edward appointed Ufford to fill Maltravers position, and placed Clinton at Chester and then in Dover, and in May 1331 appointed Neville as keeper of the forests in the northern counties.

Among the king's bannerets, Robert Ufford and William Clinton stand out as the men with the greatest administrative ability, undertaking more posts than many of their fellow magnates, After 1337 it is significantly Clinton who continued at Dover as Warden. He later assumed the post of Justice of the Forest south of Trent. Furthermore, in 1351 he was appointed to the custody of Calais. Robert Ufford acted as a commissioner of array in Norfolk and Suffolk in May 1351 and again in June 1352. Both were men of relatively small resources, who

remained closely associated with the basis of their landed authority - Clinton in Kent, Ufford in East Anglia.

Government service could be demanding; it was also lucrative. Nevertheless, the king's agents could never refuse to take on tasks for which they were appointed, without rousing the king's anger and ruining their own careers, as is illustrated by the fate of Richard Pembridge, who in 1372 refused to go to Ireland.<sup>1</sup> But refusal of responsibility was never attempted by Edward's knights and bannerets in this period. They were wholly reliable and tirelessly energetic in all aspects of the king's service.

---

1 C.J. Given-Wilson, The Court and Household of Edward III 1360-1377 (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, St. Andrews University, 1975) p.139.

## 6. THE CREATION OF THE EARLDOMS, MARCH 1337

The culmination of at least seven years' active service to the crown in every sphere of government by William Bohun, William Montagu, Robert Ufford and William Clinton came in March 1337, when all four men were elevated to earldoms. Loyal support to the king as diplomats, royal councillors and administrative agents was recognised and rewarded as it had not been, probably since the days of Henry I.<sup>1</sup> Comital dignity was seen as the natural reward for long and devoted service; Edward III showed that he fully realised the value of their unique contribution to government and honoured them in the belief that their loyalty would set an example to their contemporaries, and that he might expect even greater services from them in the future. Above all were emphasised their duties as military commanders. Edward expected a certain return for his generosity in the form of immediate military backing and in the future service of the new earls and their descendents.

The peerage creations of March 1337 should be seen primarily in the context of Edward III's military preparations for war with France.<sup>2</sup> English forces had been campaigning in Scotland from the summer of 1336, but action by Philip VI during the spring of 1336 in transferring the crusading fleet from the Mediterranean to the ports of Normandy seems to have convinced Edward that conflict with the French was inevitable, and this feeling grew as the Scottish campaign progressed.<sup>3</sup> In December Edward therefore disbanded the majority of his forces and returned to England.<sup>4</sup>

- 
- 1 J.O. Prestwich, "The Military Household of the Norman Kings", E.H.R. XLVI (1981) p.23.
  - 2 E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War" in Historical Studies of the English Parliament I, p.244.
  - 3 H. Ellis, Original Letters Illustrative of English History I no.XVIII; Kenneth Fowler, The King's Lieutenant, p.33.
  - 4 Nero C.VIII fols. 242r-243v.

A further cause for general concern was the sudden and unexpected death of the king's brother, John, earl of Cornwall on 13 September 1336,<sup>1</sup> thus depleting the number of active English earls to only five.<sup>2</sup> His brother's death also deprived Edward of a chief of command in Scotland, and, since this was probably already in his mind, an obvious candidate for regent in England should Edward lead his forces overseas. It also left a substantial block of lands at the crown's disposal. The earl's body remained at Perth where he died,<sup>3</sup> until the royal forces gathered in Berwick at the beginning of December prior to being officially disbanded. The king and his personal entourage from Berwick left Scotland on 15 December for Hatfield where the court gathered to spend Christmas,<sup>4</sup> presumably taking the earl's body with them. The funeral ceremonies were celebrated in London at St. Pauls and Westminster during the second week in January 1337,<sup>5</sup> and immediately afterwards final summons were sent out assembling a parliament to meet in Westminster on 3 March.<sup>6</sup> When the last set of summons were

1 Scottish sources, notably Fordun, claim that Edward murdered his brother in a fit of anger, but there is no hint of this story in any English sources, with the sole exception of John of Reading.

2 The earls of Norfolk, Oxford, Surrey, Arundel and Warwick. Henry, earl of Lancaster and Leicester and Hugh, earl of Devon were both almost blind, and Humphrey de Bohun who had just succeeded his brother John as earl of Hereford and Essex was in constant bad health. John de Bretagne, earl of Richmond resided permanently overseas, and the heir to the vacant Kentish earldom was only six years old. In addition Hugh de Frene, acting on behalf of his wife as earl of Lincoln died in December 1336.

3 Nero C.VIII fols.206r, 277v where the body was dressed by the apothecary of the earl of Montagu. The entry is wrongly dated 11 September.

4 E101/387/19. About this time the king's second son William of Hatfield was born, was baptised by William Melton, Archbishop of York, but died almost immediately afterwards and was buried in York Minster. Chron. Bridlington in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Vol.II, R.S. (ed.) W. Stubbs, pp.128-129.

5 Annales Paulini in Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, R.S. (ed.) W. Stubbs, p.365; Adae Murimuth, p.78.

6 R.D.P. IV, 464-473; C.C.R. 1337-39, 113-14; T.F. Tout, Chapters III, p.62 n.1. It was first summoned to York for 13 January.

sent out from the Tower on 14 January, the king explained that the chief purpose in calling parliament was to deal with the defence of the realm, and that the venue had been altered in order to sit closer to the point of danger. The court then departed on a brief tour of the midland counties before settling in the Tower on 25 February in preparation for the forthcoming session.<sup>1</sup>

The four household bannerets who were to become the focus for attention in this parliament were only loosely attendant on court during this period. William Montagu left Berwick shortly after the royal party on the 18 December and presumably spent Christmas at court.<sup>2</sup> William Bohun disbanded his troops five days before the king left Berwick, and though his subsequent movements are unknown he is likely also to have spent the Christmas feast at court.<sup>3</sup> Robert Ufford was left behind in Scotland to organise the defence of certain strategic castles in the absence of a field army, and from 3 January to 24 March 1337 he was occupied in fortifying Bothwell castle.<sup>4</sup> He was, however, back in England by the time that the garrison of Bothwell surrendered to the Scots in exchange for safe conducts to England.<sup>5</sup> William Clinton was not in Scotland during 1336 but was engaged on duties on the south coast in his capacity as Constable of Dover. All gathered in London at the beginning of March for the opening of parliament. At the last minute the court transferred across the city from the Tower to Westminster palace before the opening ceremonies on the 2 March.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 E101/387/19; E101/388/2; Nero C.VIII fol.263r. While on the road they were entertained by the services of a minstrel of John Pulteney who appears to be ingratiating himself with the king at this time.

2 Nero C.VIII fol.241r.

3 Nero C.VIII fol.241v.

4 Possibly Robert de Scales who joined Ufford with a force of seventeen men at arms in mid-January.

5 Chronicon de Lanercost p.288 says this was while Ufford was absent.

6 E101/388/2 states that parliament opened on 2 March.

When parliament opened properly on Monday 3 March it was before a summoned assembly of nineteen bishops and archbishops, thirty-two abbots, ten earls, forty-eight magnates and fourteen clerks and other officials,<sup>1</sup> as well as community representatives. No account has survived of the business which occupied this body from 3 March to 16 March, but it is clear that an important part of its time was devoted to the French threat. Surviving diplomatic correspondence of about this period shows how deeply aware were the English of the dangers facing the country from any projected trip overseas by the king. Concern centred on the problem of Scottish involvement: the two questions were inseparable. On 28 January safe conducts had been issued for the simultaneous arrival of envoys from France and Scotland.<sup>2</sup> Until the alliance between the French and the Scots was broken, Edward was ill-advised to leave England.<sup>3</sup> The arguments both for and against the king leaving the country were carefully weighed by members of the council with the advice of expert diplomats and legists.<sup>4</sup> A feeling was expressed that at the very least Edward should do his utmost to keep open all possible lines of communication. Special attention was paid to the examples set by the king's grandfather in dealing with a similar situation in 1305-6.<sup>5</sup> The idea was toyed with of utilising the concern of the English people by urging the local communities to appeal to the Pope for aid and a draft document was even drawn up by the city of London, though it was never despatched.<sup>6</sup> As a result of discussion in this

---

1 R.D.P. IV, 464. William Bohun, Hugh Audley and Henry of Lancaster did not receive summons, presumably as they were with the king at the time. The bishoprics of Norwich and Ely were both vacant.

2 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.380-81; James Campbell, "England, Scotland and the Hundred Years War in the Fourteenth Century" in Europe in the Late Middle Ages (eds.) J.R.Hale J.R.L. Highfield and B. Smalley (London, 1965) p.195.

3 C47/File 28/5 nos. 39, 41, 42; C47/File 30/7 no.13.

4 i.e. the official of Canterbury, Alexander de Biknor and Elias de Johnstone. For Johnstone see Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration pp.25-44. For Adam Murimuth termed the officer of the court of Canterbury see Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty I, Selden Society VI (1892) p.xxxiii.

5 C47/File 30/7 no.9.

6 C47/File 30/7 nos.15-17.

parliament a number of important embassies were sent out all over the continent. Batholemeu Bardi was given safe conduct to go overseas in the king's service on 4 March.<sup>1</sup> Soliciting further aid from Spain was mooted, especially through alliance with the king of Castile.<sup>2</sup> Above all the council was anxious to keep open the processes of Montreuil and Perigord, though Alexander Bicknor later expressed his personal fears that Edward might in fact have forfeited his right to do so by his warmongering activities.<sup>3</sup> The bishop of Lincoln was sent out to Aquitaine as the parliament closed to see to its defences.<sup>4</sup> But the major decision taken in parliament concerned the adoption of a strategy based on Edward I's system of Flemish alliances, which in affect committed the country to undertaking military action on the continent<sup>5</sup> to be headed by five important members of the king's military household, chief of these being two of the newly created earls, Salisbury and Huntingdon. Edward was demanding immediate service from his new earls.

To finance this "coalition policy" vast resources of money not available from ordinary sources of revenue were required. So council raised the notion of utilising the chief natural product of the realm. An embargo was placed on the export of wool in order to force up its price on foreign markets. Restricted sale could then be allowed to the king's allies and creditors in the Netherlands. Accordingly prohibition on the export of wool was enacted and corresponding injunctions issued confining cloth manufacture to England. To encourage production

- 
- 1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.382.
  - 2 C47/File 28/5 no.39. 11 March protections were issued to Peter de Arreys and Berenger Calderun who were going overseas for the king; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.390.
  - 3 C47/File 30/6 nos. 2-6; C47/File 30/7 no.12.
  - 4 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.403.
  - 5 E. Deprez, Les Preliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans, p.418 prints a letter by Edward III claiming that this decision was taken in parliament. E.B. Fryde, "Parliament and the French War", p.245. Otto, lord of Cuijk, one of Edward's allies in the Low Countries was promised that his debts would be repaid.

cloth workers were granted special privileges. As a corollary, sumptuary laws were also enacted forbidding the use of foreign cloth by anyone who did not possess at least £100 in annual rents.<sup>1</sup>

Only four surviving petitions are enrolled on the parliament roll for this period, and they are of little significance nationally.<sup>2</sup> Some interest in the maintenance of public order was as always expressed. On 19 March Constantine de Mortimer was appointed to survey the household of the earl of Norfolk, and Ralph de Boking, the earl's steward, was instructed to reduce the number of feed retainers on the earl's household list to those authorised by Mortimer.<sup>3</sup>

But the most spectacular moment in parliament occurred on the closing day. On Sunday 16 March Edward formally, in a public ceremony at Westminster, created his son, the six-year-old prince Edward, Duke of Cornwall, investing him with the estates of the old earldom of Cornwall so recently acquired from his brother John.<sup>4</sup> The young Duke was given the right of appointing sheriffs in the county of Cornwall, and endowed with various other lands. In the same way as the county of Chester was entailed, the Duke's appanage was to descend to the eldest sons of the Duke's heirs "such heirs being kings of England"<sup>5</sup> so that the duchy was in effect annexed permanently to the crown of England.

---

1 Murimuth p.78, though we are told that this was entirely without effect.

2 Rot. Parl. II p.96; E.B. Fryde "Parliament and the French War", p.242 believes that the petition published by H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles in Rotuli Parliamentorum Hactenus Inediti MCLXXIX . MCCCLXIII (Camden Society) 3rd Series, LI (1935) pp.268-272, under 1339 belongs to this parliament, but this seems very unlikely.

3 C49/File 7/4; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.434.

4 Or did he? G.E.C. III, 435 mentions the date as 3 March, citing Rot. Parl. IV (1406) ?recte III (1406) or IV (1416), and charter roll 11 Edward III, arguing that the charter enrollment endowing the duke with heritable lands and dated 17 March speaks of the title as having been conferred at an earlier date. But there is no reason why this should not have been done on the previous day.

5 J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, The House of Lords in the Middle Ages. A History of the House of Lords to 1540 (London, 1968) p.327.

In creating the first duchy in English history Edward was well aware that he was creating a precedent, though he claimed that Cornwall formed an ancient patrimony "over which in past ages Dukes have successively presided."<sup>1</sup> It has been suggested that the title was in some way connected with Edward's relinquishing his own ducal title to Aquitaine in favour of a higher claim to the French throne.<sup>2</sup> It may be that Edward already had in mind to go abroad and appoint his young son titular head of a regency council, leaving the country under the governance of one whose title equalled that of the son of the de facto king of France, who was Duke of Normandy. Whatever the reason, it was not an act in isolation. Within a few years, Reginald of Guelders was elevated to a dukedom by the Emperor, and William count of Julich was made a marquis.

On the same day Henry of Lancaster and William Bohun, the king's cousins, were made earls of Derby and Northampton. William Clinton, William Montagu and Robert Ufford were given the respective titles of Huntingdon, Salisbury and Suffolk, and Hugh Audley, who was married to the second of the three Clare heiresses, and in possession of a large portion of the Gloucester-Hertford estates, was created in his own right earl of Gloucester.<sup>3</sup> All six men had close connections with the royal household. Henry of Lancaster had been a squire in the household under Mortimer and Isabella, and though he seems to have left the household lists soon after the fall of Mortimer, when he assumed the active headship of the Lancaster lordship, he remained closely attached to the court and fought in Scotland alongside the king's bannerets regularly from 1333. Hugh Audley had also been a member of the military household, and had fought in Scotland in 1335. The household connections are important. It is clear that Edward made a more or less arbitrary decision to elevate his bannerets to peerage status and raise men from the lower

---

1 J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, The House of Lords in the Middle Ages. A History of the House of Lords to 1540 (London, 1968) p.327.

2 Ibid. The title was formally claimed on 7 October 1337. E. Deprez, Les Preliminaires, pp.171-172.

3 Michael Altschul, A Baronial Family in Medieval England: The Clares, 1217-1314, pp.74, 165.

ranks correspondingly to fill the gaps created. Clinton, Montagu, Bohun and Ufford were honoured in this singular manner as the four chief members of the royal household. Prior to the winter of 1335-36 there had been seven bannerets, but then Ralph Neville, Roger Swinnerton and Gilbert Talbot all left the household permanently, and their departure seems to have been the only reason for their exclusion from the king's liberality of March 1337.<sup>1</sup>

Edward's reasoning is made clear in the lengthy preamble to the charters endowing the new earls of Huntingdon and Gloucester:

Among the marks of royalty we consider it to be the chief that through a due distribution of positions, dignities and offices, it is buttressed by wise counsels and fortified by mighty powers. Yet because many hereditary ranks have come into the hands of the king, partly by hereditary descent to coheirs and co-parceners according to our laws and partly through failure of issue and other events, this realm has long suffered a serious decline in the names, honours and ranks of dignity.<sup>2</sup>

It was in effect an attempt to strengthen Edward's own position by surrounding himself with grateful servants who shared his attitudes with regard to the forthcoming conflict with France. Edward thus trusted to increase his own status and ensure the better governance of the realm in the interests of peace by raising the military might of his most loyal subjects.<sup>3</sup> It was also an opportunity to reward friendship as is clear from the very different wording of the charter in favour of William Montagu:

Considerantes eciam inter alios quos in comites diversorum locorum disposivimus, promovendas probitatem, strenuam, et providencian circumspectatam et geminatam morum et generis claritatem delicti et fidelis nostri Willelmi de Monte Acuto

1 They were not with the king overseas in 1338-40. Neville with Clinton was certainly involved in the regency council during this period, and Thomas Swinnerton was with the king as a knight 1338-1340. Neither Swinnerton nor Talbot fought in Scotland in 1336 as household men and probably not by themselves either. Neville did fight in 1336. Swinnerton fought in Scotland in 1337, though Talbot did not. Audley, by contrast, did not fight in Scotland in 1336, though he did fight in 1335 and 1337.

2 R.D.P. V pp.27-29; J.E. Powell and K. Wallis The House of Lords p.326.

3 "...alie eciam terra nostro subiecte domino contra hostium et adversariorum conatus securius et decencius defensari paxque nostra inter nostros ubique subdidos conservari illesa poterunt...C53/124 m25 (Charters in favour of Robert Ufford and William Bohun).

necnon labores sumptus et pericula quibus pro nobis et nostris semper in oportunitatibus prova promptitudine se submitit ... de comitatu Sarum cingendo sibi gladium investivimus...<sup>1</sup>

For this unprecedented piece of generosity Edward III was at pains to win popular support. Charters and grants were carefully endorsed by the consent of "the prelates, magnates and whole council in parliament",<sup>2</sup> presumably because whereas Audley in right of his wife and Lancaster as his father's representative both had good claims to assume the title to earldoms whose authority they were exercising as a matter of course, Montagu, Clinton, Ufford and Bohun had no such claims.<sup>3</sup> It has been advanced that such earldoms as are justified in feudal law are in the crown to give of its own power, whereas completely new creations required wider consent so as not to be subject to future dispute.<sup>4</sup>

Edward would have had in mind the pattern of his father's attempts to endow friends and followers. The lords Ordainer in 1311 laid heavy emphasis on prohibiting the king from making gifts "without the assent of the baronage, and that in parliament." Edward II had in fact made only three new earldoms outside the immediate royal family, and two at least of these roused feelings of violent opposition. At the time when Gaveston was made earl of Cornwall, opinion was strongly divided over whether the title could be granted outside the royal family in this way, and the majority of the barons objected. Eventually the earl of Warwick in collusion with the earls of Lancaster and Pembroke took it upon themselves to rid the country of Gaveston for good by secretly executing him. In 1322, in the wake of a spate

---

1 C53/124 m26.

2 Duke of Cornwall: "By king and council in parliament"; Montagu: "By king and all the council in parliament"; Clinton: "By king and concil in full parliament". By contrast, the charters in favour of the earls of Derby and Gloucester are simply endorsed "By king". Cal. Cha. Rolls IV, 390, 399-401, 403.

3 It seems that William Bohun was not yet seen as exercising the authority of his brother's earldoms of Hereford and Essex. The Constablership of England was not delegated to him until 1338.

4 Sir Geoffrey Ellis, Earldoms in Fee. A Study in Peerage Law and History (London, 1963) p.48 n.4 discusses this point.

of executions and attainures after the battle of Boroughbridge, the elder Hugh Despenser was granted the title of earl of Winchester, while Andrew Harcla, the sheriff of Cumberland who had personally defeated Thomas of Lancaster, was created earl of Carlisle. Harcla barely survived a year in his new dignity before being seized and executed for treasonable correspondence with the Scots. The elder Despenser continued to rule the country with his son until his execution in 1326, their growing greed and ambition attracting more and more hatred. Roger Mortimer's self elevation to the earldom of March in 1328 aroused equal disgust among contemporaries who balked at the novelty of his title, the scale of his ambition, and the means he employed to obtain it. Many magnates were absent from the Salisbury parliament at which the title was conferred, and it was said later that Mortimer bullied and threatened those present so that they were unable to express their opinion freely.<sup>1</sup>

That Edward was wise to seek the approval of his chief magnates in creating new peerage titles is shown by a petition of protest sent by the bishop of Exeter, John Grandisson, within a few days of these events. The bishop was in fact principally concerned by a writ he had received ordering him to be intendant on the Duke of Cornwall for the temporalities of the bishopric of Devon as parcel of the Duchy. He accepted the king's right in general to create new titles "il semble maisque nostre seigneur le Roi de son Roial poer puisse de novel faire Ducs et countes et ordenir Duchiez et countiez, et de les departir a son volente quieles puissent estre forfeites et returnir a lui et a ses heirs" but objected in particular to attempts to confuse the temporalities of a bishopric with the estates of an earldom or duchy, since a bishopric, founded in pure and perpetual alms and by the authority of Rome, could not be forfeited or altered without damage to the Pope and perjury of the king's coronation oath. For, as Grandisson

---

1 Rot. Parl. II, 52-53.

believed, "la substance de la nature de la corone est principalement en la persone du Roi come teste, et en les pieres de la terre come membres qui tenent de lui par certeyn homage, et nomement des prelates..."<sup>1</sup>

Edward III, by associating his own interests with those of the established nobility, effectually won national support for his personal policies and reversed the two hundred year trend of dwindling numbers in the hereditary peerage. Since the reign of king Stephen, when two contending candidates existed for many of the titles, kings had been reluctant to make new earldoms. In the thirteenth century there were only two titles created: de Quincy as earl of Winchester in 1207, and twenty years later Hubert de Burgh was made earl of Kent on his marriage with Margaret of Scotland.<sup>2</sup> Henry III created no other titles outside the royal family; nor did Edward I, who indeed seems to have pursued a policy of annexing many earldoms to the crown.<sup>3</sup> Though Edward II was not so parsimonious with peerage creations, his choice of beneficiaries proved singularly unfortunate.<sup>4</sup>

The magnates were very sensitive on any issues which might be held to derogate their position as "pares Regis". At the trial of Roger Mortimer it was frequently stated that Mortimer had been so greedy for power that he had deprived the young Edward III of the counsel of his natural advisers, and unanimously declared that he should therefore be condemned to death as a traitor. But the magnates were uncertain about condemning Simon Bereford in the same way, because he was not a peer of the realm, and they begged that delivery of judgement on their

---

1 The Register of John de Grandisson, Volume III, Exeter Episcopal Registers, (ed.) F.C. Hingeston Randolph, p.840.

2 1189 the bishop of Durham was given the earldom of Northumberland, but it was obvious that this would revert to the crown within a few years.

3 K.B. MacFarlane, "Had Edward I a policy towards the earls?" History L (1965) pp.145-159.

4 The Irish earldoms were somewhat different. See S.G. Ellis, "The Destruction of the Liberties: Some Further Evidence", B.I.H.R. LIV (1981) pp.150-161.

part should not be held to constitute a precedent.<sup>1</sup> Some notions were advanced concerning the privileged position of the king's earls. The earl of Devon, Hugh Courtney, in 1335 was reported as boasting "inter simplices Devones, qui alium Regem non vident" that his comital dignity elevated him to a position of extreme authority within his county "quod par Regis est, et sibi licet leges condere, et de omnibus iudicare....et se ipsum sapienciorum regni iactat, et ab eo negocia regni principaliter dependere." The bishop of Exeter considered this claim to be contemptible, but it was a view shared by many of his contemporaries with equal fervour.<sup>2</sup> Edward III secured a measure of popular approval for his policies partly by seeking to enoble only such men who by their proven worth were acceptable to their fellow magnates, and partly through general and open largesse among all sections of the nobility at a crucial time and throughout his reign.

Each of the new earls was endowed with a notional jurisdiction over an area of authority. In recognition of this a sum representing the third penny of the chief county of the earldom was granted to each earl: £20 out of the issues of pleas in <sup>the</sup> county <sup>of</sup> Suffolk to Robert Ufford, £20 in Huntingdonshire to William Clinton, £20 in Northamptonshire to William Bohun and to William Montagu £20 in Wiltshire. The earl of Derby was granted the third penny of Derbyshire. Hugh Audley, already in receipt of the third penny in Gloucestershire in right of his wife, did not require an additional grant in his own name.<sup>3</sup>

£20 seems to have been a customary though not invariable value placed on the third penny of a county. During the pre-conquest period earls may actually have received the third value of the pleas arising out of the county, but by the

---

1 Rot. Parl. II, 52-53.

2 The Register of John de Grandisson, Volume II, Exeter Episcopal Registers, (ed.) F.C. Hingeston Randolph, p.294.

3 Cal. Cha. Rolls pp.390, 399, 400, 401.

twelfth century a notional value was established which remained more or less fixed thereafter, though it could vary in amount in individual cases. Edmund of Woodstock, created earl of Kent in 1321, was granted £30 out of the issues of his county. Hugh Despenser and Andrew Harcla the following year each received £20 from their respective counties. Roger Mortimer in 1328 assumed a £10 fee from the allied counties of Shropshire and Staffordshire. One hundred years earlier in 1227 Hubert de Burgh was granted £50 out of the issues of Kent as a third penny. By the reign of Edward III, however, this composition had become more or less fixed at £20 per annum.<sup>1</sup> The count of Julich received £20 as earl of Cambridge in 1340, as did the king's son Edmund in 1362 of the same county. Ralph Stafford was granted £20 out of Staffordshire in 1351.<sup>2</sup> Possession of the third penny was considered one of the chief marks of comital status. In 1349 Henry of Lancaster, by now earl of Lancaster and Derby, was also created earl of Lincoln, over which he had already been enjoying absolute lordship for about a year. Edward III granted him £20 representing the third penny of Lincolnshire "lest the said title be said to be wholly empty and useless".<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless the receipt of the third penny could and did remain separate from the distinction of comital status. Enjoyment of the third penny did not necessarily confer earldom. In 1248, thirty-two years after the death of John the Scot the last earl of Huntingdon, the escheators of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire were ordered to pay one Simon de Senlis rents from the third penny of the counties which were said to be in the king's hand because there was no existing earl of Huntingdon.<sup>4</sup> Similarly Henry de Bohun was probably in receipt of the third penny of county Hereford after 1166 through descent from

---

1 Sir Geoffrey Ellis, Earldoms in Fee, p.82.

2 R.D.P. V, 41, 54.

3 Ibid. 45, 46; J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, House of Lords, p.356.

4 G.E.C. Vol.VI, 164n(m) identified as probably the grandson of an illegitimate brother of Simon Senlis III, earl of Hunts.

the eldest heiress of earl Roger of Hereford, though he was not himself created earl of Hereford until c.1200.<sup>1</sup> Conferment of the third penny was never a matter of course; it remained a royal prerogative to be granted at will either in fee or for life.<sup>2</sup> Payments as recorded on the Pipe Roll during the reign of King John and in the early thirteenth century were irregular and unreliable.<sup>3</sup> But during the fourteenth century this distinction was becoming confused. In 1334 Hugh Courtenay complained that the Treasurer had taken it upon himself to deprive him of the third penny of Devonshire because he was not an earl, even though he had always been in receipt of this sum.<sup>4</sup>

Closely related to the grants of the third penny was the grant to each of the new earls, with the exception of Hugh Audley, of what was generally held to be the yearly value of an earldom in lands and rents.<sup>5</sup> The avowed purpose of these grants - in the case of Montagu, Clinton and Ufford 1000 marks - was that they should:

continue to maintain more honourably and better the state and honour of an earl and so that they may more easily support the burden incumbent on so great an honour...<sup>6</sup>

This was a feature which fifty years earlier had been quite unknown. In 1307 Piers Gaveston when created earl of Cornwall was given the county of Cornwall though he did not possess lands of his own to support the dignity. Contemporaries record their astonishment that the king should so use an earldom to enoble a royal favourite. This trend continued, especially with the excessive reward of Andrew

- 1 J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, House of Lords, p.101.
- 2 The Red Book of the Exchequer (ed.) Hubert Hall, pp.64, 65.
- 3 Sir Geoffrey Ellis, Earldoms in Fee, p.81; G.E.C. Vol.VI, 165.
- 4 J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, House of Lords, p.324.
- 5 Compare the author of the "Modus Tenendi Parliamentum" who considered £400 to be enough in Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages (eds.) Nicholas Pronay and John Taylor (Oxford, 1980) p.81.
- 6 J.E. Powell and J. Wallis, House of Lords, p.326.

Harcla in 1322, who obviously did not command the personal wealth necessary to maintain his new rank. Harcla was therefore granted 1000 marks per annum to be received from the exchequer until satisfied with suitable lands to the same value "for the more abundant maintenance of such estate".<sup>1</sup> Roger Mortimer conferred upon himself £1000 lands and revenues in 1328 as earl of March,<sup>2</sup> though his patrimony was already quite sizeable, and had been augmented with estates seized from the Despensers and their adherents. Within twenty years of Gaveston's elevation to the titled peerage, not only had it become commonplace to endow newly created earls with large estates, but the principle was extended and applied even to those whose personal wealth was far in excess of the notional value of an earldom.

Did the new earls of 1337 require endowment by the crown in order to support their new dignities? Robert Ufford most certainly required landed grants to maintain his new rank. His landed income in 1337 was valued at roughly £400. Even with the grant of a further 1000 marks Ufford clearly found the maintenance of a lifestyle comparable with that of his fellow earls quite a burden. His personal retinue, even in wartime, was seldom larger than about forty to fifty men at arms, as compared with the forces of over one hundred men at arms frequently fielded by his peers. As a result, Ufford rarely appears as a character of much forcefulness. He was the subordinate diplomat with Bohun and Bishop Burghersh on the 1337-1338 mission, and though he was appointed joint military leader in the Low Countries and France in 1340, it was Montagu who was the more active partner. Most significantly, he is found raising the £3000 required for his ransom from the king of France in 1341-2 through the agency of the earl of Salisbury.

---

1 R.D.P. V, 18; J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, House of Lords, p.294.

2 Cal. Cha. Rolls 1327-1341 p.55.

William Montagu, contrary to general opinion, did not require the grant of 1000 marks to support his new dignity. His patrimonial inheritance was consolidated and fairly substantial, though greatly reduced by loss of a third of this as his mother's dower over which he was never to gain control. In real terms his patrimony, with additional grants and purchases made over the preceding decade, was worth in 1337 about £1300. The 1000 marks thought to be the basic requirement for the maintenance of comital status had been given to Montagu in 1330 by a grateful king and nation for his services in arresting the earl of March. Montagu was in fact relatively wealthy. He was able to support a retinue of approximately eighty to one hundred men, and frequently over the next seven years lent the king large sums of money. As we have seen from the charter of creation, Edward's intention in Montagu's case at least was as much to reward the faithful service of a close friend as to set up a man of modest means among the ranks of the wealthy peers.

In the case of William Clinton the grant was necessary, not so much in personal terms, but as an endowment of a heritable dignity. Clinton's patrimonial inheritance was minute; as younger son of a minor Warwickshire knight he inherited nothing from his father. By right of his marriage with the wealthy heiress Juliana de Leyburn he had control of the vast Leyburn inheritance in Kent plus dowers from two previous marriages by his wife. Julian's heir to most of this wealth was her son by her first marriage, the young Lawrence Hastings; any sons born of Clinton's hitherto childless marriage, would have been left almost penniless on their father's death.<sup>1</sup>

William Bohun, unlike the other earls, was granted lands and rents worth £1000 per annum, with the proviso that should he or his heirs succeed, as seemed likely, to the earldoms of Hereford and Essex, this was to revert to the crown,

---

1 Even in 1337 it was almost certain that there would be no children. At his death in 1354 his heir was his nephew John.

on the assumption that the earl would then possess enough inheritable landed wealth to support his comital status. In fact Bohun's personal wealth was already fairly extensive. His father had ensured that his son should be provided with a competent landed settlement. Bohun had added to this in 1335 by marriage with Elizabeth, the wealthy widow of March's heir Edmund. Besides this, he possessed considerable moveable wealth in the form of jewels and other valuables inherited from his father<sup>1</sup> and in gifts from the king, which enabled him to maintain a large retinue of followers and live with some degree of magnificence. Why Edward chose to be extra generous to his cousin is never explained, but may be connected with Bohun's proximity to the throne.<sup>2</sup>

The earl of Derby was promised 1000 marks, but this was never intended to be converted into landed wealth, since Henry of Lancaster as heir to three wealthy earldoms would, on the death of his father, inherit a sufficient landed estate to support his title. Instead he was to receive a pension out of customs receipts. As Henry enjoyed by his father's grants an ample income,<sup>3</sup> he was more or less independent of the king's generosity for maintaining his position as an earl.

In each case, with the possible exception of William Montagu, it was the possession of heritable landed property in association with the comital title that was emphasised. Hugh Audley was granted no such wealth since he already enjoyed the greater part of the Clare estates by right of his wife. Yet he held them only for as long as she should live. When she died her heir was her son Hugh Despenser. Possibly it was assumed that Audley, who had only one child,

1 M.M. Bigelow, "The Bohun Wills", American Historical Review II (1896) p.430.

2 Edward I settled the succession on his daughters in default of male heirs in 1292. Should the young duke of Cornwall not reach manhood, the order of succession in 1337 would be: the infant heir to the earl of Kent (aged 6), issue of Eleanor, countess of Bar, Edward and Thomas Monthermer, issue of Margaret, duchess of Brabant, Humphrey and William Bohun. The death of Edward III's second son William shortly after birth at Christmas 1336-37 possibly shook Edward's sense of security.

3 Robert Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster I, 380.

a daughter, Margaret, would not produce sons, and that the earldom would escheat to the crown at his death.<sup>1</sup>

All the earldoms, while their charters of creation rarely state so, were assumed to be granted in fee, to descend only to heirs of the body lawfully begotten, to the exclusion of heirs general. The grant of the third penny to William Montagu speaks of "de comitatu Sarum cingendo sibi gladium investivimus gracioso sibi et heredibus nomen et omen comitis dicti loci ... confirmavimus eidem comiti et heredibus suis viginti libratas redditis et exitibus com. Wiltes."

The charters in favour of the other earls all have similar clauses.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless it is clear from supplementary charters granting landed endowments that this was generally interpreted as meaning heirs male of the body. The situation had been made no clearer in 1328. None of the original charters in favour of the earls of Ormond, Desmond, March or Cornwall survives, but supplementary charters for Ormond and March state simply that lands were to descend to their heirs, whereas those in favour of Desmond and Cornwall speak of heirs of the body lawfully begotten.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the king did intend that the title of earl and the third penny should descend in a different way from the inheritance. Hubert de Burgh's title was entailed in this way as early as 1227 on the children of his marriage with Margaret of Scotland, though his heir general John, his son by his first wife Beatrice Bardolf, succeeded to his estates.<sup>4</sup> This was a practice increasingly likely with the developing concept of the earldom no longer as dependent on possession of heritable lands but as a dignity heritable in itself.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Audley himself was born c.1289, his wife was aged forty-five. Neither his daughter Margaret nor her son ever claimed the title.

2 C53/124 m26; E328/108/1; R.D.P. V, 27-32; Cal. Cha. Rolls IV, 400, 401.

3 G.E.C. Vol.X Appendix K p.121.

4 J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, House of Lords, p.147.

5 Ibid., p.296.

Consideration of the descent of these estates is instructive. John of Eltham's heir was his brother the king. When the earl of March was executed for treason, his son Edmund who survived him by a year was never so styled, and the infant Roger who succeeded to the estates in 1331 was not properly restored until 1354. The earldom of Ormond descended directly until 1515 when the last earl Thomas died leaving two daughters and an heir general, his cousin. The title was eventually granted to the son of one of the co-heiresses.

The new earldoms of 1337 descended in equally arbitrary manner. Montagu's title passed by direct succession, until the earl's great grandson Thomas' death in 1428 left an only daughter Alice who was married to Richard Neville. Claiming the earldom by right of his wife Neville petitioned the council for confirmation. The council assumed that the earldom had descended to her and her heirs, and therefore decreed: "Quod omne ius et titulum ad que Thomas comes Sarum ultime defunctus de iure regni admitti debuit, filius filii et heredis sue debet admitti."<sup>1</sup> Thomas Montagu's heir general was his uncle Richard Montagu. Heirs general in practice were always excluded.

William Clinton had no offspring: his heir was his nephew John, who did not inherit the earldom which reverted to the crown in 1354. Robert Ufford was succeeded in 1369 by his only surviving son William, but the second earl died in 1382 without surviving issue and his heirs were the sons of his four sisters. None of these claimed the title, and four years later Richard II granted it to Michael de la Pole, with the justification that William Ufford had died without heirs male, and that the greater part of the patrimony with which he was endowed for the support of this dignity had escheated to the king.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Sir Nicholas H. Nicolas, Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council III, p.328; Sir Geoffrey Ellis, Earldoms in Fee, p.206, though it is doubtful whether the title would have been allowed to pass to a man of less importance and proximity to the king.

2 Despite attempts by Suffolk in his will to ensure that the inheritance passed to one of his daughter's children or his nephew Robert de Willoughby of Eresby. G.A. Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England, (Cambridge, 1957) p.42.

William Bohun's only son Humphrey died without sons in 1373, leaving two daughters. The elder Eleanor was married to the king's son Thomas, created earl of Buckingham in 1377 and Duke of Gloucester in 1385, and the younger Mary was later to be married to the future Henry IV. Neither succeeded to the title earl of Northampton, which was later assumed without licence by the earl of Stafford, who married Eleanor's only surviving daughter Anne.<sup>1</sup> The earl of Derby, later also earl of Lincoln and duke of Lancaster, died in 1361 also leaving two daughters, the elder of whom died childless. The younger, Blanche, married John of Gaunt. Their son Henry did not automatically assume the title earl of Derby, but was like his maternal grandfather created by the king earl "vita patris". The earl of Gloucester had only a daughter, Margaret, who was forcibly abducted by Ralph Stafford. Neither Margaret nor Ralph ever claimed the title earl of Gloucester, which Richard II considered himself free to grant to his uncle as a dukedom in 1385.<sup>2</sup>

The succession of earldoms in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was determined as much by the king's will as by entitlement. Though a more or less general pattern of inheritance emerged whereby an earldom would be allowed to descend unmolested through a sole heiress but escheat to the crown where a multiplicity of heirs threatened division of the indivisible,<sup>3</sup> in practice the active participation of the king in such transfers was always important.

The six new earls and the king's son were far from being the only people to receive rewards or grants in the March parliament of 1337. On the same day as Edward girded the new earls he also dubbed twenty new knights.

---

1 R.D.P. II, 163 for the position as representative of the eldest daughter. This is a legal anachronism.

2 Though it was probably by right of his marriage with Margaret that Stafford was created earl of Stafford in 1351.

3 Sir Geoffrey Ellis, Earldoms in Fee, pp.60-63, 85-88.

About half of these new knights were royal officials, members of the judiciary and sergeants at arms. Chief of these was Robert Sadyngton, who four days later was appointed chief baron of the exchequer,<sup>1</sup> and Roger Hillary and William Scot, one of the king's sergeants, who were together appointed justices of the king's bench.<sup>2</sup> Another official, John de Coggeshale, was sheriff of Essex and a son of a minor tenant of the earls of Hereford in that county.<sup>3</sup> John Pulteney and Simon Swanlon<sup>4</sup> were leading London citizens: Pulteney was then acting mayor, Swanlon had been an M.P. for London in 1329-30.<sup>4</sup>

Six men cannot be identified with any certainty. Roger Daungerville may possibly have been a younger son of John Daungerville of Sprouton in Suffolk.<sup>5</sup> William la Zouche was in all probability grandson of William la Zouche of Harringworth and would have been sixteen at the time of the investiture. He went overseas in the bishop of Lincoln's retinue in October 1337.<sup>6</sup> William Basset was possibly a younger son of Ralph Basset of Drayton, whose mother Joan was a daughter of the influential household family of John de Grey of Wilton and Ruthin. Thomas de la More, John Stretche, and John de Bolingbroke are more or less unidentifiable.

The rest were young members of magnate families. Most prominent of these was the earl of Salisbury's youngest brother, Edward, aged between fifteen and twenty, and probably as yet unmarried. Thomas de Swynnerton, a younger son of

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.400.

2 Ibid., p.397. William Scot had been summoned to the parliament with the other officers of the council. R.D.P. V, 464.

3 C62/114 m1; Charles Moor, Knights of Edward I Vol.I, 220.

4 A draper. He was alderman 1327-1334, M.P. for Middlesex 1339-40 and 1344. Sylvia L. Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London 1300-1500 (Chicago, 1948) p.365; L.J. Loftie, A History of London II (London, 1883) pp.309, 393, 394.

5 Charles Moor Knights of Edward I Vol.I, 270.

6 G.E.C. XII, 941. His mother was Joan daughter of William Inge C.J. and he himself was married to Margaret daughter of William Ros of Helmesley.

Roger de Swynnerton, prominent in the royal household since the reign of Edward II, was also knighted on this occasion. Thomas had himself been a member of the royal household since 1336 as one of the king's squires.<sup>1</sup> Both Swynnerton and Edward Montagu were to fight overseas with Edward III: Swynnerton from 1338-40, Montagu in 1346.<sup>2</sup> Another knight John Lisle was to serve during the following year at the siege of Dunbar with the earl of Salisbury.<sup>3</sup> Salisbury's influence as patron can be detected with most of the new knights. Another who fought in Montagu's retinue at Dunbar was Richard Damory of Bucknell (Oxon), nephew and heir of Roger Damory who had married one of the Clare heiresses.<sup>4</sup> Roger Bavent, Salisbury's brother-in-law, was knighted during this parliament.<sup>5</sup> Montagu was also able to see two of his personal retainers knighted: John de Mere was Salisbury's steward and later one of his executors. In April 1337 when Salisbury went overseas Mere acted as one of his attornies.<sup>6</sup> John Luterele, described by Montagu as "nostre bachelor", was enfeoffed by the earl with lands in East Coker on 11 March during the parliament, and Montagu at the same time leased to him the Isle of Lundy.<sup>7</sup> John Darcy, the son of the steward of the household, was knighted on 16 March, and later joined the royal household to fight with the king overseas in 1338-40.<sup>8</sup> Like the new earls the knights were endowed with annuities of varying amounts for the maintenance of their new dignity.

1 Nero C.VIII fol.230r. He was his father's heir since the eldest son died v.p. and the next son Robert was a priest. G.E.C. XII, 587.  
 2 E36/203 fol. 125v; G.E.C. IX, 84.  
 3 E101/20/24.  
 4 G.E.C. IV, 46; Charles Moor Knights of Edward I Vol.I, 10, he held lands in Somerset and Dorset near Montagu.  
 5 He married Montagu's sister Hawise.  
 6 C270/32/33; C.P.R. 1345-48 pp.140, 421. He may have been an old retainer of the earl of Cornwall since he was granted the keepership of Mere castle of the lands of the earl of Cornwall.  
 7 E328/108/13, 14.  
 8 E36/203 fol. 123v.

John de Here received the custody of Here castle valued at £80.<sup>1</sup> Richard Damory was also promised £80 per annum to support his knighthood, and on 4 April he was assigned the manor of Haddington (Oxon) towards this sum, worth £40.<sup>2</sup> John Pulteney was granted an annual fee of 100 marks, £50 of which was derived from Queenshithe in London, the rest from the farm of the city.<sup>3</sup> Edward Montagu was promised £100 in fee, to descend to his heirs male "ut ipse in ordine militariis quem a domino rege suscepit se valeat decencius continere."<sup>4</sup>

At the same time the king raised some bannerets from the ranks of the household knights. John Darcy was knighted as a banneret.<sup>5</sup> Reginald Colham, a household knight from 1334-36 was elevated to banneret status and had 400 marks landed rents bestowed on him.<sup>6</sup> Henry Ferrars, who had recently entered royal service from that of the deceased earl of Cornwall, was given in tail male 400 marks per annum on 18 March, and made chamberlain of the household.<sup>7</sup> Another of the earl of Cornwall's bannerets, Thomas Poynings, was recruited into Edward's service and assigned 200 marks per annum in recognition of his services to the king's brother.<sup>8</sup> About this time his brother Michael also joined the royal household.<sup>9</sup> William fitz Warin, knight marshal of the royal household in 1334 was permitted to raise his banner, for which he was granted in tail male Ilchester (Soms), the farm of Wilton, and the advowson of the church at Rothley (Leics.)<sup>10</sup>

---

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.441.

2 Ibid., p.412.

3 Ibid., p.419. He was also granted repayment of debts totalling £388 10s 4d.

4 E403/294 m2; C62/117 m3; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.401.

5 E361/2 rot.7; Nero C.VIII fol.230v.

6 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.401.

7 Ibid., pp.418, 427; Nero C.VIII fol.230v.

8 C62/114 m5; C.P.R. 1334-38 p.401 partly satisfied with Shatford (Surrey) and a meadow and mills in Oxford.

9 E36/203 fol.123v.

10 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.427; Cal. Cha. Rolls p.397.

To others of the king's chief military supporters from the earl of Warwick, who received a gift of £500 on 19 March,<sup>1</sup> to Roger Beauchamp, one of the king's yeomen who was given in fee 100 marks per annum,<sup>2</sup> gifts and grants of land and money were distributed liberally. The earl of Arundel as Justice of North Wales at the king's pleasure received back his office for life on 10 March; nine days later he was promised Arundel castle quit of rent.<sup>3</sup> On the same day William Daubeney was granted the two manors of Kempston (Beds) and Tottenham (Middx),<sup>4</sup> and Maurice Berkeley received in fee the manors of Mawardyn and Winferton (Hereford) and Fulbrook and Westhale (Oxon), an enlargement of a previous life grant.<sup>5</sup> John Molyns on 23 March received a grant "for good service, with the assent of the prelates, magnates and others of the council in parliament" of the remainder of Swirford and Henley.<sup>6</sup> On 12 March Nicholas de la Beche, constable of the Tower of London, was granted the reversion of Watlington "with the assent of the chief men-in-parliament assembled" for good service to the king and for future service to the duke of Cornwall.<sup>7</sup> Each of these men was to serve either overseas with the king's household in 1338-40 or on the regency council in England. Edward was attempting to ensure the full commitment of his military tenants in the event of future warfare on the continent.

The clergy were not forgotten in the general distribution of largesse, and again Montagu's family profitted. Two days before William was enobled and his youngest brother knighted, another brother Simon, bishop of Worcester, was trans-

---

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.394.

2 Ibid., p.394.

3 Ibid., p.406.

4 Ibid., p.401.

5 Ibid., p.428.

6 Cal. Cha. Rolls IV, 399.

7 Ibid., p.391.

lated to the far richer see of Ely.<sup>1</sup> Worcester was then filled by a Benedictine monk, Thomas de Hemenhale, who had been elected to the see of Norwich in 1336, but had failed to secure Papal acceptance. Edward was then able to confirm the Pope's own nominee Anthony Bek to the see of Norwich on the same day. Thus all parties were satisfied, a necessary move if the king was to rely on clerical support in war with the Pope's ally France, and if attempts to tax ecclesiastical property in pursuit of this enterprise were not to meet the fierce resistance of the church in England.

The new earls were personally invested by the king, who girded each of them with the sword of his earldom, and provided them with rich gowns for the occasion.<sup>2</sup> Robert Ufford later bequeathed his sword to his heir as an object of special reverence.<sup>3</sup> It must have been a magnificent occasion. The six new earls and the king's son were clothed at royal expense in robes made of purple Brussels cloth and trimmed with the finest furs, silks and velvets. Others of the company were dressed with equal magnificence.

Parliament ended on 16 March after this ceremony with a great feast in the Great Hall at Westminster, at which the new earls and knights were the principal guests. A parallel function was held by the queen in the small hall for their wives and the women of her household.<sup>4</sup> The king's goldsmith, Gavain de Suthorp, at the king's command made four great silver disks worth nearly £8 to decorate the main table,<sup>5</sup> and the expenditure of the royal household that week on food and provisions rose to nearly three times that for the previous week.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 R.M. Haines, The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century, p.82.

2 E361/2 rots. 7d, 8d.

3 Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas, Testamenta Vetusta (London, 1826) p.73.

4 ...et tenuit magnam aulam illo die cum omne solemnitare et domina regina tenuit parvam aulam ad sumptus regis cum comitessis, dominabus et domicellis. E101/388/2.

5 Nero C.VIII fol.198v.

6 E101/388/2. Total costs that week were £665 7s.

As an unprecedented show of liberality it did not pass without criticism.

Thomas Grey remarked that "As queux countis et autres ses bons gentz le roy departy sy largement de ses possessions de apain reteient il rien devers ly de terres apurtenaantz a sa coroune, mais ly couient viuere de sureuous et subsidies a graunt charge du poeple."<sup>1</sup> How much justification was there in this charge?

Robert Ufford, promised 1000 marks in lands and rents, received the first substantial portion of this on 19 March, totalling £313 6s 8d, not quite half of the promised sum. As a notional caput to the new earldom Ufford was assigned the castle of Eye in Suffolk, with the appurtenant manor, town and jurisdictional rights, the manor of Thorndon worth an assessed £207 1s 0½d, the manors of Hertsmere and Stowe in Suffolk valued at £20, the manor of Caston worth £60 and that of Hanley valued at £126 5s 7½d.<sup>2</sup> Hanley, Eye, Thorndon, Hertsmere and Stowe had come into the king's hands only on the death of the earl of Cornwall,<sup>3</sup> and Edward now withheld them from the grant of the earldom as a duchy. Ufford had been holding Caston for the past decade at farm, the king simply now remitted him that annual debt.<sup>4</sup> In addition Suffolk was promised the reversion of Benhale (Suffolk) at that time held in dower by Eleanor, widow of Guy Ferre, and valued at £133 6s 8d.<sup>5</sup> Until this should fall in or until the outstanding £120 should be converted into lands and rents, Ufford was to receive £253 6s 8d per annum from the exchequer.<sup>6</sup> In July he was granted £25 5s of this £120 on the manors of Dedham (Essex) and rents from the moiety of the manor of Combes (Suffolk) of which

1 Scalacronica p.167.

2 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.496.

3 E403/294 m27.

4 E372/182 rot.1; E372/183 rot.16d; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.60.

5 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.418.

6 On 30 June 1339 he surrendered his letters patent to this and requested £108 11s 5½d in arrears to him, from the first fruits of Counties Norfolk and Suffolk. C.P.R. 1338-40 p.265.

he already had partial control as guardian during the minority of John de Thorp.<sup>1</sup>  
The rest appears to have remained a charge on the exchequer until 1363.<sup>2</sup>

Fully half of William Clinton's promised grant of 1000 marks derived from the single manor of Kirketon, which too had come to the crown after the death of the earl of Cornwall. £100 was to come from the reversion of the manors of Holme and Glatton in Huntingdon then in the possession of Queen Isabella and, approximating towards a caput of the earldom, the reversion of the site of Huntingdon castle held by the dowager countess of Pembroke and worth only 10s.<sup>3</sup> Neither of these reversions fell in during the earl's lifetime, and he received their value out of the farm of the issues of county Kent. The balance of £232 16s 8d was paid from the issues of the farms of counties Kent, Cambridge and Huntingdon, and from the towns of Winchelsea, Rye and Sandwich, the manor of Ham and the seven royal hundreds in Kent.<sup>4</sup> As Constable of Dover, receiving a good portion of his annual income from the Cinque Ports and their allied liberties, his prestige was thus greatly enhanced while relieving the burden on the exchequer considerably.

In order to realise his £1000 grant William Bohun was also promised reversions. For chief castle of the new earldom Bohun was to receive the castle of Oakham, with its associate right to appoint the sheriff of Rutland, then in the hands of the new earl of Gloucester by right of his wife, but which would escheat to the crown in the event of his death. The reversion of the castle and manor of Fotheringhay, held in dower by the countess of Pembroke, and those of Stamford and Grantham (Lincs) which the childless earl of Surrey had quitclaimed to the

---

1 E372/183 rot.1; C.P.R. 1338-40 p.14; C.C.R. 1337-39 p.305.

2 E101/571/27.

3 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.415. The castle was dismantled by Henry II but a chapel and the county gaol remained on the site. V.C.H. Huntingdon Vol.II, 130.

4 C.C.R. 1341-43 pp.61, 63.

king in 1317 and received back for life increased their value by £139 16s 11½d.<sup>1</sup> The reversions of Eastwood, Rayleigh and the hundred of Rochford (Essex), held for life by Queen Philippa completed the grants.<sup>2</sup> Until these reversions should fall in, and the first did not do so until 1347, the revenues were met by assignments from the customs receipts of London, Boston, Kingston and from the farms of the city of London and county Essex.

Montagu's new earldom was built on a single block of reversions valued at 800 marks and then in the hands of the earl of Surrey. This consisted of the castle and honour of Trowbridge and the manors of Aldbourne, Amesbury, Winterbourne (Wilts), Canford (Dorset), Henstridge and Charleton (Somerset). Until these should fall in, Montagu's needs were met by revenues derived from the coinage of tin in Cornwall, in which he had held an interest since 1330.<sup>3</sup> In February 1341 enquiries were made as to whether the earls of Salisbury anciently held the town of Old Surum by right of their earldom, but this attempt to enlarge his grant seemingly failed and Montagu never saw the outstanding 200 marks converted into lands in his lifetime.<sup>4</sup>

Each of the new earldoms was built up of lands already in the hands of other tenants as reversions or escheats. No attempt was made to touch crown lands or ancient demesne.<sup>5</sup> The now extinct earldom of Cornwall, in Edward's hands since the death of his brother, constituted a major parcel of these lands.<sup>6</sup> On the

---

1 F. Royston Fairbank, "The Last Earl of Warenne and Surrey and the Distribution of his Possessions", Y.A.J. 19 (1907) p.209. Fotheringhay was anciently held by the earls of Huntingdon, and Northampton castle may have taken the place of Huntingdon castle as the caput of the earldom V.C.H. Huntingdon II, 7.

2 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.416; C.P.R. 1338-40 pp.100, 460, 490; Cal. Cha. Rolls IV 484.

3 C.C.R. 1337-39 pp.441, 489; C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.426, 427; C.P.R. 1338-40 p.183.

4 C.P.R. 1340-43 p.204.

5 See R.S. Hoyt, The Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History 1066-1272 (New York, 1968) p.124; P.B. Wolfe, The Royal Demesne in English History. The Crown Estates in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509 (London, 1971) pp.59-60.

6 The king granted that the earl's executors should hold his estates, with the exception of Berkhamsted for one year after his death to cover funeral expenses. C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.441, 455.

strength of the quitclaim made by the earl of Surrey to Edward III during 1317 when the earl had been desperate to win royal support for his divorce, Edward also granted away the reversion of certain Warenne estates, despite the fact that the earl of Surrey had also settled on his brother-in-law, the earl of Arundel, as his heir general, and had received crown confirmation of this settlement.<sup>1</sup> The estates in Warenne's hands thus promised to the new earls included lands granted to the earl of Salisbury which should have escheated to the countess of Lincoln, but which the crown claimed by right of a series of agreements made by the countess in 1322 and 1331 renouncing her right in them for security for the remainder of her inheritance.<sup>2</sup> Queen Isabella had held Glatton and Holme since 1327 when they had escheated to the crown on the execution of the younger Despenser. Formerly they had been crown property since they passed by inheritance to Edward I in 1300 on the death of his cousin Edmund of Cornwall without issue.<sup>3</sup> The site of Huntingdon castle and Fotheringhay had apparently been granted to the countess of Pembroke by the crown and were expected to revert on her death. Both had been in Scottish hands during the latter part of the previous century through inheritance from the last earl of Huntingdon. Fotheringhay had been forfeited to Edward I in 1297; Huntingdon came to the crown in 1306 after the murder of John Comyn and had been granted to the countess of Pembroke for life.<sup>4</sup>

Even these estates were in some measure shortly to revert to the crown again. Since the grants were issued only in tail male there was a good chance that some at least would revert to the king for default of male children within a generation. If such far sightedness sounds unlikely in a king endowing heritable earldoms, the

---

1 F. Royston Fairbank, "The Last Earl of Warenne and Surrey and the Distribution of his Possessions", Y.A.J. 19 (1907) p.221.

2 See below pp.253-254.

3 V.C.H. Hunts III pp.178, 185. 1314 granted to the Abbot of Thorney at farm for life for £100. 1323 given to the younger Despenser but escheated in 1326.

4 V.C.H. Hunts II, 130; C.C.R. 1341-43 p.61.

comment of Edward in response to a petition by Clinton shows he was thinking along these lines. Clinton had petitioned the king that in the event of his death his executors be allowed to keep Kirketon one year after his demise to cover the costs of making necessary repairs to the manor, and the king granted the request "which will be greatly to the advantage of the king if the earl die without heir male of the body".<sup>1</sup>

Both Clinton and the king seem to have assumed that there would be no children to succeed to the title, though neither William nor his wife was elderly.<sup>2</sup> In addition, £500 of Bohun's endowment would certainly revert to the crown within the next generation, if not considerably sooner, since, as was patently obvious, his invalid brother Humphrey would not marry. Similarly, the 1000 marks which Henry of Lancaster was to enjoy for life would return to the crown when he and his heirs were absorbed in the Lancaster and Leicester earldoms. Popular disquiet was directed against heavy taxation: since all the new earls were endowed by means of reversions, they were dependent on assignments of customs and other revenues for their annual revenues.<sup>3</sup> Most of the reversions did not fall in until after many years - Warenne in 1347, queen Isabella in 1358, queen Philippa in 1360 and the countess of Pembroke not until 1377.

If anyone was cheated in the endowment of the six earls it was other nobles, especially the heirs general to the lands with which the new earls were endowed. No-one had a greater right to protest at the new creations than Alice de Lacy suo iure Countess of Lincoln through her father Henry de Lacy (died 1311) and of Salisbury through her mother Margaret de Longspee (died c.1306). The value of the combined Lincoln-Salisbury estates enabled Alice to enjoy an annual income of

---

1 C.P.R. 1334-38 p.564.

2 Possibly connected with Clinton's recurring bouts of ill-health.

3 See petition in G.L. Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance in England to 1369, p.244 n.1.

10,000 marks from her inheritance,<sup>1</sup> which was given with Alice to her first husband Thomas of Lancaster in 1294.<sup>2</sup> In fact her expectations of enjoying even a fraction of this vast fortune were never realised. Over a period of forty years the combined earldoms were subjected to a series of agreements with the crown, forced or voluntary, which were designed to annexe as much as possible of her rich estates for the royal family and favourites.

In 1317 an important part of the Salisbury inheritance was alienated never to be recovered as a result of a private war between Thomas of Lancaster and the earl of Surrey. Alice and Thomas had probably been estranged for some while, but in May 1317 Alice was abducted, not entirely unwillingly, from her maternal manor of Canford and carried off to Reigate.<sup>3</sup> Over the next year the two earls attacked and plundered one another's estates whenever the opportunity arose. Peace was eventually agreed based on an exchange of estates. For a grant of 1000 marks per annum in lands and rents in Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire, areas of interest outside his own territorial blocks in the north and the midlands, Thomas of Lancaster gained control of estates in Yorkshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Sussex and the Welsh Marches, which greatly enhanced his authority. Warenne likewise received from Alice's Salisbury inheritance a life interest in the manors of Aldbourne, Winterbourne Earls, Amesbury, Trowbridge, Canford Magna, Shapwick, Henstridge, Charleton and Ardington.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 C.I.P.M. V, 279; Robert Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster I, 19.

2 1292 betrothal. On 28 December 1292 Lacy surrendered Pontefract and it was regranted in tail male with remainder to Edmund the king's brother and father-in-law of the bride and the heirs of his body. Cal. Cha. Rolls II, 427; Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster I, 19 thus enhancing Lancaster's estates in the north. Two years later Alice and Thomas were married on 28 October 1294 and the same day Henry Lacy and his wife Margaret jointly made three separate releases entailing their two earldoms away from their right heirs and granting them to the young couple.

3 F. Royston Fairbank, "The Last Earl of Warenne and Surrey", Y.A.J. 19 (1907) pp.198-213. Part of an attempt to put fresh impetus into an attempt to obtain divorce from Joan of Bar and retaliation against Lancaster who stood with the king over the question of his relationship with his mistress, Maud de Nerford. Alice had been living at Canford since c.1314. Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster I 26 n.2.

4 Robert Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster I, 337; C.P.R. 1317-21 pp.319, 264.

In 1322, in the aftermath of the execution of her estranged husband for treason, Alice fell victim to royal displeasure, as a result of which she was forced to sign away to the king her whole inheritance, receiving back only part of it for her support during her lifetime. The rest passed into the hands of the Despensors and their adherents.<sup>1</sup> Of greatest importance here is her quitclaim of the group of West Country manors of her Salisbury inheritance, which her husband had already granted for life to the earl of Surrey, and of the Welsh estates of her Lincoln inheritance. These she was persuaded under duress to grant to the Despensors in fee or in reversion, and was never to recover them. They were used by Edward III to create the new earldom of Salisbury.<sup>2</sup>

The disgrace of the Despensors and the deposition of Edward II brought about a slight alleviation in the position of Alice and her new husband Eubulo Lestrangle.<sup>3</sup> In the first parliament after the fall of Roger Mortimer Alice and her husband petitioned for the recovery of her estates in the hands of Mortimer and Isabella. Mortimer himself had seized the Welsh estates including Denbigh, Ros, Rywynok, and Dynmael which Alice had granted to Despenser, and Isabella too had helped herself liberally to Alice's inheritance.<sup>4</sup> Edward was slow in responding, mainly because he had already granted away the Welsh estates to William Montagu as reward for his services against Mortimer in that same parliament. On 16 February Alice once again quitclaimed all her lands which Edward II had regranted to her in dower, and Edward III was induced to grant back some of these to Alice and

---

1 Robert Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster I, 33n3, 338.

2 C.P.R. 1321-24 pp.84, 141, 175, 178-183, 194, 196, 197, 215, 221, 262, 343, 355, 448, 449. Order for her arrest 22 March 1322; grants by the king to Alice of the remaining estates 10, 12, 13 July. The younger Despenser was promised the West Country manors, the earl of Winchester was granted the Welsh estates.

3 Licence for marriage 13 July 1322. C.P.R. 1321-24 p.178.

4 C.P.R. 1327-30 pp.66, 68, 69; Robert Somerville Duchy of Lancaster I, 35. Isabella seized control of Clitheroe, Pontefract, Berwick St. James, Winterbourne Earls, Aldebourne, Upavon, Netheravon, Whitgift, Cowick, and Snaith, Penwortham, Tottington, Rochdale, Slaidburn and Bowland Forest, all of which she retained; with the exception of Pontefract.

Ebulo jointly in fee so that they might descend to their heirs.<sup>1</sup> By now this was probably as much as Alice hoped to salvage from her two earldoms. Edward III granted part of her remaining inheritance in tail to Alice in order to secure his hold on the rest of her lands seized by his mother and Mortimer and which had thus escheated to the crown. So Alice's dual inheritance was reduced to an estimated value of only 800 marks per annum. This Edward promised to make up to 1200 marks with a gift of the reversion of certain lands held in dower by Alice, the widow of William de Stepham.<sup>2</sup> Alice was left with only 12% of her total inheritance.

Edward, having secured his right to retain control of much the larger part of Alice's Salisbury-Lincoln estates, made immediate use of part of them in favour of Montagu, thus raising him by annual landed wealth among the ranks of the highest in the land. Alice and Ebulo obligingly quitclaimed their rights to these lands at Easter 1331 for £200.<sup>3</sup> It was but an obvious step for one with his powerbase in the West Country to be created earl of Salisbury, and endowed with such lands as anciently appertained to that earldom. Thus Montagu was granted the reversion of Alice's West County manors, which she had released in favour of the earl of Surrey. Again Alice, now widowed for a third time and aged nearly sixty obediently quitclaimed her interests in the Warenne reversions in Montagu's favour in November 1337.<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, despite her seeming compliance, Edward was strictly speaking acting illegally and to Alice's manifest detriment.<sup>5</sup> Each of her three husbands was entitled to be styled earl of Salisbury "iure uxoris", though both Lestranger

---

1 As there were no children by this marriage, Roger Lestranger of Knockin and John Lestranger were Ebulo's heirs but they received nothing of Alice's lands which Roger eventually quitclaimed to Henry of Lancaster in 1355.

2 Cal. Cha. Rolls IV, 213; C.P.R. 1330-34 p.74.

3 D.L. 25/3347.

4 C.P.R. 1334-38 pp.549, 550, Hugh de Frene her third husband died in Scotland in December 1336.

5 Unless by one of the preceding transactions with the crown Alice had relinquished her hereditary title to the earldom of Salisbury which is unlikely.

and Frene seem to have preferred simply to use the title earl of Lincoln.<sup>1</sup> After the death of earl Thomas use of the style seems to have lapsed, and Edward III appears to have assumed that he was free to bestow the title elsewhere, even though Alice was still living and could well have remarried, temporarily at least taking the title to someone else.<sup>2</sup> None of the earls would have endured such treatment without fierce protest. That Alice was old and had no one to protect her interests allowed the king to get away with an act of sheer theft, which he would scarcely have tried on a stronger individual. No formal protest was ever acknowledged by Edward III, and as he could scarcely have ignored Alice's claims totally had she objected, we may assume that she could not face the battle which would inevitably have ensued had she protested, but remained quiet, despite having been deprived of her hereditary title. Alice had rarely bothered to style herself countess of Lincoln and Salisbury in the ordinary course of events;<sup>3</sup> in October 1337, however, she suddenly assumed it in a grant of livery and maintenance to one of her valets John de Womeleye in the manor of Bolingbroke, probably out of deference to the emotions of her retainers.<sup>4</sup> It is the only instance surviving of this use of the title after March 1337, so clearly Alice was prepared to bow to the inevitable.

The lengths to which Edward was prepared to go to secure Alice's estates testifies to the probability of Montagu's personal ambition to assume the style earl of Salisbury in preference to that of Dorset or Wiltshire. Montagu's creation as earl of Salisbury was the only clear attempt to set up comital

---

1 Robert Somerville Duchy of Lancaster I, p.33.

2 Royal mandate not to do so dated 1336.

3 The only other known instance DL36/2/199 is dated 1327 granting John Talbot the constabulary of Lincoln castle.

4 DL36/2/48 dated 8 October 1337. Bolingbroke was actually a Lincoln not a Salisbury manor, so the use of the title was not immediately connected with this particular grant.

families endowed with lands anciently associated with the titles. On each of the other new earls was bestowed the area as near as possible to the sphere of his greatest personal influence, but no attempt was made to reconstitute the ancient shape of these earldoms.

Theft of comital titles was not carried out in the interests of the remaining new earls, and William Clinton was not proclaimed earl of Kent, as his landed position might suggest as the most suitable title for him to assume. Though the king's uncle, Edmund earl of Kent, had been executed for treason in 1330 and many of his estates escheated to the crown and granted out to others,<sup>1</sup> Edward held his uncle entirely guiltless, and had restored his cousins to the title immediately after the fall of Mortimer.<sup>2</sup> The existing holder of the title was his six year old cousin John,<sup>3</sup> whose title Edward respected.<sup>3</sup> The earldom of Huntingdon was apparently chosen as a convenient style close to Clinton's personal powerbase, which could be suitably endowed with lands properly pertaining to that title. Even during the mid-fourteenth century earldoms were still largely territorial honours, and estates were generally expected to correspond.<sup>4</sup>

Probably the choice of William Bohun's title as earl of Northampton was dictated by what lands were available for the crown to grant out. Bohun's personal estates were scattered but the main block centred on and around Essex. Northamptonshire was convenient, and allowed Edward to provide Bohun with Fotheringhay castle, anciently used by the earls of Huntingdon-Northampton as the caput of the honour, and with Oakham castle, occasionally associated with Northampton-

---

1 C49/46/6 dated c.1337 list of who held lands belonging to the earldom of Kent.

2 Rot. Parl. II, 55.

3 G.E.C. Vol.VII, 148-150. He was summoned to parliament as earl of Kent 1 January 1348 and died 1352.

4 e.g. Harcla was made earl of Carlisle, and the Bigod lands endowed to Thomas Brotherton as earl of Norfolk, and the county of Cornwall was given to the earl of Cornwall. But see Matilda gave de Vere the choice of Berks, Wilts, Dorset or Oxon in none of which he had major holdings.

shire for administrative convenience.<sup>1</sup> He was then granted additional lands in Essex, closer to his other estates, where it was clear he would eventually inherit his brother's earldom.

It is more obvious why the title earl of Suffolk was chosen for Ufford, since he held the majority of his estates in East Anglia and especially in Suffolk where his patrimonial inheritance centred on Ufford, Bawdsey, Wykeham, Petistre, Benges and Combes. Edward had at his disposal the issues of four Suffolk manors and another four in Norfolk with which to endow the new earl to a title which was assumed without fuss to have been in abeyance at least since 1075.<sup>2</sup>

The long term benefits to the crown of creating five new comital families were only of secondary importance. No king would have envisaged succeeding generations of Montagus, Clintons, Uffords and Bohuns working harmoniously with the crown. Edward elevated the new earls in March 1337 in order to increase the valuable service of the four most active members of his household, and honoured two men whose wealth and standing dictated that they be so elevated, at a moment of supreme importance for his personal ambitions. It was as administrators and governors of the kingdom, as diplomats and, above all, as military commanders of his forces in the forthcoming conflict with France that Edward's new earls were expected to justify his generosity. With their enhanced status the king's bannerets might perform functions requiring greater authority

- 
- 1 V.C.H. Huntingdonshire Vol.II, 7. The earldoms of Huntingdon and Northampton were united in earl Waltheof and descended through his daughter Maud and her husbands until 1184. The earldom of Huntingdon continued in use until the death of John the Scot, Maud's grandson, without issue in 1237, after which the title was not used. G.E.C. Vol.VI, 164.
  - 2 G.E.C. Vol.XII, 429. Hugh Bigod 1140-41 created earl (charter unknown) used the style earl of Norfolk though it has been suggested that as no earl of Suffolk was created this was included in the title. Later Bigods were known only as earls of Norfolk.

and social prestige, such as only the chief magnates of the realm were able to fulfill. Whilst they lived, and Robert Ufford lived to be over seventy, the king would and did demand of all of them the most tireless devotion to his service, and they for their part repaid him. Although the earldoms of Gloucester and Huntingdon both escheated to the crown within twenty years, as did those of Derby and Northampton within Edward's own lifetime, Edward could still consider his generosity amply rewarded in the personal contributions to government of the six loyal recipients of royal favours in March 1337.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Manuscript Sources

British Library.

- Additional MS. 9951 Liber Cotidianus Garderobae, 14 Edward II  
 Additional MS. 17,362 Wardrobe Book of 13 Edward II  
 Additional MS. 46,350 Wardrobe Daily Foreign Accounts, 7-8 Edward III  
 Cotton MS. Caligula D III includes conditions of Montagu's ransom  
 Cotton MS. Galba E III Great Wardrobe of Queen Philippa, 6 Edward III  
 Cotton MS. Nero C VIII Liber de Compotis diversorum redditum in garderoba  
 Regis, from 4 Edward II  
 Kings and Royal MS. 12D,XI A letter from Montagu to the Pope  
 Stowe MS. 553 Account Book of the Wardrobe, 15-17 Edward II

Durham, Dean and Chapter Muniments

Register I includes the text of a tract on the office of the Earl Marshal

Public Record Office

Chancery

- C47 Chancery Miscellanea  
 C49 Parliamentary and Council Proceedings  
 C53 Charter Rolls  
 C62 Liberate Rolls  
 C76 Treaty Rolls  
 C81 Chancery Warrants

Exchequer

- E36 Miscellaneous Books  
 E43 Ancient Deeds, Series WS  
 E101 King's Remembrancer, Accounts Various  
 E159 King's Remembrancer, Memoranda Rolls  
 E326 Ancient Deeds. Series B  
 E328 Augmentation Office, Ancient Deeds, Series BB  
 E361 Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, Enrolled Accounts, Wardrobe and  
 Household  
 E372 Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, Pipe Rolls  
 E403 Exchequer of Receipt, Issue Rolls  
 E404 Exchequer of Receipt, Warrants for Issues

## Duchy of Lancaster

DL25 Ancient Deeds, Series I.  
DL34 Ancient Correspondence  
DL36 Miscellaneous Charters

## Special Collections

SC1 Ancient Correspondence  
SC8 Ancient Petitions

B. Printed Sources

## I. Narrative Sources

Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum. Robertus de Avesbury De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls Series (London, 1889).

Annales Londonienses : Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II (ed.) W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, Volume I, (London, 1882).

Annales Paulini : Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II (ed.) W. Stubbs, Rolls Series (London, 1882).

The Anonimale Chronicle 1331-1381 (ed.) V.H. Galbraith (Manchester, 1927).

The Brut (ed.) F. Brie, Early English Text Society, 2 volumes (London, 1906-1908).

The Buik of the Chroniclis of Scotland (ed.) William B. Turnbull, Volume III, Rolls Series (London, 1858).

Chronicle of England of John Capgrave (ed.) F.C. Hingeston, Rolls Series (London, 1858).

Chronicon Angliae 1328-1388, Monk of St. Albans (ed.) Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls Series (London, 1874).

Chronicon de Lanercost 1201-1346 (ed.) J. Stevenson, Bannantyne Club Volume 65 (Edinburgh, 1839).

Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh (ed.) Hans Claude Hamilton, 2 vols. (London, 1848-1849).

Chronicon Galfridi le Baker of Swynbroke (ed.) E.M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889).

Chronicon Henrici Knighton vel Cnitton Monachi Leycenstrensis (ed.) Joseph Rawson Lumby, Rolls Series (London, 1889-95).

Chronique de Jean le Bel (eds.) Jules Viard et Eugène Deprez, La Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, 1904).

Eulogium Historiarum Volume III (ed.) F.S. Haydon, Rolls Series (London, 1863).

French Chronicle of London (ed.) George James Aungier, Camden Society, 28 (London, 1844).

Oeuvres de Froissart (ed.) K. de Lettenhove, 25 vols, (Brussels, 1876).

Chroniques de J. Froissart 1307-1346 (ed.) Siméon Luce, 4 volumes, Libraire de la Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, 1869-1872).

Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvon of a Canon of Bridlington : Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Volume II (ed.) W. Stubbs, Rolls Series (London, 1883).

Historia Angliana of Thomas Walsingham, 2 volumes, (ed.) H.T. Riley, Rolls Series (London, 1863-4).

Johannes de Fordun Scotichronicon (ed.) Edward Goodall, 2 volumes, (Edinburgh, 1759).

Scalacronica by Sir Thomas Gray of Heton, Knight. A Chronicle of England and Scotland from AD MLXVI - AD MCCCLXXI (ed.) Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1836).

## II. Published and Calendared Documents

Accounts of the Chamberlains and other officials of the County of Chester 1301-1360, The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire, (Manchester, 1910) (ed.) Ronald Stewart-Brown.

Accounts of the Expences of John of Brabant and Thomas and Henry of Lancaster AD 1292-3, Camden Miscellany II, Camden Society Vol.55 (1853) (ed.) Joseph Burtt, esq.

Les Ambassades Angalises pendant la guerre de Cent Ans. Catalogue Chronique (1327-1450), Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes (1898) pp.550-577.

The Baronage of England, Sir William Dugdale, three volumes in two (London, 1675-76).

A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts of the 10th, 11th and 14th Years of King Edward II, Archaeologia XXVI (1836) pp.318-345.

Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1327-1341 (London, 1912).

Calendar of Close Rolls, 1313-1346 (London, 1893-1904).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, London, Volume III 1307-1357 (ed.) Joseph Bain, (Edinburgh, 1887).

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters 1305-42, 1342-62 (ed.) W.H. Bliss et al (London, 1895).

Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1327-1347 (London, 1913-1915).

Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Vols.VI - VIII, (London, 1910-1913).

Calendar of Memoranda Rolls, 1326-1327 (ed.) R.E. Latham (London, H.M.S.O. 1968).

Calendar of Miscellaneous Inquisitions, 1307-1349 (London, 1916).

Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1313-1345 (London, 1898-1902).

Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London 1323-1364 (ed.) A.H. Thomas (Cambridge, 1926).

Calendar of Treaty Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Volume II, 1337-1339 (ed.) John Ferguson, H.M.S.O. (London, 1972).

Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Hustings 1258-1410 (ed.) R.R. Sharpe, two volumes (London, 1889-90).

Caxton's Book of Curtesye (ed.) Fred J. Furnivall, E.E.T.S. 3 (1868).

A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Governance of the Royal Household . . . . Edward III - William and Mary (Society of Antiquaries, 1790).

The Coucher Book of Walley Abbey Volume III (ed.) W.A. Hulton, esq., Chetham Society XVI (1848).

The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290 (ed.) John Carmi Parsons (Toronto, 1977).

De Legatis et Legationibus Tractatus Varii (ed.) Vladimir E. Hrabar (Dorpat, 1902).

English Medieval Diplomatic Practice Volumes I and II (ed.) Pierre Chaplais, H.M.S.O. (London, 1975).

Feet of Fines for Essex (eds.) R.E.G. Kirk and E.F. Kirk, Essex Archaeological Society, Volume III (Colchester, 1899-1949).

Fleta Volume II (eds.) H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, Selden Society LXXII (1953).

A Fifteenth Century Courtesy Book (ed.) R.W. Chambers, E.E.T.S. 148 (1914).

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica (ed.) Thomas Rymer, Royal Commission Edition, four volumes, (London, 1816-30).

Le Guerre de Cent Ans vue a travers les Registres du Parlement (1337-1369), (ed.) Pierre-Clement Timbal (Paris, 1961).

The Household of Edward IV. The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478 (ed.) A.R. Myers (Manchester, 1959).

The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II 8th July 1311-7th July 1312 (ed.) F.D. Blackley and G. Hermensen (Edmonton, 1971).

Knights of Edward I, (ed.) Charles Moor, Harleian Society, five volumes (London, 1923-32).

The Knights of England (ed.) W.A. Shaw, two volumes (republished, London, 1971).

Liber Quotidianus Garderobae Anno Regni Regis Edwardi Primi Vicesimo Octavo (AD 1299 - 1300 (ed.) John Topham et al., Society of Antiquaries (London, 1787).

Manuscripts of Sir Thomas Hare, Bart. at Stow Hall, Norfolk, Historical Manuscript Commission Reports 9, Appendix 3rd Report, pp.250-252 (London, 1872).

Memoranda de Parlamento, 1305. Records of the Parliament Holden at Westminster on the Twenty-eighth day of February in the Thirty-third Year of the Reign of King Edward the First (AD 1305) (ed.) Frederick William Maitland, Rolls Series (London, 1893).

Monasticon Anglicanum, six volumes in eight (London, 1817-30) Sir William Dugdale.

Observations on the Institution of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, Archaeologia XXXI (1846) pp.1-163, Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas.

Original Letters Illustrative of English History Volume I (ed.) Henry Ellis (London, 1825).

Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, Edward I and Edward II (ed.) F. Palgrave, Record Commission, (London, 1827-34).

Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages (eds.) Nicholas Pronay and John Taylor (Oxford, 1980).

The Percy Chartulary (ed.) M.T. Martin, Surtees Society 117 (1909).

Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, composed during the period from the Accession of Edward III to that of Richard III, Volume I (ed.) Thomas Wright, Rolls Series (London, 1859).

Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council (ed.) Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas 7 volumes, Record Commission (London, 1834-7).

Proceedings before the Justices of the Peace in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Edward III to Richard III, The Ames Foundation (London, 1938).

Records of the Borough of Nottingham, Volume I, 1155-1399 (ed.) W.Henry Stevenson (London, 1882).

Records of the Wardrobe and Household 1285-6 (eds.) Benjamin F. Byerly and Catherine Ridder Byerly (London, H.M.S.O. 1977).

Recueil des Lettres Anglo-Francais 1265-1399 (ed.) F. Tanquery (Paris, 1916).

The Red Book of the Exchequer Part III (ed.) Hubert Hall, Rolls Series (London, 1896).

Regesta Regum Scottorum. VI. The Acts of David II King of Scots 1329-1371 (ed.) Bruce Webster (Edinburgh, 1982).

The Register of John de Grandisson, Volume III, Exeter Episcopal Registers (ed.) F.C. Hingeston Randolph (London, 1894-7).

Report of the Lords' Committee Touching the Dignity of a Peer, Volumes I-IV (1826-1829).

Rotuli Parliamentorum Volume II, 1326-1377 (ed.) J. Strachey et al. (London, 1767).

Rotuli Parliamentorum Hactenus Inediti MCLXXIX - MCCCLXIII (eds.) H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, Camden Society 3rd Series LI (1935).

Rotuli Scotiae, Volume I (Record Commission, 1814).

The Rights and Jurisdictions of the County Palatine of Chester, the Earls Palatine, the Chamberlain, and other officers; and Disputes Concerning the Court of Exchequer with the City of Chester, etc. (ed.) Joseph Brooks Yates Camden Miscellany II, Camden Society 37 (1856) pp.3-37.

A Roll of Arms Compiled in the Reign of Edward III 1327-40 (ed.) Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London, 1829).

Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench Under Edward III, Volumes V and VI (ed.) G.O. Sayles, Selden Society 76 and 82 (1958-1965).

Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty I, AD 1390 - 1404 and 1527 - 1545 (ed.) Reginald G. Marsden, Selden Society VI (1892).

Select Pleas of the Forest (ed.) G.J. Turner, Selden Society XIII (1899).

Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals (eds.) L.C. Loyd and D.M. Stenton (Oxford, 1950).

Statutes of the Realm, Record Commission, 9 volumes (London, 1810-1828).

A Survey of the Honour of Denbigh 1334 (ed.) P. Vinogradoff and F. Morgan, British Academy (London, 1914).

Two Chartularies of the Augustinian Priory of Bruton and the Cluniac Priory of Montacute (ed.) H.C. Maxwell Lyte et al., Somerset Record Society VIII (1894).

Testamenta Vetusta, or illustrations from wills of manners, customs, etc. (ed.) Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London, 1826).

The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell 12 July 1338 - 27 May 1340 (eds.) Mary Lyon, Bryce Lyon, H.S. Lucas, with the collaboration of John de Sturler, Academie Royale D'Histoire de Belgique, Commission Royale D'Histoire. (Brussels, 1983).

The Will of Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex, with extracts from the Inventory of his effects 1319-1322, The Archaeological Journal II (1846) pp.339-349.(ed.) T.H. Turner.

Yorkshire Sessions of the Peace, 1361-1364 (ed.) Bertha Haven Putnam, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series C (1929).

### C. Secondary Sources

- Robert W. Ackerman, "The Knighting Ceremonies in Medieval English Romances", Speculum, XIX (1944) pp.285-313.
- Michael Altschul, A Baronial Family in Medieval England: The Clares, 1217-1314, (Baltimore, 1965).
- Elias Ashmole, The History of the Most Noble Order of the Garter and the Several Orders of Knighthood Extant in Europe (London, 1715).
- James Fosdick Baldwin, The King's Council in England During the Middle Ages, (Oxford, reprinted 1969).
- E.W.M. Balfour-Melville, Edward III and David II, (London, 1954).
- , "Two John Crabbes", Scottish Historical Review, 39 (1960) pp.31-34.
- Joshua Barnes, The History of that Most Victorious Monarch Edward III, (Cambridge, 1688).
- Geoffrey Barraclough, "Edward I and Adolf of Nassau. A Chapter of Medieval Diplomatic History", Cambridge Historical Journal, Volume VI (1940) pp.225-262.
- B. Behrens, "Treatises on the Ambassador Written in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries", E.H.R. LI (1936) pp.616-627.
- Michael J. Bennet, Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (Cambridge, 1983).
- M.M. Bigelow, "The Bohun Wills", American Historical Review II (1896) pp.430-435, 631-649.
- F.D. Blackley, "Isabella and the Bishop of Exeter" in Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson (eds.) T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969) pp.220-236.
- C.H. Hunter Blair, "A Note Upon Medieval Seals with Special Reference to those in Durham Treasury", Archaeologia Aeliana Third Series XVII (1920) pp.244-313.
- R.A. Brown, H.M. Colvin and A.J. Taylor, The History of the King's Works, Volumes I and II (London, H.M.S.O. 1963).
- P.H.W. Booth, The Financial Administration of the Lordship and County of Chester 1272-1377, Cheetham Society Third Series (28) (Manchester, 1981).
- Richard H. Bowers, "From Rolls to Riches : King's Clerks and Moneylending in Thirteenth Century England", Speculum, 58 (1983) pp.60-71.

- F.W. Brooks, "The Cinque Ports' Feud with Little Yarmouth in the Thirteenth Century", Mariners Mirror XIX (January 1933) pp.27-51.
- H.C. Bruntall, "Savernak Forest in the Middle Ages", Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine XLVIII (1937-39) pp.371-386.
- Montagu Burrows, The Family of Brocas of Beaurepaire and Roche Court, Hereditary Masters of the Royal Buckhounds with some Account of the English Rule of Aquitaine (London, 1886).
- James Campbell, "England, Scotland and the Hundred Years War in the Fourteenth Century" in Europe in the Late Middle Ages (eds.) J.R. Hale, J.R.L. Highfield and B. Smalley (London, 1965) pp.184-216.
- Mildred Campbell, The English Yeoman Under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts, (New Haven, 1942).
- Christine Carpenter, "The Beauchamp Affinity - A Study of Bastard Feudalism at Work", E.H.R. XCV (1980) pp.514-532.
- Pierre Chaplais, "English Diplomatic Documents to the End of Edward III's Reign" in The Study of Medieval Records. Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major (eds.) D.A. Bullough and R.L. Storey (Oxford, 1971), pp.23-56.
- Alan B. Cobban, The King's Hall Within the University of Cambridge in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1969).
- G.E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct or Dormant 13 volumes in 14 (London, 1910-1959).
- D. Crouch, "Geoffrey de Clinton and Roger, Earl of Warwick: New Men and Magnates in the Reign of Henry I", B.I.H.R. LV (1982) pp.113-124.
- G.L. Crump, "The Arrest of Roger Mortimer and Queen Isabel", E.H.R. XXVI (1911) pp.331-332.
- G.P. Cuttino, English Diplomatic Administration, 1259-1339 (Oxford, 1940).
- , "The Process of Agen", Speculum, XIX (1944) pp.161-178.
- Ralph Philip D'Arcy, The Life of John, first Baron Darcy of Knayth (London, 1933).
- James Conway Davies, The Baronial Opposition to Edward II. Its Character and Policy (2nd Edition, London, 1967).
- , "The First Journal of Edward II's Chamber", E.H.R. 30 (1915) pp.662-680.
- Eugène Deprez, Les Préliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans: La Papauté, la France et l'Angleterre 1328-1342 (Paris, 1902).
- N. Denholm Young, Collected Papers (Cardiff, 1969).

- N. Denholm Young, The Country Gentry in the Fourteenth Century with Special Reference to the Heraldic Rolls of Arms, (Oxford, 1969).
- , History and Heraldry 1254-1310. A Study in the Historical Value of the Rolls of Arms, (Oxford, 1965).
- , Seigneurial Administration in England, (Oxford, 1937).
- P.C. Doherty, Isabella Queen of England 1296-1330 (Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1977).
- Robert Douch, The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury 1301-1344 (unpublished M.A. thesis, Southampton, 1950).
- , The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury 1301-1344, B.I.H.R. 24 (1951) pp.55-58.
- Sir Geoffrey Ellis, Earldoms in Fee. A Study in Peerage Law and History, (London, 1963).
- S.G. Ellis, "The Destruction of the Liberties: Some Further Evidence", B.I.H.R. LIV (1981) pp.150-161.
- F. Royson Fairbank, "The Last Earl of Warenne and Surrey and the Distribution of his Possessions", Yorkshire Archaeological Journal 19 (1907) pp.193-164.
- John Ferguson, English Diplomacy 1422-1461, (Oxford, 1972).
- Kenneth Fowler, The King's Lieutenant: Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster 1310-1361 (London, 1969).
- Robin Frame, English Lordship in Ireland 1318-1361 (Oxford, 1982).
- , "The Justiciarship of Ralph Ufford: Warfare and Politics in Fourteenth Century Ireland", Studia Hibernica 13 (1973) pp.1-47.
- E.B. Fryde, "Edward III's Wool Monopoly: A Fourteenth Century Trading Venture", History XXVII (1952) pp.8-24.
- , "Dismissal of Robert de Wodehouse from the Office of Treasurer, December 1338", E.H.R. 67 (1952) pp.74-78.
- , "Financial Resources of Edward III in the Netherlands 1337-40" 2nd part, Revue Belge (1967) pp.1142-1216.
- , Edward III's War Finance 1337-41. Transactions in Wool and Credit Operations (unpublished D.Phil., Oxford, 1949).
- , "Parliament and the French War 1336-40", Historical Studies of the English Parliament, I (eds.) E.B. Fryde and Edward Miller (Cambridge, 1970) pp.242-261.

- Natalie Fryde, "A Medieval Robber Baron Sir John Wolyns of Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire", in Medieval Legal Records Edited in Memory of C.A.F. Meekings (gen. eds.) R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post, H.M.S.O. (London, 1978).
- , The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326, (Cambridge, 1979).
- Margaret Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter", Birmingham University Journal I (1947-48) pp.13-50.
- C.J. Given-Wilson, The Court and Household of Edward III 1360-1377 (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, St. Andrews, 1975).
- , "The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's household, 1360-9", B.I.H.R. 51 (1978) pp.183-187.
- Anthony Goodman, "The Military Subcontracts of Sir Hugh Hastings, 1380", E.H.R. XCV (1980) pp.114-120.
- Antonia Gransden, "The Alleged Rape by Edward III of the Countess of Salisbury", E.H.R. LXXXVII (1972) pp.333-344.
- R.M. Haines, The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century, (London, 1965).
- L.W. Vernon Harcourt, His Grace the Steward and Trials by Peers: a novel enquiry into a special branch of constitutional government, etc. (London, 1907).
- G.L. Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance in England to 1369 (Oxford, 1977).
- H.J. Hewitt, Cheshire Under the Three Edwards (Chester, 1967).
- , The Organisation of War Under Edward III 1338-62 (Manchester, 1966).
- Mary C. Hill, The King's Messengers 1199-1377. A Contribution towards the History of the Royal Household (London, 1961).
- George Arthur Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England (Cambridge, 1957).
- , "The Rebellion of the Earl of Lancaster 1328-29", B.I.H.R. (1955) pp.84-89.
- R.S. Hoyt, The Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History 1066-1272 (New York, York, 1968).
- Dorothy Hughes, A Study of the Social and Constitutional Tendancies in the Early Years of Edward III (Reprinted Philadelphia, 1978).
- Joseph Hunter, "Journal of the Mission of Queen Isabella to the Court of France and of her long residence in that country", Archaeologia XXXVI (1856) pp.242-257.
- , "On the Measures Taken for the Apprehension of Sir Thomas Gurney, one of the Murderers of King Edward II, and on their final issue", Archaeologia XVII (1838) pp.274-297.

- Hilda Johnstone, "Poor Relief in the Royal Households of Thirteenth Century England", Speculum V (1929) pp.365-389.
- , "The Wardrobe and Household of Henry Son of Edward I", Bulletin of John Rylands Library 7 (1922-23) pp.382-420.
- Charles Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward I", T.R.H.S. 4th Series VI (1923) pp.50-72.
- J.H. Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward II", T.R.H.S. 4th Series XII (1929) pp.75-104.
- W.R. Jones, "The Court of the Verge: the Jurisdiction of the Steward and Marshal in the Household in Later Medieval England", Journal of British Studies 10 (1970-71) pp.1-29.
- M.H. Keen, "Treason Trials Under the Law of Arms", T.R.H.S. 5th Series XII (1962) pp.85-103.
- C.L. Kingsford, "Sir Otho de Grandisson (1238-1328)", T.R.H.S. 3rd Series III (1909) pp.125-195.
- J.L. Kirby, "Councils and Councillors of Henry IV, 1399-1413", T.R.H.S. 5th Series XIV (1964) pp.35-65.
- A.R. Larson, The King's Household in England Before the Norman Conquest (London, 1904).
- Alfred Larson, "The Payment of Fourteenth Century English Envoys", E.H.R. LIV (1939) pp.403-414.
- J.H. Le Patourel, "Edward III and the Kingdom of France", History N.S. 43 (1958) pp.173-189.
- , The Medieval Administration of the Channel Isles, 1199-1399 (London, 1937).
- Alun Lewis, "Roger de Leyburn and the Pacification of England 1265-67", E.H.R. (1939) pp.193-214.
- N.B. Lewis, "The Last Medieval Summons of the English Feudal Levy, 13 June 1385", E.H.R. LXXVIII (1958) pp.1-26.
- , "The Organisation of Indentured Retinues in Fourteenth Century England", T.R.H.S. 4th Series XXVII (1945) pp.29-39.
- , "The Recruitment and Organisation of a Contract Army, May to November 1337", B.I.H.R. 37 (1964) pp.1-19.
- , "The Summons of the English Feudal Levy, 5 April 1327" in Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson (eds.) T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969) pp.236-349.
- L.J. Loftie, A History of London, Volume II (London, 1883).

- H. Stanford London, "Some Medieval Treatises on English Heraldry",  
The Antiquaries Journal 33 (1953) pp.169-183.
- H.S. Lucas, "Diplomatic Relations Between England and Flanders 1329-1536",  
Speculum 11 (1936) pp.59-87.
- , The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War 1326-1347, (University  
of Michigan Publication Volume VIII 1929).
- K.B. McFarlane, "Bastard Feudalism", B.I.H.R. 20 (1945) pp.161-180.
- , "Had Edward I a 'Policy' Towards the Earls?" History N.S. 50  
(1965) pp.145-159.
- , Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights (Oxford, 1972).
- , The Nobility of Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1973).
- May McKisack, "Edward III and the Historians", History N.S. 45 (1960) pp.1-15.
- , The Fourteenth Century 1307-1399 (Oxford, 1959).
- J.R. Maddicott, Thomas of Lancaster 1307-1322. A Study in the Reign of Edward II  
(Oxford, 1970).
- Gervase Mathew, The Court of Richard II (London, 1968).
- Garrett Mattingly, "The First Resident Embassies: Medieval Italian Origins of  
Modern Diplomacy", Speculum XII (1937) pp.423-439.
- H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England,  
H.M.S.O. (London, 1926).
- A.R. Myers, "The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, 1466-67", Bulletin of  
John Rylands Library 50 (1967-8) pp.207-234, 443-481.
- , "The Household of Queen Margaret of Anjou 1452-3", Bulletin of John  
Rylands Library 40 (1957-8) pp.79-111, 391-431.
- , "Some Household Ordinances of Henry VI", Bulletin of John Rylands  
Library 36 (1953-4) pp.449-467.
- E.G. Miller and M.R. James, The Bohun Manuscripts, Roxburgh Club (Oxford, 1936).
- G. Mollat, The Popes at Avignon 1305-1378 (Edinburgh, 1963).
- A.W. Moore, History of the Isle of Man, 2 volumes (London, 1900).
- J.E. Morris, "Mounted Infantry in Medieval Warfare", T.R.H.S. 3rd Series 8  
(1914) pp.77-102.
- , The Welsh Wars of Edward I: a contribution to medieval military  
history based on original documents (Oxford, 1901).
- K.M.E. Murray, The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports (Manchester, 1935).

- J.E. Neale, "The Diplomatic Envoy", History N.S. XIII (1928-9) pp.204-218.
- Stella Mary Newton, Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince. A Study in the Years 1340-1365 (Bury St. Edmunds, 1980).
- Ranald Nicholson, Edward III and the Scots: the Formative Years of a Military Career 1327-1335 (London, 1965).
- , "The Last Campaign of Robert Bruce", E.H.R.LXXVII (1962) pp. 233-246.
  - , Scotland in the Later Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1974).
  - , "The Siege of Berwick, 1333", Scottish Historical Review 40 (1961) pp.19-42.
- H.S. Offler, "England and Germany at the Beginning of the Hundred Years War", E.H.R. LIV (1939) pp.608-631.
- Sir Francis Palgrave, An Essay Upon the Original Authority of the King's Council, The Commissioners of the Public Records of the Kingdom (London, 1837).
- J.R.S. Phillips, Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke 1307-1324 (Oxford, 1972).
- Austin Lane Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216 (Oxford, 1961).
- J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, The House of Lords in the Middle Ages. A History of the English House of Lords to 1540 (London, 1968).
- Michael Powicke, "Edward II and Military Obligation", Speculum XXXI (1956) pp.92-119.
- , Military Obligation in Medieval England. A Study in Liberty and Duty (Oxford, 1962).
- J.O. Prestwich, "The Military Household of the Norman Kings", E.H.R. XCVI (1981) pp.1-35.
- M.C. Prestwich, "English Armies in the Early Stages of the Hundred Years War: A Scheme in 1341", B.I.H.R. LVI (1983) pp.102-113.
- , War, Politics and Finance Under Edward I (London, 1972).
- A.E. Prince, "The Payment of Army Wages in Edward II's Reign", Speculum XIX (1944) pp.137-160.
- , "The Strength of English Armies in the Reign of Edward III", E.H.R. XLVI (1931) pp.353-371.
- Bertha Haven Putnam, The Place in Legal History of Sir William Shareshull, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, 1350-1361 (Cambridge, 1950).
- , "The Transformation of the Keepers of the Peace into the Justices of the Peace, 1327-1380", T.R.H.S. 4th Series XII (1929) pp.19-48.

- Donald E. Queller, The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages (Princeton, 1967).
- , "Thirteenth Century Diplomatic Envoys: Nuncii et Procuratores", Speculum XXXV (1960) pp.196-213.
- V.B. Redstone, "Some Mercenaries of Henry of Lancaster 1327-1330", T.R.H.S. 3rd Series (1913) pp.151-166.
- R.R. Reid, "The Office of the Warden of the Marches, its Origin and Early History" E.H.R. XXXII (1917) pp.479-496.
- J.H. Round, The Commune of London and Other Studies (Westminster, 1899).
- , The King's Serjeants and Officers of State with their Coronation Services (London, 1911).
- Mary C.L. Salt, "English Embassies to France in the Reign of Edward I; their Personnel, Powers, Equipment and Objects", B.I.H.R. VI (1929), pp.29-31.
- I.J. Sanders, English Baronies. A Study of their Origin and Descent 1086-1327 (Oxford, 1960).
- , Feudal Military Service in England: A Study of the Constitutional and Military Powers of the Barones in Medieval England (Oxford, 1956).
- A. Saul, "Great Yarmouth and the Hundred Years War in the Fourteenth Century", B.I.H.R. LII (1979) pp.105-115.
- N. Saul, "The Dispensers and the Downfall of Edward II", E.H.R. XLIX (1984) pp.1-33.
- , Knights and Esquires: The Gloucester Gentry in the Fourteenth Century (Oxford, 1981).
- V.J. Scattergood and J.W. Sherborne (eds.) English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1983).
- J.W. Sherborne, "Indentured Retinues and English Expeditions to France, 1369-1381", E.H.R. LXXIX (1964) pp.718-746.
- Robert Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster Volume I (London, 1953).
- Anthony Steel, "The Place of the King's Household in English Constitutional History to 1272", History N.S. 15 (1930-31) pp.289-295.
- E.L.G. Stones, "The Date of Roger Mortimer's Escape from the Tower of London", E.H.R. LXVI (1951) pp.97-98.
- , "The Folvilles of Ashby Folville, Leics.", T.R.H.S. 5th Series I (1957) pp.117-136.

- Sir Geoffrey le Scrope (c.1280 to 1340), Chief Justice of the King's Bench,  
E.H.R. LXIX (1954) pp.1-17.
- Grace Stretton "Some Aspects of Medieval Travel", T.R.H.S. 4th Series VII (1924)  
pp.77-98.
- R.J. Sutton, Robert Ufford: Tige des Seigneurs de Poswick à la Croix Engrêlé  
(Olne, 1968).
- James Tait, "The Date and Authorship of the Speculum Regis", E.H.R. XVI (1901)  
pp.110-115.
- Sylvia L. Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300-1500 (Chicago, 1948).
- William Thwaites, Isle of Man: its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, Antiquities,  
Botony, Zoology, etc. (Sheffield, 1863).
- T.F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, six volumes,  
(Manchester, 1920-1933).
- , The Collected Papers, with a Memoir and a Bibliography, Volume II,  
(Manchester, 1932).
- , The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History (Manchester, 1914).
- G.J. Turner, "The Justices of the Forest South of Trent", E.H.R. XVIII (1903)  
pp.112-116.
- George Unwin (ed.) Finance and Trade Under Edward III (Manchester, 1918).
- Juliet Vale, Edward III and Chivalry. Chivalric Society and its Context 1270-1350,  
(Bury St. Edmunds, 1982).
- The Victoria Histories of the Counties of England. 160 Volumes (London, from 1900).
- Bertie Wilkinson, The Chancery Under Edward III (Manchester, 1929).
- James F. Willard and William A. Morris (eds.) The English Government at Work,  
1327-1336, three volumes, The Medieval Academy of America,  
(Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1940-1950).
- Bertram Percy Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History. The Crown Estates in  
the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509 (London,  
1971).
- A.C. Wood, A History of Nottinghamshire (Nottingham, 1947).
- Charles R. Young, The Royal Forest of Medieval England (Leicester, 1979).

