

## Part 2 Performance of the Reformist Barons' Government

### 5

#### *Custos Pacis* and Henry III's patronage policy towards the gentry in 1264

##### Introduction

If we consider assessments of the gentry in the history of England, especially history since the 16th century, praise has been focused on the enterprise spirit of their economic activity, their progressiveness in the political field, their commitment to the renaissance culture and their ambitious navigation to the new world. However the most impressive characteristic of the gentry in English history seems to be the predominant political and social role of a gentry family in a rural society. When and how did the image of gentry of this kind emerge in the history of England? To answer this question scholars sometimes mention the establishment of the office of justices of the peace in the mid-fourteenth century. Chronologically the predecessor of the justice of the peace was *custos pacis* or keepers of the peace in the thirteenth century.

*Custos Pacis*, keepers of the peace, in each county were first appointed by the government of Simon de Montfort, the earl of Leicester, in July 1263 to muster the county force, *posse comitatus*, and to rival the king's *curiales* sheriffs in each county in the same year. But soon the baronial reformists lost control of the government, and in December 1263 king Henry III appointed the new *custos pacis* in almost every county in England. In May 1264 the earl of Leicester's army gained a victory against king

Henry III at the battle of Lewes, and in June the reformists' government again appointed the new *custos pacis* in every county. After the death of Simon de Montfort in the battle of Evesham on the 4th of August, 1265, the king began to appoint *custos pacis* in some counties. What was common to these *custos pacis* on several occasions in the 1260s, was the character of their duties. It was to keep the peace in the county using the entire force of the county. They were independent from the control of the sheriffs. Twenty years later Edward I appointed new keepers of the peace, *conservatores pacis*, in 1287, who were ordered to keep the king's peace in each county and whose duty was regulated by the statute of Winchester enacted two years before.

The fact that the new official was created by the reformist barons in the course of the reform movement, 1258–1265, appears to suggest its epoch-making significance in the history of England. Was there any relation between the reform plan and the establishment of the new official? Did the baronial reform plan influence the emergence of small landlords into the local administration of thirteenth-century England? What was their political and social function in local society? Paying attention to these issues, in this chapter mainly the establishment of *custos pacis* in 1264 will be investigated.

### 1. Historiography

Tracing some preceding studies about the peace keeping system in thirteenth century England, I will pick up some points to be considered in this chapter. W. Morris focused his attention on the authority of sheriffs in the peace-keeping system of the county. According to his explanation, the sheriff was established

to preside over the crown pleas in the county court from the latter half of the twelfth century and he was ordered to keep control over the outlaws and to array the *posse comitatus*, force of the county, to preserve order. Morris concluded that the sheriff began to take the general responsibility of peace keeping in each county in the early thirteenth century. He also mentioned the transition of peace-keeping power from the sheriff to the *custos pacis* in the middle of the thirteenth century, but did not make an intensive analysis of the transition.<sup>1</sup>

Helen Cam emphasized the communal responsibility of each hundred in the peace-keeping system of local society. According to her explanation, in the *Edictum Regium* in 1191, local residents above 15 years old were ordered to have a duty of peace keeping. In 1205 King John ordered the constable of each hundred and township to take charge of arraying the residents' force to deal with local disorder, and the chief constable of each county to take general control of hundred and township constables. In 1242 the royal ordinance made villeins as well as freeholders in the village organized in the peace-keeping system under constables. The statute of Winchester in 1285 ordained that the view of *posse comitatus* should be made twice a year. Cam also mentioned the significance of *custos pacis* of 1264, and, assessing their role of leading *posse comitatus*, concluded that the *custos pacis* in 1264 should be regarded as the representatives of local community to maintain public order among residents, though they were nominated by the central government.<sup>2</sup>

Alan Harding traced the establishment of the peace keeping system under the king's initiative in medieval England in the thirteenth century. He emphasized the important role of sheriffs,

who were ordered to select four or eight sergeants in each county from 1241, and later to make use of local constables for the maintenance of the king's peace. According to his opinion the *custos pacis* of 1264 did not remove power from the sheriff, but was created as a new office with a different function from the sheriff. It was the judicial power. For his theory the most important change in the history of *custos pacis* did not happen in 1264, but in 1287, when the new keeper of the peace, *conservatores pacis*, were entitled to hold the judicial power. He noticed that there was a need to establish the judicial office in this period because there were abundant cases of trespasses in the eyre rolls of the mid-thirteenth century, mainly initiated by writs of *querulae*, personal appeals by small landholders. His main concern was in the founding of the justice of the peace in the mid-fourteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

H. Ainsley simply regarded the history of the peace-keeping system in thirteenth century England as a developing process of the king's peace. He regarded the *custos pacis* as one of the king's local officials, who was ordained to cope with the attack from the baronial opponents in the period of anti-royal movements, such as in 1187, 1230s and 1258–65. He ignored the role of a communal idea of public peace in local society, which might have created the office of *custos pacis*.<sup>4</sup>

The baronial reform movement, which began in April, 1258, moved forward on the initiative of some reformist barons, such as Simon de Montfort, Richard of Clare, Roger Bigod and others, until the end of 1259. But after April 1260 King Henry III gradually re-established his authority in the government. Although in July 1263 the earl of Leicester and his adherents temporarily grasped the initiative of government and for the first

time appointed *custodes pacis* in twenty-four counties, the king soon recovered his authority and kept the power of appointing of sheriffs and his *custodes pacis* till the battle of Lewes in May, 1264. But here we should listen to what John Maddicott wrote in his *Simon de Montfort*. He called our attention to the localities, writing 'baronial keepers of the counties were put into office by the same combination of local and baronial initiative as had halted the eyres. It was these appointments, more than anything else, which recreated the old alliance between the reformists and the localities.' He also refers to *custos pacis* in June, 1264 and says, 'most important of all was the assent of the knights', 'new keepers of the peace (i.e. *custos pacis*) were asked to supervise the election of four knights from each shire to attend parliament on 22 June at the latest.'<sup>5</sup>

In any case the appointments were made by the king or by the baronial reformers to accomplish their political ambitions of the time. But the agreement of the localities also matters. In the letter of June 4, 1264, the earl of Leicester's government ordered the *custos pacis* as follows; if you shall find any such evildoers and disturbers of our peace, or also any bearing arms, you shall have them arrested immediately and kept in safe custody and you shall take with you, *posse comitatus*, the entire force of the county.<sup>6</sup> The cooperation of the local force was crucial for the accomplishment of the policy of the central government. In order to know the historical significance of the appointment of *custos pacis*, we should also see the matter from the standpoint of inhabitants of each county. So in this chapter I will see how the king or the central government valued their ability as an agent in the county, and also how well those appointed worked as a leader of the local people's peace keeping organization.

## 2. Offices and benefits granted to *custos pacis*

As mentioned above, in 1264 there were two kinds of keepers of the peace (*custos pacis*), those appointed by the king in December, 1263, and the others appointed by the Earl of Leicester's government in June, 1264. Keepers on the king's side numbered 29 and those on the earl's side 37. (See table 1) Of them all, only one person, John St Valery, was appointed twice.<sup>7</sup> This means the king and the reformist barons selected persons by standards different from each other. The fact that keepers of the peace of both sides existed in the same year, though they did not co-exist in parallel, means that in each county there were at least two factions politically different from each other. The second keepers were appointed only six months later than the first ones. So we can compare the two types of keepers in the same year. From the comparison we shall learn the hostile relations among the local people in a county, what peace keeping meant for the local people and the route of influence from the central government to local inhabitants.

Clive Knowles and H. Ainsley have already identified the names of the keepers of both sides in each county, and I have investigated their careers and landholdings.<sup>8</sup> We can know the feudal relations between each keeper and his lords, i.e. the king or magnates. And we can also get information about their adherence to the reform movement from the judicial records of the time. However there was no record extant of the office of the keeper itself. So far scholars have investigated what they were ordained to do, and what purposes or motives the government had in mind. I used the eyre rolls which show what type of persons among the keepers were presented by their fellow jurors in the county. From their presentment we can assume how

table 1 *custos pacis* in 1264

king's <i>custos pacis</i> 1263,12,24–1264,5	counties	reformists' <i>custos pacis</i> 1264,6,4–1265,8
Eustace de Balliol John de Balliol Peter de Brus Adam de Monte Alto Adam de Gesemuth Robert de Nevill Henry Percy Ralph fitz Randolf Peter de Malo Lacu Stephen de Meinil Roger de Lancastre	Cumberland Westmorland  Lancashire Northumberland Yorkshire	Thomas Multon of Gilsland John de Morvill  William le Butler ('65,6,8) John de Plessey John de Eyvill
	Lincolnshire	Adam de Newmarket
Philip Marmium Andrew Lutterel	Nottinghamshire Derbyshire	Robert de Stradley Richard de Vernon → Robert de Stradley ('65,6,8)
Roger Mortimer John fitz Alan John de Verdun Hamo Lestrangle James Alditele	Staffordshire Shropshire	Ralph Basset of Drayton
	Warwickshire	Thoma de Astley
	Leicestershire	Ralph Basset of Sapcote
	Northamptonshire	William Marshal
('64,4,26) William de Moine	Huntingdonshire Cambridgeshire	Henry Engain Giles de Argentin → John de Scalariai ('64,6,18)
	Norfolk Suffolk	John de Burgh elder William Bovil → Roger Bigod ('64,7,9) → Hugh le Despenser ('64,7,9) → Thomas de Multon of Frampton ('64,9,21)
	Essex Hertfordshire	Richard de Tany elder
	Bedfordshire	Walter de Bello Campo
	Buckinghamshire	John fitz John
Philip Basset	Oxfordhire Berkshire  Wiltshire	Gilbert de Elsefield, Robert fitz Nigel → Nicholas Hanrad ('64,7,27) Geoffrey Scudemor
Roger Clifford John Giffard	Gloucestershire Worcestershire Herefordshire	William de Tracy

Roger Leyburn → Robert de Crevequer (64,4,18)	Kent	Hnery de Montfort → Fulk Payforer (64,7,27)
John de Warenne	Surry Sussex	John de Wauton, Frank de Bohun → Simon de Montfort younger (64,6,9)
John de St.Valery Reynold fitz Peter Ralph St. John	Hampshire	John st. Valery
Alan la Zuche	Dorset Somersetshire  Devonshire	John de Adler, Brian de Gouiz → Brian de Gouiz (65, 6,27)  Oliver Dinham → Hugh Peverel (65,2,28)

the hundred jurors expected the keepers to behave in the society of landholders in the county. We shall also learn what kind of person in a local society the king or the reformist barons would choose as an agent of government.

First I investigated the receipt of benefits by each keeper, 29 of king's side and 37 of the reformist barons' side (John St Valery was counted as a king's keeper in this chapter). The period studied is from ten years before the reform movement till the end of the reign of Henry III, i.e. between 1248 and 1272. The benefits were divided into five heads, such as landholding, the benefit-grants from the king, offices appointed by the king, judicial procedure of private affairs and others. (See table 2) In the category of landholding were included registration of landholding, pardon from forfeiture and disinheritance, succession, recovery of the holding, advowson and wardship, and licence of land lease. The benefit-grants mean here grant of various benefits, recognition, fulfilment and quittance of debts, exemption charters, grace and remission of payment, privileges, and promise of benefits. The office-holding includes appointment to



table 2 entries in official records of *custos pacis* in five periods

	29 king's keepers					37 reformists' keepers				
	I 1248- 1258,4	II '58,5- '59,12	III '60,1- '64,5,14	IV '64,5,15 '65,8,4	V '65,8,5 '72,11	I	II	III	IV	V
<b>A landholdings</b>										
1 confirmation	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	3
2 disinherit	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	11
3 inheritance	6	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	4
4 redemption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
5 advowson, custody	3	0	3	0	12	2	0	0	1	2
6 lease permission	5	2	1	0	4	1	0	2	0	3
<b>B benefits</b>										
1-1 grant	17	2	31	0	92	5	1	4	5	8
1-2 forfeiture	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2
2-1 order of payment	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
2-2 quittance permission	6	1	4	0	12	0	0	1	0	9
3 quittance charter	4	0	1	0	3	9	0	0	0	1
4 payment extention	2	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	1
5 liberty grants	14	0	13	0	23	3	0	1	5	6
6 grants promise	1	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
<b>C office grant</b>										
1-1 appointment	7	1	57	0	12	8	15	14	44	10
1-2 removal	2	2	4	4	5	2	2	10	3	4
2-1 commission	10	5	32	1	52	4	0	7	35	16
2-2 dismissal	1	0	11	12	15	0	1	3	5	3
3 mandate	10	0	7	0	20	2	1	5	17	4
4 bestowment	4	10	19	0	20	5	2	4	7	10
5 inquiry order	7	9	13	2	22	4	1	4	9	6
6 other orders	13	3	20	8	13	5	1	9	13	4
7 pledge	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	3	4	0
<b>D conflicts</b>										
1 offenders	2	1	5	12	5	0	0	2	6	3
2 deffenders	0	2	0	1	6	0	2	0	0	0
3 pleadings	2	3	8	1	5	4	0	0	1	7
4 investigation	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	3
<b>E others</b>										
1 mainprise	0	0	1	0	13	0	0	1	1	8
2 recommendation	8	2	7	0	110	33	2	0	6	4
3 attestation	20	5	21	4	25	15	9	15	44	5
4 guarantee	2	0	3	0	0	3	3	4	1	0
5 advice giving	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	0
6-1 confirmation of grant	0	0	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
6-2 dismissal of grant	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1

offices, commission of power, mandate to fulfil an office, empowerment as assessor or investigator, administrative order, and pledge work. The judicial procedure includes appeals, presentment and indictment, and orders to settle the matter by justices. Here I consulted *Patent Rolls, Close Rolls, Inquisitions Miscellaneous* and *Foedera*. As these records are 'public' records which tell us about the relation between the king and his subjects, we will be able to discover from them how the king treated each keeper.

Next the period will be divided into five. The first period is ten years, 1248–1258, before the reform movement began. The second starts from April, 1258, and ends in December, 1259, during which period the movement developed most profoundly. The third period starts at the beginning of 1260, when the reformist barons were divided into two groups, the reformists and the conservatives, and ends at the battle of Lewes in May 14, 1264. The fourth was the period when the earl of Leicester virtually dictated the realm through the name of the king from May, 1264, to the battle of Evesham in August 4, 1265, when the earl was killed. After that day the fifth period lasts till the end of Henry III's reign, November, 1272.

I made a table of receipt of benefits by keepers of the peace divided period by period. (See table 2) At first sight we can easily notice some characteristics. One of them is the numbers of king's keepers with benefits surpassed those of the reformist counterparts. The numbers of king's appointees with benefits naturally became large in the first and fifth periods when the king held the authority of the government. On the other hand the numbers of the reformist barons' appointees' experiences were rather small even in the second period when the barons

took the initiative of the government. The numbers became large only in the fourth period. We can also read from the table the tendency that the numbers with benefits on both sides increased as time went on.

First I will check the table of office-holding among the keepers. (See tables 3 and 4) Before the reform movement started eighteen (62%) of the twenty-nine king's keepers had already been appointed to various offices, while only thirteen (35.2%) of thirty-seven reformist barons' keepers had had an experience of office-holding. In the second period, the number of the office-holding keepers of the first group decreased from 18 to 10. It could be part of the reform plan to purge some of the king's appointees from their offices once the reformist barons took the initiative. Otherwise the reformist barons answered the request from the locality to purge some of the king's friends, *amici regis*, in the county for their malpractice in their office.<sup>9</sup> (Andrew Hershey published an article on this theme.<sup>10</sup>) Though the number of office-holders on the reformists' side increased in this period, it increased only by one (from 13 to 14). As a matter of fact there was a chance of office holding in this period, for the reformists' appointees to be commissioners in the county to prepare for the special eyre by the new justiciar, Hugh Bigod. Notwithstanding, only a few of them became commissioners. The local knights who were nominated as commissioners in 1258 seems to have been different from the group of those who would be appointed as keepers of the peace in 1264.

In the third period, though the earl of Leicester took the initiative of government temporarily in 1263, the king kept appointing sheriffs throughout this period. So all the king's appointees were granted at least an office during the period.

table 3 King's keepers; entry or non-entry of office holding and benefit grant

name of Custos	a. office holding					b. benefit grant					c. a+b		d. status		
	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V	I	V	DNB	Dugdale	Ainsley
Alan, John fitz	o	o	o	x	o	o	x	x	x	o	⊙	⊙	o	o	
Aldithele, James	o	o	o	x	o	x	x	o	x	o	○	⊙	baron	o	baron
Balliol, Eustace de	x	x	o	remo.	o	o	x	o	x	o	○	⊙	x	o	baron
Balliol, John de	o	o	o	remo.	o	o	x	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	o	o	baron
Basset, Philip	o	o	o	remo.	o	o	o	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	baron	o	
Brus, Peter de	x	x	o	x	o	o	o	o	x	o	○	⊙	x	o	baron
Clifford, Roger	x	o	o	o	o	o	x	o	x	o	○	⊙	o	o	baron
Crevequer, Robert	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	○	x	x	o	
Gesemuth, Adam de	x	x	o	remo.	o	o	x	o	x	o	○	⊙	x	x	
Giffard, John	x	x	o	remo.	o	x	x	o	x	o	x	⊙	baron	o	
Lancaster, Roger de	x	x	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	o	x	⊙	x	o	
Lestrangle, Hamo	o	x	o	o	o	o	x	x	x	o	⊙	⊙	x	o	baron
Leyburn, Roger	x	x	o	o	o	o	x	o	x	o	○	⊙	o	o	
Luterel, Andrew	o	x	o	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	⊙	x	x	o	
Malo Lacu, Peter de	o	x	o	x	x	o	x	x	x	o	⊙	○	x	o	
Marmium, Philip	o	x	o	x	o	o	x	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	o	o	
Meinil, Stephen de	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	○	x	x	o	
Moine, William de	x	o	o	x	o	o	x	x	x	o	○	⊙	x	o	
Monte Alto, Adam de	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	o	x	o	x	○	x	x	
Mortimer, Roger	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	baron	o	baron
Nevil, Robert de	o	o	o	o	o	o	x	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	baron	o	baron
Percy, Hnery de	o	o	o	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	⊙	○	x	x	baron
Peter, Reynold fitz	o	x	o	x	o	o	x	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	x	x	
Randolf, Ralph de	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	○	x	o	
St. John, Ralph de	o	x	o	o	o	o	x	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	x	o	
St. Valery, John de	x	x	o	o	remo.	x	x	x	x	x	x	remo.	x	o	knight
Verdun, John de	o	x	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	o	○	⊙	x	o	
Warenne, John de	o	x	o	remo.	o	o	o	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	earl	o	
Zuche, Alan la	o	o	o	x	o	x	x	o	x	o	○	⊙	baron	o	

note. remo.=removal, c.a O+b O=⊙, a O+b X=○, X+X=X, X+remo.=removal.

DNB=Dictionary of National Biography

table 4 Reformist's keepers; entry or non-entry of office holding and benefit grant

name of Custos	a. office holding					b. benefit grant					c. a+b		d. status		
	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V	I	V	DNB	Dugdale	Ainsley
Argentin, Giles de	x	o	o	o	x	x	x	x	o	x	x	o	o	o	baron
Astley, Thomas de	o	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	x	knight	baron
Adler, John de	o	o	o	o	o	exch	x	x	x	x	Oexch	o	x	x	commi
Basset, Ralph, of Drayton	x	x	o	o	x	exch	x	x	x	x	exch	x	baron	o	baron
Basset, Ralph, of Sapcote	x	o	o	o	x	exch	x	x	x	x	exch	x	baron	o	baron
Bigod, Roger le	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	x	⊙	o	o	o	earl
Bohun, Frank de	x	x	x	o		x	x	x	x	o	x	o	x	o	
Bovil, William de	o	x	x	o	o	o	x	o	x	o	⊙	⊙	x	x	
Bello Campo, Walter de	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Burgh, John de	x	o	o	o	o	o	x	disch	x	o	o	⊙	x	knight	baron
Butler, William le	x	o	x	o	o	x	x	o	x	x	x	o	x	x	
Dinham, Oliver de	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	o	x	⊙	x	knight	
Despenser, Hugh le	o	o	o	o	x	x	x	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	baron
Elsefield, Gilbert de	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	o	x	o	
Engain, Henry	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	o	
Eywill, John de	o	o	o	o	o	x	x	o	o	o	o	⊙	x	o	
Gouiz, Brian de	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	o	disch	x	x	x	x	baron
Hanrad, Nicholas de	o	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	baron
John, John fitz	x	o	o	o	o	x	x	o	o	o	x	o	x	o	
Marshal, William	x	x	o	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	o	o	x	o	
Montfort, Henry de	x	x	x	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	o	o	o	o	
Montfort, Simon de, younger	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	x	o	o	
Morvill, John de	x	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	commi
Multon, Thomas de, Gilsland	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	
Multon, Thomas de, Frampton	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	o	
Newmarket, Adam de	x	x	x	o	o	o	x	x	o	o	o	⊙	o	o	baron
Nigel, Robert fitz	x	x	x	o	x	exch	x	x	x	x	exch	x	x	x	knight
Payforer, Fulk	o	o	o	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	
Peverel, Hugh	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	knight	
Plessey, John de	x	o	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	⊙	x	x	commi
Scalariis, John de	o	x	o	o	o	x	x	x	x	o	o	⊙	x	x	
Scudemor, Geoffrey de	o	o	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	
Stradley, Robert de	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Tany, Richard de	o	x	o	o	o	exch	x	x	o	o	Oexch	⊙	x	o	commi
Tracy, William de	x	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	
Vernon, Richard de	o	o	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x	o	x	x	x	commi
Wauton, John de	o	x	o	o	o	exch	x	x	x	x	Oexch	o	x	x	

note: exch=exemption charter granted. disch=order of discharge duty. c: a:O+b:exch=Oexch, ⊙=a:o+b:o

table 5 landholdings of each keeper

king's keeper	county where each held tenure	county where each was appointed	reformists' keeper	county where each held tenure
Balliol, J. Balliol, E.. Monte Alto, A. Gesemuth, A. Nevill, R. Malo Lacu, P. Brus, P. Percy, H. Randolf, R. Meinil, S. Lancaster, R.	Beds. Herts. Northants. Northumb. Westm. Leic. Linc. Suffolk Northumb. Linc. York, Wilts. Beds. Kent, Somers. Surrey Linc. York, Cumb. Durham unknown unknown unknown Westm. Essex	Cumberland  Westmorland Lancashire Northumberland Yorkshire	Multon, T. Gilsland  Morville, J. Butler, W. Plessey, J. Eyvill, J.	Cumb.  Unknown Lancs. Northumb. York.
		Lincolnshire	Newmarket, A.	Linc. Notts. Derby. York.
Marmium, P.	Glouc. Hereford, Linc. War. Wilts.	Nottinghamshire	Stradley, R.	Notts.
Luterel, A.	Leic. Linc., Notts. Somers. York.	Derbyshire	Vernon, R.	Derby, Bucks.
Mortimer, R. Alan, J. Verdun, J. Lestrangle, H. Aldithele, J.	Devon, Dorset, Glouc. Heref. Oxon. Wors. Glouc. Oxon. Norf. Salop. War. unknown unknown unknown	Staffordshire Shrops.	Basset, R. (Drayton)	Leic. Notts. Staff. War.
		Warwickshire	Astley, T.	War. Glouc. Lanc.
		Leicestershire	Basset, R. (Sapcote)	Staff. Leic.
		Nortamptonshire	Marshal, W.	Lanc. Northumb. Northampt. Linc.
Moine, W.	Dors. Glouc. Wilts. Camb.	Huntingdonshire Cambridgeshire	Engain, H. Argentin, G.	Hunts. Camb. Camb. Essex
		(Hunts. Camb.)	Scalariis, J.	Camb. Hunts.
		Norfolk	Burgh, J.	Norf. Suff. Linc.
		Suffolk	Bovil, W.	Linc.
		(1Norf. Suff.)	Bigod, R.	Norf. Essex
		(2Norf. Suff.)	Dispenser, H.	Leic. Linc. Northumb. York.

		(3Norf. Suff.)	Multon, T. Frampton	Linc. Suff.
		Essex, Hertford	Tany, R.	Essex
		Bedfordshire	Bello Campo, W.	Worc.
		Buckinghamshire	John, fitz J.	Devon, Linc. Lanc. Norf. Notts.
Basset, P.	Norf. Suff. Camb.	Oxfordshire Berkshire Wiltshire	Elsefield, G. Nigel, R. Scudemore, G.	Oxon. Berk. Wilts.
Clifford, R. Giffard, J.	Heref. Wilts. Worc. Berk. Glouc. Wilts.	Gloucestershire Worcestershire Herefordshire	Tracy, W.	Devon, Wilts.
Leyburn, R.	Salop. Staff.	Kent	Montfort, H.	unknown
Crevequer, R.	Kent	(Kent)	Payforer, F.	Kent
Warene, J.	Bucks. Camb. Linc. Norf. Oxon.	Surrey Sussex	Wauton, J. Bohun, F.	Surrey Sussex
		(Surrey, Sussex)	Montfort, S. younger	unknown
Peter, R. St. John, R. St. Valery, J.	Oxon. unknown unknown	Hampshire	St. Valery, J.	unknown
Zuche, A.	Devon, Sussex, Wilts. Hunts. Camb.	Dorsetshire Somersetshire Devonshire	Adler, J. Gouiz, B. Dinham, O.	Somers. Unknown Devon.
		(Devonshire)	Peveler, H.	Devon.

The reformist barons' appointees were also favoured with an office, the number being increased from 14 to 18. In the fourth period only eight of king's appointees got a job. In other words the earl of Leicester's government purged twenty one of the king's appointees from offices. The reduction was severer than the second period. Certainly all the reformists' appointees got the office of *custos pacis* and some other offices, too. For fourteen of them this was the first opportunity to get a governmental office in their career. In the next period, after the battle of Evesham, 23 of 29 king's appointees got offices. Among the 37

reformists' appointees, six were killed in the battle, one fled, and two were held as hostages. After these nine persons are deducted, among the other 28, eighteen (24.2%) were nominated for some offices. The placement rate of reformist barons' keepers had almost been doubled since the first period. From these data we know what the king's policy with regard to personnel was. He chose officials almost exclusively from a particular group of people. On the other hand the reformist barons tried to purge those king's favourites from their offices every time they took the initiative of government. The number of persons who could get a governmental office for the first time in the second and the fourth periods was twenty four (64.8%), which considerably exceeds that of the first-time-appointees (37.9%) of the king's side. The king kept employing his favourites to governmental offices, but the reformist barons gave a chance to those who had not been appointed to any office by the king.<sup>11</sup>

We should not forget that some of the king's keepers were appointed to some offices continuously, except in the fourth period. They were three magnates, Roger Mortimer, Robert Meinil, John Balliol, and a courtier, Philip Basset, and four favourite barons, John fitz Alan, James Audley, Peter Percy and Alan la Zuche.

Next I will check the benefit-grants from the king to each keeper between 1248 and 1272.(see tables 3b and 4b) In the first period nineteen (65.5%) of the 29 king's keepers were granted some benefits, while only twelve (32.4%) of the 37 reformists' keepers gained such a favour. We can read the same kind of tendency as the office-holding. Of the twelve reformists' keepers above mentioned, six were granted exemption from juror service and other minor commissions in the localities, while



---

only six were granted money, land or other gifts. Some of the king's keepers had already experienced the office of sheriff. But that was not the case of the reformists' keepers. So the keepers in the former group consisted of the people ranked higher than those in the latter group in the local society.

In the second period neither the king's nor the reformists' keepers were granted many benefits. Only the magnates on both sides were granted the same benefits as ever. In the third period seventeen persons of the king's side gained some benefits, less than the nineteen in the first period. The same was the case for the reformists' keepers. The contrast between the two sides is very clear in the fourth period as is the case of office holding. None of the king's keepers were granted any benefit, while ten out of 37 of the reformists' keepers got a chance. That is, not all the barons' keepers benefited even when the reformist barons took the initiative of government. After the battle of Evesham as many as 24 king's keepers were favoured with benefit, while twelve of the reformists' keepers benefited. If we take into account that it was the time after the earl of Leicester had been killed and the king recovered his power, the number of twelve not small for the reformists' keepers.

Keepers of the peace on the reformist barons' side were less favoured with benefits than those in the king's side in every period. Those who were favoured in every period, were twelve (41.3%) on the king's side and five (13.5%) on the reformists' side. The difference is sharp. The keepers on the reformists' side tended to receive benefits in the second and fourth period, but only Roger Bigod, earl of Norfolk, received benefits constantly. In contrast the keepers on the king's side were generally granted benefit in the first, third and fifth period, and moreover

16 persons (55.1%) were favoured constantly. This difference is also big. The keepers who received little or no benefit did exist on both sides. The number is 6 (20.6%) of the king's keepers and 22 (59.4%) of the reformist barons' keepers, a difference of more than three-fold. It is clear that the reformists' keepers were chosen from the people who had not been favoured by the king's policy of patronage. The king distributed his patronage to the particular group of people from the first period to the end of his reign, and his patronage policy was accelerated as the time went on. On the other hand the reformist barons did not adopt a policy of the same kind as far as my investigation is concerned. In other words delivering benefit was out of their authority even if they did virtually take the initiative of government. Some scholars criticized the earl of Leicester for giving benefit to his own sons, Henry and Simon, but his partiality was the case only in the fourth period.

If we consider the office holding and benefit grant together and compare the difference between the first and the last period, we will understand how many appointees were favoured by the king's patronage policy. Before the reform movement began, thirteen of the king's keepers were favoured with both office and benefit, and after the battle of Evesham, the number rose from five to eight. (see tables 3c and 4c) The same rise can be seen in the case of the reformist barons' keepers, but the rising rate of the king's keepers was triple that of the reformists' keepers' rate. It is comprehensible that the king's keepers should be favoured as a reward for their service to the patron. But in the case of reformists' keepers the explanation will be rather complicated.

As mentioned before, the reformists appointed completely

different persons except one to the office of *custos pacis* in June 1264. Most of them had not been favoured with office nor benefit by the king before the reform movement. In December 1263 the king replaced the first *custos pacis* appointed by the reformers in July 1263, and nominated a new group of persons to the office. So at that stage the king kept his old policy of patronage not to give any office to people other than his favourites. But after the rebellion was over, the king seems to have changed his policy, and started dispensing patronage to them, too. Why did this happen? I will return to this point later.

We need to reconsider the king's patronage as a reaction to the side of the reformists. It is natural for the ruler to give patronage to his subjects, expecting their better service to him. King Henry III had used this policy since his personal rule started in the 1230s. It is also natural for the people in disfavour to demand a chance for office and benefit from the ruler. The reformist barons gave a chance to these people in the course of their movement. But that is not the whole of the story. Even when the reformist barons took the initiative of government in the second and the fourth period it did not happen that all the appointees of the reformists' side were given benefits. The rate of gift-giving by the reformist barons was much smaller than that of the king. On the other hand a handful of magnates of both sides were appointed to various offices and given benefits at any period of the movement, (as were the cases of Roger Bigod, Hugh le Dispenser and Giles de Argentin.) When the ruler appointed these magnates to some office, he might have valued their fidelity and responsibility to the government, and at the same time he may have assessed their influence in the locality. Patronage policy has validity in retaining the former purpose,

but is not suitable in securing the latter purpose. The king must have recognized the political influence of magnates over their followers and affinities. But how could he trust the rather localized people who had no direct connection with the king? On the other hand the reformist government might have evaluated how efficiently their nominees would accomplish the duty of peace keeping in the locality.

### 3. Classification and Residency of the *Custos Pacis*

Several scholars have already undertaken investigating research on the classification of *custos pacis* in the 13th century. Powicke, Knowles and Ainsley concluded that the reformist barons' appointees were selected from the knightly class,<sup>12</sup> while the king's appointees were from the magnates and courtiers.<sup>13</sup> Is this classification true? It is rather difficult to examine whether each of the keepers of the peace was magnate or gentry, because we have no census of landholders on a nationwide scale in 1264. So through examining several public registers in this period, we will be able to infer to which class each keeper belonged. In the group of "barons", I will include earls, barons or the persons holding substantial property. In the group of "gentry" were classified knights and the persons who were employed as jurors, commissioners of inquiry or assessors of taxes. Other than these two groups there should be the third group of landholders of intermediate rank.

Among the 29 king's appointees seventeen (58.6%) were classified as "barons", while only four were ranked as "gentry". On the other hand the number of "barons" of the reformists' appointees was as small as four (10.8%) out of 37, and the appointees ranked as "gentry" as many as seventeen (45.9%).

Judging from this summary, just Powicke concluded, the king's keepers were "barons" and the reformists' were "gentry".

Allocation of the county for each keeper is rather complicated. Generally speaking the reformists' government assigned one county to one person, for example, assigning Cumberland to Thomas Multon of Gilsland. The king assigned five counties, namely Cumberland, Westmorland, Lancashire, Northumberland and Yorkshire, to eleven persons as a group. Alan la Zuche, the king's favourite baron, was assigned to Dorset, Somerset and Devon, while the reformists' government assigned one individual to each of these counties. (see table 1)

Investigation of their landholding county by county also shows us another interesting characteristic. Using the *Book of Fees* I have noticed the following points. Not a few of the king's keepers held land in more than two counties. There are only two, Adam de Gesemuth and Ralph fitz Peter, who held land in only one county in the record. But as many as sixteen reformists' keepers held land only in one county, of whom fourteen persons were holding land in the county to which they were appointed as a keeper. Twelve keepers in the reformists' side held land in more than three counties. Eight of them held land in the county to which they were appointed as a keeper. The relation between land holding and the county of his keepership was not close as far as the king's keepers were concerned. One of the king's keepers was appointed to a county where he held no land. Four of them were appointed to more than two counties. In the case of the barons' keepers the rate of non-residency was lower than the case of the king's appointees. (Seven or 18.9%)

Based on the survey mentioned above, roughly speaking,

we dare say that reformist barons had a tendency to choose local small landholders to be keepers, whereas the king selected his courtiers and large landholders to the office. The reformists recognized the capability of peace keeping in the county as a criterion of selection. In consequence they selected the person who had held complaints against the king's policy of patronage.

One example can be cited here. The counties of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire had been treated as twin counties since the eleventh century, and single sheriffs had been nominated to these twin counties. As far as the keepers of the peace were concerned, the king appointed one person, William le Moine, to these twin counties in 1264. He was not appointed in December as was the case of the other king's keepers. In these two counties the turmoil by adherents of the reformist cause had developed since 1263 when the earl of Leicester took the initiative of government. Eventually after the king's army overpowered the Montfortians in Northampton in early April, William was appointed to be the keeper of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire. But in the next month the king's army was defeated by the Montfortians. On June 4, the earl's government appointed Henry Engain and Giles de Argentin to these counties as *custodes pacis*. The former mainly held land in Huntingdonshire and the latter in Cambridgeshire, being a strong supporter of the earl. The eyre rolls in the 1260s tell us that William was presented by the hundred jury for his aggressive exaction from the local people while he was a sheriff. On the other hand Giles, who was disinherited by the king immediately after the battle of Evesham for his adherence to the earl, could recover his holdings by the presentment of jurors of Cambridgeshire later. These presentments by the jurors reveal

---

how the appointees were regarded by the local lesser landholders.<sup>14</sup>

#### 4. King's patronage to gentry

The sheriff as a king's agent in the country had been established since the eleventh century. But the introduction of new governmental agents into local society may have stimulated two problems: namely how the peace-keeping responsibility in the county should be shared by the several officials, and how much the central government would be responsible for the public service of local communities. H. Cam thought the public or communal duties were performed by the mutual obligation of local residents. According to her opinion the Statute of Winchester, though it was established in the parliament, should be regarded as the codification of the communal responsibility of the inhabitants in the local community.<sup>15</sup> But H. Ainsley thought the peace-keeping work was under the royal authority throughout the middle ages, and the institution of the office of keepers of the peace in 1264 means the distribution of the king's local agents to extend the king's peace more efficiently.<sup>16</sup> Concerning the peace keeping system in the county, Cam gave priority to the communal duty, while Ainsley attached importance to the authority of the king's government.<sup>17</sup>

But how did the keepers of the peace actually muster the force of local residents to fulfil the governmental order? If the keepers were appointed and sent out by the central government to each county, were the local residents willing to serve them with arms? If there was a communal force in each county and hundred from the ancient days, was that strong enough to cope with the military powers of the knightly forces as seen in the

Barons' War? If the communal peace-keeping systems, tithing and frankpledge, had already existed before the establishment of keepers of the peace, was it possible for the authority of the time to direct them to be centralized in the hand of the king or his government?

I have gathered some examples of the work of local forces in the 1260s. What was the actual duty of the keepers of the peace in 1264? In December 1263 the king ordered the keepers to utilize the *posse comitatus* to maintain the peace in the county.<sup>18</sup> But what was actually ordered was not the peace keeping of ordinary times but the suppression of the disorder caused by the earl of Leicester's adherents in the county. Six months later in June 1264 when the earl of Leicester's government appointed the new keepers, the real reason for the appointment is evident from the political situation of the time. Though the king was a captive of the earl's army after the battle of Lewes, 'royal constables still held the castles, the Marcher lords and some northern nobles were actually disobedient to the earl. Queen Eleanor and other royalists were in France preparing invasion with mercenaries, and the papal legate threatened excommunication and interdict. So the earl placed his sons in control of the coast of Norfolk and south-east and south-west of England.'<sup>19</sup> And his government ordered each keeper to levy *en masse* for the protection and safety of these parts. The letter to each keeper says 'for the inviolable observance of that peace throughout our realm, ...you should diligently undertake the keeping of our peace there.' In the annals of London the reformist barons' government definitely wrote to the sheriffs and the keepers on the 4th of July 1264 as follows: It is more safe and more advantageous, with security to the person, to be in goods in some



---

small measure damnified, than the total loss of land and of goods, by the impious hands of those who, thirsting for your blood, will spare neither sex or age, if they can prevail, to be delivered up to the sufferings of a cruel death.<sup>20</sup> With an excuse the government ordered the inhabitants, namely 'eight able foot soldiers with arms from every vill, to be arrayed in *posse comitatus*'. The real purpose of the establishment of the keepers of the peace in 1264 was not the peace keeping of the county but the protection of the reformist government. In the governmental logic the fighting in *posse comitatus* under the keeper of the peace means the observance of the peace of the realm, even though it was not in the regional interest. So the keepers of the peace must have some means to persuade or to oblige the villagers and burgesses to follow them.

I have found no evidence to show that the keepers of the peace on the king's side mustered the villagers to *posse comitatus*. Many of the king's keepers were barons, so they could use their own tenants and household knights for the king's military levy.<sup>21</sup> However after the battle of Lewes the earl of Leicester's associate magnates became less than before, they could expect only a small number of feudal tenants and household knights to muster.<sup>22</sup> So the earl of Leicester's government had to rely on the non-feudal forces. As was seen above the government ordered the keepers of the peace to utilize the villagers' and burgess' force to defend the interests of the reformists' government. Cam found in an eyre record an incident of keepers mustering local people to fight against the king's army.<sup>23</sup> In early April 1264 just before the Battle of Northampton, William Marshal, who would be appointed as the keeper of the peace of Northamptonshire by the reformists' government in June, called

the constables of the town together, and made an appeal toward the town's people in the general assembly to fight against the Lord Edward's army which had seized the town. The assembly was held at Cow Meadow under the town wall, William addressed the county community on behalf of the earl of Leicester about the necessity of fighting against the Lord Edward's army. There appeared some other persons who also made addresses. For a few days after 4 April townspeople as well as the earl's army fought against the attacks from outside but soon were overpowered. Unfortunately Cam did not explain why the townspeople agreed to William's appeal. Putting the peace of the town first, it did not make sense for them to fight against the king's or the prince's army. The episode cited by Cam attests that whether William succeeded in arraying the townspeople to fight against the royal army as a matter of fact depended on the influence and the reliability of the reformists' government.

The much clearer contrast between the king's keepers and those of the reformist barons' is their class structure and their careers. As we have seen many of the king's keepers were barons or king's courtiers. Some of them had already had an experience of office holding before the reform movement. On the other hand reformist keepers were middle rank or small landholders, in other words gentry, resident in the county to which they were appointed as a keeper. Some of them also had experience being a sub-sheriff or a constable.<sup>24</sup> The king's exercise of patronage before the reform movement, excluded some of the politically-minded gentry.<sup>25</sup> We are not sure whether the earl of Leicester really meant to choose the experienced gentry resident in the county as keepers of the peace, when his government instituted the office in 1264. But in consequence of the

earl's appointments on that occasion the promising gentry were introduced to the important office of peace keeping in the county. If the office could be utilized efficiently, the reformists' central government could hold the mind of the local people better than before.

### Conclusion

If the reform movement brought these results, what happened after the death of Simon de Montfort? The king again appointed keepers of the peace between August 1265 and December 1267. The selection employed his usual criteria. Did the reform movement leave no effect in selection then? No. Because at least three of the barons' appointees were nominated as new keepers by the king in this occasion. Another seven of the barons' appointees were assigned to various offices by the king. All of them belonged to the knightly class or gentry.<sup>26</sup> In 1287 new keepers, *conservatores pacis*, were appointed to each county by the government of Edward I. Most of them were chosen from the gentry. So the appointment of the gentry as keepers of the peace in 1264 meant a change of the standard of selection in the administrative history of England, though for King Henry III it meant only a small widening of his patronage policy.

### Notes

- 1 Morris, W.A., *The Medieval English Sheriff to 1300*, Manchester, 1927, pp.28, 58, 60, 117, 147-50, 174-5, 226-7, 234-5; Jewell, H.M., *English Local Administration in the Middle Ages*, Newton Abbot, 1972, pp.165-8.
- 2 Cam, H.M., *The Hundred and the Hundred Rolls*, London, 1930, pp.188, 189, 190, 191, 246; Stubbs, W., *Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History*, 9th ed., Oxford, 1913, pp.257-8.

- 3 Harding, A., 'The Early History of the Keepers of the Peace', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., X(1960), pp.87–8, 91, 92, 93–5, 97–9, 106, 108, 109; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1258–66, p.283; *Close Rolls*, 1261–64, p.243ff.
- 4 Ainsley, H., 'The Problem relating to the Maintenance of Law and Order in thirteenth Century England, with reference to the *custos pacis*', PhD thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1968, pp.1, 8, 11, 23, 28, 29, 30–2, 35–6, 37, 46, 48, 57, 60–2, 63, 64–6, 66–7, 68, 70–1, 73, 76, 77–84, 85–7, 89–93, 94–6, 250, 258; Stewart-Brown, R., *The Sergeants of the Peace in Medieval England and Wales*, Manchester, 1936, pp.98–9; Stubbs, *op. cit.*, pp.399, 400.
- 5 Maddicott, J., *Simon de Montfort*, Cambridge, 1994, pp.212, 285, 288.
- 6 Treharne, R.F., and Sanders, I.J., ed., *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion 1258–1267*, Oxford, 1973, pp.292–3.
- 7 John de St. Valrey was appointed as *custos* of Hampshire by the king in December, 1263, and was appointed as the same by Simon's government in June, 1264.
- 8 Knowles, C.H., 'The Disinherited, 1265–80', PhD thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1959, part ii, pp.74–78; Ainsley, *op. cit.*, appendix A, B, C.
- 9 Philip Marmion, Peter Randolf, John Verdun, John de Warenne.
- 10 Hershey, Andrew H., 'The rise and fall of William de Bussey: a Mid-thirteenth century steward', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 44, 2000, pp.104–22.
- 11 John d'Eywill, Adam de Newmarket, William Marshall, John de Vaux, John fitz John, John de Ware, John de St. Valery, Andrew Wake.
- 12 Powicke, F.M., *King Henry III and the Lord Edward*, Oxford, 1947, p.445; Ainsley, *op. cit.*, p.51.
- 13 Ainsley, *op. cit.*, p.70.
- 14 Asaji, K., 'Jurors of Armingford Hundred'. (See chapter nine)
- 15 Cam, *Hundred and Hundred Rolls*, pp.188–190, 191, 132, 246.
- 16 Ainsley, *op. cit.*, pp.1, 11, 13–4, 17–29, 35, 46–8, 57–8, 59, 84–7, 101–2.
- 17 Ainsley, *op. cit.*, p.48.
- 18 Ainsley, *op. cit.*, pp.59–60; *DBM*, pp.292–3.
- 19 *DBM*, pp.47–8.

- 
- 20 *De Antiquis Legibus Liber: Chronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum*, ed., by T. Stapleton, Camden Society, 1846, p.68; *E(nglish) H(istorical) D(ocuments)*, III, p.178.
- 21 *Close Rolls*, 1261–64, pp.377–80, 381–2.
- 22 *CPR*, 1258–66, pp.360, 362; *Foedera*, i, p.444; Ainsley, *op. cit.*, p.81; Powicke, *op. cit.*, p.475; Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*, Oxford, ii, p.95.
- 23 Cam, *op. cit.*, p.191; Hunter, J., *Rotuli Selecti*, Record Commission, 1834, pp.153–7, 166, 194; Treharne, ‘The Battle of Northampton, 5th April, 1264’, *Northamptonshire Past and Present*, vol.2, 1955, p.22.
- 24 Ainsley, *op. cit.*, p.54; Cam, *op. cit.*, pp.193–4.
- 25 Carpenter, D.A., ‘The Decline of the curial sheriff in England, 1194–1258’, *EHR*, XCI, 1976, pp.4–6, 27–8, 31.
- 26 Harding, *op. cit.*, p.100.

## Household accounts of the countess of Leicester, 1265

Barons and nobles in thirteenth century England were not only large landowners of demesne estates and knight fees dispersed all over the British Isles as well as on the continent, but also great travellers through those estates. They kept two kinds of chief administrators, one for estate management and another for their households. The first one, the estate steward or *senescallus*, was his master's representative, supervising everything concerning the estate management, was a focus of the scattered manors and households, and sometimes presided over his master's court, and could be an attorney at the king's court. He was an experienced administrator and often subsequently became a sheriff or a judge. The second one, the steward of the household or *senescallus hospicii*, was not a large scale landowner, and was a person of lesser rank. He travelled with his master, taking care of the daily life of his or her household. So far many studies have been done of the former kind of stewards, for example of Adam de Stratton, than the latter ones. Recently Dr. C.M. Woolgar made a comprehensive study of British medieval household account rolls, and in the detailed introduction he discussed the development of the forms and techniques of medieval domestic accounting practice. He placed those records in the context of the administrative systems for which they were created. On the other hand Dr. Kate Mertes surveyed the household account rolls of Britain between 1250 and 1600, and regarded the households of the nobility as the very core of noble power and social life, placing much stress on the military power included in the households<sup>1</sup>. Based on the household account

rolls of Eleanor, the countess of Leicester, 1265, the present study will inquire into the importance of the baronial household against the background of thirteenth-century English political society.

### 1. Sources

The Household Account Rolls of the countess of Leicester are now kept in the British Library. The earliest date in the extant account is February 19, 1265, when her husband, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, was at the height of his power having held the king as his hostage since the battle of Lewes. The last date in the rolls is October 1, but the last account is for the date of August 29. Judging from the manners of description there must have been other rolls for earlier accounts than that of February 19, though only 13 membranes survive now. On the top of the second membrane, the bottom of the first one is sewn with dentiform stitches. In the same manner all the membranes are sewn together. Almost all the membranes are written on either side<sup>2</sup>.

When countess Eleanor left Dover for France at the end of October 1265, she took the roll to her refuge, the Dominican nunnery of Montargis, founded by her dead husband's sister, Amicia. At the end of the eighteenth century it was noticed there, and in 1831 purchased by the Trustees of the British Museum and brought to England. The manuscript was written by more than two scribes, Christopher and Eudo being two of them, while a third, unknown person wrote the twelfth and thirteenth membranes<sup>3</sup>.

According to the studies of Labarge and Mertes, Eleanor's household accounts are written in a rather generalised pattern,

such as is also seen in the accounts of other thirteenth century magnates<sup>4</sup>. On the front side of each membrane entries for about two weeks are arranged in daily paragraphs. The daily entries follow in the departmental order of expenses, like those of the pantry, buttery, kitchen, and stable, with the day of the week and the list of the recipients' names at the top. The wardrobe accounts are on the back of each membrane, sometimes without date but in chronological order in the same sequence of hands that wrote the front entries. The account for the wardrobe includes expenses for cloths, messengers, gifts, stipends, wages, fees, carriage and donations. It also mentions the names of the persons who took care of payments in the household. The household steward or another official probably accounted for the money and stocks he spent, to the countess. This household account was probably drawn up by the steward or someone to report to the countess how he spent the money or stocks for the household. He did not mention items or services for which payment was not necessary. There is no entry for the purchase of fresh vegetables, possibly gathered from the castle garden<sup>5</sup>. Household grooms were not paid wages for their service in the household, but usually wages and travelling expenses were paid when they were sent to London or elsewhere to buy something valuable for the countess or for her children. Money incomes are not entered at all in the rolls. Receiver's accounts listing cash receipts from manors are not extant as far as the countess's household rolls are concerned. By the way the reeve of the countess's manors, like Brayburn in Kent, draw up a manor account roll with the household steward occasionally<sup>6</sup>.

After the household rolls were purchased by the British Museum in 1831, several studies appeared based on them. In



1841 T.H. Turner and B. Botfield published a transcript of the manuscripts with an introduction to the text, which surveyed the life of Eleanor and explained the contents of the text, such as food, prices, recipes, wages, and so on. The following year M.A.E. Green, using the published text, illustrated the daily life of Eleanor against the political background in 1265<sup>7</sup>. Two years later W.H. Blaauw, in his *Barons' War*, described the account roll in detail, especially about the horses, archers, and retainers in the household<sup>8</sup>. In 1871 C.H. Pearson published the second edition of Blaauw's *Barons' War* with a great deal of annotation, in which he identified the warriors who adhered to Eleanor till her surrender of Dover castle at the end of October<sup>9</sup>. C. Bémont mentioned the household rolls of Eleanor in the introduction to his *Simon de Montfort* as a source of domestic details for the countess's life<sup>10</sup>.

It was the study of M. Labarge that made the best use of the text. As the title of her publication indicates, her main interest of research centred around the everyday life of an earl or a great baron in thirteenth century England. A reasonably complete and unromanticized portrait of domestic life in a great baronial household of the time emerges from her skilful use of Eleanor's household rolls with other contemporary evidence. About the reason why she selected Eleanor's rolls for her research, she wrote as follows:

a study of daily life is not concerned with Earl Simon's extraordinary political position; rather it looks for the features of his household which mirror the general pattern of life among all the great barons. The countess of Leicester's household account is interesting, not so much because it covers this period of upheaval, although this is reflected in

the sober language of its entries, but because it typifies the careful accounting system characteristic of every large household. It illustrates most vividly how the steady round of household administration followed a fixed routine, even in a time of civil war and catastrophe. What the countess's household roll tells us about her own establishment may be taken as typical of the other great baronial households of the time<sup>11</sup>.

As we can read here, Professor Labarge regarded the accounts as a source for the study of the domestic life of baronial family in thirteenth century England, while Dr. Woolgar tried to use the same material as one of the sources to understand medieval family financial activity in general. It seems that the scholars have been more interested in the common or general pattern of baronial life or their financial system. Is there any other approach to the rolls? The baronial necessity for keeping a certain size of household may vary from one baron to another, and depend on the circumstances of the time. For example the household accounts tell us that Simon visited his wife at Odiham castle with some 160 horses with Lord Edward as a hostage, in the middle of March. Dr. Maddicott says, 'If he had a military household of perhaps 100 to 150 knights, as the sum of the evidence tentatively suggests, he probably had more in his pay than any thirteen-century English king'<sup>12</sup> In the case of the countess of Leicester, however why was it necessary for a lady to keep a fair size of household and a well-established financial system in the time of civil war? The present study will inquire into the significance of the countess of Leicester's household against the political background of the time.

## 2. The size of Eleanor's household

Prof. Labarge estimates that the earl's household consisted of three kinds of members, i.e., in the first place the earl and the countess and their children, in the second a body of knights, esquires and men-at-arms fulfilling their quota of military service, and in the last place officials who carried out the administration of the estate, or handled the routines of everyday life. But when we read the household accounts, it is rather difficult to create a clear image of the household, because it never mentions if they were full-time workers or part-time labourers, nor how many grooms, carters or huntsman there were. How many servants did work as cook or stableman? In Eleanor's roll the laundress is mentioned only once through the whole period it covers. As Queen Eleanor and Lord Edward kept an individual household, the countess and her sons seem to have had their own *familia* households<sup>13</sup>. In the rolls there is no mention of the households of her fourth son, Guy, of the fifth son, Richard, or of her daughter, Eleanor. The last two children appear to have lived in their mother's household<sup>14</sup>. Concerning the military section of the household in the rolls, there is no trace of any *miles*, *armiger*, or sergeant as a member of her household. Concerning the officials dealing with estate management, the reeves of two manors, Chawton and Brayburn, appear when they draw up account with the household steward, whose name is not clear from the rolls. Other household servants, such as clerks, tailors, cooks, and smiths, worked and lived sometimes in the household, and occasionally moved out.

It seems rather difficult to distinguish household members from persons whose names appear in the account rolls. Grooms, damsels and huntsmen in the rolls usually appear anonymously.

It is certain that no precise number of Eleanor's household will ever be gained from the unintelligible writing of the rolls. There is the same type of difficulty in estimating the size of a household from the food consumption. The countess and the members of her household consumed various types of foodstuffs. What they consumed almost everyday were grain (bread), wine, ale, and herring. Like other foodstuffs, the rate of consumption of these four varied from day to day. For example minimum consumption of grain was five bushels, while the biggest was four quarts( ie., 32 bushels). As many as 1700 herring were served for the table on the 19th of March<sup>15</sup>. Herrings were counted in round figures every time. Doesn't this suggest the steward's accounting method of the time?

Next, we need to know who were provided with meals in the countess's household. Every entry on the recto side of each membrane begins with the day of the week, and was followed by a note as to whom the food was for. The countess sat at the table almost every day as hostess. Those who dined at Eleanor's board consisted of household (*familia sua*), garrison (*garnestura*), and guests. If a quota of food for each member can be reckoned, the size of the household and the garrison would become clear. The smallest consumption of grain by the household may be five bushels of ground grain, which occurred on the 5th of May. On that day there was no guest, because the marshal reported 28 horses in his stable to the steward, which was the average number the countess kept through the period. Whether the garrison of Odiham castle was provided with food by the countess on that day is not clear, though it is not mentioned as recipients in the roll. On the other hand the entry for the 6th of March demonstrates that those partaking that day were the

household and the garrison, with no guest. They consumed 10 bushels of grain<sup>16</sup>. The number of horses in the stable was 28. Comparing the two entries the difference of grain consumption of five bushels may have been consumed by the garrison. But this is guesswork. We need to be cautious readers of the account rolls. We should see another example.

The entry for the 23rd of February mentions that there was no recipient of the countess's hospitality on that day, but the consumed grain amounted one quart and a half, which could not have been eaten by Eleanor only. So the entry *pro Comitissa* should be interpreted as *pro Comitissa et suis*. Next, the entry for the 15th of April says *pro Comitissa et familia*, and *pro Comitissa et ...et predictis* for the following day. The grain consumption of each day is the same amount, one quart and six bushels. So *predictis* of the 16th of April means the *familia*, which, judging from the grain consumption, must include the domestic staff of the household as well as the blood family. The entry of the 27th of April says *pro Comitissa et...et familia*. In this case, too, *familia* includes the household servants, because, if it means the blood family only, it should be listed just next to the countess, and should not come after the guests<sup>17</sup>. Then, *pro Comitissa* can be understood as for Eleanor, her kin and household servants, and *pro Comitissa et garnestura* means for Eleanor, her kin, servants and garrison. As there are a lot of entries of the kind, the garrison of Odiham castle, though they were not Eleanor's servants nor tenants, was apparently provided with food by the countess in the castle.

The meaning of the partakers' list of Eleanor's household account can be understood as just outlined. Next, in order to know the size of the household, we should investigate how the

partakers' number related to the daily consumption of grain. Let us see an example. There are eight entries out of sixteen on the recto side of the first membrane of the rolls where the garrison is listed with the household<sup>18</sup>.

February 27, *pro Comitissa et suis et garnestura,*

1 quarter 2 bushels consumed

28, *pro Comitissa et garnestura,* 1 quarter 4 bushels

March 1, *pro Comitissa et .... et predictis,* 2 quarters

2, *pro Comitissa et garnestura,* 1 quarter 2 bushels

3, *pro Comitissa et predictis,* 1 quarter 4 bushels

4, *pro Comitissa et predictis,* 1 quarter 2 bushels

5, *pro Comitissa et predictis,* 1 quarter 6 bushels

6, *pro Comitissa et predictis,* 1 quarter 2 bushels

The list appears to tell us that on the first day of March Eleanor had some guests from outside. It may easily be seen that a little more grain was consumed on that day. On all the other seven days those eating consisted of her household and the garrison only. But the amount of grain consumed varied from day to day, the largest amount being 14 bushels while the smallest was 10. It seems difficult to assume that the number of her household or the garrison changed every day. It is improbable that the steward, in accounting for the auditor, changed the portion of grain every day for the same numbers. Considering that the amount of grain provided for almost the same numbers of people varied from day to day, there should be some relation between the number of people the grain in the account could support and of those present. A certain number of people besides the core of the household seem to have been provided with food from time to time at the countess's expense. In these circumstances the amount of grain in the account roll fluctuated from

day to day. Let us see another example.

For the fifth of May, when Eleanor had no guest to dine and five bushels of grain are recorded in the accounts. With this amount of grain how many persons could eat in a day? The account rolls says *Panis, v. bus. de froile*, and the editor of the rolls annotated that *de froile* means 'ground'<sup>19</sup>. M.M. Postan says one pound of flour made one pound of bread in the thirteenth century<sup>20</sup>. We need the conversion rates of the weights and measures to know how many persons' supply of bread could be made with a certain amount of wheat or flour. Only rough estimates are possible from the figures in the rolls itself. *Grosseteste* in the thirteenth century mentioned that a quarter of flour made 180 loaves of bread<sup>21</sup>. In this connection, according to a twentieth century cook book, three pounds of flour make bread for from two to four people depending<sup>22</sup>. The weight of one bushel of flour varies between 43.75 pounds and 62.5 pounds depending on the dryness. Consequently five bushels of flour could supply enough bread for between 145.5 and 416.5 persons. Woolgar supposes that people in a thirteenth century magnate's household ate twice a day, breakfast and dinner<sup>23</sup>. So the household would consist of a half of these numbers of people, between about 72 and 208. The number seems to be too large to be the household constituents. In fact, Dr. Mertes estimates that the size of Eleanor's household was between 25 and 30 persons<sup>24</sup>. On the same day the household consumed one hundred herrings. Different amounts of food might be supplied subject to a person's rank in the household<sup>25</sup>. Considering these factors together, the core of Eleanor's household would have consisted of less than fifty. Anyway her pantry supplied food for not a few people besides her own household.

### 3. Household Rolls (1) expenditure

#### (1) Partakers

The clerks of the household rolls wrote the partaker's names of the week at the beginning of the daily entry. Then the names of partakers, who dined at Eleanor's hospitable board, follow. After *pro Comitissa* her sons are sometimes listed, Henry, Simon junior and Guy, and various kinds of visitors with their followers or households<sup>26</sup>. At the end of the partaker's list are Eleanor's household, the garrison and others (*aliis*). The countess dined with a lot of visitors, including countesses, barons, prelates and the earl of Leicester's major subjects, each with his own household, knights, sergeants, servants, yeomen (*valettus*) and *familia*. In the middle of March her husband, The earl of Leicester, and her son, Henry de Montfort, visited Odiham Castle accompanied by Lord Edward and Henry, son of Richard of Cornwall, who had been defeated and captured in the battle of Lewes in 1264. Each of them seems to have brought their own household. At Odiham Castle both Lord Edward and the earl of Leicester, who were to fight at Evesham the following August, dined at Eleanor's board<sup>27</sup>. The households of both leaders were nourished these at the countess's expense for about two weeks. Eleanor's titled female friends, the countesses of Aumale and Oxford, came to Odiham with their households, and the latter stayed there for four successive nights. One of her servants visited individually on the other day eating at Eleanor's table. The abbot of Waverley called on her twice, and the prioress of Wintney came with nuns<sup>28</sup>. Barons sometimes dined at her table with their wives. Eleanor's place looks like a meeting point where the prince, the earl, countesses, barons, and their wives were in a company at the table, while the household



members of those people were provided with food in the same compound. This meant that people, either friends or opponents in the turbulence of the Barons' War, could sit at the same table. Eleanor sent out her servants for presenting robes to the king's brother, and another servant was sent out for a barber from Reading for the sake of Lord Edward<sup>29</sup>. Her household expenses were used to keep friendly relations with the royal and baronial families<sup>30</sup>.

Some groups of burgesses of the three Dover ports, Winchelsea, Sandwich, and Dover, were invited to her table at Dover Castle several times in June, July and August. These were three of the Cinque Ports, whose Warden was her son, Henry de Montfort, in 1265. Even after Earl Simon's army was defeated at Evesham in August, these three were against the Lord Edward's army till next spring. This must have been a politically meaningful invitation<sup>31</sup>.

### **(2) Almsgiving to the poor**

In the household accounts were recorded ten occasions of almsgiving to the poor at Odiham, Porchester and Dover. In any case almsgiving was included in her household's budget. The most remarkable case occurred on the fourteenth of April, when she gave alms to eight hundred poor people. In the entry of the thirty-first of May the almsgivings of fifteen successive days are summed up<sup>32</sup>. The countess's dwelling in the castle was not an incident isolated from the rest of the world, but a welfare centre for the people in the surrounding area.

### **(3) The earl of Leicester's arrival**

Earl Simon stayed fourteen consecutive days at Odiham accompanied by a large number of soldiers between the nineteenth of March and the first of April. During the stay of

Eleanor's husband the style of the daily roll changed a little. For the nineteenth of March, the first day, the entry was written in the style of the daily accounts as usual. From the following day the daily account disappeared, and the expenses for the next thirteen days are written in a lump. The sum is twelve pounds seven shillings two pence. The purchases of daily food of the first day, such as grain, wine, eggs and herrings, are accounted as costing about three times as much as the ordinary amount. In the collective account for these thirteen days, there is no entry for daily food. Quite interestingly it also accounts mostly for extraordinary expenses, such as a cauldron (*caldarium*), a sturgeon (*sturio*), a whale (*baleyna*) or raisins (*racemus*). These items were paid by Eleanor's steward. In other words daily expenses for these thirteen days must have been settled by the household steward of the earl of Leicester. On the second of April Eleanor's steward paid for ale which was consumed by the earl's household before the earl left Odiham. We can assume that Eleanor's household was absorbed into that of the earl for these thirteen days<sup>33</sup>. The same arrangement occurred while the countess and her household moved from Odiham to Porchester between the first and the second of June, and from Porchester to Dover between the twelfth and the thirteenth of June, escorted by her son, Simon junior and his household.

#### (4) Donations

Eleanor made pious donations constantly. It may be the usual piety of a noble woman, but the purpose of the donation was affixed to some occasion of her offerings. On the ninth of May through a chaplain of Oxford she offered twenty six shillings eight pence for Simon de Montfort, *pro Domino S. de Montforti*. After she heard the news of her husband's death in

the battle of Evesham, she offered through John Scott twenty-two shillings six pence for the soul of her dead husband<sup>34</sup>. These offerings were not for general charity but for her personal purpose as the wife of the earl of Leicester.

#### (5) Messengers

To the countess, not only her husband and sons but also the King's brother, barons, prelates and Loretta de Montfort, her husband's French relative, sent messengers carrying letters. The household steward paid some money to them. He also paid out-going messengers to those people. Most messengers are mentioned anonymously but a few of them were known by their names, like Gobithesti who delivered a letter to the earl of Leicester as far as Hereford at a crucial time in May. Some messengers from France in late July were paid in a usual way and also served wine. Messengers carried letters to the countesses of Lincoln and Aumale, and the wife of Gloucester in Cardiff reflecting the political importance of their husbands in 1265. Eleanor also sent messengers to the bishop of Worcester and the sheriff of Southampton. The thirteenth of June appears to have been an important day, because she was on her way from Porchester to Dover escorted by her son Simon junior, and around then she sent a letter to her husband at Hereford and the sheriff of Southampton as well as to the constable of Wallingford Castle. At the same time she received a letter from Loundre, a Bigorre town in southern France<sup>35</sup>. All these seem to reflect the gradual worsening of the circumstances around Eleanor since Lord Edward's escape from the guard of the earl of Gloucester's brother towards the end of May. Anyway we assume that the countess's dwelling place could have been a relay station of various information for the Montfortians.

#### 4. Household rolls (2) purchase and stock

The household steward purchased victuals roughly every seven to ten days, stocked in the store room in the castle. King Henry III granted Odiham Castle and the manor to Eleanor in 1236. At Odiham the victuals were supplied from the manor and also from Chawton manor which was held by the earl of Leicester<sup>36</sup>. When the countess's household were at Porchester, the food supply was from Chawton, too. When at Dover, food and living necessities were supplied not only from Brayburn manor which was held by Eleanor, but also from near-by towns or through London merchants. Odiham castle was surrounded by a moat where fish were obtainable, but grooms were sometimes sent off to bring fish from Channel ports, as a fisherman called Simon was sent to Farnham to get fish from the fishpond of the bishop of Winchester<sup>37</sup>. The steward paid by tallies for these items to reeves of manors or merchants<sup>38</sup>. He sometimes bought goods on credit.

At Porchester or Dover as well as at Odiham, some articles, such as wine, herrings, and oats, were supplied not only from Eleanor's stock, but also from the stock of the castle, *de stauro castri*<sup>39</sup>. Both Porchester and Dover were royal castles in 1265. Accordingly the king appointed constables and provided garrisons, victuals, and munitions there. Eleanor's expenses counted on the stocks of the castles to supply food for her household. The steward once in a long while paid the constable only a part of the cost of food. Various living necessities, like cloths, garments, harnesses or parchments, were purchased by some of the household members who were sent to London, or through merchants<sup>40</sup>.

When the household was short of hands, the steward em-

ployed grooms, carters or huntsmen from outside. At Odiham castle only two grocery carts were recorded in the roll. So the steward sometimes paid for the hiring of carts together with carters and horses. There is no record of ships at Porchester or Dover provided for Eleanor's use. There were two entries for rented ships in the accounts. At Dover two masons were employed to repair an oven with two assistants receiving the pay of six shillings six pence. The employment of someone for vene-section at the chamber cost five pence paid through a chamber-lady<sup>41</sup>. The household of the countess purchased goods and employed hands from the surrounding area with the effect of extending economic and social relations with local society.

### 5. Household members

It is very difficult to identify the servants of Eleanor's household individually, as Professor Labarge noted<sup>42</sup>. We, however, can at least categorise the names of the servants into the following three groups. The first group were persons named only by the first name; the second group were those by the first name and function; the third were those by the first and family name<sup>43</sup>. Besides these three a lot of people were named only by their function or duty, like grooms or messengers. The name of the steward who presided over the household does not appear. Two clerks of the three who wrote the account are known to us by name, Christopher and Eudo. Grooms and messengers were paid at every service when they led a horse or carried a letter, and paid off when they were dismissed. They can not be seen as full time members of the household.

People in the first group were not paid for their ordinary service as a household member, but paid for their extraordinary

work, such as delivering a letter, looking for a person or purchasing something valuable in a town<sup>44</sup>. They were supplied with livery periodically. It appears that they lived near the countess, served her and were supplied with meals and clothes. Those in the second group were supplied with meals and clothes like those in the first group, but they usually worked with assistants. For example Walter the clerk had some grooms, Radulfus the fisherman kept some assistants, and Seman sent out his messengers. Each of them was given a leading part in the household<sup>45</sup>. Persons in the third group are limited in number and it seems that they were not attending the countess constantly, for their names appear occasionally in the partakers' list, which means that they were visitors. One of them, Richard of Havering, who was sometimes listed as a partaker, was a leading servant of de Montfort and recorded as the person through whom Eleanor's donation to a chaplain was presented<sup>46</sup>. In like manner Fulco de Constable, John Scot, Michael de Kemesing, Adam and Thomas Mabil, Robert Valle, John de Angeli and Thomas Chalelotte were also visitors, and they served Eleanor through their assistants, who stayed in the castles constantly as full members of the household<sup>47</sup>.

Considering these characteristics we can suppose that the countess's household was composed of the following kinds of constituents. First, a few trusted executives to whom the authority of spending and personnel affairs was committed. Secondly, ordinary servants by whom domestic work was carried out. Thirdly, subordinate servants of the cook, marshal, butler and the like. Lastly, extraordinary workers who were employed temporarily. The second group was the nucleus of the countess's household, and, moving with her from Odiham to Dover by way

of Porchester, worked hard to gather up eighty-four horses and numerous grooms<sup>48</sup>. The first group was faithful to Eleanor to the end, fighting against Lord Edward's army at Dover in September. After several talks between the two sides in September and in October, the life and possession of twenty six of her supporters were avouched by Lord Edward. Among those the names of Richard of Havering, John Scott and Michael de Kemesing are found<sup>49</sup>. William de Wortham, one of Eleanor's servants, died with Earl Simon at Evesham<sup>50</sup>. At the end of October Eleanor left Dover for France, never to return.

The size of Eleanor's household depends on how we define the term 'household'. The nucleus of it, regular attendants on the countess, may have numbered from twenty-five to thirty, as Dr. Mertes estimated. The number of people who were often provided with meals at the expense of the household may have been about one hundred or a little more, included visitors and part time workers. It mostly depended on the circumstances surrounding Eleanor. After the eleventh of August, Dover castle became a gathering point for the supporters of the baronial cause. The account began to record white wine for *familia* and that for knights separately from that day till the end of the month. One and a half oxen were consumed in a day during this period. Eleanor seems to have been surrounded by many mighty warriors.

#### 6. Military capacity of the countess

As far as the accounts are concerned, it does not appear that Eleanor retained any knights. There is only one entry of an '*armiger*' of the countess mentioned in the accounts. Neither expenses for armour nor cost of repairing arms were recorded

except for harnesses. But she seems to have been surrounded by various kinds of armed people, who visited the castles from elsewhere. On the sixth of June, for example, *presentibus Dominus R. de Brus, A. de Montforti, cum tota familia, et servientes Domini S. et garnestura Castri*<sup>51</sup>. The earl of Leicester, who visited his wife at Odiham in the middle of March, brought a formidable number of men-at-arms. In early march she kept around forty horses in the stable. On the seventeenth her son Henry came with 172 horses, and two days later with the arrival of her husband the number jumped up to 334. This kind of increase in the number of horses occurred at the beginning of June, when her son Simon junior escorted her from Odiham to Porchester, then to Dover<sup>52</sup>. On the first of August a ship was hired to transfer a machine (*sic.*) from Porchester to Dover. On the twelfth of August her son Richard hurried with one hundred hired mariners by ship from Winchelsea to Dover<sup>53</sup>. The countess's military ability was strengthened by these people and a machine, especially during those three occasions, i.e. the earl of Leicester's stay at Odiham castle, Simon junior's guard service from Odiham to Dover, and the reassemblage of the Montfortians after the battle of Evesham. Was the countess defenceless in other periods?

The answer is no. Garrisons were stationed at each castle, Odiham, Porchester and Dover. The Garrisons of these castles seem to have had a close connection with the household of the countess, whose household expenses covered the meals for the garrison for some days after the twenty-seventh of February. The same thing happened with the garrison of Porchester castle early June. Not a few times in late June and July, the castellans, servants and watchmen at Dover castle were provided with



meals at Eleanor's board<sup>54</sup>.

Odiham Castle was granted by the king to his sister Eleanor in 1236. For the castles in the king's hand he nominated a constable, carried out repairs, and garrisoned at his expense. The constable held the castle for the king and rendered accounts like the sheriff of the shire. In the thirteenth century the king often commissioned the constableness to magnates or his courtiers. When a newly committed constable was placed in charge of the castle, it is not clear from the entries in the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls* whether he discharged the former garrison and recruited new persons<sup>55</sup>. Most magnates and courtiers, though nominated by the king, did not really move to the place of the castle committed to their care, but stayed at their own base or near the king, sending a deputy to the castle<sup>56</sup>. We can see an example in Eleanor's accounts. Simon junior was the constable of Porchester Castle in 1265. When he was away from the castle, there is an entry for an allowance paid to the constable of Porchester. The editor of the roll noted that this may mean the deputy of Simon junior<sup>57</sup>. The deputy constable, leading the garrison, worked hard for the benefit of Eleanor, escorting her son Amaury de Montfort to bring two horses from Dover<sup>58</sup>. According to the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, the constable of Odiham castle was ordered in 1236 to give seisin of the manor of Odiham with the castle and appurtenances to Eleanor, and in 1253 King Henry granted to Simon de Montfort and Eleanor the manor of Odiham and the castle of Kenilworth for the lives of both or either of them<sup>59</sup>. Whether the right of nominating a constable was also given to the grantee or not, Henry le Fonun, constable of Odiham in 1265, was not nominated by the king but by Simon<sup>60</sup>. The constable managed the castle store for the

provisions of the garrison, while Eleanor kept her own store for her household. Each of them obtained stocks independently. However the countess often invited the garrison to her board. On the other hand the household steward recorded that some articles, like wine, herrings or oats, for the use of the household were supplied from the store of the castle or at the expense of the constable. He was paid for some of them, but not for others<sup>61</sup>. The countess's household and Odiham garrison were organisations independent from each other, but they were inter-related concerning the preparation of food and feed.

When the household was at Porchester castle in June, the steward laid there a stock of necessities from the earl of Leicester's Chawton manor as well as from the castle store at Porchester. On the other hand the countess invited the garrison to her board on some days from the first of June. The steward paid the constable for a part of the expenses of oats<sup>62</sup>. While they were at Dover castle, the steward got there a stock from Brayburn manor held by Eleanor, as well as from castle store of Dover. In the account rolls there is a memorandum noting that the steward got two tuns of red wine from the castle store of Henry de Montfort, constable, who was away then. The castellans, in the place of deputy constable, were stationed at Dover castle, who were not paid for the steward's use of the castle stores at all. It seems that the castle store was not in the castellans' custody. Eleanor provided the castellans, servants and watchmen of Dover castle with meals<sup>63</sup>.

What did these constables and garrisons do for Eleanor? Henry le Fonun, constable of Odiham, stayed on her side till the news of the earl of Leicester's death at Evesham reached him. Then by the order of the king he surrendered the castle to the

royal army<sup>64</sup>. Concerning the constable of Porchester Castle there is no detailed information after the battle of Evesham<sup>65</sup>. According to Wykes, in September the castellans in Dover castle held the castle against the king's army outside. As far as the garrisons of these castles are concerned, they could be a potential force for the benefit of Eleanor and her household<sup>66</sup>.

The countess was not defenceless. Around twenty five horses were constantly kept by her marshal. On the twenty first of June Simon junior borrowed nine horses from members of Eleanor's household before heading for the fight in support of his father<sup>67</sup>. Two of her household, Seman Stoke and William de Wortham, were engaged in the battle on the side of de Montfort's army<sup>68</sup>. Minimum force was retained in the household but to hold the castle against the attack from outside the constable and the garrison were the potential force for Eleanor's household.

## Conclusion

The social and political characteristics of the countess's household are as follows.

1. The countess of Leicester did not stay at one place continuously, but moved from one place to another intermittently leading a fair size of household. Each member of it was faithful to her till she left England at the end of October, 1265. Then some of them were pardoned and made peace with the king.
2. The countess received to her dining table members of the royal family, several countesses, some abbots and prioresses with each one's household. She tried to keep contact with these influential people whether they were on the earl of Le-

---

icester's side in the Barons' War or not. The household members of different magnates could also meet at Eleanor's residence.

3. The household had some influence on the area surrounding its residence. The steward of it purchased food and living goods, employed temporary hands from among the local society, and gave alms to the local poor. Burgesses of Channel ports, invited to her board several times, were faithful to Eleanor and the earl of Leicester's army even after she left for France.
4. The countess and her household could function as the auxiliary base of Montfortians. Her household expenses covered the provisions of food for her husband's army, the gift to the king or his family. After the death of her husband, his supporters gathered to her place and got supplies there. Letters were delivered to her from her husband, the king, countesses and French relatives, and she despatched a lot of messengers to each of them. She worked like a relay station for the sake of her husband.
5. Her household expenses provided meals for the constables and garrisons of Odiham, Porchester and Dover castles, and those people held the castles on her side.

The household account rolls of the countess of Leicester presents us with little useful information about the complicated problem of the seigniorial administration in relation to the royal administration<sup>69</sup>. But it gives us a lot of information about the baronial household in the social and political context. The household as a magnates' military base was an important image in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the thirteenth century it had a military function, different from that in the

following centuries.

Reading the rolls in the political context with other documents, contemporary chronologies or correspondence for example, there may emerge information about the baronial household as the core of power in the society of thirteenth century England. The present research focuses on the military powers kept in the countess's household, and the meaningful ties that bound local people, merchants, burgesses and ecclesiastical houses to her and her household, with some reference to the relation between the two households, Simon's and Eleanor's.

#### Notes

- 1 Denholm-Young, N., *Seignorial Administration in England*, Frank Cass, 1937, pp.1-8, 66-67; Woolgar, C.M., *Household Accounts from Medieval England*, British Academy, 1992, pp.4, 9; Mertes, Kate, *The English Noble Household 1250-1600*, Blackwell, 1988, pp.1-2.
- 2 British Library: Add MS. 8877. Average sizes of the membranes are 20.3 cm wide and 50.8 cm long.
- 3 *Manners and Household Expenses of England in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, ed. by T.H. Turner, Roxburghe Club, 1841, pp.liv, 21, 27.
- 4 Labarge, M.W. , *A Baronial Household of the Thirteenth Century*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1965, p.189; Mertes, *Ibid.*, pp.76-8; Woolgar, *Ibid.*, pp.7, 12, 36.
- 5 According to C.A. Wilson, *Food and Drink in Britain from the Stone Age to the 19th Century*, Academy Chicago Publishers, 1973, pp.329, 339, the Anglo-Saxons grew cabbage, carrots, and beets in Britain. There remains a recipe of fresh vegetable salad in a manuscript of 1393.
- 6 Woolgar, *op. cit.*, pp.12, 36. *Manners*, p.60.
- 7 Green, M.A.E., *Lives of the Princesses of England*, London, 1842, vol.2, pp.125-151.
- 8 Blaauw, W.H., *The Barons' War including the Battles of Lewes and Eve-*

- sham*, London, 1844, pp.281–93.
- 9 Pearson, C.H., *The Barons' War*, 2nd ed., London, 1871, pp.313–35.
  - 10 Bemont, C., *Simon de Montfort*, Paris, 1884 (translated by E.F. Jacob, Oxford, 1930, xvii–xviii).
  - 11 Her publication is based on her doctoral thesis of 1939 (The Personal Dispute between Henry III and Simon and Eleanor de Montfort, Oxford). Adam Marsh's advice to Eleanor, Grosseteste's Rules and *Statuta*, and other household rolls, such as Roger Leybourne's, Richard of Swinfield's and Bogo de Clare's, are utilised in her publication. Labarge, *op.cit.*, pp.15–16; Woolgar, *op.cit.*, pp.4.
  - 12 Maddicott, J.R., *Simon de Montfort*, Cambridge U.P., 1994, p.311. Cf. Maddicott, *English Historical Review*, 115, Nov. 2000, pp.1284–5.
  - 13 Labarge, *op.cit.*, p.53, *Manners and Household Expenses*, p.15.
  - 14 Labarge, *op.cit.*, pp.46, 60.
  - 15 *Ibid.*, p.14.
  - 16 *Ibid.*, pp.7, 30.
  - 17 *Manners and Household Expenses*, pp.4, 21, 27.
  - 18 *Ibid.*, pp.5–7.
  - 19 Labarge, *op. cit.*, pp.73–5, *Manners*, xxxvi.
  - 20 Postan, M.M., 'Famulus', *Economic History Review*, suppl., no.2, p.20.
  - 21 *Walter of Henry*, ed by Oschinsky, D., Oxford, 1971, pp.404–5.
  - 22 Barry, M., & Goolden, J., *The Big Food and Drink Book*, BBC Books, pp.47, 48.
  - 23 *Manners*, pp.42, 47, 48.
  - 24 Mertes, *op. cit.*, p.207.
  - 25 Woolgar, *op. cit.*, p.29.
  - 26 Prelates; Abbot of Waverley, prioress and nuns of Wintney, prioress of Amesbury, Magister Ralph Coudriana, Magister J. de London, Magister William Ingeniator, Magister Nicholas Midicus. Magnates and *familia*; Margeria de Crek, Countess of Aumale, Katterina Lovel, Mabilia de Waltham, Countess of Oxford. Household of the Earl of Leicester; J. Govium, Hereward the Marisco, Reginald Fillet, Robertus Brus, Thomas de Estleye, Anketil de Martivale, Richard of Kemsing, John rector of Katerington, Richard of Havering, Maule (daughter of Peter Brus), Gauterus Damar, Ingeram Baioll, Robertus Corbet, Galeranus de Moncens, John de Mukegros, John de la Hay, J. de Snaves, Guil-

- lelmus Ernard, Radulfus d'Ardi, Radulfus Haket, Peter Burton, J. de Dover, Thomas Salekin, Thomas Sandwich, Mathew Hastings, N. Hecham.J. de la Warre, Fulk Constable.
- 27 *Manners*, pp.13, 31; Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward*, 1947, p.505.
- 28 *Manners*, pp.9, 10, 12, 13, 19, 42, passim.
- 29 *Manners*, pp.8, 9, 17, 21, 25, 26, 31.
- 30 *Ibid.*, pp.15, 30, 35, 37, 47. Powicke, *op.cit.*, p.708.
- 31 *Ibid.*, pp.25, 47, 50, 62, 77. Knowles, C., *The Disinherited*, PhD thesis, Wales, 1959, pt.1 p. 22. *Annales Monastici*, vol.2, *Rolls Series* pp.104. 369.
- 32 March 5, April 6, 14, 17, May 5, 16, 31, June 27, 28, July 11.
- 33 *Manners*, pp.13–15.
- 34 *Ibid.*, pp.24, 67, 34, 64.
- 35 *Ibid.*, pp.24, 34; 23, 76; 33, 34.
- 36 *Ibid.*, pp.5, 15, 21, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 60, 63. *Cal. Pat. Rol.*, 1232–47, p.166, *Manners.*, p.53.
- 37 Labarge, *op.cit.*, p.80, *Manners*, pp.9, 30.
- 38 *Ibid.*, pp.45, 46, 47, 60, 63.
- 39 *Ibid.*, pp.3, 4, passim. Woolgar *op.cit.*, p. 19.
- 40 *Manners*, p.47.(Bedehampton); p.30 (Domina Wimarc), p.49. (*Vinum emptum in villa*).
- 41 *Ibid.*, pp.65, 66, 67, 68.
- 42 Labarge, *op.cit.*, p.63.
- 43 ⓐ; Seman, Neirnuyt, Jacke, Dobbe, Digon, Treubodi, Slingway, Christopher, Eudo, Bolletto. ⓑ; (Laundress) Petronilla, (Marshal) Colin, (messenger) Gobitesti, (butler) Andrew, (cook) Symon, (baker) Ralph, (tailor) Hique, (barber) Roger, (carter) Gilbert, ⓒ; Richard of Havering, William de Wortham, John Scot, Thomas Slekin, John de la Valle.
- 44 *Manners*, p.10.
- 45 *Ibid.*, pp.17, 56, 63.
- 46 *Ibid.*, pp.24, 29, 44–5.
- 47 *Ibid.*, pp.32, 40, 44–5, 49.
- 48 Labarge, *Medieval Travellers*, London, 1982, p.54.
- 49 *Royal and Historical Letters of Henry III*, ed. W.W. Shirley, 1866, vol.2, pp.294–6.; Pearson, *op.cit.*, p.326, n. 5., 327, n.2, 310–11.

- 
- 50 Labarge, *Baronial Household*, p.63.
- 51 *Manners*, pp.13, 42, 47, 49
- 52 *Ibid.*, pp.13-14, 42-51.
- 53 *Ibid.*, pp.65, 66.
- 54 *Ibid.*, pp.5, 6, 12, 16, 42, 51, 52, 54.
- 55 Jewel, H.M., *English Local Administration in the Middle Ages*, Newton Abbot, 1972, pp.180-1.
- 56 *Cal. Pat. Rol.*, 1258-66, p.266; *Cal. Lib. Rol.*, pp.201, 282.
- 57 *Manners*, p.47.
- 58 *Ibid.*, pp.39-40.
- 59 *Cal. Pat. Rol.*, 1247-58, pp.5, 250, cf. *Ibid* 1232-47, p.166.
- 60 *Manners*, p.44.
- 61 *Ibid.*, p.44.
- 62 *Ibid.*, pp.44, 47.
- 63 *Ibid.*, pp.51-2.
- 64 Knowles, *op.cit.*, pt.1, p.18.; *Abbreiatio Placitorum*, 1811, p.175.
- 65 *Wykes, Rol. Ser.*, pp.178-9.
- 66 No military evidence in the account rolls.
- 67 *Manners.*, pp.57-8.
- 68 *Cal. Pat. Rol.*, 1258-66, p.670; *Ibid.*, 1266-72, pp.16, 58.; Maddicott, *op. cit.*, pp.66-8.
- 69 Denholm-Young, *op.cit.*, pp.2-5.