Published by the University of Manchester at
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS (H. M. McKECHNIE, M.A.,-Secretary)
8–10 WRIGHT STREET, MANCHESTER, 15

CHAPTERS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY OF MEDIAEVAL ENGLAND

THE WARDROBE, THE CHAMBER AND THE SMALL SEALS

BY

T. F. TOUT, M.A., F.B.A.

Professor of History and Director of Advanced Study in History

VOLUME II

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

1937

First Printed 1920
Reprinted with minor additions and corrections 1937

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER PUBLICATIONS
No. CXXVII

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VII

PAGES

LIST OF THE LONGER NOTES IN VOLUME II.

DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED IN VOLUME II.

CHAPTER VII

THE REIGN OF EDWARD I

1272–1307

SECTION I

The Wardrobe during Edward's Absence Abroad, 1272–1274

On November 20, 1272, the feast of St. Edmund, king and martyr, the English magnates, who had just attended the funeral of Henry III., proclaimed his son, the absent crusader, as Edward I., and from that day his regnal year began. Nearly two years were to elapse before the new king returned to England to take the reins of state into his own hands. It was an unprecedented situation, and one that severely tested the prevalent theories of government. It was met, however, and successfully met, on the conservative lines natural to the school of Henry III.

The thirteenth century made little distinction between the king in his public and private capacities. The arrangements made to carry on the government in the name of the absent Edward I. are a striking illustration of this confusion. When Edward left England on his crusade, he took most of his household with him; but made careful arrangements for the government of his family and estates, and for the representation of his interests in England during his absence. These dispositions are contained in an instrument, drawn up on August 2, 1270, just before his departure.[1] The essence of them was the appointment of a small commission of trusted advisers, with full powers to act on his behalf in any circumstances that might arise. Of

[1] *Foedera*, i. 484.

the five attorneys originally named by him, grievous sickness, soon followed by death, made it impossible for three of them to act for long.[1] The two able to serve were Walter Giffard, the high-born archbishop of York, the royalist chancellor after Evesham, and Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, the marcher baron who had done more than any one else to secure the ruin of earl Simon and his cause. To them was soon added Robert Burnell, Edward's ablest household clerk, already his most confidential friend. Burnell was originally destined to accompany his master on the crusade,[2] but he certainly never carried out this intention, and remained in England busy on his lord's affairs.[3] Before the end of 1270 he was associated with Edward's other representatives. The three survivors were now called the lieutenants, vicegerents or attorneys of the lord Edward.[4] Edward's acts, issued by the three, were "given by Burnell," and sealed with a special seal, used for the lord Edward's business during his absence.[5] Thus the favourite domestic clerk became in substance the chancellor of his absent master.[6]

After the death of Henry III., Edward's three vicegerents took upon themselves the administration of the kingdom. Want of documentary evidence makes it impossible to speak with precision as to every step in the process, but it is clear that the three owed their position, not to any baronial appointment as regents, but to Edward's personal nomination as his representatives. It is no small proof of the triumph of the monarchy over the baronage that the hereditary successor to the throne was able, when still the heir, to make complete dispositions for the government of his expected kingdom.

The strength of Edward's position was recognised the day

[1] These were Richard, king of the Romans, paralysed on Dec. 13, 1271, and dead on April 2, 1272; Philip Basset, the sometime royalist justiciar, who died on Oct. 29, 1271; and Robert Walerand, who died about Jan. 1272.

[2] He received letters of attorney with that object on Aug. 2, 1270; *C.P.R., 1266–72*, p. 450.

[3] *Ib.* pp. 457, 507, 531, 596, 650, and other entries give conclusive proof of his continuing in England.

[4] *Ib.* p. 617. Compare *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 49; *Royal Letters*, ii. 346. *R.G.* ii. 350 shows the archbishop, Mortimer, Philip Basset and Burnell, acting together before Oct. 27, 1270.

[5] *C.P.R., 1266–72*, p. 650. The king's son, like the king, had now his "seal of absence."

[6] For Edward's chancellors before his accession, see above, I. 256, note 1. I cannot find that Burnell was called chancellor, but he acted as such.*

after the king's death, when the great seal was surrendered to archbishop Walter Giffard.[1] It was good policy that selected the greatest ecclesiastical dignitary in England as Edward's chief *locum tenens*.[2] If Edward had succeeded in 1270 in forcing the monks of Canterbury to accept Burnell as archbishop Boniface's successor, the head of the English church would have been Edward's household clerk. But as it was, his brains and industry supplemented the more occasional action of his two more dignified colleagues. Like the king, the regents consulted the council, in which at this period the curialistic element was more prominent than the baronial. When, in January 1273, parliament took oaths to the new king, its members swore fealty before his three lieutenants. Yet among the three, the archbishop as chief councillor, primate and regent, held a position that was almost monarchical.

As regards the administration, a minimum of disturbance was effected. The chancery changed heads, but the treasury remained for a year with Henry III.'s last treasurer. The veteran household clerk, Walter of Merton, was again chancellor before the end of November,[3] but it was not until October 2, 1273, that Philip of Eye, the treasurer, surrendered the keys of the exchequer to brother Joseph of Chauncy, prior of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem.[4] Under these ministers the offices of state pursued their normal course. But the wardrobe so essentially involved a royal household that, when the old king's household was broken up after his funeral, no formal steps were taken to set up a new one. The only wardrobe now was the wardrobe that had followed the lord Edward on his crusade. The former clerks of Henry III.'s wardrobe now either disappeared from history, like the veteran Peter of Winchester, or were busy in other employments, like the ex-controller, Giles of Oudenarde, whom we now find occupied in the collecting of the crusading tenth.[5]

[1] *Foedera*, i. 497.

[2] Archbishop Boniface died before Edward went on crusade, and there followed a two years' vacancy at Canterbury.

[3] An act was given "by the hand of Walter of Merton the chancellor" on Nov. 29, 1272; *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 1.

[4] *Ib.* p. 32. Philip of Eye had succeeded John Chishull before Dec. 1271; *ib., 1266–72*, p. 609.

[5] *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 25. In 1272 he was keeper of the king's works in the

Even when there was no wardrobe, wardrobe work had to be done in England. To some extent the exchequer, as during Henry III.'s foreign journeys, performed this task, but for the most part it devolved on Robert Burnell, either on his own initiative or in conjunction with the exchequer. Thus we find him early in 1274 receiving money from the exchequer for the vaguely described purpose of furthering the king's affairs.[1] But very small sums were now paid into the exchequer, and Burnell, like his master, had to depend almost entirely on the Italian bankers, whose advances made it possible to maintain the administration with credit. During the two years of his charge Burnell received advances from the royal merchants Luke Natalis and Orlandino di Poggio,[2] citizens and merchants of Lucca, amounting in all to £7687 : 13 : 8. The detailed enumeration of the way in which this large sum was expended shows that it was all used for purposes that in normal times would have been made chargeable on the wardrobe. Moreover, when Edward returned, he acknowledged this amount as a debt to the wardrobe, and made provision for its repayment at the same time, and in the same fashion, as he arranged for the repayment of the advances by the same merchants for the support of his wardrobe abroad.[3] This same Luke of Lucca seems also to have been appointed by the English regency to discharge the very definitive wardrobe work of making provision for the new king's coronation, a purpose for which a thousand

Tower (*C.P.R., 1272–81*, pp. 100, 129), and by 1279 keeper of the Tower itself; *ib.* p. 254. He was sometimes called "Giles of the wardrobe"; *ib.* pp. 255, 261, 269, 301. Giles's main occupation now was, however, as keeper of the great wardrobe. See later in the chapter on the great wardrobe. The association of the great wardrobe and its keeper with the Tower at this date is significant. Giles was also keeper of the wardrobe of Alfonso the king's son, but this was a dependent wardrobe, for which Giles answered in the king's wardrobe; *Pipe, 12 Edw. I.* m. 31 d.

[1] *I.R., 2 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 25, "ad negocia regis inde expedienda." In 1272–3 the exchequer paid the wages of the "ministri de Turre"; *ib. 1 Edw I., Easter.**

[2] *Podium* means "small hill," French *Puy*, Tuscan *Poggio*. Surely M. Bémont errs for once when he writes, "Orlandino de Pozzo"? *R.G.* ii. 300.

[3] *C.P.R., 1272–81*, pp. 131, 132, gives particulars of the contract between Edward and the Lucca merchants, and makes it clear that the sums advanced to Burnell were for wardrobe work. Besides large sums for cloth and other great wardrobe commodities, they included the expense of maintaining the king's children, a sum of 77*s.* 6*d.* "for windows to the wardrobe." Each item can be brought under one of the recognised wardrobe "tituli."

marks were advanced to him from the exchequer before Easter 1273.[1] Accordingly, some reservation must be made when we say that there was no wardrobe in England, between Edward's accession and his return from beyond sea.

We are on far firmer ground in turning to the wardrobe which accompanied the new king on his travels. We have seen already that, since his coming of age, Edward had had a household and wardrobe establishment of his own. Like the household establishment of all the greater nobles, it was on the same lines as that of the king, though somewhat less differentiated in its parts.[2] When in 1270 Edward left England for the Holy Land, he perforce had to divide his household. Some of his principal officers remained, like Burnell, in England. But the organised wardrobe establishment and its officers went oversea with their master. The keepership of Edward's wardrobe had now passed from Ralph Dunion to another clerk, Philip of Willoughby, partial accounts of whom go back to 1269–70. Later, Willoughby rendered at Acre,[3] apparently on the eve of Edward's final departure from Palestine, accounts to his master for the expenses of the active period of the crusade. Unfortunately these accounts are lost, but we still possess a summary of Willoughby's next account, which began on November 4, 1272, at Trapani in Sicily, and was continued until Willoughby gave up office on October 18, 1274, nearly three months after Edward's return to England.[4] The account began when he was still

[1] *I.R., 1 Edw. I., Michaelmas*, No. 22, "Lucasio de Lucca et sociis suis, mercatoribus, mille marcas ad providencias garderobe regis faciendas contra coronationem suam."

[2] Thus Edward's keeper, Ralph Dunion, also transacted personally "great wardrobe" business, such as the purchase of cloth, which in the king's wardrobe was falling to separate hands; *R.G.* i. supplément, p. 51.

[3] *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* No. 121, m. 22. "Reddit compotum [*i.e.* Ph. de Wylugheby] de xi li. xv s. in xlvij s. tur. de remanentia compoti sui de eadem garderoba reddita apud Acon." *Exch. Accts.* 350/5 is a roll of liveries, mainly from the exchequer, made to Edward's wardrobe, chiefly received at Acre.* It records the various sums, and their custodians, sent from England, and the expenses of the messengers who brought news from England. Thus David of Ashby, a Dominican, was sent by queen Eleanor to tell her son the state of the king's health, and William Bigod to announce Henry III.'s death; *ib.* 350/6 may be part of a receipt roll of Edward's wardrobe before his accession.

[4] It is extant in *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* m. 22, and partly in *Exch. Accts.* 350/8. "Compotus Phillipi de Wylugheby [Wilueby in *Exch. Accts.*] de garderoba regis de quarto die Novembris, anno lvij° regis Henrici incipiente, quo die rex applicuit apud portum Trapolitani, usque ad diem sancti Luce Euangeliste, anno

simply the "lord Edward, the first born son of the king." When the news of his accession reached Edward in Sicily, he seems to have simply continued the old officers and office under new titles. In Italy, as in England, the servants of the king's son now became the ministers of the king. For the first time in our history, the organised household of the heir-apparent became the household of the monarch without the least breach of continuity.

The wardrobe accounts of Edward I.'s first keeper are of more interest to the historian of Edward's crusade than to the historian of the royal wardrobe. They are the accounts of an adventurer who was involved in heavy expenses and who was too far from home to receive remittances from his regular revenue. The account is divided naturally into three parts. In the first the cost of Edward's wanderings through Italy, Savoy and France, was calculated in pounds of Tours. At this stage Edward depended almost entirely upon loans and advances, partly from Englishmen, but mainly from foreign merchants, supplemented latterly by a few gifts from English magnates. His receipts amounted in the aggregate to over £19,000 sterling.[1] In the second stage the king was in his own lands in Gascony, and half the receipts, now reckoned in pounds of Bordeaux, came from the Gascon treasury, through Osbert, constable of Bordeaux.[2]

predicti regis secundo, antequam rex commisit custodiam eiusdem garderobe magistro Thoma Beke, per breue regis, et per visum et compotum Thome de Gonneys qui habuit contrarotulum in garderoba predicta." Between Nov. 4 and 29 the title "rex" is given by anticipation. It was not thought worth while to begin a new account after the accession. To *Exch. Accts.* 350/8 a mutilated "onus" of Giles of Oudenarde for works in the Tower, etc., up to the end of 7 Edw. I. is prefixed.*

[1] *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* m. 22. "Summa turonensium, £77,326 : 17 : 0 sterlingorum £19,331 : 14 : 3." It follows that the English sterling pound was at this date four times the value of the "livre tournois." In 1279, £12 : 10*s.* sterling was allowed for £50 "black money of Tours"; *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 304. Are we to assume, then, that the black *livre tournois* had the same value as the ordinary pound of Tours? Or had the rate of exchange altered? See also the next note below. The Lucca merchants, represented by Lucasius, claimed to have paid £23,264 : 4 : 2 into the wardrobe during these periods; *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 132. Short advances, soon repaid, were perhaps not included in the accounts. This £23,000 was in addition to its payments to Burnell in England, referred to above.

[2] *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* m. 22. "Reddit compotum de £4162 : 12 : 4 ster. in £18,038 : 0 : 3 bord., receptis de thesauro regis in Vasconia per manus Osberti, constabularii Burdigale." The pound sterling was therefore worth about four and a third "livres bordelais." Sometimes the pound of account in Gascony was the "libra chipotensis," which became less valuable than the pound of Bordeaux, for in 1290, £44,191 : 2 : 8 "chipotenses" were equal to £8071 : 8 : 9½ sterling; *Pipe, 21 Edw. I.* m. 26. This makes the pound sterling roughly equivalent to five and a half pounds "chipot." The decline of the £ chipot. now became very rapid, for by 1312 it was only worth one-eighth of the pound sterling; *Foedera*, ii. 188, "in chipotensibus, videlicet octo pro uno sterlingo computatis." Ducange gives no satisfactory explanation of the meaning of "chapot." or "chipot." It was the currency of Bigorre; *Arch. Hist. de la Gironde*, i. 30-31. I owe this reference to Mr. C. G. Crump.

At this stage the king's receipts were nearly £8500 sterling.[1] In the third stage Edward was back in England, and for the first time his accounts were drawn up in terms of English money. For the first time also the English treasurer contributed a scanty subsidy of £200 to the wardrobe receipts. The coronation charges now swelled the royal needs, and in less than three months over £3600 sterling were received, though this sum was far from defraying the liabilities incurred by the coronation.[2] For the whole period of the account the royal receipts were £31,457 : 4 : 4½. The expenses were still heavier.

The provisional arrangements of the period of 1272–4 were inadequate for the government, either of the realm or household of a crowned and resident sovereign. Edward was crowned on August 19, 1274. On September 21, a month later, he appointed Burnell chancellor.[3] Edward soon made him bishop of Bath and Wells, and ruled England with his help until his death in 1292. Next day, on September 22, Edward appointed Philip of Willoughby escheator beyond Trent.[4] It looks as if Philip entered at once on work incompatible with attendance

[1] *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* m. 22. "Summa burd. £36,799 : 1 : 0 sterl. £8492 : 1 : 10."

[2] *Ib.* m. 22. "Summa £3634 : 8 : 4½." In the expenses a special account of the cost of the coronation from "William de Wyndleshore et Joceas le Akatur," for coronation expenses. Joceas is very often a Jewish name at this time. Some of the charges for the coronation were still unpaid years later. Philip Willoughby also accounted for the household of Alfonso the king's eldest son, from May 2, 1274, to the Wednesday after the 15th August, and for that of his daughter Joan, before she was given to her grandmother, the countess of Ponthieu, to be brought up.

[3] *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 99.

[4] *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 57. By 1278 Willoughby was baron of the exchequer. He was appointed chancellor of the exchequer on April 11, 1283, *ib., 1281–92*, p. 60, and retained that office until his death on Sept. 20, 1305. He was often "locum tenens" of treasurer Langton, whose career, like Philip's own, began in the wardrobe and ended in the exchequer. Philip was dean of Lincoln 1288–1305.

at court, though he remained responsible for the accounts till October 18. During these weeks, however, Anthony Bek, then a clerk of the king's household, was several times described as keeper of the wardrobe.[1] Apparently, he simply filled up the gap until permanent arrangements could be made; for from October 18 his brother, Thomas Bek, accounted for the wardrobe as its keeper. With his appointment the permanent wardrobe establishment of Edward I. was completed.

A slightly different method of dealing with our subject is now admissible. Up to 1274 the whole wardrobe establishment was in a state of rapid growth, and our only way of working out that growth and of tracing the correlation of the different parts was by adhering to a chronological method which, though indispensable for tracing out the subject as a whole, is confusing in relation to the various aspects of wardrobe operations, which are apt to remain unrealised when no conspectus of each of these aspects is attempted. Already we have pushed out of the chronological narrative one important sphere of wardrobe work by relegating to a separate chapter the history of the great wardrobe. It will be our object, so far as is possible, to pursue this course for the future, though the time is still not quite ripe for doing this to any very great extent. The importance and constitutional position of the wardrobe was still to fluctuate widely from one generation to another. These fluctuations still so much depend on the general course of history that it will remain desirable to consider the subject as a whole in relation to epochs which roughly correspond to the various reigns which we have still to traverse. But while still dividing our general narrative into the old-fashioned regnal arrangement, we can within each reign adopt a freer and less chronological method of treatment. And this is the easier since with increasing specialisation of the various offices of state and household, we are increasingly able to study each in isolation. As soon as this becomes possible, we must put together in separate chapters matters which were previously treated in connection with each

[1] He is twice so called on the patent roll of 1274, viz. on Oct. 7 (p. 59) and on Oct. 11 (p. 60). In both these entries Anthony Bek was acting at the Tower of London, of which, before June 2, 1275, he became keeper and constable; *ib.* p. 92. Here again the close connection of the wardrobe and the Tower appears.

other. For the next fifty years, however, we must still pay great attention to the general chronological review, though striving to make it less and less narrowly annalistic. We can also to an increasing degree confine ourselves more rigidly to our own subject, though for some time to come we shall still be compelled to make occasional digressions on the parallel history of the chancery and the exchequer.

We can begin this method of treatment with the personal reign of Edward I. and treat the wardrobe history from 1274 to 1307 under separate heads within that period. Let us first deal with the personal aspects of its history and treat of the officers of Edward's wardrobe and of their relations to the other clerical agents of his policy.

SECTION II

The Wardrobe Staff under Edward I.

Edward I.'s general political outlook was so conservative that his method of choosing his servants differed rather in practice than in theory from that of Henry III. There was, no doubt, all the difference in the world between an orderly mind, loving efficiency and method, and a thriftless, easy-going temperament, desiring chiefly to be surrounded by personal friends and dependents; between the king who was a good Englishman and mainly served by English-born followers, and the king who was surrounded by foreign favourites, both of high and low degree. But father and son shared the same general point of view, the same distrust of the magnates, both in church and state, and the same desire to work through the royal household staff, whose ways were familiar to them through long years of constant intercourse. Edward's ideal seems to have been to rule, firstly, through the attached servants of his youth, like Burnell, and then by a sort of civil service of household officers for whom he would provide orderly promotion, and who were assured of a career in the royal service so long as they remained faithful. Leaving aside the lay ministers, with whom we have little direct concern, we have to note two distinctive features of Edward's policy in this relation. One is the fact that nearly all his most famous ministers were in early life clerks in his wardrobe, but received their ultimate reward by elevation to posts in the chancery and exchequer. With this exception, Edward seems to have made a point of selecting a large proportion of his clerical ministers from within the offices over which they were put. His highest officials, then, were promoted civil servants, like the ministers of the modern German Empire, not political ministers after the fashion approved of by the baronage, and required by present English custom. At this period the two groups of king's clerks, who had most to do with the more responsible business of the crown, were the clerks of the wardrobe and the clerks of the chancery. Aiming, like his father,

at treating both these classes as personal and domestic servants, Edward continued Henry's policy of employing household clerks and chancery clerks indifferently in the execution of his policy. But where under the old king all was confusion between the two services, under his son there is every appearance of orderly co-ordination between them.

The exchequer officials were less politically important, because more removed from the court, and less in personal contact with the crown. Only the treasurer himself was in intimate relation with the king. Accordingly, with two or three exceptions, his subordinates are seldom mentioned in the chronicles and general histories. But it was also a feature of Edward's policy that the exchequer had to accept for its chiefs men who had served their apprenticeship to affairs, sometimes in the chancery, but more frequently in the wardrobe. The office which had the longest traditions of independence and method was the one which required the most careful supervision.

A lifelong career in some branch of the royal service was insured to the royal clerk in whose fidelity and capacity Edward had confidence. The greatest post open to them in the king's service was the chancellorship. We have already spoken of the brief chancellorship of Walter of Merton before Edward's return. Both in his position as a household clerk and in his resignation of the chancery before receiving his bishopric, he set the type to most of his successors. Of the five chancellors in the thirty-three remaining years of Edward I.'s reign, two, Robert Burnell (1274–1292) and John Langton (1292–1302), ruled over the chancery for twenty-eight consecutive years. Yet their custody of the great seal was but the culmination of previous years of faithful service. Burnell's chancellorship was the reward of his discharge of the duties of chief clerk of the household of Edward before his accession, and for his successful representation of his master's interests in England during the crusade. John Langton was but a "simple clerk of the chancery"[1] when he was put over the office in which he had so long served. A second case of promoting a chancery clerk to be chancellor in this reign was that of William Hamilton, chancellor between 1305 and 1307.

[1] *Ann. Dunstaple*, p. 373. Before 1286 he was keeper of the rolls of chancery (*C.P.R., 1281–92*, p. 242), being, it is said, the first recorded holder of that office.*

His merits were those of a good official, and he had proved his fitness for his high office by frequently keeping the great seal as deputy for both Burnell and Langton.[1] Six years before his appointment, Edward declared that there was no one in the realm so expert in the laws and customs of England, or so fit to act as chancellor.[2] A fourth chancellor who went through a long apprenticeship in the royal court was William Greenfield (1302–4), a clerk of the king's household, a civilian and a diplomatist. The only chancellor of the reign whose career was not wholly devoted to the royal service was Ralph Baldock (April to July 1307), who only became a member of the king's council a few weeks before his appointment as chancellor.[3]

Burnell's position was unique. Not one of the other chancellors was, like him, the king's most confidential minister, and none of them attracted nearly as much attention from the chroniclers as he had received. None of Burnell's successors, save Baldock, bishop of London after 1306, held the rank of bishop while chancellor, for Greenfield resigned immediately on becoming archbishop-elect of York, and Langton had to wait two years after his resignation before he was suffered to hold the see of Chichester. One of them, Hamilton, who, like Burnell, died in office, was never a bishop at all.[4] Just a shade of his father's suspicion of an over-mighty chancellor may have survived in Edward's breast, to be disregarded only in the case of such a friend as Burnell. With one exception, the typical chancellor of the second half of the reign was the promoted clerk of the chancery or household, whose whole outlook was narrow and departmental, and whose personality and status were those of an official rather than of a magnate.

Edward's six treasurers varied in type much more than his chancellors. The first three, Philip of Eye (1271–1273), Joseph

[1] He was deputy, or vice-chancellor, in 1286–9, when Burnell was abroad with the great seal; *Peckham's Letters*, pp. 934, 936, 939. He also kept the great seal between Feb. 20 and June 16, 1299, when chancellor Langton was at Rome seeking the bishopric of Ely; *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, pp. 394, 422. Hamilton was executor of Burnell's will; *C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 484.

[2] *Ib., 1296–1302*, p. 309. Edward here calls him his confidant (secretarius).

[3] *Foedera*, i. 1009.

[4] Hamilton's highest ecclesiastical preferment was the deanery of York.

Chauncy (1273–1280), prior of the Hospital of St. John in England, and Richard Ware (1280–1283), abbot of Westminster, represented the traditions of Henry III.'s reign, and two of them were members of religious orders. Under them the exchequer was, as we shall see, circumscribed in its operations. It was more in evidence when men of Edward's own school became its treasurers. The first of these, John Kirkby, a chancery clerk, who had constantly acted as Burnell's right-hand man, served as treasurer from 1284 to 1290, and made a deep mark in that office. His tradition of activity was well kept up by his wardrobe-trained successors, William March (1290–1295) and Walter Langton (1295–1307). Of March we can only say now that he was the only great officer of state during the reign who was removed from office for "political reasons." He fell, a chronicler tells us, because Edward, who rarely dismissed a minister, made him the scapegoat of the unpopularity incurred by the merciless taxation of the clergy in 1295.[1] Of the other treasurers of Edward's choosing, Chauncy resigned from failing health,[2] Ware and Kirkby died in office, and Langton survived the king. But while Edward had no wish for his chancellors to hold high ecclesiastical office, every one of his treasurers was, or soon became, a head of his house or a bishop. Edward's three last treasurers all accepted bishoprics soon after they had taken up office,[3] but none abandoned the exchequer in consequence. Of Langton it may be said that he was the first treasurer of the exchequer who was in fact, if not in name, the king's chief minister. He stood to the later part of Edward's reign in the same relation that Burnell stood to the earlier part of it.

[1] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* No. 144, m. 20, "antequam idem episcopus [*i.e.* Bath. et Well.] amotus fuit ab officio thesaurarie predicte." Compare *Flores Hist.* iii. 280, which tells, in language borrowed from the parable of the unjust steward, how March "amotus est a villicatione sua." *Annales Regis Edwardi*, in Rishanger (R.S.), p. 473, relate how Winchelsea resisted the imposition of a tax of a half on the clergy, and that the king "cum juramento affirmauit, quod tale preceptum nusquam a sua conscientia emanauit, sed thesaurarius, . . . hoc ex propria pharetra procurauit; ex qua re amotus fuerat ab officio suo." For his virtues as a bishop and his career in the wardrobe, see later, pp. 16, 17 and 21.

[2] This is perhaps a fair inference from *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 382, June 1280, acquittance to Chauncy from making any accounts, and *ib.* p. 424, Feb. 1281, a mandate to admit as prior of the Hospital William of Henley, formerly attorney of Joseph, late prior.

[3] Kirkby was bishop of Ely in 1286; March, bishop of Wells in 1293; and Langton, bishop of Lichfield in 1296.

Even more than the chancery the wardrobe was the school of the Edwardian administrator. The keepers and controllers of the king's wardrobe were all men of mark. Though never mentioned as holding one of these offices either for prince or king, Burnell himself belonged to the same type, for he was above all things the resourceful and faithful household clerk, elevated by his master's goodwill to the highest positions in church and state. It was natural, then, that the ablest and most ambitious clerks in England should seek advancement as clerks of the king's wardrobe. As chiefs among the wardrobe clerks, they had authority that rivalled the authority of the greatest ministers of the state, and from the wardrobe promotion to the most dignified and lucrative offices constantly followed. Even high-born personages, like the brothers Thomas and Anthony Bek, the sons of a great Lincolnshire baron, did not disdain to begin their careers as clerks of the royal household.[1] Anthony Bek, the younger brother, who filled up a temporary gap in 1274;[2] Thomas Bek, who was keeper from October 18, 1274, to November 20, 1280, were able and efficient men, though perhaps too "baronial" in their outlook to be altogether men after Edward's own heart. Anyhow, when Thomas became bishop of St. David's in 1280, he quitted the royal service for good, though he never became, like Anthony, bishop of Durham after 1283, a leader of opposition to his former master.

Bek's three successors were men of more markedly official type, obscure in origin and family, prepared for command by long service as household clerks, and owing everything to their master's goodwill. Master William of Louth, the first of them, began life as a wardrobe clerk, held the new office of cofferer during the whole of Bek's keepership, and was, on his retirement, promoted over the head of the veteran controller, Thomas Gunneys. Louth kept the wardrobe for ten years from

[1] They were the sons of the baron of Eresby. Anthony Bek was a king's clerk by 1266, though imprisoned in Kenilworth; *C.P.R., 1258-66*, pp. 553, 649. Was he the Anthony Bek, knight, of 1265? *ib.* p. 490. For the household ordinance of their kinsman the lord of Eresby, see later, pp. 182-183.

[2] On April 25, 1274, he witnessed the surrender of some Gascon lands to the crown as "domini regis cancellarius"; *Recognitiones Feodorum*, p. 24, ed. Bémont. Was the keeper of the wardrobe, present with Edward in Gascony, acting as keeper of the great seal also? Or was he "chancellor" of Edward's "private chancery," that is that of the privy seal?

November 20, 1280, to November 20, 1290.[1] When he left the wardrobe for the bishopric of Ely, he had been sixteen years continually in its service.

The next keeper after Louth was also found within the office. This was the Leicestershire clerk Walter of Langton, who had been from early life in Edward's service, and latterly, as the personal clerk of the controller Gunneys, had presented the special account of the Welsh war, after Gunneys' death, as virtual deputy of the former controller.[2] From 1281–2 he was regularly serving as a wardrobe clerk,[3] being, for instance, in Gascony with the king between 1286 and 1289.[4] On July 1, 1288, if not earlier, he was acting as cofferer;[5] on May 1, 1290, as

[1] His accounts are *Pipe, 12 Edw. I.* No. 128, m. 31 d, *ib. 13 Edw. I.* No. 130, m. 5 and 5 d, *ib. 19 Edw. I.* No. 136, m. 31 and 31 d, *ib. 21 Edw. I.* No. 138. m. 26 and 2 d. Louth was elected bishop on May 12, and consecrated Oct. 1. After his election W. Langton acted as his *locum tenens* in the wardrobe; *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, f. 42. Langton held the deanery of St. Martin-le-Grand, which had resumed its former close relationship with the chiefs of the wardrobe; *C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 230. He was well spoken of in the chronicles; for example, *Ann. Osney*, p. 325, "virum magnificum et eminentis scientie . . . qui diutius thesaurarie [? thesaurarii] garderobe domini regis officium gessit ita laudabiliter et honeste ut etc." William of March succeeded him as dean of St. Martin's. *The Victoria County History of London*, i. 599, truly describes St. Martin's as "a corporation of officials rather than a religious house." The chief omission in Miss M. Reddan's admirable account of this foundation, *ib.* pp. 555-566, is that she fails to notice the specially intimate relations of St. Martin's and the wardrobe. This intimacy became less conspicuous in the fourteenth century, though William of Melton, Thomas of Ousefleet, William of Cusance, William of Mulsho, William of Pakington, were all deans of St. Martin's and wardrobe officers.

[2] *Pipe, 19 Edw. I.* No. 136, m. 31. The "Walteri Le Lange" of App. to Oxenedes, p. 327, should read "Walteri de Langeton." Compare later pp. 113 and 115. He may very likely have accompanied Edward in his crusade. He began life as a poor clerk; Hemingburgh, ii. 271. He was from his youth up in Edward's household; *Foedera*, i. 956.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 352/12, p. 7, a memorandum of a settlement of Langton's wages "a tempore quo primo venit in garderobam, anno regis decimo," up to Sept. 14, 1290.

[4] *Misc. Books Exch. T.R.* vol. 201, contains a very large number of entries of payments "per manus W. de Langeton," *e.g.* ff. 15, 24 d, 33, 58. On f. 56 he is "clericus garderobe." He had 25*s.* only for robes; f. 84: and only 7½*d.* a day wages; *Chanc. Misc.* 4/4 m. 22 d.

[5] *Exch. Accts.* 352/12, a book of prestita, distinguishes those "antequam W. de Langeton recepit coffrar. thes." and those after that event. The next prest is dated on July 1, 1288. I should extend the last two words to "coffrariam thesaurarie"; *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, f. 4 d. For the new office of cofferer, see later, pp. 21-23. *Ib.* 4/4 m. 22 d, when recording his wages, paid from Nov. 1, 1288, to Feb. 19, 1290, adds "quia in crastino vacauit ex toto pro priuatis per cccclxxvj dies" This is confirmed by *ib.* 4/5, f. 4 d, which shows

controller. Almost at once, the election of Louth to Ely led to Langton acting as his lieutenant in the wardrobe, and when the bishop concluded his account he became his formal successor. He was now to hold the keepership for the five years from November 20, 1290, to November 20, 1295. He was then raised to the treasurership of the exchequer, succeeding in that office to Master William of March, his predecessor as controller of the wardrobe. These two wardrobe clerks held the treasury between them from 1290 to 1307, and it is hard not to connect the experience they had acquired in the wardrobe with the remarkable changes in the relations of the two treasuries, which, as we shall see, characterised their long period of service in the exchequer. Langton, who became bishop of Lichfield in 1296, has already suggested an obvious comparison with Burnell. Both of these were greedy and self-seeking men and neglectful prelates. But they were good officials, and deserved the unmeasured confidence of their master. This arose in the days of the king's close personal relations with them, when they were the most trusted clerks of his royal household. On becoming bishops they were out of the household, but the king's confidence in them lasted till their relations were severed by death.

John of Drokensford, that is, Droxford,* in Hampshire, was, on November 20, 1295, appointed Langton's successor as keeper. He also had been a wardrobe clerk, first acting in Gascony between 1286 and 1289.[1] Originally a sort of auxiliary, he was, on November 20, 1288, regularly admitted to the king's wages as *ostiarius*.[2] His promotion was rapid. After a few months (May–November 1290) as cofferer, in succession to Langton, he was called on November 20, 1290, to follow Langton as controller; five years later he took Langton's place for a third time,

him in London at Lent. Ash Wednesday that year was on Feb. 15, so Feb. 19, the date of his withdrawal from court, corresponds nicely. It is significant that he was out of court for the first year of his holding high offices in the wardrobe.

[1] *Misc. Books Exch. T.R.* vol. 201, f. 43, records the payment of a prest towards his wages in 15 Edw. I. (1286–7). Another entry under his name is struck out. It runs, "J. de Drokenesford, clerico, existenti in garderoba ad auxilhandum in eadem."

[2] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/4, f. 32, shows that he became usher at a wage of 4½*d.* a day, from Nov. 20, 1288, "quo die admissus fuit primo ad vadia regis." This clearly refers to his wages as usher, and is not incompatible with the statement in the previous note.

and now in the supreme direction of the wardrobe. Droxford remained keeper from November 20, 1295, until Edward's death on July 7, 1307. Again keeper under Edward II., and subsequently bishop of Bath and Wells, Droxford has not received much attention from the chroniclers. The records, however, show that he was an important personage, the chief fellow-worker of Langton, and his constant *locum tenens* at the exchequer during the continued troubles of the last twelve years of the reign. It is unfortunate that his accounts are only very imperfectly preserved.[1] It is some consolation for the long gaps in the series that the only household accounts of a whole regnal year which have been completely printed belong to his time.[2]

The second officer of the wardrobe was now definitely styled controller.[3] Edward's controllers are more varied in type than his keepers. The first, Thomas Gunneys (1272–1283), who had served the king long before his accession, remained in office until his death on August 15, 1283, though debarred from further promotion. He had probably run his course and was not a man of striking parts. But he had by his side his clerk, Walter of Langton, afterwards the famous keeper, treasurer and bishop.[4] Of Gunneys' successor, William of March, who remained controller till May 1, 1290, we have already spoken. He was a man of some distinction and independence. As treasurer of the exchequer he proved an adequate successor to John Kirkby, whom he succeeded as treasurer,* and was in better repute as bishop of Wells than his predecessor, Robert Burnell.[5] Walter Langton, the controller from May to November 1290, has also been mentioned earlier. The regularity of his promotion, as

[1] Only the first three years of his accounts are among the exchequer enrolments; *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* No. 144, m. 22. The accounts of his later years have to be pieced together from the "various exchequer accounts" and other sources.

[2] This is *Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobæ anno regni regis Edwardi primi vicesimo octavo*, printed in 1787 by the Society of Antiquaries, to which we shall so often have occasion to refer.

[3] See above, I. pp. 247-248, and below, pp. 35-39.

[4] The special Welsh war roll of 1282–4 was tendered by Walter de Langton, as clerk of Gunneys, who died before the end of the account; *Pipe, 19 Edw. I.* No. 136, m. 31. Compare above, p. 15, and below, pp. 113 and 115.

[5] Between his fall in 1295 and his death in 1302, he devoted himself with zeal to diocesan affairs. Between 1324 and 1329 some efforts were made to secure his canonisation. He is the only "garderobarius" who died near the pale of sanctification.

clerk, cofferer, controller, treasurer of the wardrobe and treasurer of the exchequer, is typical of the orderly advancement of the successful official of Edward's reign. Similarly Langton's successor as cofferer and controller was that John Droxford who, later, was to succeed him as keeper of the wardrobe. Of the two controllers under Droxford, the first, John of Benstead, served for just short of ten years, from November 20, 1295, to September 25, 1305. Benstead's successor, Robert of Cottingham, controller from September 26, 1305, to the death of the king on July 7, 1307,[1] is the most shadowy personage among the higher wardrobe officers of the reign.

The careers of most of these wardrobe officers of Edward are well known. Their lives are, with scarcely an exception, written in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and we have only to correct these articles by more precise indications of their various relations to the wardrobe than was possible when these biographies were written.[2] Benstead's life has, however, never been adequately worked out,[3] though he is certainly one of the strongest and most influential ministers of the latter years of Edward I. His distinctive personality, his picturesque and diversified career, and his intimate relations to his sovereign, all make him worthy of a careful study. Reserving some aspects of his position in administrative history until later for fuller treatment, it will be enough to note here that his earliest connection with the wardrobe was apparently when he tendered the hanaper accounts for the year 1292–3.[4] The ordinary clerk of the hanaper was among the obscurest of officials, but within two years of holding this office, Benstead, after active wardrobe work, probably as *ostiarius*, during Edward's critical Welsh campaign of 1295,[5] rose on

[1] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/6, for these dates.

[2] For instance, I may mention that my articles on Walter Langton and William March are wrong in describing them as "clerks of the chancery." A good many corrections and additions may be suggested from the details given in various parts of this text.

[3] The account of him in the *D.N.B.* is quite inadequate. As to the form of his name, he is almost invariably called "Benstede" in the records. Does this correspond to Banstead, Surrey, or Binstead, Isle of Wight, or to the two Binsteads in Hants and Sussex? Probably not to Banstead, a name generally written "Banstede" in contemporary records, *e.g.* in *Exch. Accts.* 367/24, and *Chanc. Misc.* 3/22.*

[4] *Misc. Books Exch. T.R.* vol. 202, pp. 54, 92. See also for Benstead, below, pp. 36-39, 68-70, 77-79 and 225-226.

[5] *Ib. passim.* The work done by him suggests that he was "ostiarius."

November 20, 1295, to the office of controller, and retained that post nearly ten years. We shall see, later on, that Benstead was the first controller who can be proved to have been keeper of the privy seal in virtue of his controllership.

Benstead was called in 1302, "the royal clerk who stays continually by the king's side."[1] This was a true enough description of Benstead in the years preceding his controllership, for in 1294–5 he accompanied the king throughout his Welsh expedition, and was never absent from court at all.[2] Moreover, the duty of remaining by the king's side was not less incumbent upon him when he became controller of the wardrobe, keeper of the privy seal, and custodian of the wardrobe archives.[3] Nevertheless, the phrase of 1302 is a curiously inexact description of Benstead's relations to the court during the greater part of his controllership. The designation of king's "secretary," by which he is sometimes described, perhaps indicates better his relations to his master. For secretary, at that date, meant little more than confidant,[4] and Benstead was in the front rank among Edward's confidential agents. What confidant had a better right to be called *secretarius* than the keeper of the *secretum*? As keeper of the personal seal, Benstead was, in modern phrase, private secretary to the king, just as the chancellor was his official secretary of state. We have already seen, in the case of William Hamilton in 1299, that the keeper of the great seal was similarly described by Edward I. as his secretary.[5]

After 1295 Benstead was too indispensable in the conduct of high affairs of state for him to be constantly kept at the king's side, immersed in routine business. No official was more busy than he in military preparations, the survey and improvement of

[1] *C.C.R., 1296–1302*, p. 606; Prynne's *Records*, iii. 935, "qui juxta latus nostrum moratur assidue." The date is Sept. 13, 1302. Benstead was then rector of Monkton.

[2] *Misc. Books Exch. T.R.* vol. 202, p. 22, records that he was paid his wage of 4½*d.* a day for the whole of 23 Edw. I. "quia nichil vacauit."

[3] See for this later, pp. 36-39.

[4] For the meanings of "secretary" at this period, see Miss L. B. Dibben's *Secretaries in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* in *E.H.R.* xxv. 430-444. In the introduction to *Mem. de Parl.* (1305), p. xliii, F. W. Maitland, after pointing out that Benstead had recently been called secretary, unhappily conjectures that another royal clerk, John of Berwick, "possibly holds the privy seal." He did not realise that in 1305 a "secretary" might also well be keeper of the privy seal. For Berwick see later, p. 42, note 2, and p. 83, note 3.

[5] See above, p. 12.

fortresses and similar work, whether in Scotland or during the king's sojourn in Flanders in 1297–8. On occasion he served on the battlefield itself.[1] No man went more often on missions, diplomatic or financial, on his master's behalf. Accordingly the first counter rolls, tendered by him at the exchequer for the years November 1295 to November 1298, were delivered by his clerk and attorney, Peter of Collingbourn.[2] In 1299–1300 he was absent from court for more than a third of the year.[3] In subsequent years the accidental survival of a large number of the accounts of his expenses, when away from court, show that he must have been more often acting by proxy than in person.[4] His last and longest absence from his work was caused by a mission to Bordeaux, which lasted from July to October 1305. When approaching his return, he was relieved of the controllership, and became chancellor of the exchequer. In 1306 he was sent on an embassy to the papal court at Lyons. Thus he was drawn away from the wardrobe work in which he had first gained his master's confidence. We shall find him again at the wardrobe early in the next reign.

It is one of the standing difficulties of the mediaeval historian, who has to depend upon record sources for his material, that he can seldom visualise with any clearness the personalities of the men whose external careers he is able to trace in almost superabundant detail. Of the chief representatives of the clerks of Edward's wardrobe we can only attempt to appreciate the

[1] Benstead was appointed with earl Patrick of Dunbar to count the slain in the battle of Dunbar; Cotton, p. 312, who gives the total as 10,052, an impossibly high number.

[2] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* No. 144, m. 22. For his attendance at court while the king was in the Netherlands, see later, p. 46, and note 4.

[3] *L.Q.G., 1299–1300,* pp. 52, 55, 75. He was absent from court 135 days in all.

[4] These are in *Exch. Accts.* 308/30, 309/5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. They show Benstead absent from court in 1301 from Jan. 1 to Jan. 22, May 7 to May 27, June 4 to June 25, and again after June 28. In 1304 he was away from Oct. 8 to Nov. 19. In 1305 he was still more often away, namely, from Jan. 7 to Feb. 28, April 26 to July 9, and July 12 to Oct. 26, when he went to Bordeaux and back *via* Paris. His mission to Lyons lasted from Oct. 15, 1306, to April 10, 1307. It looks as if his constant absence in 1305 led to his replacement as controller by Cottingham in September of that year. These bills for expenses were paid by the wardrobe and sent as vouchers to the exchequer, which preserved them. I am indebted to Mr. C. L. Kingsford for calling my attention to them. See accounts of "nuncii." They are well worth working out in more detail.

personality of a few. Fortunately the most important are the best known. Burnell and Walter Langton were both admirable officials, pursuing their master's interests with a zeal and prudence equal to that with which they sought advancement for themselves and their families. Both were negligent prelates and sublimely careless of the decencies of their position. They are the best because the most strenuous examples of the official type to which, we may well believe, many of the less known household clerks conformed. The only variants from them to a striking degree are Anthony Bek and William March. Of the reputation for sanctity gained by the latter, we have already spoken. Of Anthony Bek, however, we know little in the days when he was a wardrobe clerk, and our impression of his character is derived from the times when he was lord of the Durham palatinate and one of the fiercest leaders of opposition to his former master. Bek was not, indeed, the only example of independence. More than one of the prelates who, under Edward II., threw in their lot with the lords ordainers, owed their career to the household service of his father.

The third wardrobe office in importance was the new office of cofferer (*coffrarius*). This post was generally held by men who were afterwards advanced to the keepership and the controllership. Of this type were William of Louth, the first known cofferer, who acted for the whole of Thomas Bek's keepership (1274–1280), and his successors, William of March (1280–1284), Walter of Langton (1287–1290), and John of Droxford, appointed on May 1, 1290, and promoted on November 20 to the controllership.[1] Of these we have said enough already. Their successors, Philip of Everdon (1290–1295 ?), Langton's cofferer, and Walter of Barton[2] (1295–? 1297), left less mark. But the last two cofferers of the reign, Ralph of Manton (1297–1303) and Walter of Bedwyn (1303–1307), were both men of great importance and activity in their department, though they never obtained higher promotion in it. The Scottish war kept Manton much in the

[1] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, f. 42. "Johanni de Drokenesford, clerico, existenti *loco coffrarii* per preceptum regis a primo die Maii, quo tempore magister Willelmus de Marchia factus fuit thesaurarius de scaccario."

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 354/1, on Feb. 9, 1296, describes Everdon as "dudum coffrarius regis," and Barton "tunc coffrarius regis." Manton was acting on June 5, 1297; *C.C.R., 1296–1302,* p. 110.

North, but he had his share in diplomatic history also.[1]* We have one vivid glimpse of Manton's personality by reason of his tragic end. Like many other *garderobarii*, Manton was as much of a soldier as a clerk. He was by virtue of his office practically the paymaster of the army in Scotland, notably in October and November of 1302.[2] Nor was he content to issue money from Roxburgh and other headquarters of the host. He went by the king's orders to Scotland as an inspector of fortresses.[3] Upon occasion he did not scruple himself to take the field, and was one of the victims of the successful ambush laid by the Scots which resulted in the battle of Roslyn of February 23, 1303. Taken prisoner with many others, Manton was brutally hacked in pieces by his captors, when they thought themselves robbed of the spoils of victory by an English counter-attack. "Ralph the cofferer," as he was called, vainly sought to purchase mercy from Simon Fraser, the Scots commander, by large offerings of money. Fraser fiercely reproached him for defrauding his king and withholding their wages from the soldiers. A clerk of holy church, clad in a hauberk of iron, had no right to clerical privilege. Thereupon a "ribald near at hand, seized the wretched cofferer and cut off his hands and his head."[4] Whether these details, told us by the Yorkshire chronicler, Langtoft, are true or not, they suggest that the subordinate clerks of Edward's wardrobe did not differ in type from those whose careers are better known. But it was part of the duty of the more prominent wardrobe clerks to serve the king in his wars, accompanied by their *comitiua* of

[1] He received the "litera obligatoria" of the count of Flanders for a loan of £10,000 at York in July 1297, "ad deferendum in garderoba"; *Exch. Accts.* 308/19.

[2] *Ib.* 10/14. In Oct. and Nov. 1302 Manton paid £2250 in wages, receiving from the exchequer £2600, and from the Frescobaldi £23. John of Ockham was throughout acting as his clerk and assistant. The document is described as "onus garderobe," and the clerk who transcribed it in the exchequer got 12*d.* for his two days' labour.

[3] *Ib.* 364/13, f. 34. "Missus in Scotiam per preceptum regis ad statum diuersarum municionum eiusdem regni superuidendum."

[4] Langtoft's *Chronicle*, ii. 344-6, R.S.:

> "Ore es-tu cy trové sanz albe et sans amyt,
> En hauberke de fere, ke n'est pas habit
> As clers de sainte eglise par kanke chant et lit;
> Tu averas jugement solum toen merit."

Manton's heart was buried, at the king's charges, in the church of the nuns of Holywell at Shoreditch, near London; *Exch. Accts.* 369/11, f. 33 d.

men-of-arms and archers. We shall see, later on, the extreme development of this system in the reign of Edward III.

Even the inferior offices of the wardrobe were often held by men of mark. The usher and sub-usher, who came after the cofferer, illustrate this. If John Rede, the *ostiarius* of 1279, gained little promotion, it was otherwise with Benstead, who was *ostiarius* before 1295, and with his successor, William Melton, of whom we shall hear much in the next reign. When in February 1300 Melton was transferred to the service of queen Margaret,[1] he was replaced as usher by John Langford, who acted until nearly the end of the reign, and[2] under whom John of Swanland was *sub-ostiarius*.[3] Another sub-usher was Henry of Montpellier.[4] Early in the reign the king's surgeon and physician were accounted as wardrobe clerks, and in 1279 William of Saint-Père and Master Simon are included amidst their number. Twenty years later Master John of Kenley, *physicus regis*, and Philip of Beauvais, *chirurgicus regis*, are in a category by themselves.[5] On the other hand Edward I.'s policy of subordinating the wardrobes of members of the royal house to his own involved the doctrine that the servants of his wife and son were still his servants.[6] Thus William of Blyborough, though early assigned to the service of Edward of Carnarvon, figures for the whole of the reign as a wardrobe clerk of the king.

There were seldom much more than half-a-dozen real wardrobe clerks at once, so that even the least important of them was something of a personage. It will not, therefore, be quite useless to put together a few more names of Edwardian wardrobe clerks, though little can be said about them. Such were Mr. Stephen of St. George, who, with Henry of Montpellier, were among the few

[1] *MS. Ad.* 7965, m. 123; *L.Q.G.* pp. 87, 313. Melton was succeeded by Langford on Feb. 11, 1300, and became cofferer of queen Margaret (*ib.* pp. 355-8). He was in 1301 transferred to the service of Edward of Carnarvon. See later, Ch. VIII. p. 171.

[2] In 1307 Langford was succeeded by Gilbert of Bromley; *Exch. Accts.* 369/16.

[3] *L.Q.G.* p. 313.

[4] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, m. 9.

[5] *L.Q.G.* pp. 313-14.

[6] For this see also later, pp. 42 and 165. For Blyborough see later, Ch. VIII. Sect. I. (pp. 166-168, 170-171 and 176). He brought treasure to Edward at Acre and was still receiving robes in the wardrobe in 1299–1300; *L.Q.G.* p. 313. He remained in the prince of Wales's service until 1307.

instances of foreign wardrobe clerks at this time.[1] Twenty years later we have also Mr. Edward of London [2] and Mr. John Bush,[3] Peter of Collingbourn, Peter of Bramber and William of Corby. Among names which we shall hear more of later are those of Robert of Wodehouse, clerk of the kitchen in 1303–6,[4] his successor Roger of Wingfield,[5] Roger of Northburgh,[6] and John of Fleet. Even these lists are not exhaustive. The personal clerks of the leading wardrobe officers may well have had more real power than some of the subordinate clerks. A good instance of this type is Thomas of Butterwick, the active and prominent clerk of Benstead.[7] Another is John of Ockham, already a wardrobe clerk in 1296, then the chief assistant of Manton as cofferer, and later the clerk of keeper Droxford.[8]

Not only the clerks of the wardrobes of the king's kinsfolk, but the clerks of subordinate branches of the king's wardrobe, such as the great wardrobe, were now considered as ordinary wardrobe clerks. We shall treat of these elsewhere, but it is worth noting here that Giles of Oudenarde, the only wardrobe officer of Henry III. who remained in his son's wardrobe service, was provided for by Edward in the great wardrobe, over which he was chief for many years, rather than in the main office. The wardrobe required politicians, but the great wardrobe of stores was adequately staffed by the dull clerk of the type Henry III. affected. Moreover, Giles, though a clerk by profession, was

[1] See for Stephen of St. George, *C.P.R., 1272–81*, pp. 61, 76, 209, 242, 295. He first appears in 1274; became Edward's proctor in the papal court in 1283; was still employed in 1290, and died before Oct. 1291 (*ib., 1281–92*, pp. 86, 374, 447). His brother, Peter of St. George, a monk of Monte Cassino, was appointed king's chaplain "in consideration of the merits of Master Stephen of St. George, his brother." Does not this suggest an Italian origin for the St. Georges? There was also a Mr. James of St. George in the royal service, to whom, and to whose wife Ambrosia, Edward granted a pension for life on Oct. 20, 1284, which they were still enjoying in 1304; *Exch. Accts.* 364/13. A "clericus uxoratus" in England is worth noting.

[2] "Regis familiaris clericus"; *C.C.R., 1296–1302*, p. 428.

[3] *MS. Ad.* 8835, f. 117.

[4] In 1296–7 Wodehouse and Flete were transcribing privy seal letters under Benstead; *MS. Ad.* 7965, m. 29. For Wodehouse as clerk of the kitchen, see *Exch. Accts.* 363/10, m. 4, 369/16, m. 25. He was acting on Nov. 4, 1306.

[5] *Ib.* 369/16, m. 25. He was acting at the time of Edward I.'s death.

[6] Northburgh received robes in 1305–6; *ib.* 369/11, f. 164 d.

[7] For his activities, see *L.Q.G. passim.*

[8] He was already acting in the wardrobe on Feb. 8-9, 1296; *Exch. Accts.* 354/1, and 354/11, No. 33; *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 293.

technically a "buyer" only, of the great wardrobe, and was still in that capacity colleague of Adinettus the king's tailor. But after his retirement a clerk permanently became head of that institution with the title of clerk or keeper of the great wardrobe. As such he had a definite place in the official hierarchy, receiving robes regularly as a wardrobe clerk. Of Hamo de la Legh (1282 to 1287), Roger de Lisle (1287 to 1295), John of Husthwaite (1295 to 1300), and Ralph Stokes (1300 to 1307), the clerks of the great wardrobe under Edward I., we shall have to speak at length in a later volume.

The lay officers of Edward I.'s household less closely touch our subject, but a little should be said as regards the stewards of the household who acted under this prince. In the early years of the reign the dual stewardship was held by Sir Hugh Fitzotho and Sir Robert Fitzjohn. The former's record of service goes back to the barons' wars, when on October 15, 1265, he received the custody of the Tower and City of London, then in the king's hands, in return for his services after the battle of Evesham.[1] The London chronicler, who records his appointment, adds *et vocatus est senescallus*. This certainly became his title soon afterwards, for he attended the lord Edward on his crusade,[2] and perhaps acted as his steward during the expedition. On his master's return in 1274 he was already steward of the king's household, and remained in office to his death in 1283.[3] In the ordinance of 1279 he is designated "chief steward," while his colleague, Sir Robert Fitzjohn, is called the "other steward." Robert remained in office until after 1286, when he attended Edward on his long visit to Gascony, in the course of which he seems to have died. In the summer of 1286 he presided at Paris over the steward's court in a noteworthy trial which vindicated the right of the king's steward to try offenders of the royal household, even

[1] *Liber de Ant. Legibus*, p. 79. The day is from *C.P.R., 1258–66*, p. 463. Compare *ib.* pp. 467-8 for the grant to Hugh of the houses of Robert of Linton, the Montfortian keeper of the great wardrobe. See later, in chapter on great wardrobe. In Feb. 1269 he was reappointed as the lord Edward's deputy; *Lib. de Ant. Leg.* pp. 124, 225. He was probably already attached to his household.

[2] *C.P.R., 1266–72*, p. 440.

[3] On Feb. 6, 1283, he was exempted, by reason of his services beyond sea and in the realm, from the requirement to account for the stewardship of the household or any other office; *ib., 1281–92*, p. 55. He was dead before April 14; *C. Inq. Misc.* ii. 276

for offences committed on foreign soil.[1] His colleague was already Sir Peter of Champvent, a Savoyard cousin of Otho of Granson,[2] who continued to act from 1286 to about 1292, when he became chamberlain. Becoming chief steward after Robert's death, Champvent's colleague as "other steward" was Sir Walter de Beauchamp.[3] It looks as if, on Champvent's promotion, Beauchamp became sole steward. Anyhow he is so acting before April 1293,[4] and from that time onwards the stewardship of the household permanently remained under one control. Beauchamp acted from 1289 to 1303,[5] when he died. He was a man of mark, but had apparently the defects of his qualities.[6] His successors, Robert de la Ward [7] (1303–1307) and John de Thorp [8] (1307), carried on the stewardship till Edward I.'s death.

[1] Fleta, p. 68.

[2] He was acting from 1288 to 1290 (*Exch. Accts.* 352/12, m. 14, *R.G.* ii. 368, *Rot. Parl.* i. 17, and Fleta, p. 68), and was still chamberlain on Dec. 26, 1292; *Foedera*, i. 784. For his acting in Gascony with Fitzjohn, see *Misc. Books Exch. T.R.* vol. 201, ff. 64-69. He received 4*s.* a day wages; *ib.* ff. 76, 77. Champvent sometimes acted as "locum tenens senescalli" at later dates, for instance on Dec. 6, 1295, and on Sept. 23, 1296; *Exch. Accts.* 353/28. Beauchamp was then steward.

[3] He was acting from Nov. 20, 1289, with 4*s.* a day wages; *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5.

[4] *Rot. Parl.* i. 93 speaks of the "senescallus" in the singular, if we may trust the printed text.

[5] He was acting on Feb. 1, 1303; *Ch.R.* 89/44, *Foedera*, ii. 748; and died on February 16, 1303; *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 325; Dugdale, *Bar.* I., 249. His later fees and allowances from the wardrobe are detailed in *Exch. Accts.* 357/12.

[6] *Siege of Carlaverock*, p. 30, says of him:

> "Mes vous ne orrez parler james
> De seneschal ke ne ait une mes."

[7] Acting April 8, 1303 (*Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London*, edited by R. Sharpe, D. p. 222), and on Dec. 4, 1306; *Ch.R.* 93/68.

[8] Acting May 23–June 10, 1307; *ib.* 93/54.

SECTION III

Wardrobe Organisation under Edward I. The Household Ordinance of 1279

The first landmark in the history of the wardrobe under Edward I. is formed by the Household Ordinance, issued by the king at Westminster, on November 13, 1279. It is no systematic survey, nor innovating statute, but a simple administrative ordinance, detailing the names, offices, emoluments and functions of the chief officers of the household, and adding a few plain and unsystematic directions as to how their work was to be done. Even the formal legislative acts of Edward I. brought in few novelties, but the Edwardian policy of definition always involved a certain amount of change, and a still greater amount of systematisation and co-ordination. Anyhow it is the first royal ordinance concerning the government of the household that is now extant since the *Constitutio Domus Regis* of the late Norman period. Though only a small part of it is concerned with the wardrobe, the whole of it is so important that I have thought it best to set it out in print, especially since, though not unknown, it has been comparatively little studied and never used in detail by earlier historians. It affords us sure ground for basing upon it a short sketch of the organisation of the wardrobe under Edward I., and of its relations to the household as a whole. Such a survey is the more instructive since in most essential matters the structure of the wardrobe remained much what it had already become towards the end of the thirteenth century. Even the constant splitting off of fresh dependent branches, and their gradual progress towards independence, did not much affect the institution from which they originated.

The Ordinance of 1279 presents the household of Edward I. as an assembly mainly of soldiers and domestics, in which the clerks were few and poorly paid. It pictures to us the motley crowd of knights, esquires, sergeants-at-arms, yeomen (or valets), marshals, chamberlains, along with porters, ushers, cooks and other domestics, side by side with the more modest

establishment of king's clerks, with whom we are mainly concerned. The discipline and government of the throng was supplied by the select clerks and knights who in England, as in contemporary France, constituted the directive element in the royal establishment.[1] The military direction was with the knights, at whose head were the two stewards, and the two marshals. The king's chamberlain, important as he was, is not mentioned in the ordinance, doubtless by reason of the curious reserve that is often shown in speaking of an officer so near the king's person. With the stewards and marshals rested the coercive jurisdiction, which only laymen could exercise with sufficient authority. But the clerks supplied the brains and the education of the royal household, and it is with the clerks, or rather with one section of them, that we are chiefly concerned. There was no longer the old confusion of "king's clerks" in a single class. Some "king's clerks," notably the clerks of the chancery, are no longer in practice a real part of the household, though they might serve in it upon occasion, and other sources tell us that they still continued their nominal relations with the court.[2]

Household clerks in the narrower sense were now divided into three categories. The five clerks of the royal chapel, now entirely divorced from the clerks of the chancery, naturally form a class by themselves. A second category was formed by the "clerks of the offices," the accounting heads of the various domestic branches of the household, of whom are enumerated the clerk of the pantry, the clerk of the kitchen, and the clerk of the marshalsea, who had an under clerk and a keeper of the carriages under him. The third category was that of the clerks of the king's wardrobe, and of these five are mentioned by name. At their head is the treasurer; then comes the controller; then

[1] Langlois, *Le Règne de Philippe le Hardi*, p. 320, who refers to J. P. von Ludewig, *Reliquiae Manuscriptorum*, xii. 6-12 (Halle, 1741), for lists of the household of Philip III. in 1274. The same collection (1-81) gives other similar lists of the thirteenth century, mainly as recipients of robes.

[2] *Fleta*, p. 77. "Qui . . . familiares regis esse consueuerunt" suggests that they have ceased by his time to be effective members of the household. But *ib.* p. 78, "habet etiam rex *alios* clericos in hospicio suo," rather implies that the chancery clerks were still in the household. On p. 66, "cancellaria" and "hospicium" seem, however, contrasted. Moreover, Fleta's emphasis of the freedom of the keeper of the privy seal from all control by the chancellor (p. 75) stresses the differentiation of wardrobe and chancery.

the "clerk under the treasurer," who is beginning to be called the cofferer, though that post is hardly yet an office of the household; and finally two other wardrobe clerks, the usher and the sub-usher. This does not quite exhaust the list, for each of the five clerks was a man of position with his clerk, his servants and his little establishment. There was, too, the staff of the great wardrobe, brought by the ordinance into definite subordination to the wardrobe. Moreover, in the same category as the wardrobe clerks also came the king's surgeon and the king's physician. It seems strange to confuse the medical officers of the king with his wardrobe officers, but a reason is probably to be found in the fact that the surgeon shared with the wardrobe clerks and a footman subordinate to the usher,[1] or *ostiarius*, the exclusive privilege of "lying," that is, sleeping, in the wardrobe. Anyhow these two specialists, who were still assumed to be inevitably ecclesiastics, had to be put somewhere, and they had perhaps a little more affinity to the wardrobe department than to the chapel or to the "offices." Only one layman possessed the right of sleeping in the wardrobe, and he was Orlandino of Lucca, the king's chief banker. Orlandino was constantly at the king's side in the early years of his reign. He was indispensable at every stage of the Welsh wars of 1277 and 1282, sometimes receiving, more often lending, the sums needed for the daily expenses of that wandering royal household, which was also an army mobilised for service.[2]

The clerks of the wardrobe received, like other clerks of the household, a sum not exceeding eight marks a year from the king for robes. Any salary they might receive in addition was strictly temporary, until they were provided for adequately at the expense of the church. The ordinance lays down that no clerk, who had received benefices from the king, should henceforth take wages from him.[3] The fact that the career of nearly every royal clerk can be traced through the patent rolls by the record

[1] "Un vadlet a pe desuz luy."

[2] See, for instance, *Chanc. Misc.* 4/1, ff. 21 d, 30, 33 d.

[3] This was also the case in France. See, for instance, the Ordinances for the Household of Philip V. in 1318 and 1319 in *Ordonnances des Rois*, i. 660, which provided that pensions to clerks of the *hôtel du roi* were to be taken away when they obtained adequate benefices. The king's confessor was ordered to report to the king the appointments received by his clerks, so that this provision could be acted upon.

of his presentation to livings and prebends in the royal gift shows that this ordinance was no dead letter. At the time it was issued the two junior clerks, Stephen of St. George and William of Blyborough, were the only exceptions to this rule.[1] Each of these received wages amounting to 7½*d.* a day. However, their allowance for robes was only three marks each. The usher also took 4½*d.* a day wages, and three and a half marks for robes.

An important section of the ordinance provides what is seemingly a new organisation for the great wardrobe, putting it under a "buyer," who was to be henceforth keeper of the great wardrobe, with the usher of the great wardrobe to act as his controller. Elsewhere we shall study the consequences of this provision, which led in the long run to the separation of the great wardrobe from the wardrobe. Such separation, however, was not contemplated in the ordinance, which carefully provided for the absolute subordination of the keeper-buyer to the treasurer and controller. The imposition on the keeper of the great wardrobe of the obligation of responsibility for the accounts of the branch establishment made it inevitable that he should henceforth be a clerk. The function of the usher of the great wardrobe as controller also made it necessary that he too should be an ecclesiastic. We may, therefore, add at least the two heads of the great wardrobe to the staff of responsible wardrobe clerks, which consequently reached the number of seven. It was a total often found inadequate for the work that had to be done, and, both under Edward I. and in later times, the scanty clerical staff of the wardrobe had to be supplemented by borrowing clerks from other offices, and especially from the chancery. But both economy and efficiency suggested the severe limitation of the household staff. Even a stern disciplinarian, like Edward I., had to provide in the ordinance of 1279 for the purging of the household of the crowd of servants, followers, "ribalds" of both sexes, the unnecessary and unauthorised grooms and horses that ate up the king's substance, and inflicted scandal and loss on his subjects.

The ordinance enters in some detail into the daily work of

[1] Both of these men were beneficed, but apparently were not yet adequately beneficed.

the wardrobe officers. The chief of these was the keeper, still often called treasurer of the wardrobe, especially when the king's remoteness from London and the exchequer made him virtually the sole treasurer of his master. He was, as his name suggests, primarily the financial officer, but he was not allowed to act without the constant co-operation of his lay colleagues, the two stewards, and of his chief clerical subordinate, the controller. Jointly with the stewards, his equals in official rank, and generally his superiors in social status and hereditary influence, the keeper was the head of the whole wardrobe.

Though our concern is primarily with the wardrobe clerks, we must not forget the intimate relations that existed between them and the two stewards, the lay colleagues of the keeper in the direction of the household, just as elsewhere we have been compelled to say something of the king's chamberlain whose position in the chamber was even more commanding than that of the stewards in the household. Nor was this position of the stewards merely nominal or ceremonial. A primary routine function of the wardrobe officers was the drawing up each night of the daily accounts of the household, and for this purpose the stewards were associated with the treasurer and controller. At least one steward, along with the treasurer and controller, were to meet every night the heads of the various spending departments, and receive and check the record of the sums disbursed by each one of them in their respective offices during the day. To this habit of daily accounting we owe the invaluable "day books" of the wardrobe, which, when surviving, throw such a flood of light upon the movements of the court and its expenses day by day. Besides this, the treasurer and one of the stewards had to audit, once or twice a year, the accounts of the chamberlain of wines. Beyond this were the annual accounts of the great wardrobe, and the general annual accounts of the whole household, drawn up to every November 20, the feast of St. Edmund, king and martyr, the day on which the regnal year of Edward I. began and ended.

These accounts, though called wardrobe accounts, were the accounts of the whole household. Though envisaged in the ordinance as simply accounts of the household, they included, as we know, a very considerable proportion of the national accounts

also. Though the responsibility for the accounting is with the keeper, the stewards share his responsibility for the collection of the material on which they are based. Moreover, besides their share in the accounts, the stewards acted with the treasurer as a disciplinary court over the small offences against the household system of accounting, and punished such defaulters by reduction of their wages and otherwise.[1]

It has been shown earlier how, by the beginning of the personal government of Henry III., the two stewardships of the household had been differentiated from the hereditary offices, the magnate stewardships from which they sprung.[2] These latter, though originally no more than household stewardships, were now dignified with the great title of stewards of England, a title which lost nothing in the hands of magnates so ambitious as Simon de Montfort and his successors in the Leicester earldom, the earls of Lancaster. Much of the detail that is to be said on these matters will be said later.[3] It will be enough here to note that the dual hereditary stewardship of the twelfth century had its counterpart in the dual court stewardship, described in the ordinance of 1279, though not continued as a double office after 1292–3.[4] The subordination of the "other steward" to the "chief steward" in 1279 was but a step towards the consolidation of the office under a single holder of it. The effect of this change was the definite enthronement of the sole steward as the working ıay head of the king's household.

The steward of the household, having thus more slowly

[1] Mere absence from the account was an offence, punished by the loss of a month's wages. See *Exch. Accts.* 353/28, "Memorandum quod die lune, xij° die Junii, anno xxiiij°, ponuntur extra vadia per unam mensem, pro eo quod non fuerunt ad compotum illo die." Some instances of other penalties can be seen in *ib.* 354/30, "rotuli de penis compoti, anno xxvj°." On Jan. 28, 1298, "in pleno compoto apud Gandauum," Master Robert, the king's "panetarius," "ponebatur extra vadia per unum mensem, pro eo quod non habuit, nec habere voluit, panem competentem pro militibus in aula regis residentibus," so that these knights had to buy bread in the town of Ghent "ad contemptum regis." Similarly on the same day the clerk of the kitchen and the "puletarius" were fined "for fowls ill-bought on Sunday, Jan. 26." In the worst cases the offenders' wages were suspended until they were readmitted to them by the steward and the treasurer. Compare *ib.* 374/12, "Rotulus de penis compoti de anno quinto" (of Edward II.).

[2] See above, I. pp. 201-205.

[3] See the list of stewards in the concluding volume of the present work.

[4] See above, pp. 25-26.

acquired the monarchical position which the keepers of the wardrobe had gained a generation earlier, was to find a new colleague in the keeper with whom he shared the direction of the household. If his authority, like that of the keeper, trenched on politics, it was mainly because neither the king nor his subjects had as yet learned to distinguish between the administration of a household and the political government of a nation. On the whole, however, the steward was much less intimately connected with political administration than his clerical colleague. Yet his intimate relations with the king made him almost a permanent witness of royal charters, and when, after some time in Edward I.'s reign, he was described in such attestations not only by name but by office, we have in the charter roll a means of making a fairly accurate list of stewards of the household. It is true that the rolls of parliament were full of popular complaints against the excesses and abuses of the stewards' jurisdiction. It was as president of the judicial side of the royal household that the steward came most into conflict with the nation at large. The recognised judge of the members of the household and over all offences committed within the "verge" of the court,[1] he was always attempting to enlarge the limits of the "verge," until no subject, dwelling within a day's journey of where the king might happen to be, felt himself safe against the steward's encroachments. With this best-known aspect of the steward's work, we have no direct concern here.

The chief steward of the household was invariably a layman of high rank, "a man of good sufficiency," at least a knight, often a banneret, always a member of the king's council, and usually summoned to parliament. His wages and allowances were on the highest scale, and he was allowed a larger following, entertained at the king's expense, than any other household officer. An economical monarch, especially in the thirteenth century, always endeavoured to shift the payment of his servants on to somebody else's shoulders. Just as he provided for the

[1] The steward had exclusive jurisdiction in court offences. See petition of 1293 in *Rot. Parl.* i. 96. Fleta, pp. 67-68, "de placitis aulae regis," treats of the steward chiefly as a judge of the household court. The domestic marshal was his "plegium," the executor of his commands, not his colleague. The "senescallus" acts "nomine capitalis justiciarii cujus vices gerit."

clerks of the wardrobe by livings and prebends, so he provided for the knights of his household by wardships and similar lucrative offices that cost the king nothing. Thus in the ordinance of 1279 we find that Sir Hugh Fitzotho, the senior steward, was to take from the king "nothing as fee or wages or for hay and oats, for the king had provided for him in fifty librates of land under wardship." The other steward, Sir Robert Fitzjohn, had, however, a fee of ten marks a year, and eight marks for his robes, in addition to £25 worth of wardships.[1] A few years later Sir Peter Champvent and Sir Walter Beauchamp each received a wage of 4*s.* a day.

A few points in the ordinance relative to the wardrobe may be supplemented from the account of the household given by the text-book writer known as Fleta, who wrote a little later, between 1290 and 1293.[2] It is curious that Fleta tells us less about the wardrobe than of other royal offices at the time, but his standpoint is primarily that of an author of a law book, and it was a special feature of the wardrobe that it was never a court of justice. Accordingly, though Fleta tells us much of the jurisdiction of the steward over the household, he only gives a few individual references to the wardrobe. In the most important of them he speaks of it as "a place assigned only to clerks," and as corresponding to what is called in France *camera clericorum*,[3] that is doubtless the chamber of clerks of French household finance.

Passing over the wardrobe as an institution, Fleta goes on at once to give a minute description of the work of the treasurer of the wardrobe. This account is worth quoting if only because of its almost verbal agreement with the words of the ordinance of 1279. "To the treasurer of the wardrobe," writes Fleta,[4] "is entrusted the charge of the expenses of the king and his family. His office is to receive the money, jewels, and presents

[1] This seems to have been the usual custom. Compare *C.P.R., 1247–58*, p. 3, for a grant to the steward, John de Lexinton, in Dec. 10, 1247, of the wardship of the heirs and lands of John de Pabbeham, tenant in chief. *Exc. e Rot. Fin.* ii. 24, shows that the steward paid a large consideration for the grant. This also was probably customary, and suggests the large profits accruing from the wardship of a good estate.

[2] *Fleta, seu Commentarius Juris Anglicani*, p. 78, ed. Selden (1685). A new edition is much to be desired. Cannot the Selden society give us one?

[3] "Quae est locus clericis tantum assignatus quae in Francia camera clericorum appellatur."

[4] *Ib.* pp. 78-79.

made to the king; to keep the king's private receipts, to adjust the expenses to the receipts, to enrol the particulars of the expenses and to render an account every year at the end of the regnal year.[1] He does this without taking an oath, because he is sworn on the king's council. He is bound to collect together, every evening, the chief officers of the household who shall make answer to him with regard to their expenses of the day." The keeper was appointed by the king by word of mouth, so that there was never an enrolled patent of appointment, and we have to guess the time he began and ceased to act from the dates of the accounts for which he was responsible. A chronicler could still describe him as "treasurer of the king's chamber."[2]

Fleta tells us that the keeper's evening survey of the transactions of the day was performed in conjunction with "the provident clerk associated with him as controller." By the days of Edward I. this title had been formally assigned to the second in dignity of the clerks of the wardrobe, though the phrase was slow in becoming generally accepted.[3] The controller's function of checking the accounts of the keeper by his counter-roll did not prevent him standing in a position of distinct subordination to his chief.[4] He stood in exactly the same relation to the treasurer of the wardrobe that the two chamberlains of the receipt stood to the treasurer of the exchequer.[5] As under Henry III., it was still

[1] For the explanation of Fleta's curious phrase, "in singulis annis in festo Sanctae Margaretae," see later, note 1, pp. 66-67. It at least shows that the single extant MS. of Fleta was transcribed in the reign of Edward II., when the regnal year began on July 8, the feast day of St. Margaret, queen of Scots.

[2] Cotton, p. 176, calls Louth "thesaurarius camere regis."

[3] In the first years of the reign the accounts were still tendered in the ancient formula "per visum et testimonium Thome de Gunneys, qui habuit contrarotulum in eadem garderoba"; *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* No. 121, m. 22. Gunneys is, however, sometimes called "controller." A few years later the forms were "per contrarotulum magistri W. de Marchia, tunc contrarotulatoris"; *ib. 19 Edw. I.* No. 136, m. 29, and later still, "per testimonium contrarotulatoris"; *ib. 21 Edw. I.* No. 138, m. 25. In *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 432, keeper Louth and controller Gunneys are, with a curious conservatism of language, still called "keepers of the wardrobe."

[4] The older usage of the wardrobe by which, under Henry III., the superior officer still "controlled" his subordinate survived in Wales and Cheshire, where the fourteenth-century chamberlains still tendered their accounts, "per testimonium . . . justiciarii . . . parcium illarum, contrarotulatoris eiusdem camerarie"; *Pipe, 1 Edw. II.* m. 37.

[5] The chamberlains of the receipt had as their primary function the keeping of "counter-rolls," of receipts and issues of the exchequer. Hence there were normally three duplicates of both of these rolls, for which the treasurer and

his essential duty to "keep the counter-roll," which acted as the chief check upon the keeper's book-keeping. But by this time the controller had got a definite sphere of his own, quite apart from his preparation of a duplicate account, a duty which perhaps often tended to be a formality. He was now specially responsible for the custody of the archives, entrusted to the wardrobe.[1] These archives comprised not only the wardrobe records properly so-called, but the large number of state documents, often originating in the chancery and exchequer, which were for convenience of reference deposited in the wardrobe or specially transcribed for its use. But the most important function of the controller is that he was the head of the secretarial department of the household, and as such the keeper of the privy seal.

The setting up of the privy seal as a normal part of administrative routine is a well-marked feature of the history of Edward I.'s government. It followed that there must be a keeper of this seal and that he must, as secretary of the household, be a person of influence. That there was a keeper of the privy seal from the beginning of the reign of Edward I. is certain, for so early as April 22, 1275, a royal writ instructs the treasurer and chamberlains of the exchequer to cause the keeper of the privy seal and other ministers, having custody of documents, to deliver to them, by indenture, records bearing on the feudal relations of the English to the French throne.[2] Again, about 1290–1293, Fleta expatiates on the office, and emphasises the fact that the keeper of the privy seal is the only custodian of a royal seal who is independent of the chancellor.[3] Nevertheless, for the whole of Edward I.'s reign I have found no instance of any person mentioned by name as keeper of the privy seal, and the ordinance for

the two chamberlains were respectively responsible. This function of the chamberlains is well brought out in *I.R.* No. 203, m. 1, recording the appointment, in April 6, 1323, and entry into office on May 2, of the chamberlain John Langton; "et die lune proximo sequente, videlicet secundo die mensis Maii, incepit primo idem Johannes *contrarotulare receptum et exitum scaccarii*."

[1] *MS. Ad. 7965* (25 Edw. I.), f. 16 d proves this, "pro quodam coffero empto pro diuersis scriptis et titulis existentibus sub custodia contrarotulatoris."

[2] *Foedera*, i. 521. We shall see that later keepers were also custodians of archives. Compare the instructions to Adam de Lymbergh in 1329; *ib.* ii. 761, *C.C.R., 1327–30*, p. 453. Sometimes, however, the treasurer of the wardrobe was regarded as ultimately responsible; *Rot. Parl.* i. 344, *C.C.R., 1323–7*, p. 415.

[3] *Fleta*, p. 75.

the household of 1279 gives us no hint of the existence of such an officer. The reason for such silence is doubtless that the keeping of the privy seal was not a separate office but was an incident of the office of the controller. When this state of things began it is impossible to determine, and it is not until Benstead's controllership that we get any clear evidence of the fact. When the proof comes it is negative, for the two passages in the wardrobe accounts, which give us the indication, do not call Benstead keeper, though they show that he was responsible for the letters of the privy seal. The first of these tells us how in 1296–7 two wardrobe clerks, who were afterwards to become conspicuous, John of Fleet and Robert of the Wodehouse, were engaged in "transcribing and enrolling letters made under the privy seal under John Benstead."[1] The second, in Benstead's own controller's book of 1299–1300, shows that in that year Geoffrey of Stokes was paid wages and expenses for 260 days for abiding in the court, partly during his master's absence, "for making letters under the privy seal."[2] During this year Benstead was away from court 114 days on the king's business,[3] and it was therefore absolutely necessary that he should be represented by his clerk at court to keep the seal and draft the writs which the king needed almost daily. So much were the controller's functions secretarial that Benstead, even when not keeping the seal personally, because away from court, had seven clerks in attendance

[1] *Ad. MS. 7965*, m. 29, "Johanni de Flete et Roberto de la Wodehus, transcribentibus et irrotulantibus, sub domino Johanne de Benstede, diuersas litteras factas sub priuato sigillo."

[2] *L.Q.G.* pp. 75, 313, 326. The entry is: "Galfrido de Stokes, clerico domini Johannis de Benstede, *moranti in curia in absencia eiusdem domini sui pro literis sub priuato sigillo faciendis*, percipienti per diem iiij d. et ob., pro expensis unius equi sui, et vadiis unius garcionis, eundem equum custodientis, pro huiusmodi vadiis per cclx dies in uniuerso, per quos moram traxit in curia infra annum presentem, modo quo predicitur per compotum suum factum apud Craddeleghe, xxiij° die Aprilis, anno xxix°, £iiij, xvij s., vj d." It is probable for similar reasons that the letters of Benstead, referred to in the following entry, are letters under privy seal, "Oliuero de Akinn, deferenti litteras domini Johannis de Benstede cancellario Anglie pro negociis regis, pro expensis suis, xij d."; *MS. Ad.* 35,292 "Jornale garderobe 1302–1305," f. 62. The entry is dated Dec. 16, 1304. G. Stokes continued to write for the privy seal after Benstead had been succeeded by Cottingham as controller and keeper. See *Exch. Accts.* 368/25, Dec. 5, 1305, "in uno cursore conducto, portanti litteras domini J. de Drokenesford domino G. de Stokes ad habendum ibidem litteras de priuato sigillo regis pro diuersis rebus spectantibus ad garderobam."

[3] *Ib.* p. 75.

on him to copy "certain bills and memoranda," and several messengers to convey his letters.[1]

Any doubt we may have as to Benstead's keepership of the privy seal may be finally resolved by going forward a few more years. Under Edward II. we shall find that the first controller of that king's wardrobe, William of Melton, is specifically called *custos priuati sigilli*.[2] We may safely then give Benstead the same title, and speculate as to how many of the controllers before his time were also keepers of the privy seal.[3] It is most probable that this had been the case from the early part of Edward I.'s reign, if not from almost the beginning of the history of the wardrobe. The evidence we have adduced that the keeper of the privy seal was, so early as 1275, specially responsible for the custody of the wardrobe records is further illuminated by the fact that the controller was both the wardrobe archivist and the keeper of the wardrobe seal.[4]

That the controller was also the king's private secretary, the keeper of his privy seal, explains the otherwise somewhat mysterious fact that the controllers of Edward I. loom almost as large in the pages of history as do the keepers themselves. But a king's secretary, well chosen, is not likely to be a mere writer of letters. The controller of the thirteenth century was in fact in exactly the same position as the chancellor of the twelfth. The gradual withdrawal of the chancellor from court made his office a necessity. He was, as Edward himself once said, the king's private chancellor, standing to the domestic administration in the same commanding position as that in which the

[1] *L.Q.G.* p. 75. [2] See later, p. 283.

[3] There are other cases of keepers of seals acting as controllers. The chancellor himself was in Henry II.'s time the controller of the treasurer and his deputy, who was now chancellor of the exchequer, kept the counter-roll of the treasury. A controller who kept a seal was the controller of Bordeaux. See *R.G.* ii. No. 1096 (1289), p. 339, "Et est sciendum quod nos, Willelmus de Luda, thesaurarius predictus [*i.e.* de garderoba], sigillum domini nostri regis quod tenet magister Osbertus de Baggeston, contrarotulator in castro Burdigale ad contractus, hiis presentibus litteris fecimus apponi, valituris perinde ac si magnum sigillum domini nostri regis presenti contractu esset appensum." If, as is very likely, Walter Langton, kept, as controller, the royal privy seal, it was the more natural for Louth to use the Bordeaux controller's seal as an equivalent for the great seal.

[4] *Foedera*, i. 521, as above. The writ to the exchequer speaks of the keeper of the privy seal as having in his custody "bulls, charters, instruments, rolls and memoranda."

chancellor stood to the public administration of the realm. In the light of this, the significance of Fleta's remark that the keeper of the wardrobe seal was the only keeper of a seal independent of the chancellor has a particular significance for us.

The establishment of the custody of the privy seal in the controllership is one of the chief evidences of the development of wardrobe organisation under Edward I. Another is the appearance of the third wardrobe officer, immediately below the treasurer and the controller, called the cofferer. This new functionary seems originally to have been the personal clerk of the treasurer, and to have been gradually entrusted with the details of book-keeping and accounts. His confidential relations to the head of the office make him a natural person to act as *locum tenens* for his principal, when the latter was called away from court. The first known officer of this description, William of Louth, was rather the personal clerk of keeper Bek than cofferer of the wardrobe, and his importance was largely due to the fact that Louth acted so often as Bek's *locum tenens*.[1] When called cofferer at all, he was the cofferer of Bek, not of the wardrobe. Even in 1279 there seems some doubt whether such an office as the cofferership of the wardrobe existed,[2] though the man who discharged its functions was admittedly the third clerk of the wardrobe. When in November 1280 Louth was raised straight from this ambiguous cofferership to the keepership, it looks as if William of March succeeded him as cofferer and that he kept that post until he became controller.[3] Gradually the official character of the post becomes clear at the same time as the succession to it becomes more precisely determined. Walter Langton is simply described as "king's cofferer" in 1290,[4] and

[1] The accounts for the years 1274 to 1280 were all presented by Louth; *Pipe, 7 Edw. I.* No. 123, m. 22, and *8 Edw. I.* No. 124, m. 24. In *ib.* m. 30, it is definitely said "quod idem magister Willelmus de Luda fuit coffrarius ipsius magistri Thome Beke per totum tempus quo idem Thomas fuit custos garderobe regis."

[2] See *Household Ordinance of 1279*, later, p. 160. In the manuscript Louth is not described by name. But between him and the controller was originally written "le coffrer desuz le tresorer," but "le coffrer" was struck out and "vn clerc" substituted for it. It seems clear that the two entries mean the same thing and that they refer to Louth, who, though theoretically "treasurer's clerk," was practically holding an independent position as cofferer.

[3] *Pipe, 13 Edw. I* No. 130, m. 5, gives March the third position among the clerks, just as Louth had held it.*

[4] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, f. 4 d. *E.A.* 352/24 (1289–90).

Droxford took his place by the king's precept.[1] His successors are indifferently "king's cofferers" and "cofferers of the wardrobe."[2] Yet even in the next reign the origin of the cofferership from the office of treasurer's clerk was not quite forgotten.[3]

The increasing absorption of their official superiors on affairs of state, which kept them absent from court for months together, made the cofferer often the working head of the wardrobe. Thus we find cofferers Manton and Bedwyn constantly acting as attorneys and lieutenants of keeper Droxford. Even when they were not their chief's agents, their primary responsibility for the drawing up of the annual accounts gave them a very strong position. It became usual for petitioners for wardrobe favours to address themselves jointly to keeper and cofferer.[4] Often the cofferer spoke in the name of the keeper.[5] Manton had four clerks working under him.[6] Droxford had assigned Manton the large sum of £66 : 13 : 4 for the extra expenses of himself, his clerk and his squire, incurred after the statute of St. Alban's had forbidden members of the household to take their meals in the king's hall. To this amount Langton the treasurer, on his own account, added £33 : 6 : 8. Bedwyn, however, demanded double that sum, though this claim for £200 a year was later challenged.[7] This was the first step in the process which in time relieved the keeper from a great deal of the active work of accounting and paying, until the cofferer became, subject to his subordination to the keeper, almost as much the financial officer of the wardrobe as the controller had become secretarial officer. The clerks of the

[1] *Chanc. Misc.* f. 42.

[2] "Coffrer le roi," *Exch. Accts.* 354/11, No. 33; "coffrarius garderobe regis," *ib.* 354/25.

[3] See Ordinance of 1318 in *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 272, "Un cofferer qi serra mytz pour le tresorer." I do not understand the entry on *Exch. Accts.* 354/27, recording a prest in the latter part of Edward I.'s reign, "Willelmo, sometario coffrarii contrarotulatoris." I have not seen anywhere else any mention of a cofferer to the controller. It may simply add a new variant to the many designations of the cofferer.

[4] For example, *Exch. Accts.* 354/11, No. 33, "a J. de Drokenesford, tresorour, . . . e a Wauter de Bedewynde, coffrer le roi, en mesme la garderobe."

[5] *E.g. ib.* 354/25, contains several letters of this type: "Patet uniuersis quod ego, R. de Manton, coffrarius garderobe regis, recepi vice et nomine domini J. de Drokenesford," etc. They are sealed with Manton's personal seal pendant.

[6] *Ib.* 354/27. They were Peter of Brember, Robert of Wodehouse, John of Fleet and William of Corby.

[7] *Ib.* 356/28.

cofferer became in a latter age the source of the "board of green cloth," which still remains the accounting-office of the household.[1] Even under Edward I. the cofferer's department formed a sort of school for future cofferers. Thus Bedwyn was the clerk of Manton before he succeeded him to that office. Ockham and Wodehouse, both cofferers under Edward II., were already clerks under Manton.[2]

Next to the cofferer in dignity came two other wardrobe clerks, who now also held official titles. These were the *ostiarius* and the *subostiarius*, the usher and subusher. There is abundant evidence that the usher was a person of considerable importance. Conspicuous among his functions was his responsibility for the expenses and arrangements, involved in the ceaseless journeys of the wardrobe from one place to another.[3] But the work specially laid upon him in 1279 is the charge of the wax-candles and fuel of the wardrobe, a responsibility which involved the position of controller to the great wardrobe. It was the duty of the subusher to go in advance of the king in his journeys and arrange for the quarters for the wardrobe.[4] Many of those who rose to high office served as *ostiarius* in the earlier stages of their wardrobe career, and the subusher was naturally generally promoted to the ushership when that office fell vacant. As the number of clerks of the wardrobe was often no more than six, it followed that all but the most junior of them had some official designation. As time went on, we can trace their names and numbers, especially from the lists of clerks who received robes while acting in the king's service. It is but seldom, however, that the acts of these subordinates survive in the records, except in the years for which we still have the detailed wardrobe accounts, kept by the king's remembrancer. We can generally,

[1] Ordinance of 1318, *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 273. The early Tudor transcriber of the ordinance wrote "clerkes of the grene clothe" in the margin of the section treating of the clerks of the accounting table at that date. The Board of Green Cloth is still the body charged with examining and passing the king's household accounts. The cofferer and the clerks of the green cloth were abolished in 1782, and the "lord steward" now presides over it.

[2] See page 40, note 6, above, for Wodehouse; for Ockham see *Exch. Accts.* 364/13, f. 30.

[3] *L.Q.G.* (1787), p. 87, brings this out clearly

[4] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, m. 9, "Henrico de Montepessulano, subostiario garderobe, preeunti singulis diebus in itinere regis ad capiendum hospicium garderobe."

however, trace the period of their activity through the record in the chancery rolls of their preferment to livings in the king's gift.

Unlike his father, Edward I. treated the wardrobes of the subordinate members of the royal house as subordinate to his own. He freely transferred clerks from his own wardrobe to those of his sons or wife, and, when holding such offices, they often continued to draw robes and allowances as royal wardrobe clerks. The effect was that all the chief officers of the subordinate wardrobes remained king's clerks. Moreover, the wardrobes of the king's kinsmen did not account directly to the exchequer but to the king's own wardrobe. Such a policy increased the personnel and increased the chances of promotion of the king's wardrobe staff. But it involved some difficulties, notably in the relations of the household of the king and his eldest son, which led to unseemly disputes while the old king was alive, exciting such scandals as the fierce feud between the prince of Wales and Walter Langton, and the exile of Peter Gaveston by the king. The result was that the king and his son were surrounded by rival bodies of advisers, and all Edward of Carnarvon had to do to bring about a ministerial revolution at his accession was to substitute his own household officers for those of his father. We must recur to this subject again when we deal with the household of Edward of Carnarvon.[1]

The other dependent wardrobes of Edward I. were less important. Even the wardrobe of Edward's two queens were far from possessing the autonomy exercised by the wardrobe of Eleanor of Provence. Queen Eleanor of Castile's wardrobe[2] is not mentioned by name in the ordinance of 1279, though that document incidentally submits the queen's household to reform as part of the reformation of the king's establishment.[3] The

[1] See later, Ch. VIII. Sect. I. pp. 165-187.

[2] Mr. Geoffrey of Asphale was keeper of Eleanor's wardrobe in 1281 and also in 1286; *C.P.R. 1272–81*, p. 469; *C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 386. In 1286 Richard of Bures also acted as her receiver (*C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 386), but in 1276–1280 Walter of Kent, clerk, and in 1285 John of Berwick, clerk, were keepers of the queen's gold (*ib., 1272–9*, p. 315, *ib., 1279–88*, pp. 24, 341). By 1286 Berwick became her keeper and accounted up to her death; see *Exch. Accts.* 352/7, and *MS. Ad.* No. 35,294: "Liber domini Johannis de Berewyco de expensis regine, anno regis Edwardi xviii°." Berwick became one of Eleanor's executors.*

[3] See later, p. 162.

wardrobe of Margaret of France makes a slightly clearer impression on history, but was never independent.[1] Her expenses were only separately accounted for by her treasurer when she was dwelling apart from the king.[2] The receipt for the three years 28, 29 and 30 Edward I. was less than two thousand a year.[3] The other dependent wardrobes were those of mere children, such as that which Thomas of Papworth kept in 1273–4 for the king's son Henry, and his sister Eleanor during Edward's absence on crusade.[4] After Henry's death this became the wardrobe of his younger brother Alfonso,* and on the king's return it was put under the care of Philip of Willoughby, keeper of Edward's wardrobe in the east.[5] Later on Papworth was again in charge.[6] On Alfonso's death in 1284 it became the wardrobe of Edward of Carnarvon. At the end of the reign there was also a wardrobe for Thomas and Edmund, the king's sons by Margaret of France.* This was kept by William of Warminster and afterwards by John of Flete.[7]

The ordinance of 1279 is absolutely silent as to the king's chamber. This is natural enough since the chamber, though near the wardrobe, was still independent of it. It was, as Fleta says, the most dignified of all the offices because of its intimate association with the king's person.[8] The king's chamberlains, however, play an increasing part in history, and it was thought promotion to raise Peter of Champvent from the stewardship

[1] Master William of Chesoy was her treasurer and William of Melton her cofferer, 1298–1300; *Exch. Accts.* 357/5; *L.Q.G.* pp. 357-358. John of Godley was her keeper between 1300 and at least 1305; *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 603; *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 314. Thomas of Quarle was her cofferer from 1299 to the end of the reign. Some of his accounts are in *Exch. Accts.* 360/21, 361/3, 9. He complained of unjust additions to his "onus" by the exchequer, and the last account was settled in 7 Edw. II.

[2] Thus in her first year of married life (1299–1300) her household was "extra curiam regis" from Nov. 20, 1299, to April 12, 1300, and from May 5 to Sept. 17, 1300, but for 56 days of the former period she was "in comitiua regis" and only "vadia scutiferorum" were charged to her treasurer. Yet the total expenses of the year amounted to £3667 : 9 : 0½, *L.Q.G.* pp. 357-358.

[3] For part of 27 and all 28 Edw. I. it was £4165 : 19 : 3½ and for 29 and 30 £3812 : 8 : 0; *Exch. Accts.* 357/5 and 360/21. Most of it came from the king's wardrobe.*

[4] *Pipe, 9 Edw. I.* No. 125, m. 2d; *Exch. Accts.* 350/15, 16, 17, 18. One item was "pro una caretta parua empta ad opus domini, ad ludendum vii d." *ib.* 350/18.

[5] *Pipe, 5 Edw. I.* m. 22. [6] *C.C.R., 1279–88*, pp. 6, 225-226.

[7] Warminster acted from 29 to 32 Edw. I., *Exch. Accts.* 360/28, 361/5, 364/19: Flete succeeded him, *ib.* 364/28.

[8] Fleta, p. 79. See later, pp. 320 and 335.

of the household to the office of king's chamberlain.[1] The later history of the chamber will have to be taken up again at a later stage of this book. But the silence of the surviving records as regards the chamber must be mentioned here. It is unlikely that the chamber underwent any new developments under Edward I.; had this been the case, they would not have been so entirely veiled from us.* Closely associated with the chamber is the appearance towards the end of the reign of the king's secret seal. To this also later reference must be made.

Let us now turn from the organisation to the operations of the Edwardian wardrobe. Happily the large number of surviving rolls of "daily" and "necessary" expenses of the household of Edward's reign enable us for the first time to see the daily working of the itinerating wardrobe of the court. Only a few examples, and those chosen almost at random, need be given, but they may well serve to vivify our picture, though they could of course be indefinitely multiplied.

Let us illustrate the movements of the royal wardrobe in Britain from the "roll of necessary expenses of the household" of the fifth year of Edward I.[2] From this we can trace the daily movements of king and court during the year of the first Welsh war, the horses and carts hired for the carriage of the king's wardrobe, and the sums disbursed by the *ostiarius garderobe* to the owners of the means of transport. Thus it needed three carts with three horses each and two carts with four horses to carry the king's wardrobe about the country. Even these five carts suggest additional equipment for the king's household, strengthened to become the nucleus of the army, which the king regarded almost as the household in the field. In ordinary times "three long carts" constituted the meagre provision of the ordinance of 1279 for the conveyance of staff, equipment, and records of the wardrobe. In 1277 the five carts made, to begin with, their leisurely three days' journey from Stafford to Chester,

[1] *Foedera*, i. 784. The large fees of the chamberlain may account for this.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 350/25 and 26. It must be noted that already the dating of a chancery writ at a place is no certain evidence of the king's personal presence there. Mr. Gough's *Itinerary of Edward I.* makes errors at this period through assuming that the king was wherever a chancery writ was issued, "per ipsum regem" or "teste me ipso." The true royal itinerary is to be found in these household accounts.

a distance of just under fifty miles. When the "caravan" reached Chester, the wardrobe apparatus was unloaded from the waggons and a sum of tenpence expended for a temporary enclosed place to cast the accounts—*pro quadam clausura facta ad computandum*. Then the journey was resumed to Rhuddlan, where we have record of expenses for buying coarse thread to tie up sacks in the wardrobe, for the carriage of parchment, brought, for writing wardrobe documents, from the places of its purchase in Lincolnshire to the headquarters in Wales. Like the chancery, the wardrobe in 1277 never moved west of Rhuddlan, though some wardrobe clerks and the privy seal attended the king to Deganwy, so that there must have been a sort of branch wardrobe in addition to the headquarters. At each place where the court stopped, accommodation for the wardrobe had to be provided.[1] And after its departure the *hospes garderobe* had generally to be compensated for the damage done to his property by the stay of the wardrobe upon it.

We can equally follow Edward from these records on his most serious journeys to lands far beyond the sea. Thus we can trace on the controller's roll of the fourteenth year of his reign with the utmost minuteness Edward I.'s wanderings through France in the first months of his long sojourn on the Continent between 1286 and 1289, and the movements and doings of his wardrobe officers almost from day to day.[2] We can see one of them, Alan la Zouch, buying parchment for the wardrobe at Dover, and receiving payment for it at Boulogne. We know how much it cost to convey Master William March, the controller, and the other clerks of the wardrobe with their horses over the Channel from Dover to Wissant. We know how, on May 21 at Gard in Ponthieu, Master Walter de Waltham rendered his account, and how there and at Paris and elsewhere constant purchases were made of parchment and red wax, the privy seal colour, for the use of the wardrobe clerks. When Edward I. at last left Paris on his slow progress towards his Aquitanian inheritance, we can trace the first stages of the wardrobe with

[1] Thus in 1297 the "hospes garderobe" at Dovercourt was Galfridus le Lespre "in cuius domibus garderoba regis hospitabatur apud Dovercourt, quo die idem rex jacuit ad curiam Willelmi Fraunkes"; *MS. Ad. 7965*, m. 14.

[2] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/3, "Liber contrarotulatoris de necessariis expensis, anno quartodecimo regni regis Edwardi I."

extraordinary minuteness. Two carts, each with four horses, and hired at 4*s.* 8*d.* per cart per day, conveyed the men of the wardrobe in one day from Paris to Villeneuve Saint-Georges, not an impressive day's journey, as the whole distance could not have been much more than ten miles. Thence they went to Corbeil, another ten-mile stage, where they hired for 3*s.* 2*d.* a boat to carry them from Corbeil to Melun by water. At Melun the men of the wardrobe hired one carriage which took them from that town to Pont-sur-Yonne in four days, a distance of about thirty miles. While the king went on pilgrimage to Pontigny, and some of his servants left him to buy fresh horses at the great fair of Troyes, the men of the wardrobe pushed on, in two carriages drawn by five horses, from Pont to Toucy, a distance of over fifty miles due south. This journey, accomplished in two days, was their best travelling, and the same two carts with five horses took them in a day from Toucy to Saint-Fargeau, a little more than twelve miles, and thence to Gien, where they took boats on the Loire. It is needless to follow them on the farther stages of their journey to Bordeaux, and it is unluckily impossible for lack of material to trace even roughly the later wanderings of the *garderobarii* and their master on both sides of the Pyrenees.[1]

The wardrobe also went abroad on most of Edward I.'s later visits to the Continent. For example, in 1297, after resting on its way towards the coast, at Ipswich, Walton, Dovercourt, and Harwich,[2] the wardrobe was taken over the North Sea to Zwyn, and thence to Bruges in the ship *Bayard* of Yarmouth,[3] and further by land to Bruges and Ghent, where a house was hired for it "to cast accounts therein, and to pay cavalry and infantry their wages."[4]

In the latter years of the reign the wardrobe was often with

[1] The late Mr. H. Gough's *Itinerary of Edward I.*, so useful when the king is on this side of the Channel, is unluckily inadequate for Edward's movements abroad at this time, 1286–89. A complete itinerary is certainly impossible, but much could be done to fill up the gaps and correct some of the slips of Mr. Gough for these years of travel.

[2] *MS. Ad. 7965*, ff. 14 and 15. [3] *Ib.* f. 24.

[4] *Ib.* f. 30, "pro stipendiis carpentariorum faciendorum quoddam interclusum in domo in qua garderoba hospitabatur apud Gandauum ad computandum in eadem et ad soluciones faciendas equitibus et peditibus de vadiis suis."

the king in Scotland, and quarters for it were sometimes taken at Berwick, along with the other courts and offices of state. In 1291 and 1292 both wardrobe and chancery were at Berwick.[1] In its wanderings through the enemies' lands in Scotland, as well as in its continental journeys, the wardrobe must often have been exposed to considerable danger. The accounts of 1303–4 show that it was guarded by Dickon of Weighton, the *vintenarius* of a company of 24 crossbowmen.[2] It was rarely that the whole force was present, but Dickon and some of his followers seemed always at hand. This was apart from the retinue of armed followers which the officers of the wardrobe were accustomed to provide for the king's use. Thus in the Flemish campaign of 1297, keeper Droxford furnished 3 knights and 29 esquires, with horses, and controller Benstead, 2 knights and 12 squires.[3] Again, in 1301, Droxford and Benstead followed Edward of Carnarvon in his first Scottish campaign with 3 knights and 16 squires and 2 knights and 11 squires respectively.[4] In 1304, also, Droxford provided 4 knights and 11 esquires, and Benstead 1 knight and 13 squires.[5] Both retinues fought and lost horses in battle, but while Droxford drew no military wages himself, Benstead took the wages of a banneret in addition to those he received for his followers. We shall see these precedents extensively acted on in later wars.[6]

The elaboration of government tends to establish the centralisation of its machinery in some fixed centre. Though London was the only great town in England, it was not yet a "capital" to any large extent. Nevertheless, we have seen how practical convenience had established the normal home of the exchequer at Westminster by the middle of the twelfth century, and how Magna Carta had indirectly established the common bench in permanent quarters, hard by the exchequer, in Westminster, the court suburb of mediaeval London. Later on, we

[1] *C.C.R., 1288–96*, pp. 174, 200.

[2] *MS. Ad. 8835*, "Liber garderobe, 32 Edw. I.," f. 80.

[3] *Ib. 7965*, ff. 67, 67 d. The other royal clerk, John Berwick, so often associated with them, had a larger "comitiua" of 4 knights and 28 squires.

[4] *Ib. 7966 A.*, f. 85.

[5] *Ib.* ff. 58 and 57.

[6] See for more particulars later, on pp. 141-143 of the present volume, and also see in Vol. III. the part played by the wardrobe clerks' retinues in the Netherlandish campaigns of the early years of the Hundred Years' War.

shall see that even the chancery was, during Edward I.'s reign, to feel the need of fixed headquarters. Moreover, convenience pointed to these quarters being in London, where business could be transacted easily, where the king was often in residence, and where the officers and clerks could live a pleasant and sociable life. The chancery, in fact, was slowly "going out of court," and being "in court" was the chief reason for any administrative department leading an uneasy life of constant wanderings in the train of an ever restless king. The wardrobe could not in itself go "out of court," for it was in its essence the brain and hand of the court. But in the well-co-ordinated system of Edward I. it was rapidly becoming much more than an instrument of the court. It was becoming, as we shall see, the office which gave unity of policy and direction to all the departments of state. It was in practice as much a wheel of the national machine of government as the chancery and exchequer themselves. It followed that the wardrobe, despite its endless travels, needed some sort of permanent establishment in London, where archives and accounts could be stored, and where business could often be more conveniently despatched than with the king. Accordingly, the wardrobe accounts are full of allowances for expenses of clerks journeying in London and elsewhere *extra curiam*. Absence from court was becoming as inevitable for the wardrobe officers as for the chancellor, and this became still more the case when the wardrobe, already a perambulating chancery and exchequer during the king's absences from home, and especially during campaigns, became in the later years of Edward I.'s reign the virtual collector of the taxes. The result was that the cofferer and other clerks were often out of court, notably at the time of drawing up the annual account.[1] Of the frequent absences of the higher wardrobe officers from court, we have already given striking instances in tracing the career of Benstead.[2] Under

[1] The later wardrobe accounts of Edward I. afford abundant testimony to these absences. A curious earlier case is that of a protection for a year being given to William of Louth, when he was still cofferer; *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 259. In the year Nov. 1299–Nov. 1300 the cofferer Manton was out of court 145 days; *L.Q.G. 28 Edw. I.* pp. 52, 55, 62, 66, 68, 72 and 73.

[2] See above, p. 20, note 4. Benstead's successor, Cottingham, was "out of court" from March 14 to August 15; *Exch. Accts. 369/11*, f. 31. Though Cottingham does not make much show in the history of his time, his appointment as one of Edward I.'s four executors proves the king's confidence in him. The other executors were Walter Langton, friar Luke of Godford, and the almoner, Henry of Bluntesden; *Exch. Accts.* 369/16, f. ½d. All four were, or had been, household clerks, attached to the wardrobe or the king's chapel.

Edward II. the "wardrobes of England, Scotland and Gascony" were solemnly transferred in 1322 from Westminster to York.[1]

In 1279 the wardrobe officers ate in the king's hall, and the most intimate of them were allowed to sleep in the wardrobe. Abuses came from both practices, and especially from the former, which was the more provocative of disorder since the privilege was shared by a whole crowd of members of the household. When war came, the household fighting force was inflated into a small army, and the demands upon the royal kitchen must have taxed to the uttermost the resources of mediaeval domestic economy. After a few years of warfare, a remedy was found in the household ordinance, called the statute of St. Albans *de aula non tenenda in hospicio regis*. This measure was passed on April 13, 1300,[2] when the court was at St. Albans on its way to the north, and was at once put into execution. It is one of the numerous household ordinances whose text is unknown to us,[3] and we are left to guess its exact provisions from the study of its operations in the wardrobe accounts. How far the prohibition against dining in hall extended is not clear. It certainly included the steward's department, for Walter of Beauchamp after April 13 received £200 a year "for the expenses of his mouth, and of his knights and esquires who were wont to eat in the hall but do so

[1] *Pipe, 2 Edw. III.* No. 173, m. 43.

[2] The exact day is proved from *L.Q.G.* p. 203: "per statutum factum apud sanctum Albanum, xiii° die Aprilis, anno presenti." This wardrobe account shows that it was acted upon at once in all the departments affected, with the exception of the queen's wardrobe, where it did not come into operation until after April 14; *ib.* p. 358. In 1300 Easter Sunday was April 10, so this ordinance, issued on the Wednesday of Easter week, followed the good old fashion of legislation at the solemn courts held at the great feasts of the Church. The court was at St. Albans from April 6, the Wednesday in Holy Week, to the Thursday, April 14, in Easter Week; Gough, *Itinerary of Edward I.* ii. 188. The use of the term statute for this "household ordinance" should make us chary of pushing back the well-known distinction of statute and ordinance earlier than the reign of Edward III.

[3] Another unknown ordinance is the statute of Woodstock, possibly later in this reign, which seems to have limited the operation of the statute of St. Albans; *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 307. See later, pp. 248 and 249. And an important "statute" seems to have been drawn up about 1290, see *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5 f. 5, which records payment "pro una magna pelle percameni empta ad statutum hospicii regis transcribendum cum regula, iij d. et ob."

no longer by reason of the statute of St. Albans."[1] It extended also to the other bannerets and knights of the household.[2] It was also interpreted to involve the exclusion from hall of the earl of Hereford, constable of England, who had now joined the court to do his hereditary duty against the Scots.[3] It also comprehended humbler functionaries such as the *nuncii*, who carried messages to and from the court, though apparently they got their allowances under another heading.[4] It was doubtful whether it extended to the queen's messengers.[5] To settle such problems, a roll of those assigned wages in lieu of board was therefore drawn up by the marshal of the household.[6] The test then became enrolment for wages on the marshal's roll.

Among the groups, thus affected by the statute of St. Albans, the wardrobe was certainly included, for from April 13 keeper Droxford received an allowance of £200 a year for the keep of himself and the clerks and esquires of his department.[7] This

[1] *L.Q.G.* p. 92.

[2] *Ib.* pp. 200 and 207.

[3] *Ib.* p. 201. This entry shows that the constable's fee was fixed at 5*s.* a day, because that sum was determined "quia comedit extra hospicium," according to "constituciones domus domini Henrici regis secundi" which had been examined by the treasurer and barons of the exchequer for the purpose. The fee was 3/6, if he ate in the household. The words quoted in the account are pieced together from the text of the "constitutio domus regis" of 1135, so that exchequer history was something at fault. It is interesting, however, to find a document 165 years old forming a precedent for the payment of salaries and a striking illustration of the continuity of household tradition.

[4] *Ib.* p. 102, where Peter of Bramber's 4½*d.* a day wages stop after April 13, "quia vacat titulo isto per ordinacionem factam de hospicio apud *sanctum* Albanum." But the entry under Rhys ap Maelgwn, another "nuncius," shows that it was only a matter of bookkeeping. After April 13, "vacat *titulo isto* et vadia sua allocantur in rotulo marescalli"; *ib.* p. 101.

[5] *Ib.* p. 101. "Simon nuncius regine" is paid his 4½*d.* a day up to April 13, "quo die vacat hic quousque sciatur voluntas ipsius regis."

[6] The first of these is for 28 Edw. I. in *Exch. Accts.* 357/28, and is entitled "rotulus de vadiis scutiferorum et aliorum diuersorum existencium ad vadia in rotulo marescalli, tam pro expensis equorum et garcionum suorum quam orum suorum, incipiens die xiij° Aprilis, quo die aula vacauit ex toto per statutum factum apud *sanctum Albanum* de aula non tenenda in hospicio regis." In this sum of the "vadia familie regis, regine et principis" it is entered day by day, the place of sojourn being in each case given. The roll for 29 Edw. I. is in *ib.* 359/14 "a view of wages of those not eating in hall, 3 Jan. 1301." Knights were to have 2*s.* a day, lesser personages 4½*d.*, 2*d.* or 1½*d.* The roll was drawn up by John Collingbourn, and a profane hand wrote in after the business part, "Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen Johannes erat. Inter natos mulierum non surrexit major Johanne." Was this sarcasm or gratitude? The allowances in lieu of board continued until the end of Edward I.'s reign.

[7] *L.Q.G.* p. 84, "Domino Johanni de Drokenesford, custodi garderobe regis,

was in substance the equivalent as concerns the wardrobe to the withdrawal in 1293 of the chancery "out of court,"[1] and its establishment as a self-sufficing office to be maintained and fed by its chief, who received a fixed fee for the purpose. Just as this separation of the household of the chancery from the court contributed to the independence of that office as a department of state, so did the statute of St. Albans break up the disorderly unity of the household which followed from its members sharing in the common table in the king's hall. In compensation smaller and more effective units were established when each of the household "offices," like the chancery, formed a little society of its own, dependent upon its departmental chief for its board, lodging and social life. If the nature of the case made it impossible for the wardrobe to follow the chancery in going "out of court," it shows a tendency in that direction. The wardrobe becoming, like the chancery, a national office had to acquire some measure of internal independence. However, against this growth of corporate feeling must be set the tendency towards the formation of sub-departments within the wardrobe. Thus Droxford was ordered to pay, out of his £200, a hundred marks to Manton the cofferer for the expenses of the meals of the cofferer and his staff.[2] Similarly the clerks of the chapel became differentiated from the clerks of the wardrobe, just as in an earlier generation they had become separated from the clerks of the chancery.

A further aspect of the tendency to localise even an itinerating office of state, like the wardrobe, is to be seen in the development under Edward I. of at least two permanent wardrobe storehouses, or "treasuries," as they were more commonly called. The vagueness of the term "treasury" has led to hopeless confusion

---

percipienti per annum ducentos libros pro expensis oris sui et clericorum suorum qui solebant comedere in aula regis, et non comedunt ibidem amplius per statutum factum apud *sanctum Albanum*, etc." In 28 Edw. I. the period April 14 to Sept. 29 was rather generously treated as half a year, for the rest of the period the allowance was 11*s.* a day. For the payments in 29 Edw. I. see *MS. Ad. 7966 A.* f. 48 d.

[1] Chancellor Langton and his clerks were put "extra curiam" on Jan. 1, 1293. See page 76, note 3, below.

[2] *L.Q.G.* p. 88. A further allowance of 50 marks was also made to Manton from general wardrobe resources. Cofferer Bedwyn, under Edward II., claimed £200 for the board of his office under Manton, but this claim was challenged; *Exch. Accts.* 356/28.

in both early and later writers between these "treasuries of the wardrobe" and the "treasury of the exchequer," a confusion for which there is perhaps more justification than the equally venerable confusion between the treasurer of the wardrobe and the treasurer of the exchequer. The distinction, however, is perfectly clear, and the treasury at Winchester having long become ancient history, the treasury of the exchequer was now naturally enough part of the buildings permanently occupied by the exchequer within the royal palace at Westminster. Even earlier than the reign of Edward I., there were traces of quasi-permanent wardrobe establishments. In the first days of Henry III., there was, at times, a king's wardrobe in the New Temple at London, which was at least a "treasury" in the sense of a place of deposit for specie in the friendly custody of the Templars as bankers.[1] As early as 1243 and 1246, the "king's wardrobe at Westminster," though still only in operation when the king was in residence there, was sufficiently often used to make it worth while to assign special chambers for its service, and to maintain them constantly in proper condition.[2] Later in the reign, we have a treasury of the wardrobe in the Tower of London,[3] which, though later specialised for the "great" and "privy" wardrobes, arose in an age when even the former of these two institutions was very imperfectly differentiated from the main wardrobe. Early in Edward I.'s reign we find that there were two chief treasuries of the wardrobe, one within the Tower of London, and the other within the precincts of the abbey of Westminster. It is the former storehouse that is meant, when the records speak of the king's wardrobe of the Tower of London.[4] The Tower storehouse was already becoming

[1] See above, Vol. I. Ch. VI. pp. 245-246.

[2] *C.R., 1242–47*, pp. 19 and 435.

[3] *C.P.R., 1258–66*, p. 218, shows this already in operation in 1262. The "king's treasury in the Tower" in 1241 was a branch treasury of the exchequer; *ib., 1232–47*, p. 249. There was also an exchequer treasury in the Tower in 1297–8, where certain jewels of the lady Blanche of France were deposited. This was the "superior thesauraria regis apud turrim." "Superior" here means on a higher story simply.

[4] For example, *C.P.R., 1272–81*, pp. 60, 61. The wardrobes of the magnates also showed the same tendency to become localised, with fixed headquarters or storehouses. Thus we find that Edward's son-in-law, Humphrey Bohun, Earl of Hereford (d. 1322), had, before his death, established his wardrobe in a house in the City of London; *C.C.R., 1323–27*, p. 26, an order of 1323 to the treasurer to "survey the house that was the seat of the earl of Hereford's wardrobe in London," which, like the rest of the Hereford estates, had escheated to the crown on his treason.

largely used for the stores of the great wardrobe, and probably had also a special connection with the chamber. Moreover, the Tower wardrobe had already a close relation with the workshops of smiths and armourers and the storehouse of arms and armour which, a generation later, was to split off from the earlier wardrobes to make the king's privy wardrobe of the Tower.[1] As yet, however, the wardrobe and its branches were still very imperfectly differentiated, for it was not until the very end of the reign that the great wardrobe began to seek for special quarters of its own.

Far more prominent in the records than the treasury of the Tower is the treasury within the abbey of Westminster,[2] which was also more definitely specialised for the wants of the main wardrobe establishment. Records, ranging from 1291 to 1299, enable us to locate this wardrobe in the crypt underneath the glorious new chapterhouse which the piety of Henry III. had erected for the monks of Westminster.[3] In 1290–91 this crypt

[1] Already in 1273 there were royal armourers and smiths established within the Tower of London, and also "Hugo le Flecchcr, artillator quarellorum regis in turri regis Londoniarum"; *I.R., 2 Edw. I., East. T.* No. 25. Compare *L.Q.G.* p. 58, which especially associates with this Tower wardrobe the name of John of Flete.

[2] *C.P.R., 1266–72*, pp. 332, 404, suggest it may have already existed in 1269–70.

[3] See H. Harrod's paper "On the Crypt of the Chapterhouse at Westminster" in *Archaeologia*, xliv. 373-382. In 1290–91 the treasury of the wardrobe, "subtus capitulum Westmonasterii" was newly paved, but John the Convert only charged £5 : 7 : 10 for the operation, of which the paving was only one item; "Et in domo thesaurarie garderobe regis subter capitulum Westmonasterii pauiendo, hostiis et aliis reparandis, anno xix°," *Pipe, 32 Edw. I.* Compare *Exch. Accts.* 357/13: "Inventarium factum per Rad. de Manton ... apud Westmonasterium, mense Nov., in principio anni regis Edwardi xxviii^{i}, de omnibus jocalibus ciusdem regis ... inventis *in thesauraria garderobe eiusdem regis subter capellam monachorum ibidem.*" "Capella monachorum" and "capitulum" are clearly equivalent terms. Dr. Armitage Robinson tells me that the crypt under the chapterhouse never was paved until recently. But he relies for this view on the absence of any traces of an earlier pavement. However, at the price charged, John the Convert's pavement may well not have been sufficiently substantial to leave any traces in much later centuries, and it is not unthinkable that the charge may have been made without the work having been done. But the passage seems to me absolutely decisive in fixing the site of the wardrobe treasury, and I therefore entirely accept Mr. Harrod's view. The tendency in some quarters to seek for the "king's treasury in the

was newly paved, and by 1296 it contained such stores of treasure that it already attracted the cupidity of thieves.[1] Doubtless the great development of the functions of the wardrobe as a spending department made it a convenient place to deposit the specie, collected to support the king's army in the field. Moreover, the incessant movements of the king at this time made it prudent to preserve in the treasury within the abbey both a great collection of wardrobe rolls and account books, and a large proportion of the more precious jewels and plate belonging to the crown.[2] It thus became in practice both the record office and the treasury of the wardrobe. As a result of this, the treasury in the Tower became more and more a store of "great wardrobe" commodities, cloth, spices, arms, armour and their like. Its more precious contents were gradually transferred to the treasury at Westminster. In 1298 it was called the "old treasury of the king," and the deposit of some jewels there was noted as something extraordinary.[3] In the next year there was nothing of value left in it.[4]

The treasury of the wardrobe at Westminster escaped without material damage from the thieves who assailed it in 1296. It was equally lucky in being outside the ravages of a disastrous fire which on March 26, 1298, spread from the palace to the abbey, and, while reducing most of the monastic buildings to ashes spared the chapterhouse and the treasury beneath it.[5] Accordingly the treasury under the crypt continued to be extensively used, for in 1302 keeper Droxford deposited in it a store of

abbey" in the room later called the "chapel of the pyx" can be supported by no contemporary authority. Moreover the trial of the pyx was a function of the exchequer, and the treasury of the wardrobe had nothing to do with the exchequer.

[1] *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 218. On June 6, 1296, a commission was issued to deliver Newgate gaol of John le Keu, "in custody there for trespasses committed at the king's treasury within the abbey of Westminster." Compare Hall, *Antiquities of the Exchequer*, p. 19.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 357/13 give interesting details.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 357/13. A memorandum that certain jewels were stored at Westminster states that they "capta fuerunt de vetere thesauraria regis apud turrim Londonie," where they had been deposited so late as Nov. 10, 1299, but in that month they were transferred to Westminster.

[4] Harrod, p. 345, "In 28 Edward I. there was nothing left in the Tower treasury save a few old zones."

[5] *Ann. Worc.* p. 536, "Et occulto Dei judicio omnia alia edificia monachorum *preter capitulum* in carbones et cineres conuertebat."

jewels found in Edinburgh Castle.[1] But the confusion in the abbey that must have followed the fire was enhanced by the extraordinary laxity of discipline and morals into which the convent was now falling, and the removal of the court, the exchequer, the common bench and the wardrobe offices to the north, which immediately followed, reduced the supervision which could be exercised over the royal treasure deposited within the house and practically left its custody to the vigilance of the monks themselves.[2]

The lax discipline of the monastery gave an opportunity in 1303 to a bankrupt merchant of loose life, named Richard of Pudlicott, who had started life as a clerk.[3] His change of profession had not profited him and he was now reduced to great financial dist ss. He first planned a bold scheme to rob the monks of their own plate. Succeeding in this design, Richard next wove a more subtle plot for breaking into the wardrobe treasury. He obtained the connivance of many of the monks, including some of the officers of the abbey. He also procured the help of the keeper of the adjacent palace. According to his own clearly unveracious story, Pudlicott was, for the first four months of 1303, suffered to bore a way through the wall from the churchyard that separated the east end of the enclosure of the abbey buildings from the adjacent palace. At last, on April 24, he effected an entrance into the treasury, remained there until April 26, and then departed, laden with its chief contents. It looks more likely, however, that Pudlicott was let into the crypt by the complaisance of his friends within the abbey. However this may be, the treasury was robbed. But the booty was so carelessly disposed of that pieces of stolen plate and jewels were discovered in the churchyard, fished up from the Thames, and found scattered about in various neighbouring places. This first gave rise to

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 354/9, "et omnia ista . . . idem dominus deposuit in garderoba Westmonasterii."

[2] The crypt was, and is, only accessible directly from the church itself.

[3] I adopt Pudlicott rather than "Podelicote" since it is the modern form of Pudlicott, near Charlbury, Oxfordshire, the only place name suggesting this surname. Pudlicott's clergy is proved by *Ann. London*, p. 143, which record the execution of "Johannes de Potekot clericus . . . propter fractionem thesaurarie." I have rashly assumed his identity with Richard. If this be so, his clergy did not save him from the gallows. A worthier instance of a clerk turned trader was Hamo of Chigwell, mayor of London under Edward II.

suspicion, and resulted in a royal writ, issued on June 6 from Linlithgow, appointing a commission to enquire into the matter.[1] The details of the crime seemed already to be notorious, and many arrests were made, including that of Pudlicott himself, in whose house were found many spoils, both of the robbery of the wardrobe and of his previous theft of plate from the abbey refectory. But stolen treasures were also found in possession of the sacrist of the abbey, of the keeper of the royal palace, and in other strange quarters. Before long the abbot and most of the monks were either put into the Tower or called upon to find bail.[2]

At last, on June 20, Droxford himself came to London with the keys of the empty treasury. Then full stock was taken of the damage inflicted.[3] The official estimate of the value of the stolen treasures was £100,000.[4] The greater bulk of it was in plate and jewels, for the exigencies of the campaign made it unlikely that specie, urgently wanted in Scotland, could be hoarded to any large extent at Westminster. Some store of foreign gold coin there certainly was, and this was hopelessly lost, while a large proportion of the jewels and plate were recovered.[5] Elaborate and repeated enquiries proved up to the hilt at least the negligence, and in some cases the complicity, of many of the abbey and palace officials. For a long time afterwards, suspected accomplices in the crime were arrested at Lynn,[6] at York,[7] and various other places. After a year, six of the lay offenders were hanged, but Pudlicott, a hero after his lights, took upon himself the chief blame, and thus screened his monastic accomplices. He paid the penalty of his daring. Over two years after the crime, he was hanged, regardless of his clergy.[8]

Pudlicott was the last sufferer, for Edward in the long run found it politic to hush up a scandal so gravely affecting

[1] *Foedera*, i. 956. Another commission was afterwards appointed.

[2] *Ib.* i. 959. [3] Cole, p. 277. [4] *Foedera*, i. 959.

[5] See the inventory of the jewels lost and recovered in Droxford's indenture in Cole, pp. 276-284. Mr. Hall (p. 19) suggests that only plate and jewels were stored in the wardrobe treasury, but *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 289, shows that "gold florins"—doubtless the Florentine coin so called—were among the objects stolen.

[6] *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 289. It is here that 100 gold florins were found among the booty.

[7] *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 112.

[8] Pudlicott's fate is made clear from *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 486. The date of his execution was Oct. 29, 1305; *Ann. Lond.* p. 143.

both his own officials and his favourite abbey. Before long all the monastic offenders were released and the lax custodians of the royal palace restored to their charge.[1] Perhaps the fierce contentions that rent the abbey for the rest of Edward's reign were the final effects of the storm of scandals.[2] The indignation which the Westminster annalist manifests at the want of respect shown to clerical immunities is perhaps among the most conclusive testimonies to his consciousness of the sorry part played by the house in the whole transaction.[3] To the historian of the wardrobe the often told tale [4] of the robbery is mainly important because it led to the transference of the bulk of the wardrobe

[1] *Ann. Lond.* p. 244 shows the restoration to office of John Shench, keeper of Westminster palace, who held office by reason of Joan his wife's hereditary fee, and who had been so remiss as to suffer his underling, William of the Palace, to abet the burglary.

[2] Rishanger, p. 420, notes the triple scandal to the king, his household and the monks of Westminster.

[3] See, for instance, *Flores Hist.*, R.S. iii. 115, 117, 121 and 321, and especially p. 115, where the Westminster chronicler, whose manuscript is now in the Chetham Library, Manchester, compares the robbery of the treasury with the outrage at Anagni, which happened a few months later. He admits that only ten monks were actually imprisoned, but he is careful, at the risk of spoiling his flow of eloquence, to insist that the whole robbery was wrought "per unicum latronem." Pudlicott is clearly the scapegoat for the misbehaviour of the convent.

[4] Among the modern accounts of the robbery may be mentioned that in Dean Stanley's *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, more eloquent than critical; H. Harrod's useful article in *Archaeologia*, already referred to, and J. Burtt's valuable paper "On some discoveries in connection with the ancient treasury at Westminster" in G. G. Scott's *Gleanings from Westminster Abbey*, Appendix, pp. 39-43. The two fullest modern accounts are those of Mr. L. O. Pike in his *History of Crime in England*, i. 199-203, and 466-467, and Mr. H. Hall's *Antiquities of the Exchequer*, pp. 18-33. The latter of the two is perhaps the better, because, though telling the story in a book dealing with the exchequer, it recognises that the treasury robbed was that of the wardrobe. The original authorities for the account are largely printed in Palgrave's *Kalendars and Inventories of the Exchequer*, i. 251-299, Rec. Com., 1836, which includes the depositions of the juries of the preliminary enquiries and the writs for the commissions. These latter are also printed in *Foedera*. Cole, pp. 276-284, prints the indentured list, drawn up by Droxford, of the jewels lost and recovered. Some entries in the Patent and Close Roll calendars usefully supplement the continuous records, and the statements in *Flores Hist.*, referred to in the previous note, illustrate the impressions of contemporary chronicles. The French original of Pudlicott's confession, portions of which are put into English, both by Mr. Pike himself and Mr. Hall, can be read in *Exch. Accts.* 332/8. I have given a popular account of the whole incident in *A Mediaeval Burglary*, reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, October 1915. I cannot profess, however, to have given a satisfactory solution to the intricate problems involved. A detailed study of all the evidence might still be worth working out.

treasures from Westminster abbey back to the Tower, where they were under safer custody than that of the incurious and greedy monks.[1] A few months after the robbery when, in the absence of the exchequer at York, a London office for the receipt of revenue from the sheriffs and other ministers of the crown was found desirable, it is significant that the place of receipt was at the Tower and not at the exchequer's headquarters at Westminster.[2] From the renewed importance of the treasury of the wardrobe in the Tower we perhaps may trace the beginnings of the final establishment within that fortress of the regalia and other choicest treasures of the crown.* It is pretty certain that we may connect with this the beginnings of that "king's privy wardrobe in the Tower of London," which arose within the next twenty years as a storehouse of arms and armour, whose history in detail will be worked out in a later chapter.[3] With the separation of the armoury department from the cloth and spices department, there was less need for the great wardrobe to make the Tower its head storehouse. Within the next few years it found a special home of its own in the city of London.[4]

In this attempt to trace the development of the wardrobe system under Edward I. we have regarded it, just as Edward himself and his courtiers and subjects regarded it, as essentially a branch of the household administration. It was, if we may anticipate the convenient phrase of the next generation, the "wardrobe of the king's household." However large were the sums drawn from the exchequer, or exacted directly from the taxpayer for its support, the official view was that the levy was made to pay the expenses of the king's household.[5] This purely

[1] Harrod, p. 381, quotes evidence of the expenditure of 77*s.* 4½*d.* early in Edward II.'s reign for making a new door for the treasury of the Tower which suggests that the bulk of the king's treasures still remained there.

[2] *R.R., 26 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 143, shows that in Easter term 1298 more than a third of exchequer receipts were paid into the Tower. See for this later, pp. 105-106, note 4.

[3] See later the chapter on the privy wardrobe.

[4] See later the chapter on the great wardrobe.

[5] "Ad expensas hospicii inde faciendas" or "ad expensas nostras inde acquietandas" were the consecrated formulae of the writs of liberate, ordering the exchequer to transfer sums to the wardrobe. See, for instance, *liberate roll, E. of R. 19 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 58, writ of £14,000, Sept. 8, 1290; writ of £10,000, April 11, 1291; *ib.* No. 79, *32 Edw. I., Mich.*, writ of July 15, 1303. On the other hand, a writ of Nov. 25, 1283, was "ad debita nostra inde acquietanda"; *ib. 12 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 47.

domestic view comes out even more strongly in such documents as the ordinance of 1279, and in the account of the wardrobe in Fleta. Yet we should err greatly, did we regard the wardrobe as merely the machine for the ordering of the government of the court. The truth is rather that the whole state and realm of England were the appurtenances of the king's household. The army was the household in arms; parliaments and councils were the household afforced to give the king advice; the financing and administration of the whole realm belonged to the household because the whole realm was but the household considered in its widest aspect. Having now dealt with the narrower aspects of our subject, let us turn to those broader ones. Let us see the part played by Edward's wardrobe, firstly in the administration, secondly in the financing of this kingdom. In other words, we have to deal with the wardrobe as the second chancery and as the second exchequer.

SECTION IV

The Place of the Wardrobe in Edward I.'s Administrative System

The conservatism of Edward I.'s general policy is nowhere more strikingly borne in upon us than when dealing with the part played by the wardrobe in his general administrative system. His starting-point is clearly from the state of things prevailing under Henry III. If the results of his action lead to something very different from what had existed under his father, it is not so much the result of conscious action as of the slow working out of the efforts towards co-ordination and definition which sprang from his love of order and efficiency.

We may distinguish two periods in this aspect of Edward's policy. The dividing line between them is, roughly speaking, the death of chancellor Burnell. While Burnell lived, the conservative note was sounded with particular strength. Such innovations as took place occurred after 1292, and were forced upon the king by political and military exigencies.

In the first twenty years of his reign the wardrobe was envisaged by Edward much as it had been regarded by Henry III. It was part of the old-fashioned attitude of the ruler and his chief minister that no distinction should be drawn between the private and the public aspects of the king's work.[1] The court and household were as much concerned with executing the king's general business as were the national offices of state. There was not the least suggestion of rivalry and antagonism between them. The whole work to be done could be the more easily divided between the wardrobe, the chancery and the exchequer, since all alike were controlled by a strong and able monarch and a loyal minister. Against none of them was there the least breath of opposition. Accordingly the wardrobe

[1] But Edward I. himself drew the distinction between the office and person of the king, generally considered to have been first made in England by Hugh le Despenser under Edward II.; see *Placita de quo warranto*, pp. 429-430, and *Historical Collections, Staffordshire*, vi. 1. 63-64 (W. Salt Soc.).

as an administrative office could be closely co-ordinated with the executive aspects of the chancery. On its financial side the wardrobe was not so much co-ordinated with, as made dominant over, the exchequer. It will be convenient to deal with these two aspects of our subject separately, though we must never forget that in practice they constantly overlapped each other.

To appreciate the part played by Edward I.'s wardrobe in administration, we must understand how Burnell managed the chancery. It is somewhat startling to realise that the chancery was put into his hands with the same completeness of control that had been given to the baronial "chancellors for life," such as prevailed before the death of bishop Neville. The reforms, which Henry III. and the baronage had united in bringing about, were almost entirely pushed aside. There is no record that Burnell took the "chancellor's fee" of 500 marks; the hanaper accounts ceased to be tendered; Burnell received, as in the old days, the issues of the seal, paid and supported his clerks after the fashion he best preferred, and kept the rest as his profit. After 1280 at least, Burnell was "allowed his liberties and acquittances as they were wont to be allowed . . . in the times of kings Richard and John."[1] The reign of Henry III. was studiously ignored.

The wardrobe, like the chancery, showed the results of this reactionary attitude. The two offices worked closely together and overlapped at every turn. The great seal was, when the chancellor left court, deposited in the wardrobe, and that not only for safe custody but for use in sealing documents. For instance, on February 12, 1278, when the chancellor went abroad, "he delivered the seal into the wardrobe under the seal of John Kirkby, whom the chancellor had ordered to attend to the affairs of the chancery."[2] Again, in May and June 1279, when Burnell

[1] *C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 13. I am indebted for many of the statements in the text as to the position of the chancery under Burnell to the investigations made by Miss L. B. Dibben for her forthcoming treatise on the chancery.

[2] *C.P.R., 1272–79*, p. 259; *C.C.R., 1272–81*, p. 444. Compare *Ch. R.* No. 66, 6 Edw. I. No. 15, "cui cancellarius iniunxit in recessu suo quod negotia *cancellarie* expederet." The chancellor chose his own deputy then. Sometimes, however, the great seal was left with some chancery clerks, as, for example, in July 25, 1284, when Burnell went from Conway to Acton Burnell, leaving the seal with two king's clerks, one of whom, Walter of Odiham, was certainly a chancery clerk; *ib., 1279–88*, pp. 195, 271.

accompanied Edward abroad for the negotiations that culminated in the treaty of Amiens, the great seal was kept during his absence jointly by Thomas Bek, keeper of the wardrobe, and John Kirkby.[1] While king and chancellor were away, writs were issued " by the hand of Thomas Bek," just as if the keeper of the wardrobe were the chancellor, and were in due course enrolled on the chancery rolls.[2] Kirkby was the officer who almost always acted in Burnell's absence, and was clearly the most conspicuous clerk of the chancery, a vice-chancellor in fact if not in title.[3] He acted on such occasions in the wardrobe and in co-operation with its keeper. It followed, too, that in these short absences of king and chancellor abroad, the wardrobe and that part of the chancery left in England jointly governed the country.

A contrary policy prevailed during the most famous and longest absence of Edward beyond seas, his sojourn in France and the Pyrenean lands between 1286 and 1289.[4] On this occasion Edward took both his chancellor and wardrobe with him. Leaving his cousin, Edmund earl of Cornwall, as regent in England, Edward divided his council so that one section advised the regent at home, while another attended the sovereign abroad. The whole wardrobe establishment naturally followed the court. Patents of protection, issued to Louth the keeper, March the controller of the wardrobe,[5] and to both the stewards, Robert Fitzjohn and Peter of Champvent, show that the clerical and lay chiefs of the household all went beyond seas. Even the " buyer " of the great wardrobe, Hamo de la Legh, followed the king to Gascony,[6] where he died, and where his successor, Roger de Lisle, was appointed from among those of Legh's subordinates who had gone with him abroad.[7] With the wardrobe went, of course, the privy seal. Burnell also took the great seal with him, and a

[1] *C.P.R., 1272–79*, p. 314, shows Burnell left England on May 8; he returned with the king on Monday, June 19; *ib.* p. 316. Compare *C.C.R., 1272–81*, p. 531.

[2] Examples are in *ib.* pp. 530-1, and *C.P.R., 1272–79*, pp. 314-316. Bek was sometimes loosely called chancellor. See above, p. 14.

[3] Bartholomew Cotton, p. 167 (R.S.), actually calls him in 1285 " cancellarius regis Anglie."

[4] Edward and Burnell crossed from Dover on May 13, 1286; *Foedera*, i. 666; the king returned to the same port on Aug. 12, 1289, and Burnell on Aug. 10, *ib.* i. 711.

[5] *C.P.R., 1281–92*, pp. 240, 245, and 246.

[6] *Ib.* p. 239. See later, in the chapter on the great wardrobe. I do not find that Adinettus, Hamo's colleague, went beyond seas, and suspect that he remained in charge of the storehouses at home.

[7] *R.G.* ii. 323.

certain number of chancery clerks. But there was a difference of policy as regards the chancery and the wardrobe. The whole office of the wardrobe remained with the king abroad. We can trace its wanderings in its own rolls and records; but we have absolutely no sign of it exercising any activity in England. For the whole three years and a half the only references to the wardrobe that I can find on the chancery rolls have to do with its transactions before May 1286. In the same way these rolls show no trace of the work of the privy seal which was kept at the time in distant lands.[1]

It was otherwise with the chancery itself. Just as the king divided his council, taking some with him to Gascony and leaving others as the king's council in England to advise the regent Cornwall, so did Burnell divide the chancery, leaving behind him a large section of the office under his faithful henchman, William of Hamilton, who, since Kirkby's elevation to the treasury of the exchequer, had become Burnell's chief helper in the chancery. Though simply described in the chancery itself as supplying the place of the chancellor,[2] Hamilton was called by so great a personage as archbishop Peckham the vice-chancellor.[3] The chancery rolls show that ordinary business was transacted as usual by this truncated chancery, and, save for the time when the Welsh war of 1287 took the regent to the west, transacted almost exclusively at Westminster.[4] More ceremonious transactions stopped altogether. The charter rolls, for instance, are a blank for more than three years,[5] and the volume of patents

[1] Some chancery writs enrolled on the fine rolls are even warranted " by writ of the great seal "; *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1272–1307*, pp. 243, 262. Such " writs of great seal " were in effect orders of the chancery in Gascony to the chancery in England.

[2] *C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 513; *ib., 1288–96*, p. 50.

[3] *Peck. Lett.* iii. 934, 936, and 939 (R.S.). In some cases Hamilton was addressed by Peckham as " the king's vice-chancellor," though in another letter he was simply called " king's clerk."

[4] Disregarding short absences, as for instance when earl Edmund spent Christmas 1287 at his castle of Berkhamsted, the only long absence of the chancery from Westminster was between July 16 and Sept. 1, during which time it worked at Gloucester and Hereford.

[5] There is no extant charter roll for either 15 or 16 Edw. I., and the roll for 17 Edw. I. has only twelve entries, dated just before the king's return; *C. Ch. R., 1257–1300*, pp. 339-40. It is possible, of course, that the rolls for the former years have been lost, but the survival of the short roll of 17 Edw. I. rather heightens the probability that few, if any, charters were issued in England during the king's absence.

issued was diminished by half.[1] Yet "writs of course," judicial writs, were issued as usual, and the more pedestrian business enrolled in the close rolls and fine rolls diminished either slightly or not at all.[2] All writs issued in England were, however, tested by the regent instead of the king, and sealed with a special seal of absence. This division of the chancery tended to diffuse, and perhaps even to widen its activity.[3]

The presence of the great seal and the chancellor at court could not but somewhat restrict the administrative functions of the wardrobe in Gascony. We can trace them in part in the somewhat scanty crop of privy seals preserved for this period, and still more in the scattered records of the administrative activity of its clerks. The secretarial activities of the wardrobe were necessarily limited, but, even with Burnell always by his side, Edward had need of a private secretary, and it is significant in this relation that a stray chancery writ, drawn up a few months after the king's return, should specifically describe the wardrobe official who kept the privy seal as the "private chancellor of the king."[4] Louth, March, and Langton, who joined the wardrobe abroad, were constantly engaged both in the administration and the financing of Aquitaine.[5] It was under

[1] The Calendar of Patent Rolls for the period of the king's absence covers 70 pages, that for the preceding three years 196, and that for the following three years 188 pages.

[2] The Calendar of Close Rolls covers 159 pages for the years of absence and about two hundred for the corresponding periods before and after. The number of fines, etc., registered in the three periods is practically the same.

[3] Burnell's wish to keep up the repute of the chancery rolls is clearly shown by his order that a private covenant, made at Condom, between Englishmen, should be enrolled "pur greignur seurte fere . . . en roulle de la chancelerie." It was entered on the Gascon roll, as the chancery roll most naturally appropriate; *R.G.* ii. 420.

[4] "Quos [articulos] vobis [episcopo Agenensi] sub sigillo cancellarii nostri privati vobis mittimus inspiciendos"; *R.G.* ii. 550 (Westminster, June 4, 1290). Here we have a writ of great seal, accompanied by a document under the privy seal. I have no doubt but that the "private chancellor" was the controller of the wardrobe, already, I feel sure, the *ex officio* keeper of the privy seal.

[5] See also later, pp. 115-118. Unluckily the Gascon rolls for 1285–88 are almost entirely lost, though that for 1288–89 is long and valuable. It is printed in *R.G.* ii. 288-538. A single membrane of the roll of 14 Edw. I. is also in *ib.* 285-288. M. Bémont has notified in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, "Un rôle gascon d'Édouard Ier retrouvé" (*ib.*, 1910, pp. 219-222), how through the negligence of some official two other membranes of that roll have been misplaced and lost. The blunder has, thanks to M. Bémont, been rectified, and the rediscovered portion of the roll of 14 Edw. I. is printed in vol. xlv. of the *Archives historiques de la Gironde*.

Langton's direction that the new *bastide* of Bath was rising in the southern suburbs of Bordeaux to commemorate the long presence of bishop Burnell in Aquitaine as the chancellor of the duke-king.[1] Similarly Louth, who had in 1279 been responsible for the erection of the Welsh *bastide* of Rhuddlan,[2] was now occupied with the foundation of the obscure *bastide* of Cassac[3] in the Médoc. This application by the same wardrobe officer of the experience he had gained in planning "new towns" in North Wales to the extension of the already great network of *bastides* in Aquitaine shows that the Edwardian administrative system possessed a unity, almost approaching that of the Angevin system under Henry II. Similarly Louth was concerned upon occasion with the sealing of documents issued in Gascony. When the absence of chancellor Burnell prevented the use of the great seal, he was empowered to affix to a writ in favour of a Bordeaux banker the purely local "seal for contracts" of the castle of Bordeaux.[4] But we must wait until we deal with the financial operations of the wardrobe, before we can realise the full significance of its long sojourn in Gascony for its later history. It can, however, be suggested that the notorious administrative disorder into which England fell during the king's long sojourn abroad was not due simply to the removal of the controlling influence of the king and his chancellor. The chancery, in fact, did almost as well without Burnell as with him. It was quite untouched by the scandals which stained even the exchequer, the only administrative office wholly left in England, in the person of the chamberlain,

[1] *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 201, f. 15, "Item Langeton. Magistro Bernardo de Turre, assignato ad ordinandum novam bastidam que vocatur Baa, iuxta Burdigalam." * The "bastide of Bath" was situated outside the walls of mediaeval Bordeaux on the south, in the parish of Gradignan, beyond the faubourg Saint-Éloi. It was traversed by the "iter sancti Jacobi," the pilgrims' road to Santiago of Compostella, now the *route de Bayonne*; *R.G.* ii. 335. See for this subject my lecture on *Mediæval Town Planning* (M.U.P., 1917).

[2] See, for instance, "Welsh Roll, 7 Edw. I." in *Cal. Chancery Rolls, Various, 1277–1326*, p. 176, for Louth's activity at Rhuddlan.

[3] *Misc. Books Exch. T. of R.* vol. 201, f. 23. Cassac was in the parish of Grayan in the north of the Médoc; *R.G.* ii. 371.

[4] *R.G.* ii. 339, "et sciendum quod nos, Guillelmus de Luda, thesaurarius predictus, sigillum domini nostri regis, quod tenet magister Osbertus de Baggeston, contrarotulator in castro Burdegale, ad contractus, hiis presentibus litteris fecimus apponi, valituris perinde ac si magnum sigillum ejusdem domini regis presenti contractui esset appensum."

Adam of Stratton, and raged rampant in the two benches and in the local administration. The regent Cornwall was doubtless a weaker man than his cousin, but he was terribly handicapped by the entire absence of the wardrobe, and the division of the council and chancery. Lack of official as well as of personal control led to the judicial and ministerial scandals that Edward was called upon to remedy upon his return.

Edward's chief helpers in Gascony took a leading share in investigating the complaints of the populace against the malpractices of the king's ministers during his absence. It was in fact a trial by the ministers who had remained with the king of those placemen who had administered England in his absence. The chancery and the wardrobe reviewed the conduct of the local officers, of some of the exchequer ministers, and of both the benches. If we still regard the chancery as partially curialistic, we may almost say that the officials of the court acted as a tribunal to examine the charges against the ministers dissociated from the court. From this point of view the crisis of 1289 faintly anticipates the crisis of 1340, as to which we shall later have much to say. An examination of the persons appointed to the special commission shows this. The first *auditores querelarum*, appointed in October 1289, were balanced pretty evenly between the official and the magnate elements. They included a non-ministerial bishop, an earl, two soldiers, and three of the king's chief officers.[1] But these three were

[1] *Foedera*, i. 715. The commission was "ad audiendum," not "ad audiendum et terminandum." The effect of this restriction is well brought out in a passage in Fleta, p. 66, where he says, in the course of giving a list of royal courts then acting, "habet etiam [rex] curiam suam coram auditoribus specialiter a latere regis destinatis, quorum officium non extenditur nisi ad justiciarios et ministros regis, et quibus non conceditur potestas audita terminare sed regi deferre, ut per ipsum adhibiantur poenae secundum meritorum qualitates." This important passage can only refer to this special commission which held its sessions between April 1290 and the summer of 1293. See *State Trials of the Reign of Edward I.*, ed. T. F. Tout and H. Johnstone, Intr. pp. xvii-xxi (Camden Series, R. Hist. Soc. 1906). It seems absolutely conclusive evidence that Fleta wrote while the special commission was still holding its sessions, and therefore fixes his date of composition within these narrow limits. Another passage in Fleta raises an apparent difficulty. He says, p. 78 (compare p. 84), that the keeper of the wardrobe was bound to render his annual account on St. Margaret's day, "et de particulis compotum reddere ad scaccarium singulis annis in festo sanctae Margaretae." St. Margaret's day in the records is usually the feast of St. Margaret, Virgin and Martyr, on July 20, but it is certain that at no period was the account rendered

Burnell, Louth, and March, the men who had borne the chief burden of the day in Gascony. It shows how suspicious Edward had become that even this strong commission was only appointed "to hear," and not as usual "to hear and determine," the complaints that had arisen. Accordingly Louth and March, with Langton the cofferer, remained behind in London at Lent when the king left the capital.[1] However, before long more pressing affairs took all the three ministers away from the sessions of this restricted and therefore resultless commission. But March was promoted in 1290, on Kirkby's death, to preside over that exchequer which Adam of Stratton had disgraced, but which Kirkby had, despite his greediness, kept loyal to the king's interests. Langton searched Stratton's effects;[2] wardrobe clerks wrote minutes of the auditors' proceedings.[3] Thus

at this date. In fact, "reddere compotum" must not be pressed literally. It practically means that the account ended with the last day of the regnal year. It was then due, and was to be presented as soon afterwards as practicable. The actual delays were, as we shall see, very prolonged. The almost uniform practice was to make the account from one regnal year to the other. Under Edward I. the account was required to be drawn up to the feast of St. Edmund the king, *i.e.* November 20 (*Household Ordinance* of 1279, later, p. 161). The accounts of Edward II. were similarly ended on July 8, which was, however, the feast of St. Margaret, queen of Scots. It seems, therefore, as if Fleta's feast of St. Margaret meant that of St. Margaret of Scotland, whose celebration, therefore, coincided with the beginning of Edward II.'s regnal year. The one extant manuscript of Fleta, *MS. Cotton, Julius*, B. 8, was written in the fourteenth century, and it looks as if the scribe had altered the day of the accounts from that of St. Edmund to that of St. Margaret of Scotland in order that it might harmonise with the custom of the reign of Edward II. If this be so, the date of the manuscript would be fixed as belonging to the reign of Edward II. If St. Margaret's day be accepted as the original reading of Fleta, it would be conclusive evidence that Fleta wrote in the reign of Edward II. The former view is much the more probable. For details of the scandals of 1289, reference to the Camden Soc. volume may be made.

It is to be regretted that the passage of Fleta, quoted above, escaped the notice of Miss Johnstone and myself, when we were editing the trials. It indicates an important limitation to the powers of the special commission, of which we were not aware; *ib.* pp. xxvi-xlii. Fleta tells us distinctly that the auditors had not authority to bring the trials to a conclusion, but simply to make report to the king, who was to pass sentence upon the culprits. This singular restriction of the auditors' power accounts for the resultlessness of a large proportion of the trials on which we had then frequently occasion to comment.

[1] *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5 f. 5. It was clearly in connection with the enquiry; *ib.* f. 1 d, "in passagio garderobe, moranti Londoniis pro querelis audiendis, per plures vices vltra Tamisiam."

[2] *Ib.* f. 4 d.

[3] The wardrobe paid the cost of the secretarial work of the auditors:

the wardrobe had its full share in the reformation of the administration that followed Edward's homecoming. The ultimate decision being left with the king, Edward, very characteristically, only manifested his extreme displeasure against two of the chief offenders, Stratton and Weyland. The rest of the incriminated officers were allowed, in the true spirit of the wardrobe, to make their peace by paying to the crown fines so heavy that within four years the receipt rolls record that more than £15,000 came into the exchequer from the ten chief culprits.[1]

Thus the purging of the ministry was carried through by the co-operation of the chancery and wardrobe. This joint action continued without any great change in the general situation all through the latter part of the reign. The constant succession of wars, the increase of financial pressure, the very inferiority of the official chancellors who succeeded Burnell, made what difference there was in favour of the wardrobe as against the chancery. No better illustration can be given of the complete correlation between chancery and wardrobe that continued until after the death of Edward I. than the fact that John Benstead, controller of the wardrobe and *ex officio* keeper of the privy seal, was also frequently keeper of the great seal. On August 22, 1297, Benstead accompanied Edward I. to Flanders.[2] The chancellor, John Langton, who remained in England, attended the king at Winchelsea on the *Cog Thomas*, and at the moment of the king's departure surrendered the seal to him. Thereupon Edward gave it to Benstead to keep.[3] Edward was away from August 22, 1297, to March 14, 1298.[4] During these seven months the chancellor issued writs in England under a seal of absence,[5] while Benstead, in the Netherlands, issued acts under the great seal, one of which was the king's acceptance at Ghent of the

" Henrico de Lichfeld, clerico, scribenti petitiones et querelas coram auditoribus querelarum apud Westmonasterium." Comp. *ib.* p. 10 d, where Lichfield and two " socii " are paid " ad scribenda placita regis sub auditoribus querelarum ad duo parliamenta apud Westmonasterium."

[1] See the table in Tout and Johnstone, *State Trials of Edward I.* p. xxxviii.

[2] He was at Ghent on Nov. 27, 1297; *C.C.R., 1296–1302*, pp. 298-299, 301.

[3] *Ib.* p. 295; *Foedera*, i. 876.

[4] *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 335; *Foedera*, i. 876.

[5] *Ib.* p. 876. Langton used " sigillum regis quo, dum rex erat in Vasconia, uti in Anglia consueuit." This was, I imagine, the seal employed by Edmund of Cornwall in 1286–89, which was then kept by William Hamilton.

Confirmatio Cartarum, already allowed by the regency in England.[1] For the whole of this period the work of the spigurnel, the actual affixing of the great seal, was deputed to one Clement of Morton, who had the modest wage of twopence a day.[2] Many privy seals were issued in Flanders, also under Benstead's direction; so that it is certain that he kept both seals during this visit.[3]

Again, on chancellor Greenfield's resignation of office on December 29, 1304, after his election as archbishop of York, that he might procure consecration at the papal *curia*, Benstead was on December 30 appointed *locum tenens cancellarii* and retained the seal till January 17, 1305.[4] During this period, on January 7, he was despatched with the great seal from Lincoln to London, and instructed to remain there and deliberate on matters of state with members of the council there assembled.[5] On his arrival at London on January 17, he surrendered the seal to the new chancellor, William Hamilton. Here again Benstead was effective keeper of the seal for nearly three weeks.[6] Under such circum-

[1] *Foedera*, i. 880.

[2] *MS. Ad.* 7965, f. 25 d, " Clementi de Morton, assignato ad sigillanda breuia signanda magno sigillo regis, *quamdiu id sigillum in custodia domini Johannis de Benstede extitit*, ipso rege in partibus transmarinis agente. pro vadiis suis a xxii° die Augusti usque ad xix^m^ diem Novembris, utroque computato, per xx iiij et x dies, ad ij d. per diem, per manus proprias, xv sol." W. de Melton received payments " pro viridi cera empta pro magno sigillo regis, dum idem rex stetit in partibus Flandrie." The wardrobe was the acting hanaper as well as the acting chancery, and Morton was the acting spigurnel. Benstead's frequent absences from court, for instance for 21 days in Sept. and Oct. on missions to Brabant and the countess of Luxemburg, made such an appointment doubly necessary, *ib.* f. 22 d.

[3] *Ib.* f. 29, grant of robes to " Johanni de Flete et Roberto de Wodehus, clericis, transcribentibus et irrotulantibus *sub domino Johanne de Benstede* diuersas litteras factas de priuato sigillo."

[4] *Exch. Accts.* 368/7, a receipt roll of the wardrobe, 33-35 Edw. I., after recording receipts from Greenfield up to the day of his resignation, Dec. 30, goes on " domino J. de Benstede, tenenti locum cancellarii a dicto ultimo die Dec. usque xvii^m^ diem Januarii, domino W. de Hamiltone facto cancellario in die illo."

[5] *Ib.* 309/7, " expense domini J. de Benstede, missi de Lincolnia usque Londonias cum magno sigillo regis, et ad morandum ibidem cum aliis de consilio regis ibidem congregatis ad deliberandum super diuersis negotiis ipsum regem et regnum tangentibus." He left Lincoln on Jan. 7, reached London on Jan. 16, and received expenses there till Sunday, Feb. 28. Then the king reached London to hold parliament, during whose sessions Benstead was again *in curia*: see later, pp. 82-83.

[6] Benstead was made chancellor of the exchequer on Sept. 25, 1305, on his return from a mission to Bordeaux; see *C.P.R., 1301–7*, 7. 378; *Exch. Accts.*

stances it is natural to find chancery clerks writing in the wardrobe. Indeed the wardrobe accounts now tell us almost as much of the doings of the clerks of the chancery as do the chancery rolls themselves. There is a distinctly closer approximation between the two offices under this system than there had been between 1286 and 1289, when great seal and privy seal had both been in Gascony with their keepers in attendance on the king.

The dependence of the wardrobe on the chancery for additional assistance arose from its ordinary staff being inadequate to grapple with the work that came to it in times of pressure, not only in the continued pressure of war-time, but even under ordinary conditions at such periods as the time of the yearly account, or when an exceptional number of privy seal letters, or of diplomatic documents, had to be drafted or copied in a hurry. The pressure became increasingly frequent in the latter years of the reign, when wardrobe business had immensely increased.[1] Not unusually, also, when experts skilled in foreign fashions were needed, notaries from the outside were brought into the wardrobe, sometimes in such numbers as to attract the attention of the chroniclers, usually so incurious in matters of administration.[2] Already, as at a later age, there were always

309/9. Thus the sometime keeper of the great and privy seals became also keeper of the exchequer seal. For his further relations to the exchequer see later, p. 108. It is worth noting here, however, that the exchequer, like the chancery, was upon occasion controlled by actual wardrobe officers. The wardrobe, in short, gives unity to the various scattered departments of Edward I.'s government.

[1] For an example in 1296–97 see *MS. Ad.* 7965, f. 16 d, "Roberto de Cottyngham pro stipendiis diuersorum clericorum cancellarie, scribentium per vices quedam breuia regis secreta et quasdam ordinaciones factas apud Clarendone, viz. iiij clericis, cuilibet eorum ad iiij d. et ob. per diem." The "breuia secreta" of this passage doubtless means letters of the "secretum" or privy seal. See also *Exch. Accts.* 369/11, f. 34, which record a payment to Cottingham, when controller, "moranti apud Westmonasterium per preceptum regis ad faciendum transcribere bullas et priuilegia a summo pontifice temporibus retroactis regi concessa." The payment is to Cottingham himself and to certain clerks of chancery who helped him between Nov. 23 and Dec. 17, 1305. For later instances see Brantingham's *I.R., 44 Edw. III.* p. 220.

[2] *Ann. London*, p. 143 (s.a. 1305), "Eodem anno, vijo Kal. Nov., novem tabelliones, et die sequenti quatuor tabelliones, et tertio die proxime sequenti septem tabelliones fuerunt in garderoba domini regis ad scribendas bullas et priuilegia domini regis Anglie sub manu publica, et publicauerunt xlv bullas." This is possibly a distorted version of the copying of the bulls referred to in *Exch. Accts.* 369/11 (see previous note) about a month earlier. It is hard to believe that all these "tabelliones" were "papal notaries" of the ordinary

a certain number of professed notaries, both in the chancery and wardrobe, to deal with such matters.

One interesting impression is derived from the study of these and many similar entries in the accounts, namely, that important diplomatic documents owed a great deal of their form to the wardrobe and privy seal clerks, even when ultimately sealed by the great seal of the chancery. It is largely by reason of the co-operation of the chancery clerks with the wardrobe clerks in diplomatic work that we learn from the wardrobe accounts almost as much about the doings of the chancery clerks as from the chancery records themselves. Sometimes chancery clerks even acted as collectors of wardrobe revenue. The "fines" paid to the king in consideration of the remission of his wrath, or for grants of favours, such as the reissue of a charter, were considered personal income of the king and paid into the wardrobe at all times. When the favour took the shape of the grant or renewal of a charter, the fine was commonly paid by the recipient into the chancery, which issued the charter, but it was forwarded to the wardrobe by the chancery clerk concerned.[1] Like the

type, and they may well have been simply clerks of chancery, a certain proportion of whom were always notaries. A case in point is that of Master Andrew de Tauge, who received payments in *ib.* f. 31 as "facientem quedam instrumenta publica et expensas clericorum dicta instrumenta transcribentium." Compare *ib.* f. 38 d for Tauge's expenses "facientem quedam instrumenta publica super quoddam processum factum contra episcopos Glasgue et Sancti Andree, et stipendium unius alterius notarii auxiliantis ad dicta instrumenta facienda." And see *ib.* f. 48, where Tauge has his wages for making "duos processus in forma publica super fidelitates et homagia Scotorum . . . quorum unus liberabatur in cancellaria regis et alter ad scaccarium ipsius regis"; *MS. Ad.* 7966 A, f. 30. Tauge received expenses from the wardrobe, when sent from York to London, Dec. 21, 1300–Feb. 28, 1301, "pro processu faciendo super homagiis et fidelitatibus Scotorum." He was a regular chancery clerk, who was also a notary. However, few accounts are without similar entries, either at home or abroad. For an example of extra clerical work in Gascony, 1286–89, see *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 201, f. 56, "J. de Luda, clerico, auxilianti in garderoba ad transcribendum quasdam cartas et scripta de donacione ij s." See also *Exch. Accts.* 369/11, f. 63 d, "Mo. W. de Maldon, notario publico, et quibusdam aliis notariis publicis, et transcribentibus et in xx publicam formam redigentibus iiij xvij bullas de quibusdam priuilegiis regis, Londoniis, per ordinacionem concilii regis, mense Octobris, anno presenti xxxivo [1306] . . . xx marcas."

[1] See, for example, *Pipe, 22 Edw. I.* No. 139, m. 6, "Et de lxvj s. et viij d. receptis de Willelmo de Holcote, clerico cancellarie regis, de fine abbatis de Croxton pro confirmacione cartarum suarum habenda sub sigillo regis, tempore Roberti episcopi Bathoniensis et Wellensis defuncti."

garderobarii, the men of the chancery were prepared to turn their hands to anything. In 1301 we find chancery clerks assigned to choose infantry for the prince of Wales' Scottish campaign, for which services they received their wages and expenses in the wardrobe.[1] On the other hand, just as in the reign of Henry III., the chancery clerks still enrol in their rolls writs of privy seal emanating from the wardrobe, though with decreasing frequency.[2]

Though the offices and the officials overlapped, they were perfectly distinct from each other. Fleta's descriptions make clear how different were the clerks of the chancery, "the honest and circumspect clerks sworn to be obedient to the lord king and having full knowledge of English laws and customs,"[3] from the *garderobarii*. He emphasises in particular the fact that the keeper of the privy seal (who was, though Fleta does not say so, a wardrobe clerk) was absolutely independent of the chancellor, being in this relation unique among all the royal seal keepers in the British lands, for they were all, save the keeper of the privy seal, substitutes or deputies of the chancellor.[4] And another complication now looms large in every roll. After the first few years of Edward I.'s reign the activity of the privy seal was exceedingly conspicuous. We should know this from the chancery rolls, where, after 1292, occur memoranda of warranty for writs of chancery by writs of privy seal in ever-increasing numbers. We realise it even better from the survival from 1274 onwards

[1] *MS. Ad.* 7966 A, f. 39.

[2] A striking instance is in *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 395, where a "chancery warrant," a letter of privy seal, dated August 25, 1277, Rhuddlan, addressed to the chancellor, and ordering him to seal a patent, sent to him ready drafted, is enrolled, as if it were an ordinary letter close. Compare *ib.* p. 518, a letter of privy seal to Kentish justices in eyre, dated May 8, 1279. Compare the Welsh Roll for 5 Edw. I. in *C. Chancery R., Various, 1277–1326*, p. 157, which gives three writs of Nov. 2, 1277, at Rhuddlan, "sealed with the king's little seal before the arrival of the chancellor."

[3] Fleta, pp. 75-76.

[4] *Ib.* p. 75, "cujus [*i.e.* cancellarii] substituti sunt cancellarii omnes in Anglia, Hibernia, Wallia et Scotia, omnesque sigilla regis portantes ubique, praeter custodem sigilli privati." In the face of this we must reject the statement of M. Déprez that the privy seal was "le nœud en quelque sort de la chancellerie anglaise" and even "un service annexe de la chancellerie"; Déprez, pp. 7, 29. But M. Déprez was misled by French analogies. There was nothing in England corresponding to the "great royal chancery" of France, which was a single secretarial office supplying clerks and secretaries for all the branches of the machine of state that required writing and sealing. In England each department had a sort of secretarial home rule.

of a constantly increasing number of original writs of privy seal as "chancery warrants," "exchequer warrants," and otherwise. Now the privy seal was the seal of the wardrobe, as much as the great seal was the seal of the chancery. After it established itself in Edward's reign as a regular part of the administrative machinery of the government, it became so important that we must postpone the detailed consideration of its operations to a later part of this book. Yet at the present stage we cannot but refer briefly to the increasing scope of the privy seal, as another evidence of the large part played by the wardrobe in administration. And until after Burnell's death there is not the least evidence of any rivalry or antagonism between the writs of great and privy seal, such as we find in later times. Until the very end of the thirteenth century, the harmony and unity of the administration remained undisturbed, either by the friction of different seals or by the jealousies of different offices.

How can we best explain, then, the co-existence of different "chanceries" and different seals? What principle made it easy for wardrobe and chancery to work harmoniously together? I think the best explanation is simply that the chancery, properly so called, was the staff of administrators directly under Burnell, while the wardrobe was manned more particularly by the personal assistants of the king. The perfect understanding between king and minister made workable an arrangement that on the face of it was beset with difficulties. Considerations of immediate convenience determined in each case whether the chancellor's clerks or the wardrobe clerks were to act. The only thing which limited the freedom of the latter was the tradition that matters of high state policy, writs that set the judicial machines in motion, grants of rights, estates, and high dignities, must ultimately be authenticated by the great seal, so that the clerks of the chancery were called upon constantly to reissue in more solemn form the drafts sent to them by the clerks of the wardrobe.

No less broad explanation of the respective spheres will account for all the facts. It is tempting to say that the wardrobe came to the fore since the chancellor and chancery "were going out of court" and found it increasingly impossible to attend the king on his perpetual wanderings. That the ever-increasing

demand for judicial writs, the perpetual flow of petitions for grace and favour, the continually growing mass of records and rolls, the decided convenience of fixed headquarters were all tending towards the settlement of the chancery at Westminster, may be fully admitted. Thus in 1272 Walter of Merton, when appointed chancellor for the absent king, was ordered to remain at Westminster, as a public place, until the king's arrival in England.[1] Similarly the branch of the chancery, kept in England during Edward I.'s long absence abroad between 1286 and 1289, only once left Westminster for more than a few days during the whole of that period, and then only because pressing necessity summoned the regent to the west. Though the close personal ties between Edward and Burnell may have somewhat retarded this process, they could not stop the inevitable movement in that direction. Accordingly, after Edward and Burnell had spent the Christmas of 1279 together at Winchester, when on January 7, 1280, the king went to hunt in the New Forest, the chancellor betook himself to London "as if to a fixed place where all seeking writs and prosecuting their rights could find the appropriate remedy."[2] It must not be supposed, however, that this establishment of Burnell in London in 1280 pointed to more than a temporary settlement there.* Even this, however, was enough to show the drift of the tide.

Similarly, when the stress of affairs made it more convenient to establish the seat of government in the west or north, we find the chancery having temporary headquarters at Rhuddlan in 1277, at Rhuddlan and Shrewsbury in 1283, at Berwick in 1291–92, and at York between 1298 and 1304. But a glance at the places at which chancery writs were dated during these periods shows that, if the chancery had a centre in some convenient place, the chancellor and the apparatus of the seal still largely itinerated with the king. So late as 1315, when the favourite royal hunting lodge at Clarendon was repaired, a "chamber for the chancellor

[1] *Ann. Winchester*, p. 113, "ut moram trahat apud Westmonasterium, tanquam in loco publico, usque ad adventum principis."

[2] *Waverley Ann.* in *Annales Monastici*, ii. 393, "Item in crastino Epiphaniae, recedente rege a castro Wintoniae, versus Novam Forestam iter arripuit. Cancellarius autem ejus Londoniam reversus est, quasi ad certum locum, ubi omnes brevia petentes et jura sua prosequentes paratum remedium invenirent."

and the clerks of the chancery" was equipped at the same cost as that of the king's own chamber.[1] Thus the chancery had not fixed quarters in the sense that the exchequer and the common bench were established at Westminster. Its migrations, because more constant, were less thorough and complete than those of the exchequer, which, when removed from Westminster, moved with great pomp and apparatus, as, for instance, when it went to Shrewsbury in 1277,[2] and to York between 1298 and 1304.[3] There was also in conservative circles a decided feeling that both the chancery and king's bench ought to travel with the court, because their presence always afforded the king alternative councillors to his household staff, whose advice was likely to be much more palatable to the magnates. This feeling found its expression in a clause, imposed on Edward by the barons in the *Articuli super Cartas* of 1300, requiring that both chancery and king's bench should follow the king.[4] It is evidence that by 1306 Edward had gained the mastery over his nobles, when in that year he expressly ordered the chancery and exchequer to remain at Westminster during his last expedition to Scotland.[5] We have seen how even the wardrobe felt the growing tendency towards the localisation of the machinery of government.

There was some danger in Edward I.'s policy of treating all three departments as parts of a single political machine. It was a risk of the wardrobe losing its distinctive features and becoming a political office of state. Just as the chancery and exchequer, originally court offices, had almost shaken off their primitive domestic character, so now the wardrobe seemed drifting in the same direction. But under Edward I. we may, with these

[1] *Cal. Inq. Misc.* ii. (1307–1349), p. 50. There was also, however, a treasurer's chamber. Was this the exchequer or the wardrobe treasurer?

[2] *R.R., 6 Edw. I. Mich. T.*, No. 86, "Rotulus recepte apud Salopiam de termino Sancti Michaelis."

[3] *Flores Hist.* iii. 104; Hemingburgh, ii. 232; Trivet, p. 404; *London Annals*, p. 134. Compare *R.R., 26 Edw. I., Easter T.*, No. 143.

[4] Bémont, *Chartes des libertés anglaises*, p. 104: "D'autre part le roi voet qe la chauncelerie et les justices de soen banc lui suient, issint q'il eit touz jours pres de lui ascuns sages de la lei, qui sachant les busoignes qe viegnent a la curt duement deliuerer a totes les foiz qe mester serra."

[5] *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 455. Nevertheless the chancellor and some of his clerks soon followed the king to the north. In Jan. 1307 the chancellor, the keepers of the rolls and of the hanaper, and three other chancery clerks were lodged at Carlisle for the parliament there; *ib.* p. 529.

precautions, still recognise in the superior mobility and adaptability of the wardrobe, reason why administrative business should continue to be heaped upon it.[1] To take an instance, when king and chancellor were separated, as they often were, communications between them had to be in writing, and the royal letters to the chancellor inevitably took the shape of letters under the privy seal. Accordingly the only times during the first part of Edward I.'s reign when abundant letters under the privy seal survive are just those periods when the king and chancellor were separated. Besides the little crop of privy seals resulting from the isolation of chancellor and king in 1277, we also notice such entries on the wardrobe accounts as a grant of three shillings towards the expenses of "Jaquet, the squire of the chancellor, in going from Deganwy in the autumn to request his lord to come to the king."[2]

The changed position of the chancery after Burnell's death affected in some ways the position of the wardrobe, but it cannot on the whole be said that it influenced it prejudicially. There were no more chancellors like Burnell. John Langton, his successor, was, as we have seen, a simple clerk of the chancery, whose promotion from inside the office was after the fashion more usual in the wardrobe than in the chancery. Langton was not allowed to exploit on his own account the profits of the seal. Appointed on December 17, 1292, on January 1, 1293, the system of giving a fixed sum to the chancellor "for his expenses and robes and those of his clerks in his company and sojourning in the chancery,"[3] first devised in 1260 for the baronial chancellor,

[1] See later, pp. 95-97, for the similar reasons which increased the financial responsibilities of the wardrobe at the expense of the exchequer.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 350/26, m. 5, "Jaketto, scutifero cancellarii, pro expensis suis quas fecit in autumno eunti de Gannou ad quaerendum dominum suum de veniendo ad regem, iij s."

[3] *Pipe, 22 Edw. I.* No. 139, m. 6, *Exch. Accts.* 375/8, f. 46, "Et Johanni de Langton, cancellario domini regis, percipienti per annum d libras pro feodo suo, quod rex ei concessit per ordinacionem ipsius regis et consilii sui nomine expensarum et robarum suarum, et clericorum suorum cancellarie in comitiua sua existencium, a primo die Januarii, anno regni regis xxi°, quo die idem cancellarius fuit assignatus *ad hospicium tenendum extra curiam regis* pro se et huiusmodi clericis cancellarie, usque ad ultimum diem Dec., anno xxii°." The grant is regularly repeated in subsequent wardrobe accounts. See, for example, *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* No. 144, m. 20, *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 202, f. 28, and *L.Q.G., 1299–1300*, p. 358. Under Henry III. the exchequer paid the chancellor's fee; see *Lib. R. 45 Hen. III.* m. 16, quoted by Dibben in *E.H.R.* xxvii.

Nicholas of Ely, was revived "by order of the king and council," without a word being said of its involving the going back to an earlier system. Langton had, however, £500 instead of 400 or 500 marks, and his "fee" was paid, not from the exchequer, as under Henry III., but from the issues of the seal or from the wardrobe.

In the long run, the restoration of the chancellor's fee, and the consequential removal of the *hospicium* of the chancery *extra curiam*, established that separation of the chancery from the household towards which everything was tending.[1] On the other hand, the wardrobe gained both by reason of the less imposing personality of the chancellor, and by the method in which his stipend was to be given to him. As a result, the accounts of the keeper of the hanaper were again available, and these were now tendered to the wardrobe instead of to the exchequer, so that from another point of view the wardrobe exercised control over the chancery. More than that, on the very day of Burnell's death, October 29, 1292, the issues of the great seal were for three weeks put in the hands of two keepers, William de la Donne, who later became sole keeper of the hanaper, and Benstead, himself a wardrobe clerk, and destined to become, three years later, controller of the wardrobe. Benstead and Donne accounted for the hanaper until November 19, 1293.[2] As a further

48. Compare *Pipe, 27 Edw.* No. 144, m. 21 and *Exch. Accts.* 375/8, m. 46, recording the wardrobe payment "per ordinacionem factam per dominum regem et consilium suum apud Westmonasterium, anno xxi°."

[1] When in 1323 the hanaper accounts went out of the wardrobe accounts, the fee of the chancellor and his clerks necessarily disappeared from them also. With this went almost the last vestige of connection between chancellor and household. The above facts make it clear that Stubbs considerably postdates the separation of court and chancery when he says that "the chancellor ceased to be a part of the king's personal retinue and to follow the court . . . early in the reign of Edward III."; Stubbs, *C.H.* ii. 282. The separation of the chancery and household is recognised so early as 1285 in the statute of Winchester, which contrasts "l'hostel le rei" with "chaunceler, tresorer, consayl le roy, clerk de la chauncelerie, de l'escheker," etc.; *Statutes of Realm*, i. 95. Yet even the exchequer might be theoretically regarded as belonging to the household. Thus under Edward II. a retiring chamberlain of the exchequer is praised as one "qi ben e loiaument nous a serui en cel office e en autres, tant come il feust en nostre houstiel"; *Memoranda Roll, K.R.* No. 85, m. 18, "breuia directa baronibus." For Fleta's testimony see above, p. 72.

[2] *Pipe, 21 Edw. I.* No. 138, m. 26, "et de xxxix li. viij s. iij d. de exitibus magni sigilli per manus Johannis de Benstede et Willelmi de la Donne, custodum eorundem exituum, a die xxix° Oct. anno xx°, quo die Robertus, quondam

result, the hanaper accounts were regularly attached to the wardrobe accounts from this date to 1323, so that we have to seek much of the history of the chancery in the accounts of the wardrobe. They enable it to be written with a vividness and wealth of detail which were unattainable before their appearance. And this dependence of the hanaper on the wardrobe gave the wardrobe officers a new privilege of remitting at will the " fees of the great seal " for charters and writs, granted to their friends.[1] Another link of wardrobe and chancery was that the office expenses of the chancery, the cost of the parchment, wax and ink, as well as the salary of the chancellor and his staff regularly appear on the wardrobe accounts.

It can hardly be an accident that, at the time when Langton succeeded Burnell as chancellor, the use of the privy seal was enormously and permanently extended. The best proof of this is not so much the survival in greatly increased number of original writs of privy seal,[2] as the contrast which the study of the chancery rolls suggests between the excessive rarity with which letters patent and close are " warranted " under the privy seal before 1292, and the abundance of such warranties after that year. For the years 1272–81 I cannot find in the calendars a single instance of a patent warranted by the privy seal, and in the close rolls the first letter so warranted is dated October 21, 1277.[3] The earliest patent thus warranted is dated February 8, 1283, at Aberconway,[4] after which such instruments become fairly common both in the patent and close rolls. However, they cease altogether on the close roll from early in 1286 to 1291, a

Bathonensis et Wellensis episcopus, obiit apud Berewyck, usque ad xix^um^ diem Nov., anno eodem finiente." This dual control of the hanaper only lasted for three weeks. For the year, Nov. 20, 1292 onwards, Donne alone accounted; *ib. 22 Edw. I.* m. 6. Compare *Misc. Books Exch. T. of R.* vol. 202, pp. 54 and 92. I owe this reference to Miss Dibben.

[1] Miss Dibben for her forthcoming book has collected some interesting instances of this from the early hanaper accounts.

[2] In the *C.W.* there remain only four files for the first seventeen years of Edward I.'s reign, and fifty-three files for the second and somewhat shorter half of it. But to warrant writs of chancery was only one of the many functions of the privy seal. I feel confident, however, that the proportion of original writs of privy seal, surviving in such collections as the exchequer accounts for the later part of the reign, is at least as great as that now found among chancery warrants. All round, the privy seal was more widely used.

[3] *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 407; there is another on p. 518.

[4] *C.P.R., 1281–92*, p. 55.

time which more than covers the long absence of Edward and Burnell in Gascony; while on the patent roll there is only one between September 1284 and November 1292, this exception being an act of May 8, 1288, " by the earl of Cornwall and the treasurer " during the king's absence.[1] From the early nineties onwards such warranties are very numerous, especially perhaps when the king was in Wales or in Scotland. This is the time when so many examples of writs of privy seal have survived in the chancery warrants. We are accordingly justified in regarding the period after 1292 as the time when the letter under privy seal was definitively established as a considerable element in administrative procedure. It is soon after this that we discover, for the first time after 1232, a keeper of the privy seal in the controller John Benstead. Before the king died, it was worth the while of criminals to forge the privy seal of the king and even that of the prince of Wales.[2]

Some memoranda on the chancery rolls of Edward's later years illustrate the process of the development of the machinery which made increasingly effective the seal of the wardrobe. The formidable Welsh revolt of 1295 renewed the situation of 1277 and 1282 by necessitating Edward's personal presence for a considerable period in Gwynedd. While Edward was thus fighting the Welsh, the chancellor, John Langton, took up his quarters at Chester, so as to be fairly near the king and yet accessible for administrative and judicial business in England. Two papal envoys, Bertrand de Got and Ralph Dallemand, visited Edward at Aberconway, and were sent back home with letters addressed by Edward to the Roman court. These letters seem to have been of the sort which required the authentication of the great seal, and it is interesting to find that the two envoys on their return journey took their letters to the chancellor at Chester that he might seal them with it. The close roll notes that they took

[1] *C.P.R., 1281–92*, p. 295, though the privy seal was in Gascony, 1286–89. This writ of privy seal must have been sent from Gascony as a warrant to the vice-chancellor in England. Curiously enough there are no warranties by privy seal recorded in the Gascon Rolls between 1283 and 1290.

[2] *Ib., 1307–12*, p. 20. A pardon issued by Edward II. on Nov. 28, 1307, to John de Berneville, at the instance of Walter Reynolds, " for counterfeiting the privy seal of the late king, and that used by the present king before his accession." *See C.P.R., 1292–1301*, 26 Dec., 1298, for counterfeiting of king's and prince's privy seals by Italian merchants; I owe this reference to Miss Hilda Johnstone.

with them " a pair of letters written in French, the transcript of which letters is enrolled in the king's wardrobe and not here." [1] These French letters were plainly letters under the privy seal, and the chancery clerks knew nothing about them because they were never presented to the chancery. Nevertheless the clerks recorded on the close roll the contents of the letters addressed to them, because they had been submitted to them to receive the great seal and were therefore duly enrolled. Incidentally this story strengthens the large amount of evidence that the wardrobe had now fully become a department of state with rolls and records as well as with a seal of its own.[2]

[1] *C.C.R., 1288–96*, p. 443.

[2] Other contemporary references to the wardrobe rolls are in *C.C.R., 1288–96*, p. 149; Feb. 20, 1290, " certain letters concerning the matter of Norway were sealed secretly at London in the lodging of Robert, bishop of Bath and Wells, the chancellor . . . so that they were not enrolled on the rolls of the chancery or seen, but were forthwith carried . . . to the king's wardrobe to be enrolled on the rolls of the same." Compare *ib.* p. 443, quoted above in vol. I. p. 55; see also above, I. pp. 166-167; and *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 125, Nov. 1294, " memorandum that letters close are directed to the above persons, John Gifford and Humphrey Bohun, earl of Hereford, under the king's privy seal and enrolled in the wardrobe." These and similar passages suggest that letters of privy seal were enrolled in the wardrobe, just as letters of the great seal were enrolled in the chancery. Unluckily we have no privy seal enrolments surviving. I have noted, however, in *Exchequer Accounts* in P.R.O. K. 505/31, a very curious and barely legible document labelled " Breuia consignata de priuato sigillo," and dated 25 Edw. I. This system of enrolment of privy seal letters is the more certain since lesser dignitaries than the king also transcribed their letters of privy seal into rolls or books, some of which are still extant, as for example the privy seal letters of Edward of Carnarvon for 1304–5 in *Exch. Misc.* 5/2 (I owe this reference to Miss Hilda Johnstone), and those of Edward the Black Prince for 20 and 21 Edw. III. in *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vols. cxliv, cclxxviii, cclxxix, cclxxx and *John of Gaunt's Register, 1372–76*, Camden Series, edited by S. Armitage-Smith, 1912. It is noteworthy that in all these three cases writs of great seal are mixed with those of the privy seal.* The king alone seems to have had two separate offices for the great and privy seal. The references to rolls of the privy seal are of course independent of mere book-keeping and accounting rolls, referred to in *C.C.R., 1272–79*, p. 87, and still extant in many cases. There are innumerable instances of the purchase of parchment for the purpose of writing these documents, *e.g. MS. Tanner*, No. 197, f. 41, " maiori et balliuis ciuitatis Lincolnie pro centum duodenis pergameni emptis per ipsos . . . per mandatum regis de priuato sigillo . . . liberatis in garderoba dicti regis apud Berwycum super Tuedam pro libris, rotulis, litteris et aliis memorandis dicte garderobe inde scribendis et faciendis, vij li. ij s. xj d." (4 Edw. II.). The controller, besides keeping the privy seal, was also keeper of the wardrobe rolls and records. There are frequent references to the provision made for the carriage of these documents. See *MS. Ad.* 7965, f. 16 d., " eidem [*i.e.* Roberto de Cottyngham] pro uno coffero de corio, ferro ligato, et pro quodam coffero empto pro diuersis scriptis et litteris existentibus sub custodia contrarotulatoris "; Déprez, pp. 70-72, is therefore quite right in holding that there were rolls on which writs of privy seal were transcribed, though they were of course not rolls of chancery, as he thinks, but rolls of the wardrobe. I must to this extent withdraw the objection I made to his argument in the *E.H.R.* xxiii. 558, though I still think that the instance he relied upon to prove his point is unconvincing.

There are several other instances during these years of the separation of king and chancellor, and of the king summoning the absent chancellor to his side by writ of privy seal. Thus on April 1, 1296, Edward ordered John Langton to join him at Berwick " with all our chancery " by April 4.[1] Again on July 10 of the same year, Langton was ordered from Montrose to be with the king at Berwick by August 22 " along with the more discreet clerks of our chancery." [2] These instances show that the privy seal accompanied Edward in his long wanderings in Scotland during that year, though the great seal seems generally to have remained in England with the chancellor. The result of this was that letters patent and close were freely authenticated by the privy seal, especially when the king was outside the region where the chancellor's writ normally ran.[3] There are even examples of charters under the privy seal, which remind one of the charters under Henry III.'s small seal in 1263. For instance, in August 1306, Edward I., when in Scotland, sent to the chancellor " certain royal letters in the form of charters, sealed by the king's command by writ of the targe." [4]

Sometimes procedure under the privy seal was not effective, and the great seal was called into operation to supplement it. Thus the keeper of the forest of Dean was ordered by privy seal to allow Roger Mortimer six bucks of the king's gift. Mortimer complained that the venison did not reach him, whereupon Edward, on June 7, 1285, issued letters close under the great seal, reiterating his orders to the negligent keeper.[5] Similarly Edward writes from Dumfries a letter of privy seal asking the

[1] Stevenson, *Historical Documents, Scotland, 1286-1306*, ii. 35, " cum tota cancellaria nostra."

[2] *Ib.* ii. 78, " cum discretioribus clericis cancellarie nostre."

[3] Déprez, pp. 47-51, gives two examples from *Harl. Charters*, 14. 13. 8, and *Add. Ch.* vi. 307. A third is in *L.F.C.* iii. 19, which does not seem to have been published.

[4] *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 462. " Targe " is a common synonym for privy seal; *Rot. Parl.* i. 444, ii. 397, make the identification absolutely certain. Compare *C.W.* f. 1333, nos. 22 and 23, orders to the keeper of the privy seal to make " billes dessous la targe."

[5] *C.C.R., 1279–88*, p. 324.

chancellor and the council to protect from episcopal persecution the canons of St. Oswald's, Gloucester, "by letters of great seal, as they have already had protection previously by his letters of the small seal." [1] Contrariwise, a writ of great seal orders respite of the payment "until the king shall give further orders by word of mouth or by his privy seal." [2] Sometimes a commission was sealed on one occasion by the privy seal, and at another time by the great seal.[3] But the great seal could always override the privy seal, as when Edward issued a writ under the great seal to release a prisoner, "any previous order under the privy seal notwithstanding." [4] Though the wardrobe was nearer the king than the chancery, the chancery as the older and more dignified institution was higher in the hierarchy of state than the wardrobe.

How great was the part played by wardrobe clerks and men trained in the wardrobe during Edward I.'s declining years, can be seen from the proceedings of the parliament which met at London on February 28, 1305, which have been fully recorded in the roll that has been edited for Rolls Series by the late F. W. Maitland.[5] In his masterly introduction, which pictures to us the old king, surrounded by his ministers and counsellors, treating with the estates, Maitland has indicated the main lines of the Edwardian administrative system, as based on the chancery. He recognises also that in Edward I.'s later years circumstances had already arisen which threatened to deprive the chancery of its unique position as the one great secretarial and administrative department of state. He shows how the keeper of the privy seal was "already beginning to intervene between the king and the chancellor," and would willingly believe that "already the king, at least at times, seems to have had a more intimate clerk known as his secretary." His point is all the clearer now that we know that keeper of the privy seal and secretary were the same person, and that the masterful personality of Benstead far overshadowed the mediocrity of the new chancellor. William

[1] *C.W.* t. 22, no. 2185, "comme ils ont eu de nous auant ces heures lettres de nostre petit seal."

[2] *C.C.R., 1288–96*, p. 347; cf. *ib., 1302–7*, p. 299.

[3] *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 357; cf. *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 31.

[4] *Ib.* p. 298.

[5] *Mem. de Parl.* (R.S.).

Hamilton was no *Reichskanzler*, like Burnell, but a worthy official, recently raised to be head of an office in which he had spent the best years of his life. Indeed of the great officers of the crown only one looms large at this period, and that is Walter Langton, the treasurer, trained in his long years of apprenticeship in the wardrobe to give effect to the royal will with absolute loyalty. Moreover, Maitland indicates an inner circle of royal advisers in three "discreet men, who had not been formally summoned to the king's council because they are, we may guess, too 'discreet,' that is too intimately connected with the king's person to need any writ." [1] These three men are John of Droxford, the keeper of the wardrobe, John of Benstead, and John of Berwick, "another clerk who has been long in the service of the king and queen, possibly he holds the privy seal." Maitland's point as to this inner body of "discreet" advisers becomes the more strong in the light of the facts that Droxford and Benstead held the two highest posts in the wardrobe, and that the wardrobe was the active and permanent organisation that provided the king automatically with a series of confidential advisers. If Berwick's relations to the wardrobe are not so easily determined, he was at least a man of the same stamp and training, having been, until her death in 1290, the treasurer of the wardrobe of queen Eleanor, and afterwards continually engaged about the court, save when employed elsewhere on judicial and diplomatic business.[2] He certainly never kept the privy seal.

Some trusty barons and knights worked as loyally for Edward as any of the clerks of his chancery or wardrobe. But if a magnate, like Henry of Lacy, earl of Lincoln, served Edward

[1] *Mem. de Parl.* pp. xliii and 300. That Benstead was on the council is clear, for, as Maitland points out, he was on a committee of that body; *ib.* pp. xliv and 287. The keeper of the wardrobe was already in Fleta's time an *ex officio* councillor; *Fleta*, p. 78, "eo quod de concilio regis est juratus." No doubt the controller was also by now in the same position. In 1301 Benstead is spoken of as acting "cum aliis de consilio"; *MS. Ad.* 7966 A. f. 29.

[2] Berwick was largely employed as a justice in eyre, and in diplomatic missions; but was often busy at court as a king's clerk. For his position as treasurer of queen Eleanor's wardrobe and as one of her executors, see earlier, p. 42, note 2; compare above, p 19. All officers of the dependent queen's wardrobe were now regarded as members of the royal wardrobe staff. Thus of the whole circle of clerkly advisers of the king in 1305, every one, except the chancellor, was, or had been, a wardrobe clerk, and the chancellor himself had had his whole training in the closely allied office of the chancery. They were all in modern phrase "civil servants" by profession and not "politicians."

continually, both in war and peace, he held no specific administrative post. Lesser lay lords, like Otho of Grandison, could vie with the most astute clerk in competence to discharge a diplomatic mission or otherwise to act as the king's *secretarius* or confidant.[1] Generally, however, it was on the official circle, whether lay or clerical, that the king chiefly depended for help in the administration. On the whole, the wonder is that the king's officials worked harmoniously with the faithful magnates for so long a period. Differences of ideal, already clear enough under Henry III., were now, after nearly a generation of quietude, to assert themselves once more. With the growth of a baronial opposition in Edward's later years, the old contest of autocracy, backed by bureaucracy, and aristocracy, claiming to exercise popular control, made itself felt. And the renewed opposition took the shape of an antagonism to the household and wardrobe, even more than that of personal hostility to the king. The last aspect of wardrobe history in this reign is the beginnings of opposition to the wardrobe which we must study as soon as we have examined the relation of the wardrobe to Edwardian finance.

[1] See for him Mr. C. L. Kingsford's "Sir Otho de Grandison" in *R. Hist Soc. Trans.* 3rd series, iii. pp. 125-195.

SECTION V

The Place of the Wardrobe in Edward I.'s Financial System

The position of the wardrobe as a second chancery has to be constructed painfully from a variety of scattered sources, and even then can only be partially explained. The status of the wardrobe as a second treasury can be more easily and more copiously illustrated. The reason for this is that nearly all that we know of the wardrobe comes from the records of the exchequer, and the exchequer considered the wardrobe solely as an accounting body, receiving and disbursing a large proportion of the national revenues. At no time were the financial operations of the wardrobe more important than in the reign of Edward I., and we are therefore lucky in having still preserved, if not an unbroken series of wardrobe accounts for the reign, at least accounts surviving with sufficient continuity to enable us to form an adequate estimate of the part played by the wardrobe in the collection and spending of the national revenue. Moreover, the exchequer accounts proper, and notably the valuable series of issue and receipt rolls, enable us to compare the magnitude and scope of wardrobe and exchequer operations. As compared with the scanty and detached information we have for the reign of Henry III., our sources are copious, coherent, and satisfactory. Edward I.'s reign is therefore the earliest period which affords us material for the detailed study of wardrobe finance.

Before entering into the details of the accounts, we must ask ourselves what the figures contained in them really mean. Much confusion has been caused in the study of mediaeval finance by those who have dealt with it not taking the trouble to understand the accountant's system before making use of his figures. We are presented with long accounts, drawn up by regnal years or exchequer years, and setting forth with great particularity the "receipts" and "issues" of the accounting department. We must be on our guard against pressing these statements too literally. They can never be regarded as safe indications of the actual

revenue and disbursements of the department in the period which they cover. There is always a balance, on one side or the other, to be carried forward. On both sides the accounts record in numerous cases, not the actual receipt or payment of cash, but stages of elaborate and interminable operations of credit.

The system of payment "by tallies," of which more will soon be said,[1] is the most striking illustration of the mediaeval system of credit. Almost as important is the plan of gradually liquidating obligations by "prests" (*prestita*), that is advances or payments on account, which often run through the accounts of many years. The bewildering and varying number of accounts, the feeling that you have never got even all the recorded facts before you, is another difficulty. The complicated system of constant short loans and their continued renewal and occasional repayment equally militate against accuracy. We may feel almost sure that the expenses incurred in any one year were not paid off in full until many years later, and that instalments of such payments would dribble through the accounts year after year. At the best the accounts, whether of the wardrobe or the exchequer, can only be regarded as vaguely representing the "turnover" of the department in the year. No doubt they tend to rise and fall in a way that corresponds roughly with the rise and fall of actual income and disbursements. But for no year would it be safe to say that the stated totals represent, even approximately, the official figures on either side of the account. To expect more than this is to expect that a modern bank-book records precisely a man's income and expenditure. But the swollen total of one year may be the result of some temporary deposit of cash, due to a change of investment, and then, after a short delay, reinvested in something else, neither entry in any wise suggesting a sudden increase of affluence or extravagance. We must then be on our guard against facile generalisations based upon our mediaeval national accounts. We must not think that by adding the "foreign receipt" of the wardrobe to the sum of the exchequer receipts for a term only partially corresponding to the wardrobe period, we have obtained by this easy method the gross income of the crown for the period in question. We may always come across some supplementary

[1] See later, pp. 99-101.

or extraordinary account that vitiates all our calculations. Even if we do not, it is rash in the extreme to assume that the records surviving for us present the totality of the relevant records of the time. And rashest of all is it to assume that "records never err," and that occasional fraud and constant carelessness do not sometimes make the sums presented other than the sums paid and received. Moreover, we must not think that by adding up a series of temporary loans, repaid in some way or the other in short periods, we have an accurate statement of the gross indebtedness of the crown incurred during the time we are examining. On the other hand, it is easier to point out the mistakes of others than to avoid them oneself, and, when all safeguards are considered, the extreme difficulty of getting at the bottom of the confusions and intricacies of mediaeval finance will be only too likely to plunge any one attempting the rash task into a sea of personal errors for which he can only ask indulgence. To all these difficulties must be added the extreme uncertainty of calculations based upon huge masses of ill-arranged, technical manuscript accounts. It is not until the exchequer records have been calendared in print, something after the fashion of the calendar of the chancery rolls, that the particular sources of error, inherent in writing financial history from manuscripts, can be minimised. It is in the light of all these warnings then, that any attempt should be made to deal with the relation of the wardrobe to national finance in the first period when the abundance of material both encourages and deters us from the investigation.

As regards the magnitude of wardrobe receipts, the accounts show that they were steadily on the increase all through the reign. Setting aside, as we are bound to do, the exceptional first two years of Edward's absence, we find that we have information as to the gross wardrobe receipts for the whole periods of the keeperships of Bek, Louth and Langton, October 18, 1274, to November 20, 1295. For Droxford's long keepership, November 20, 1295, to July 7, 1307, we are less fortunate, as there seem no complete accounts for the 27th (November 1298 to November 1299), for the 30th, 31st, 32nd and 33rd years (November 20, 1301, to November 20, 1305), and for the broken 35th year (November 20, 1306 to July 7, 1307) in which the king died. Though the loss of

some of these years is important, as they must contain heavy extraordinary war expenditure in Scotland, we are enabled, however, to make some generalisations as to at least six out of the eleven and a half of Droxford's keepership. The gaps can be partly filled up from various partial accounts of these periods preserved among the exchequer accounts, and still better in the receipt and issue rolls of the exchequer.

Taking the receipts of these years, keepership by keepership, the following rough results may be stated. The general receipt of the wardrobe is constantly on the rise all through the reign. For the six years and a month of Bek's period the gross receipt is £143,931 : 3 : $2\frac{1}{2}$, giving a yearly average just short of £24,000. For the ten years of Louth's term of office the gross receipt is £549,887 : 17 : $5\frac{3}{4}$, yielding an average yearly income of about £44,745. For Langton's five years of office the receipt is £320,714 : 10 : 5, and the annual average is £64,143. For the six known years of Droxford the gross receipt is £421,342 : 13 : $10\frac{1}{2}$, and the average £70,244. For the twenty-seven known years of the reign the sum of the receipt is £1,333,435 : 4 : 9, and the annual average about £49,400.[1]

An analysis of the source of wardrobe receipts yields interesting results, and enables us to distinguish between the financial methods of the earlier and later parts of the reign. It is another of the many indications of reaction from the doctrines of 1258 that, in his early years, Edward I.'s financiers seem to have utterly disregarded the enactment of the Provisions of Oxford that all the issues of the land should go to the exchequer. A very considerable portion of wardrobe income never passed through the exchequer at all. During Bek's keepership the largest sum paid by the exchequer into the wardrobe was £6861 in 1279–80, a year where the sum of wardrobe receipts was £23,942, and the lowest sum was £50 in 1277–78 out of £19,316. This latter was not, however, the result of any natural increase of the "foreign" or direct revenue of the wardrobe. No less than £18,233 : 5 : 6 of the gross revenue of this year was borrowed from Lucca merchants, and in the previous year, 1276–77, £22,476 out of a receipt of £35,713 : 16 : 10 came from the same accommodating

[1] I shall print tables of wardrobe receipt, so far as available, in the appendix to the last instalment of this work, along with exact references to the authorities.

societies of foreign bankers. It was the period of the first Welsh war, and therefore the expenses were quite abnormal.

Under Louth the wardrobe began in times of peace to depend more largely upon the exchequer. Thus in 1280–82, the first two years of Louth's custody, two-fifths of the wardrobe receipts of over fifty thousand pounds were paid over by the exchequer. The second Welsh war again reduced the exchequer contribution to a trifling proportion of the whole, but for the whole of Louth's period we may roughly say that £20,000 a year represents the *recepta de scaccario*, and that this remained fairly constant, however the "foreign receipts," or *recepta aliunde quam de scaccario*, fluctuated. This sum represented rather less than half the average receipt of the period. Here again loans bulk largely in the "foreign receipt." For instance, in the years 1286–88, when the king was in Gascony, a loan of £25,522 : 18 : $2\frac{1}{2}$ from the merchants of Lucca swells the foreign receipt to respectable proportions.[1] Apart from the loan, it would have only been between eight and nine thousand pounds. In the next account, 1288–90, loans of nearly the same amount also figure, but the feature here is the amount of Gascon revenue paid into the wardrobe, and the large sum derived directly from the new customs.[2]

When Langton became keeper, the foreign receipt sank into relative insignificance. In 1290–91, a large amount of Gascon revenue kept up the ancient proportion, but in 1291–92 the foreign receipt was little more than a tenth of the whole, £30,000 out of £33,154 coming straight from the exchequer. In 1292–93 the exchequer only contributed £19,651 out of £34,872. In 1294–95, the year of Langton's keepership in which wardrobe transactions were largest, the exchequer paid no less than £115,820 out of a total receipt of £124,792. For the whole period the proportion of the exchequer contribution averaged a little more

[1] *Pipe, 19 Edw. I.* No. 136, m. 31 d. See also later, p. 123.

[2] *Ib. 21 Edw. I.* No. 138, m. 26, "Idem reddit compotum de xliij c iiij xi li. ii s. viij d. chipotensibus, receptis de exitibus ducatus Aquitanie, rege tunc agente in partibus illis, que valent in sterlingis viij^{ml} lxxj li. viij s. ix d. et ob." For the meaning of 'libre chipotenses," see above, pp. 6-7, note 2. In the last two years of Louth's keepership, £22 812 : 19 : $11\frac{1}{2}$ were received "de exitibus noue custume"; *ib.* m. 26.

than eighty-four per cent of the whole wardrobe receipt. This was partly, however, because the king borrowed less. It is interesting to note that occasional sums were paid into the wardrobe from the revenues of Scotland. The earliest of these was a sum of £500, which represented the profits of Scotland in the days before Balliol was recognised as king, and when Scotland was under Edward's direct administration.[1] Ireland and Gascony also continue as sources of income.

By the end of Langton's keepership Edward's evil days were already beginning. Domestic dissension and foreign war were already making orderly housekeeping and thrifty finance impracticable. Langton's last wardrobe accounts owed their abnormal dimensions to the cost, both of the war with Philip the Fair about Gascony, and of the preparations to meet the threatened disturbances in Wales and Scotland. Not only were large sums paid by the wardrobe towards meeting these extraordinary expenses, but a large amount of money due still remained unpaid when Langton left the wardrobe for the exchequer. For every year of his service the wardrobe spent more than it received, and, when he laid down office, he left an adverse balance of more than £15,000. This was largely made up from sums due to the servants of the crown and notably to the officers of the divers officers of the household and of the great wardrobe.[2] Irregularities of this description made it difficult to draw up his final statement, and it was not until January 1300 that Langton's

[1] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* No. 144, m. 20, includes among the receipt of 22 Edw. I. "d libras receptas de Ricardo de Estham de exitibus regni Scocie in medio tempore, videlicet antequam rex creauit Johannem de Balliolo in regem ibidem." In the same roll is a payment by the earl of Buchan for his relief in respect to lands held in chief in Scotland.

[2] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* m. 21, "Et habet de superplusagio $\overline{\text{xv}}$ $\overline{\text{vj}}$ iij et xix li. ix s. ij d. et ob. Quod superplusagium debetur diuersis, tam officiariis hospicii regis et magne garderobe quam aliunde . . . de annis xx$^{\text{is}}$-xxiii$^{\text{is}}$." "Superplusagium," sometimes "surplusagium," in the technical language of the accounts, means not what we should call a "surplus," but a deficit from the point of view of the exchequer. It looks, moreover, as if Langton either paid much less in fact than he accounted for, or else that he had sources of revenue not revealed in the accounts. Despite his chronic adverse balances, he left £35,868 : 4 : 7½ in the wardrobe, which Droxford received from him on his retirement. This sum was included in the £64,546 : 4 : 2 (*ib.* m. 22), which Droxford gave as his "recepta de scaccario" for his first year. It may, however, only mean that this advance from the exchequer came too late to be included in Langton's accounts.

wardrobe accounts, ending in 1295, were completely rendered to the exchequer.

Even then Langton thought it wise to bring the disposal of his deficit before the Lenten parliament of 1300, the more so perhaps because it was the mutinous assembly which extorted from Edward the *Articuli super Cartas*.[1] In this parliament Langton requested that writs of *liberate* should be issued, empowering the exchequer to pay off at least that proportion of the deficit which had been long overdue to poor servants of the crown. Edward's dependence upon the magnates at this stage was eloquently shown by the need for his treasurer to ask permission of parliament to approve of the issue of writs of great seal, which normally required no more than a royal order to the chancellor. The king, moreover, was embarrassed by the novel situation produced by Langton having, as treasurer, to audit the delayed and unbalanced accounts which he had so tardily presented, as keeper of the wardrobe. It might well be that the barons of the exchequer would shut their eyes to irregularities in the accounts of a man who was their own chief, and that Langton's enemies might make capital out of the worthlessness of exchequer control under such unprecedented and suspicious circumstances. To remedy this, Edward appointed a special commission to relieve the treasurer of the odium of auditing his own accounts. John Langton, the chancellor, and Sir Walter Beauchamp, steward of the household, were assigned to hear and examine Langton's wardrobe account in the exchequer, along with Droxford, then controller, and now keeper (who was represented by his cofferer, Ralph Manton), and other officers of the exchequer. Having satisfied themselves of the regularity of the account, the chancellor and steward reported to Edward and his council on June 13 at York. The king accepted their report and confirmed the long-disputed account.[2]

[1] This parliament met on March 6 and was still in session on March 28, when the charters were confirmed (Stubbs, *C.H.* ii. 155), and on March 31; *Rot. Parl.* i. 143-145. Easter was on April 10, and it is unlikely that its meetings continued so long. The king kept Palm Sunday on April 3 at Stratford-le-Bow (see below, p. 92, note 2), and celebrated Easter at St. Albans; Gough, *Itinerary of Edward I.* i. 188.

[2] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* m. 21. The passage, though long, is important enough to be worth quoting. "Et memorandum quod cum idem Walterus de Langeton, nuper custos garderobe regis predicti, nunc Couentrensis et Lichfeldensis epis-

The difficulties which had been considerable under Langton became overwhelming under his successor Droxford. The

copus et thesaurarius regis de scaccario, termino sancti Hilarii, anno regni regis xxviij°, finalem compotum suum predictum de garderoba predicta, prout moris est, coram baronibus de dicto scaccario reddidisset, optinuissetque in fine eiusdem compoti superplusagium antedictum, cumque idem Walterus instanter petiuisset a rege in parliamento ipsius regis apud Westmonasterium in quadragesima, anno eodem, quod, quia id surplusagium pluribus, tam pauperibus et indigentibus personis, quam aliis ex causis diuersis particulatim debetur, in releuacione paupertatis personarum illarum, juberet rex breuia de liberate fieri de surplusagio antedicto, thesaurario et camerariis dirigenda, vt saltem pauperioribus et indigentioribus de minutis particulis inde eis debitis satisfieret, rex perpendens quod idem Walterus, dicto anno xxviij°, quo dictum compotum reddidit, fuit thesaurarius scaccarii supradicti, vt predicitur, considerans quod transactis temporibus factum consimile non contigit, et quod ex causa predicta posset oriri suspicio aliqualis, presertim cum quodam modo coniecturari valeat quod dicti barones ipso episcopo, tunc thesaurario existente, miciores et fauorabiliores in hiis plus solito se haberent, volensque vt maliuolorum animorum inuidiosa detractio super hoc reprimatur, ac emulis ipsius thesaurarii ex hoc perperam cogitandi materia vndique adimatur, quodque idem negocium securiorem sorciatur effectum, apud Strateford extra Londonias, die dominica in ramis palmarum, anno eodem [April 3, 1300], assignauit Johannem de Langeton, cancellarium, Walterum de Bellocampo, senescallum hospicii ipsius regis, ad dictum finalem compotum dicti Walteri in predicto scaccario recitandum et examinandum finaliter, et ad referendum ipsi regi statum et finem compoti antedicti. Qui quidem Johannes et Walterus de Bellocampo, die Jouis proxima post festum sancte Trinitatis, anno eodem [June 9], venerunt ad idem scaccarium, et, presentibus prefato thesaurario et Johanne de Drokenesford, contrarotulatore dicte garderobe de tempore ipsius Walteri de Langeton, per Radulphum de Manton, clericum ipsius contrarotulatoris, ad hoc loco suo positum, nec non et in presencia dictorum baronum et aliorum de dicto scaccario, et tam libris ipsius Walteri de Langeton quam libris predicti contrarotulatoris sui de particulis compoti antedicti inspectis, plenius prefatum compotum recitauerunt, et particularum suarum atque aliorum omnium que incumbunt, vndique concordancias diligentius examinauerunt, et tandem prefato negocio apercius perscrutato et sagacius reserato, cum omnia in predicto compoto prius reddito clara essent et plana, et nichil scrupulo vbilibet locum daret, iidem cancellarius et senescallus, de dicto scaccario recedentes, apud Eboracum die lune, videlicet xiij° die Junii, anno predicto, domino rege ibidem versus partes Scocie tunc agente, coram ipso rege et hiis qui de consilio regis tunc presentes aderant, statum suum predictum plenius ostendebant. Quo audito, rex sepedictum compotum prefati thesaurarii prius redditum, et sic, vt predicitur, coram prefatis cancellario et senescallo superuisum, examinatum et recitatum, acceptauit, ratificauit et confirmauit et pro confirmato decreuit. Et Otoni de Grandisono, inibi tunc presenti, similiter et cancellario et senescallo predictis iniunxit quod ipsi adirent scaccarium supradictum, et acceptacionem, ratificacionem, et confirmacionem regis predictas, ex parte regis in eodem scaccario recordari et ibidem inrotulari facerent, adiciens quod de predicto superplusagio, quod habet in isto eodem compoto, superuiso, recitato, et examinato, prout superius est expressum, predicti barones fieri faciant duas indenturas, partes quatuor continentes, quarum vna pars in garderoba regis sub sigillo scaccarii, altera pars in cancellaria sub eodem sigillo, tercia pars in thesauro regis sub sigillis dicti thesaurarii et contrarotulatoris, et quarta pars apud eundem

demands upon the wardrobe somewhat decreased, but there was apparently greater inability to meet them. Though in the first year of Droxford's office the accounts showed a large nominal surplus, adverse wardrobe balances soon became normal. In 1296–97 there was a deficit of over £13,000, and in 1297–98 a deficit of nearly £40,000. This latter was the more alarming since receipts dwindled in one year from £106,000 to less than £40,000, while expenses only diminished from £119,500 to £78,500. This year too was the year of Edward's long visit to Flanders, when the barons wrested the *Confirmatio Cartarum* from the regency in his absence. The decreased military expenditure may have resulted from the truce of Vyve Saint-Bavon, but the serious falling-off of income must have been a result of the conflict of king and baronage. The fact that the accounts for the three years 1295–98 were tendered by deputy may only have suggested the preoccupation of Droxford and his controller, Benstead, in high affairs of state, but may perhaps have helped to make business more difficult.[1] Yet worse

thesaurum sub sigillis baronum remaneant, vt sic in predictis cancellaria, scaccario et garderoba regis de predicto superplusagio per indenturas easdem, mencione habita pleniori illis quibus dicta debentur debita particulariter satisfiat cum optulerit se facultas, secundum quod idem rex efficacius duxerit prouidendum. Qui vero Oto, cancellarius et senescallus, die Martis, viz. xiiij° die Junii, anno predicto, ad idem scaccarium accedentes, predictam eis per regem iniunctam seriatim baronibus exposuerunt et ex parte regis eadem sic fieri et inrotulari in dicto scaccario preceperunt. Propter quod iidem barones indenturas predictas, et cetera eis per ipsos Ottonem, cancellarium et senescallum ex parte regis iniuncta, fieri fecerunt in forma predicta. . . . Et hec omnia similiter irrotulantur in memorandis anni xxviij^{i}, termino sancte Trinitatis." It is easier to understand the general drift of this passage than to explain all its curiously involved constructions. Its substance suggests several important points. (1) The direct personal share taken by the king in the details of government, at least as soon as the parliament was dissolved. (2) The correlation and interdependence of the various departments of the government, specially illustrated by the co-operation of the chancellor and the steward in auditing a wardrobe account. (3) The recognition of chancery, exchequer, and wardrobe as the three great offices of state, each with its archives. (4) The anomalous and unprecedented position held by Walter Langton, the strong desire of the king to support him, and the fact that, so early as 1300, Langton had already excited bitter opposition and envy. (5) The curious point that the counterpart to the exchequer seal is not here the privy seal but the personal seals of the wardrobe officers. The privy seal was not, therefore, so purely a "departmental seal" as was the exchequer seal. The enrolment in the memoranda roll referred to above can be found in *M.R., L.T.R.* No. 71 (28 Edw. I.), m. 46. The wording varies and is somewhat longer, recording, for instance, the amount of the "surplus," viz. £15,679 : 2 : 2. It clears up some doubtful readings in the pipe roll.

[1] Droxford's first account for 24-26 Edw. I. (the only one to be enrolled) was

was still to come, for after November 1298 the regular succession of enrolled wardrobe accounts, which had been uninterrupted since the fall of Peter of Rivaux in 1258, was broken off, and was not renewed until Edward II. came to the throne. And at the moment when the account for 1295–98 was presented, the debts of the wardrobe for the three years already amounted to £31,092 : 5 : 2½.[1]

Under these circumstances it is harder to generalise for the years 1298 to 1307 than it is for the earlier portions of the reign. We have indeed a great mass of fragmentary documents dealing with the finances of the wardrobe in each of these years, but the figures of three years only are presented in complete wardrobe books which give us a single conspectus, one of which is luckily accessible in print. In these three known years the proportion of exchequer receipt hardly remains quite so high as it was earlier, though it is still considerable, the figures being £49,048 out of £58,155 in 1299–1300,[2] £39,031 out

presented by Ralph Manton, the cofferer, his clerk and attorney, while Benstead was similarly represented by Peter of Collingbourn, his clerk and attorney; *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* m. 22. Its appearance on this pipe roll shows that it was promptly examined and passed. We know from *Exch. Accts.* 356/28 that it was presented by Manton at York, and that he received for tarrying at York to present the account to the exchequer expenses for 91 days, between Dec. 18, 1299, and March 18, 1300.

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 354/5 gives elaborate details of the "debita garderobe de annis xxiv^{is}, xxv^{is}, et xxvi^{is}." They included debts for the expenses of wages of the household, and also for the wages of soldiers and mariners. Over £6000 was on account of the great wardrobe, and was largely due to merchants of Brabant. These were not all paid in 1307, when Droxford undertook the burden.

[2] *L.Q.G.* (Soc. Ant. 1787), p. 15, "Summa totalis recepte preter scaccarium £9106 : 16 : 2½. Summa totalis recepte tam de scaccario quam aliunde de toto anno £58,155 : 16 : 2"; cf. p. 1, "summa totalis recepte per scaccarium, anno presenti xxviii^{o}, £49,048 : 19 : 10." It is no part of my scheme to examine critically Sir James Ramsay's figures for this reign as contained in his *Dawn of the Constitution*, pp. 542-544. The difficulties of obtaining exact figures are well known to all who have made the attempt, and much caution must be employed in working from any set of figures. As a specimen of the difficulties inevitably presented by such problems, we may take the figures of this 28th year. Sir James makes the total exchequer receipts of this year £37,398 : 13 : 4. The wardrobe account quoted above makes the exchequer pay into the wardrobe nearly £12,000 more than it seems to have received! Of course the "exchequer year" began at Michaelmas and the "wardrobe year" on Nov. 20, so that the close comparison of the two sets of figures must not be pressed. It is worth noting, moreover, that the meaning of these figures is totally misunderstood in Stubbs, *C.H.* ii. 581, where they are treated as if they constituted the whole revenue of the crown, and not simply the portion dealt with in the wardrobe.

of £47,550 in 1300–1301, and £50,010 out of £64,128 in 1305–1306.[1]

We may profitably illustrate the nature of the comparatively trifling sums now received from elsewhere than from the exchequer by an analysis of the foreign receipt for the year 1300–1301,[2] which will show how insignificant the items now were. The "issues of the great seal" accounted for over £1000; pleas of the hall and perquisites of the market amounted to about £200; the money and property of the hostages at Bayonne were £2135, the largest single item in the account. Large sums also came from the sale of stores, and from what seem to be sales of products of royal estates not needed for the household. If sheriffs figured on the list, it was as farmers of royal demesnes, not as the collectors of the national revenues of their shires. The only clear item of national revenue was the small sum that came from the collectors of the fifteenth in Westmorland.[3]

The impression produced by figures such as these is absolutely illusory. We have no need to wonder at the circumstance that the dependence of the wardrobe on the exchequer for its main revenue only began, when two men trained in the wardrobe became treasurers of the exchequer, William Louth and Walter Langton. It would be clearer to say that the exchequer now began to abdicate many of its functions in favour of the wardrobe. This statement, true to some extent of Louth's period, hardly overstates the facts during Langton's treasurership of the exchequer. It would be rash to attribute any voluntary limitation of exchequer functions to the chiefs of the exchequer, even if they had happened to have had a long apprenticeship in wardrobe traditions. Many of the changes we are about to describe were doubtless due to the chronic state of war which marked the last years of Edward I.'s reign. We have seen how,

Stubbs speaks as if the £49,000 were the whole revenue of the exchequer for the year. All it means was that it was the whole revenue of the wardrobe received through the exchequer.

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 369/11. But compare note 1, p. 128, later.

[2] *MS. Addit.* No. 7966 A, wardrobe book of 29 Edw. I., ff. 1-17.

[3] At all times small sums were from motives of convenience paid into the wardrobe. Thus in *Exch. Accts.* 362/15 we find small payments from the collectors of the fifteenth in 1301–3 paid to William of Warminster, the clerk of the dependent wardrobe of the king's younger sons, Thomas and Edmund. Warminster promises to indemnify the collectors in case of difficulties arising.

in earlier times, war threw special responsibilities upon the wardrobe. It was natural then that a long period of war should tend to make these increased responsibilities seem the normal state of things. Making all allowances for this, it is difficult, nevertheless, to avoid seeing in the exceptional activity of the wardrobe of the old king's last years some element of policy. It looks as if there was a deliberate strengthening of the administration which depended upon the household, as the king's best defence against the persistent efforts of the magnates in parliament to assert control over the more public machinery of the state.

A study of the issue and receipt rolls of the exchequer for the period between 1295 and 1307 suggests that the exchequer gradually abdicated the administration and distribution of the national revenue in favour of the wardrobe. The issue rolls of this period contain little more than a record of the sums paid over by the exchequer to the wardrobe. The other exchequer payments recorded are as a rule issues to the king's agents in Gascony on account of the war carried on there against Philip the Fair, and the ordinary expenses of the administration of the office, the wages of the barons and clerks, the cost of the parchment, ink and green wax, and perhaps a few pensions and grants in addition. It is not unreasonable to deduce from these facts the inference that the exchequer now contented itself with collecting revenue which it at once paid over to the wardrobe, which spent it as the king directed. War was the great preoccupation of the time; the wardrobe was the war treasury which received all income available and spent it to further the business in hand. It was in fact the war office and the admiralty, as well as the treasury and the ministry of munitions.

The method by which the wardrobe now received its revenue from the exchequer further emphasises the paramount position of the household financial office. The traditional method for the delivery of exchequer revenue to the wardrobe had always been a writ of *liberate*, issued from the chancery under the great seal and directed to the treasurer and chamberlains of the exchequer. Of old, however, the practice had been to issue such writs on behalf of the wardrobe for small sums as occasion arose. Sometimes, however, a *liberate* writ for a single large sum

was issued, by virtue of which the wardrobe clerks drew small sums from the exchequer according to their needs. When the amount of the writ was thus wiped off, another writ for a large sum was issued. Thus so early as 1275–76 the whole exchequer contribution to the wardrobe for the year was levied by a single writ for £3000.[1] Towards the middle of the reign the occasional big writ became the almost invariable rule. In the period we are now examining the fashion was for the chancery to draw up at long intervals a writ of *liberate* for a large lump sum, such as £10,000 or £20,000, which the exchequer doled out in small payments, or rather in tallies to the same amount, carefully recorded in the accounts of the year.[2]

It was easier for the exchequer to keep the wardrobe constantly supplied, since the original short sessions of the exchequer were now a thing of the distant past. The exchequer year still consisted of two terms for each of which separate receipt and issue rolls were made up. Michaelmas term still began "on the morrow of St. Michael" or the day after, if that were a feast day; Easter term similarly commenced "on the morrow of the close of Easter," that is on the Monday succeeding the first Sunday after Easter. By this time, however, both Michaelmas and Easter terms went far beyond the few weeks' sessions of the Angevin period. Moreover, a Hilary term and a Trinity term had been intercalated, in fact if not in name, in the exchequer year, and at these periods there was always a fair muster of exchequer officers. The exchequer was now technically "closed" only in "mid term," as the vacation interval between each of the terms was called. Even in these periods, which included not more than four or five months of the year, a clerk of the treasurer was always in residence to receive and pay such moneys as were offered or demanded, and to discharge any other routine business that might arise.[3] In fact Easter and Michael-

[1] *I.R., 4 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 35; *Pipe, 7 Edw. I.* No. 123, m. 23.

[2] The wardrobe accounts record the receipt of each of these liveries, ranged under the various writs, "primum liberate," "secundum liberate," and so on.

[3] The exchequer terms under Edward I. were roughly as follows: Michaelmas term began on Sept. 30, the "morrow of St. Michael," or a day later, if that were a Sunday or holiday. It went on to Dec. 13, the feast of St. Lucy. Mid term ("medium tempus") began a few days later, and lasted until Jan. 12, the morrow of St. Hilary, when the winter session, now beginning to be called Hilary term, was held. The Hilary session often ended on Shrove Tuesday,

mas were now more important as periods of account than as periods of receipt. Receipts and issues went on intermittently throughout the year, though with less frequency in "mid term." Perhaps the greater liberty of paying, when they would, made

or at latest soon after the beginning of Lent. Then came the Lenten "mid term" which was invariably prolonged until the Saturday after Easter Sunday, the eve of the Sunday called "Clausum Pasche." One curious result was that Easter itself and the whole of Easter week were from the exchequer point of view part of the Lent "mid term." Easter term began invariably on the "morrow of the close of Easter," the second Monday after Easter Sunday. It lasted until the Saturday before Whit Sunday (*R.R., 19 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 117). It could be prolonged for a week until the Saturday before Trinity Sunday (*ib. 29 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 150, cf. *ib. 35 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 167, *33 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 154). In the former case the exchequer was closed in Whit week; in the latter Trinity term succeeded Easter term without a break. This began on Trinity Monday and lasted until Aug. 1, the feast of St. Peter ad Vincula. The summer "mid term" followed from Aug. 1 to Sept. 29. In the latter part of Edward I.'s reign, the continuity between Easter and Trinity term was usual. On the other hand, Easter term virtually began on the Tuesday, as there were usually no receipts on the Monday after the close of Easter. The exchequer then closed on July 20 instead of on Aug. 1. The exchequer did not sit on Sundays or the greater feast days and was also closed at periods of national mourning. Thus, though Michaelmas term, 1 Edw. I., nominally began on Nov. 21, "the morrow of St. Edmund," the exchequer received nothing for more than a week, and was closed from Monday, Nov. 21, to the Saturday following (*R.R., 1 Edw. I., Mich.*, No 64). A regular entry in the rolls is the payment of wages "clerico thesaurarii moranti ad receptum in medio tempore post scaccarium clausum." In Michaelmas term, 31 Edw. I. this clerk was paid from Dec. 19 to Jan. 12, and again from Feb. 22 to April 14 (*I.R., 31 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 112). The receipts in mid term were generally very trifling, especially in the beginning of the reign, being, for instance, only £14 : 14*s.* in Mich., 5 Edw. I. (*R.R.* No. 82), and in Easter, 6 Edw. I., only 3*s.* 4*d.* (*ib.* No. 88). Sometimes they are not added up along with those of the term, a practice which has led to trifling errors in the calculations of some modern investigators of exchequer finance. For instance some of Sir James Ramsay's figures need revision, where he has not noticed that the "summa" excludes the receipt of "medium tempus." The mass of receipt was still paid in at the old periods; thus Mich., 27 Edw. I. (*R.R.* No. 144), £13,336 : 12 : 9½ out of the total receipt of £21,835 : 14 : 5 was paid in between Oct. 30 and Dec. 13; £736 : 5 : 1½ in "mid term" between St. Lucy and the vigil of St. Hilary; £4967 : 3 : 6½ in Hilary "term," and in Lent "mid term" £2795 : 7 : 9½, most of which was "in garderoba." The mid-term receipt has by this time become quite respectable. Under Edward II. even the treasurer might reside during vacation. See, for instance, *I.R., 15 Edw. II., Easter*, No. 198, "Waltero, episcopo Exoniensi, thesaurario, moranti ad scaccarium de precepto regis, ipso scaccario clauso, videlicet a xxvii° die Julii usque ad xxviii^m diem Sept., utroque computato, c li." This was in 1322, when the exchequer was at York. Of course the growing importance of the exchequer as a place for hearing pleas increased the need for fairly continuous sessions, and largely accounts for the approximation of the exchequer terms to those of the legal year of the two benches. The earliest exchequer plea rolls extant are those of 20 and 21 and 43 and 44 Hen. III. They form an almost continuous series after 1266; *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, No. iv. p. 64.

sheriffs and other royal ministers somewhat tardy in bringing in their money, and a warrior king, ever living from hand to mouth, could seldom afford to wait until his revenues had slowly filtered to him through the official channels. From the exigencies of Edward's immediate needs, other administrative changes now followed, which still further enhance the part played by the wardrobe in the management of the national revenue.

Edward I. was not the first king unable to pay the expenses of the year, which were already incurred, by the revenue of that year, which could only be collected towards the end of it. His was the eternal problem that still besets both individuals and nations that their creditors call upon them to pay their accounts before they have been able to collect the accounts owing to them. From the beginning of his reign Edward had only managed to pay his way by reason of the banking facilities offered by the Italian merchants. Through the advances of the Italians the king could anticipate revenues still uncollected or in the process of collection. In short, the royal revenues were mortgaged before they were due, just as the planter in an undeveloped country gets credit for the crops he is growing, before they are ripe or ready for the market. The prolonged crisis of Edward's later years demanded more facilities for advances than the Italians were willing to allow, though all that was possible was got out of them. The problem was how to utilise to the utmost, and at the earliest possible minute, such revenue as the king was able to expect. Some steps towards the solution of that problem were now taken, whereby an ingenious development of the tally system enabled the king to get hold of, or to anticipate, his revenue at an earlier date than was possible through the cumbrous machinery of payment from the revenue officer into the exchequer, and its subsequent disbursement from the exchequer in obedience to writs of *liberate* from the chancery. Mr. Hilary Jenkinson has shown how the tally, in origin simply a receipt delivered by the exchequer to the sheriff, or other revenue officer, for moneys actually paid into the exchequer, was also* used as an instrument of credit.[1] The characteristic conservatism of the exchequer

[1] *Archaeologia*, lxii. 367-380 (1911), "On Exchequer Tallies." The only omission of this admirable article is that Mr. Jenkinson has not noticed the part played by the wardrobe in the development of the tally into an instrument of credit. *See also* H. Jenkinson, "Mediaeval Tallies," etc., *Archaeologia*, lxxiv (1925), 289–351.

made a change in the form of the tally unthinkable and unnecessary. All that was done was to date the tally precisely by writing on it the actual day of the regnal year of the king. This, already done occasionally as a matter of convenience, became, after Friday, October 27, 1290, a matter of necessity by an ordinance of the treasurer and barons.[1]

It was easier to use the dated tally-receipt as an instrument of credit, like a modern bill of exchange. The tally, originally cut and delivered when the sheriff paid in the amount specified upon it, was now prepared in advance, and made to indicate a sum which the sheriff owed or was some day likely to owe; not what he had already paid. The notched and dated stick was delivered not to the sheriff, who as yet had no claim upon it, but to any person authorised to demand from the exchequer the payment of any debt due from the crown. In other words, the exchequer discharged the king's obligations not in specie, but in what was virtually an order on a collector of revenue to pay directly to the royal creditor the sum which otherwise the tax-gatherer would have paid into the exchequer. No doubt the recipient of the tally would have preferred to have been paid in cash, but an instrument which permitted him to collect the debt himself was not to be despised. Armed with his tally, he could now levy from the sheriff the sum specified on it as due to the exchequer. As soon as the sheriff paid the money, the tally passed into his hands. Thus the receipt made out in advance became a real receipt, as tallies were originally designed to be, and the sum mentioned upon it was duly credited to the sheriff, when he produced the tally in the exchequer at the time of his

[1] *R.R., 19 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 116, records under Friday, Oct. 27, 1290, "hic primum ordinatum fuit per thesaurarium et barones de scaccario quod datum regis Edwardi scriberetur in talliis factis in recepta." Two early specimens of such dated tallies are in *Exch. Accts.* 362/7. They are thus inscribed: (1)

xx

"Vicecom. Lincoln. de vj quar. fab. cum auantag. eidem lib. ad opus dni. regis apud Algarkirke, anno re. r. E. xxx°. Tall. Rogeri de Tynnketon, seruientis rectoris ecclesie de Algarkirke, contra Reginaldum fil. Sibille de sancto Botulpho attornatum." (2) "Vicecomiti Lincoln. de lx quart. bras. hastir. cum cumul. eidem lib. ad opus dni. regis apud Algarkirk anno regis E. xxx°. Tall. Rogeri de Tunketon, seruientis rectoris ecclesie de Algarkirke contra Reginaldum fil. Sibelle de sancto Botulpho attornatum." In the same file are indentures for the receipt of corn, peas, beans, etc. These tallies are clearly an alternative form of acknowledgement.

next account. The system was found so convenient that it became enormously extended within a few years. It became as usual for the exchequer to pay the calls on it by tallies as by solid coin.[1] Through it the very limited supply of specie in the country, which was necessary in war-time as a "store of value"[2] by which foreign campaigns could be financed, was economised as a "medium of exchange." The tallies formed in effect, though doubtless inadequately and accidentally, a sort of "wooden money," if we may use the phrase, and thus discharged, like wardrobe debentures, "obligatory letters"[3] which might be a substitute for tallies, and wool certificates, some of the functions of paper currency and other modern substitutes for specie.[4]

[1] In the receipt rolls of the latter years of Edward I., and of later date, recorded receipts are often annotated as either "sol.," that is "soluta," paid in cash at the exchequer, or as "pro" such or such a person. The latter formula means that tallies to the amount specified had been handed to the person mentioned, who was charged with the duty of collecting their equivalent from the sheriff or minister against whom they were issued. See Jenkinson, p. 369. In 1307 the assignment of tallies after this fashion was still so much of a novelty that it was sometimes thought wise to warn the officers, owing money to the exchequer, that tallies in respect to their liabilities had been made and delivered to such and such a person. Thus on July 6, 1307, the mayor and aldermen of London were warned by writ that a tally of 1000 marks, out of 2000 marks, due from them as their share in the aid "ad primogenitum filium regis militem faciendum," had been given to William Trente, king's butler, to be delivered by the said William to the said mayor and aldermen, when they had paid Trente the said sum of 1000 marks; Madox, ii. 261.

[2] Professor Ashley truly says that the function of currency in early times was "not so much that of a medium of exchange as of a store of value"; *Economic History and Theory*, i. 163-64. By the fourteenth century both functions were essential, but the second was still so imperative that it was urgent to economise the amount of money required for exchange purposes. Our recent experience shows that, under war conditions, the need is as great in the twentieth as in the fourteenth century.

[3] These could be issued both by the crown and by the bankers to whom it was indebted. For instance in 26 Edw. I. the Bardi and others owed Edward 15,000 marks "de quibus non habent tallias, quia habent literam regis sub sigillo scaccarii." The king had also a "litera obligatoria" of the merchants to repay this sum; *R.R., 26 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 143.

[4] Economic historians have hardly directed sufficient attention to the extent to which substitutes for currency were employed in the middle ages. The use of the tally, as described in the text, was a very effective way of economising the scanty store of specie available. For further extensions of this system of assignment, see H. Hall's *Customs Revenue of England*, ii. 185-198, and specially the instances on p. 190 of assignments by tally to Henry Snaith, keeper of the great wardrobe under Edward III., which have direct bearing on our subject. Another substitute for specie, the wardrobe debenture, was, as we have seen, to some extent a negotiable instrument (see above, I. 51, and also later, pp. 125-126). Similarly the letters patent, pledging the king to payments

In the working out of this modest approach to modern conditions of credit the wardrobe played a very conspicuous part. This was natural enough, since the wardrobe was the most elastic and adaptable of royal offices, and had nothing that corresponded to the rigid traditions of the exchequer to hamper its freedom to make experiments and novelties in the pursuit of the royal interests. The fashion of employing tallies as assignments of debts to the exchequer, if not devised in the interests of the wardrobe, was most largely and extensively

due for the specified amounts of wool, seized compulsorily in times of stress for the royal use, were potentially negotiable. There are numerous examples of these documents on the patent roll of 1297, *e.g. C.P.R., 1292–1301*, pp. 310-311. The system was much more widely used in the early years of the Hundred Years' War. I have not, however, found an instance in which a tally was negotiated from hand to hand. In the light of these facts I cannot but think that archdeacon Cunningham underestimated the facilities for credit advances in the fourteenth century, when he said in his *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, i. 326-327 (1890), "Dealing for credit was little developed and dealing in credit was unknown; hence there was no room for a large part of the functions of modern banking." Nevertheless, the only people who made large fortunes in the fourteenth century in England were the bankers. Little need be said of the foreign societies of financiers with their remarkable international activities, continuous organisation, and great scale of transacting business. It is really relevant to our main theme that the first English commercial family whose wealth opened up the peerage to them, the Poles of Hull and London, owed their riches mainly to their gains in "financing" Edward III.'s wars. The chief difficulties in the way of the mediaeval banker were the scarcity of accumulated capital, and the usury laws. There must have been an efficient system of bills of exchange, or their mediaeval equivalent, to have enabled large sums to be readily transferred from one country to another. But mediaeval bankers started as merchants, and only gradually specialised in finance when that was found more profitable. The method of the development of this merchant-banking class in Florence has been described, with an immense wealth of detail and illustration, by Prof. Robert Davidsohn, *Geschichte von Florenz*, ii. 402-434, and in the same writer's *Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz*, iv. 268-294: "Ueber die Entstehung des Kapitalismus." Yet Florence was only one of the capitalist centres of Italy, and it was not until Edward I.'s reign was well advanced that the Florentine companies of merchants loomed as large in English economic history as the societies of Lucca, Milan, Venice, and even Genoa, to say nothing of the Cahorsins, the Jews, the Templars, and the Hanseatic "Steelyard." Much more to our purpose are the first faint beginnings of English capitalism. The facts about the early history of credit paper are given in L. Goldschmidt, *Handbuch des Handelsrechts*, i, *Universalgeschichte des Handelsrechts*, especially pp. 383-465 (Stuttgart, 1891). The best, though very brief, short account in English is in W. J. Ashley's *Economic Organisation of England*, ch. iv. "The Rise of Foreign Trade: the Advent of Capital and Investment" (1914). Sir William Ashley, however, tends to understate the amount of credit business done, as also in his *Economic History and Theory*, i. 160 *et seq.* (1888).

used in its behalf. In the years of crisis and financial stress there was a real necessity that the king's wardrobe officers, who in Scotland, Flanders, Gascony, Wales, or England were financing and directing the royal campaigns, should obtain immediate possession of such revenue as was available for fleets and armies. In Edward's earlier years the wardrobe had directly collected taxes and negotiated loans. Political reasons had made it inexpedient to continue these practices any longer. Nevertheless, it was a great waste of time and energy that there should be any superfluous intermediate stages between the collection and expenditure of revenue. The problem was to suppress the unnecessary stage of exchequer collection and distribution. Direct collection by the wardrobe gave offence to the suspicious and mutinous baronage which still clung to the principle of the Provisions of Oxford that all the "issues of the land" should pass through the exchequer. It was not wise to irritate the magnates by disregarding their love of ancient forms. Accordingly, the extension of the tally system brought the wardrobe into immediate contact with the collectors of the taxes, while recognising, at least in name, the traditional rights of the exchequer. The substantial result was that the work of collection was, through this fiction, transferred from the exchequer to the wardrobe, whose agents scoured the country, and urged on the tax-collectors the need of speedily ministering to the royal necessities. The sheriff, or other minister, did his best to cash the tallies presented to him, knowing that the exchequer at its next accounting session would acquit him of the sums thus advanced on the authority of the tallies which the wardrobe surrendered to him on receipt of his cash. The result was that the exchequer ceased to have much importance as a "treasury," or hoard of money, and now had its main function as an office of accounts. In substance the Provisions of Oxford were evaded, and the mass of the issues of the land only formally passed through the exchequer.*

It must not be supposed, however, that no cash was transferred from the exchequer to the wardrobe. There is record evidence that sums of money were despatched from time to time to meet the king's necessities. This was particularly the case when the king was outside the realm, when it was impossible to make general use of the substitutes for cash payments that might be

imposed upon reluctant subjects. Bags of money, usually £100 in each bag, were sent, when the need arose, to the king on the borders to help his campaigning against the Scots. It was necessary, however, for the wardrobe clerks to keep a sharp eye on the amounts received, and it seems to have been a regular thing for the wardrobe to send to the exchequer its record of the exact sums thus forwarded, and we note that in many cases the amounts received were less than the sums professed to be sent.[1] Here we have another instance of the wardrobe's watchfulness as regards the exchequer.

As both the spending and the collecting office, the wardrobe dominated the finances of the later years of Edward I.'s reign, as it had never dominated them earlier or later. This fact comes out most clearly when we compare the two types of issue roll, drawn up by the exchequer in those years. The one usual sort of these rolls was distinguished from the other by giving in detail the advances, by tallies or otherwise, made to the wardrobe towards liquidating the current writ of *liberate*. These rolls are of considerable length, and generally written in double columns. The other type of roll, written in a single column, is of extremely small size, and records only trivial and unimportant issues. The principle on which rolls of this character were drawn up is almost impossible to grasp; the gross amounts accounted for in them are very small; but they are eloquently indicative of what little there was left for the exchequer to do without the wardrobe.[2]

[1] See, for instance, *Exch. Accts.* 369/14, "Defectus denariorum de illis denariis liberatis et receptis apud Carleolo." On May 26 and July 24, 1307, there were deficiencies varying from tenpence to two and ninepence in eight of the sacks of £100 each.

[2] A good example of both sorts of rolls for the same form of the same year can be studied in *I.R.* Nos. 104 and 103, both for Easter term, 27 Edw. I.; and *ib.* Nos. 127 and 125, both for Michaelmas term, 33 Edw. I. No. 104 is only 30 lines long, and records nothing of importance, save a livery of 2000 marks for Gascony. The other items, amounting to about £250 in all, are a grant to the king's daughter, Mary, the nun of Amesbury, a small payment to the Templars, and a few "annual fees" of which the most interesting is the half-yearly payment of the grant of £40 a year to Rhodri ap Gruffydd, the surviving brother of Llewelyn ap Gruffydd and the grandfather of "Sir Owen of Wales." No. 103, on the contrary, records payments to Droxford amounting to £10,848 : 10 : 7½ on account of a writ of *liberate* for £15,000, dated Westminster, April 26, 1299, and also gives the wages of the clerks and barons. The contrast of No. 127 with the fuller form of No. 125 is even more emphatic. The earliest double column roll that I have noted is *I.R., 5 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 35. Unlike those of a later period, the issue rolls of Edward I. seem never to be added up.

An examination of the exchequer rolls, and particularly the receipt rolls, enables us to date, within narrow limits, the period when the wardrobe thus once more took upon itself a main function of the exchequer. Up to 1290, when the ordinance of October 27 that tallies should be dated first facilitated this extension of their use as a rude species of exchequer bills, there is no clear evidence in the rolls that the wardrobe receipt from the exchequer came to it otherwise than in cash. The same was the case up to 1295, when on December 8 a small receipt is annotated *prestitum garderobe*.[1] However, in the Easter term following there is none. In 1297, 25 Edward I., the new system is well at work. Out of a total of receipts in Easter term of that year, amounting to £39,566 : 18 : 7, I have calculated that "receipts" to the amount of £7582 : 9 : 9½ are noted as *in garderoba*.[2] Now wherever the receipt roll has the phrase attached to an item, the corresponding issue roll states that the payment in question is *per talleas*.[3] The inference then is irresistible that those payments made to the wardrobe were made by tally, and that it was for the wardrobe's benefit that the system was devised.

The unbroken development of this system from these clear beginnings is not quite certain. Thus in Easter term, 26 Edward I., the formula *in gard.* occurs only once, though it is possible that this omission may be explicable.[4] Next year, however,

[1] *R.R., 24 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 138, records under Dec. 8, 1295, the receipt "de J. de Bebington, vicecomite Cant." of "xx solidos per Walterum de Huntercombe de prestito garderobe." In the right-hand margin is "prest. garder."

[2] *R.R., 25 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 141. The first is on April 31. The entries "in gard." are not numerous, but are often for substantial amounts, notably from lay tenths and fifteenths and from the new customs. The formula is "gard." or "in gard.," written on the right-hand margin against each payment so specified, or, when a group of such come together, the entry is written once, and a bracket indicates the entries to which it refers.

[3] Mr. Hilary Jenkinson, whose personal guidance has been of the utmost value to me in this part of my investigation, informs me that wherever the receipt roll has, in this and following years, the annotation "gard." the corresponding issue roll record that the payment is "per talleas." It is one of the thousand ways in which one set of records supplements and explains another. Acknowledgement by tally was, however, so common in the exchequer that a receipt "sine talliis" was important enough to be noted; see, for instance, *R.R.* No. 143, under May 4, when the money received for the sale of five horses by the treasurer is noted in both left- and right-hand margin as "sine talliis."*

[4] *Ib. 26 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 143. This roll records a total receipt of £25,985 : 7 : 0½. Out of this £9908 : 12 : 7 is put in a special "rotulus de

27 Edward I., the period of transition was over, though the exchequer receipt marked "in the wardrobe" was still small, totalling up in the Michaelmas term to only £1198 out of a gross receipt of £21,835.[1] In the succeeding year, 28 Edward I., the practice became further extended. One result of this was a great increase of the mid-term receipt, though the tally system made this little more than nominal.[2] Five years later, in 33 Edward I., the mass of entries in the receipt roll are recorded as being *in garderoba*. In Michaelmas term of that year the figures are, gross receipt £16,633 : 13 : 4½ and sums noted as *in garderoba* £10,395 : 16 : 10.[3] In Easter term, out of a gross receipt of £26,086 : 7 : 8, no less than £19,079 : 7 : 7 were "in the wardrobe."[4] These dates make it clear that the new system was the result of the co-operation of Walter Langton, in the whole of the period of his treasurership of the exchequer, with his successor Droxford as keeper of the wardrobe. Beginning on a small scale in about 1296–97, political exigencies led to its rapid extension. It became most widely extended by 1304, the year in which the exchequer went back from York to Westminster. It was one of the many

denariis receptis ad turrim Londoniarum a crastino Natiuitatis sancti Johannis Baptiste, anno xxvi°, usque ad xxviii^m diem Augusti, scaccario tunc existente apud Eboracum." The explanation of this Tower receipt is probably that London was a more convenient place to payers than York. £8000 of this receipt came from a syndicate of Italian bankers, and the rest was largely small sums of the "gard." type, received from the south-eastern shires. In the following years, see note 2, below, the London receipt was at Westminster. It is tempting to conjecture that the Tower receipt of 26 Edw. I. was a wardrobe receipt, especially as the wardrobe had a treasury in the Tower at that time. But this is unlikely, both because the 27 Edw. I. receipt at Westminster was received by exchequer clerks and because in 1322, when the exchequer was also at York, the treasurer himself received money in London; see *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 192. Moreover, the clerk receiving the money in 26 Edw. I. was Robert de Denar, who does not seem to have been a wardrobe officer.

[1] *R.R., 27 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 144, and *27 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 145. These contain a fair proportion of "gard." entries.

[2] *Ib. 28 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 147, where the "rotulus magne recepte apud Westmonasterium post scaccarium clausum in quadragesima" records receipts amounting to £2852 : 19 : 8. Nearly all the items were annotated "gard." The phraseology suggests that exchequer clerks who had issued the tallies at once handed them over to the wardrobe, which collected the sums which the tallies stood for and spent them.

[3] *Ib. 33 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 159.

[4] *Ib. 33 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 160. Of this sum I have noted elsewhere that £11,267 : 4 : 5 came in one amount from the Irish exchequer paid "in gard."; see below, p. 111, note 1. The addition of the sums recorded "in gard." have been made by myself, and I only vouch for their substantial accuracy.

expedients devised to meet the extreme pressure on the king's finances during the closing years of his reign.

A further illustration of the ways in which the exchequer depended at this time on the wardrobe is to be found in the numerous occasions on which the exchequer was subjected to the control of wardrobe clerks. I have already spoken of the significance of the fact that an ancient wardrobe officer was now treasurer of the exchequer. There were also several instances of the temporary discharge of exchequer functions by actual wardrobe men. Thus, when in 1295 William of March was driven from the treasury of the exchequer, Droxford, at the time controller of the wardrobe, was appointed *locum tenens thesaurarii*, until the king, on September 28, found a new treasurer in Walter Langton, keeper of the wardrobe.[1] Later, between February 10 and May 2, 1297, Droxford was "at the exchequer by the king's commission in the absence of the treasurer."[2] This period covered part of the time when Langton was engaged on a diplomatic mission to France and the Netherlands, which occupied him from July 23, 1296, to the end of 1297. The vast sums disbursed by him, especially to the king's foreign allies, amounted in all to £42,657 : 14 : 10¾ It was the treasurer of the exchequer who accounted for all these sums, mainly supplied from the wardrobe and from Italian bankers to Droxford as keeper of the wardrobe.[3] The same was also the case in the spring of 1302.[4] Again, when in 1305, Langton was constrained to defend himself from his enemies at the papal court, Droxford was

[1] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* m. 20, gives among the "recepta de scaccario" of 22 Edw. I., "Et per manus J. de Drokenesford, tenentis locum thesaurarii, et camerariorum, antequam aliquis assignaretur thesaurarius per regem, £6558 : 3 : 9." Compare *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 202, p. 44 (Westminster, Sept. 1, 1295), "J. de Drokenesford, moranti Londoniis retro regis ad se intromittendum de negotiis scaccarium tangentibus, xj li. x s." For Langton's patent of appointment to the exchequer, see *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 149. Unluckily the date of March's removal from office cannot be precisely indicated.

[2] *MS. Ad.* No. 7965, f. 19, lumps his expenses at the exchequer along with those of the wardrobe clerks then working at the wardrobe account, as £157 : 6 : 7.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 308/19, "Compotus de diuersis receptis, etc. . . . W. de Langeton, Cou. et Lich. ep., redditis in garderoba per J. de Drokenesford, etc." Guy of Flanders got £26,800 of this; Langton's personal expenses were £1388 : 9 : 5½; Queen Blanche of Navarre, £1566 : 14 : 4. Langton visited France, Flanders, the Cambrésis, and Brabant.

[4] *C.P.R., 1301–7*, pp. 32 and 41 show him thus acting between April 26 and June 15.

appointed by the king as the treasurer's lieutenant, acting this time from September 7 to at least March 20, 1306.[1] Once more, Langton himself was responsible for the treasury of the wardrobe for two months after he became treasurer of the exchequer, so that between September 28 and November 20 he formally administered both the treasury of the exchequer and that of the wardrobe.

A different but analogous case is that of Benstead, who on September 25, 1305, resigned his controllership in order to become chancellor of the exchequer in succession to the veteran Philip Willoughby, who had been a *garderobarius* before the beginning of Edward's reign.[2] When Benstead was sent abroad in 1306, Droxford, still keeper of the wardrobe, and lieutenant of the treasurer, also became *locum tenens* of the absent chancellor of the exchequer.[3] This tedious enumeration shows not only the extent to which Langton and Droxford continued to work together, but the way in which the exchequer looked to the wardrobe both for the supply of its high officers, and for the filling up of casual and temporary needs. The wardrobe was the central office which gave direction and policy to the Edwardian administrative system. Yet Langton took good care to keep the wardrobe under control. He was in modern phrase a prime minister controlling policy, and not a mere departmental minister of finance. The wardrobe obeyed the mandates of the treasury, and many of its expenses were warranted by Langton by "bill of the treasurer."[4] Thus the single direction of Langton made the co-ordination of the offices effective.

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 369/11, f. 37d and 38, "Domino J. de Drokenesford . . . moranti Londoniis et assignato a rege ad tenendum locum domini W. de Langeton, Cou. et Lichfeld. episcopi, domini regis thesaurarii, ipso thesaurario agente in partibus transmarinis penes summum pontificem, etc."

[2] *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 378; *Exch. Accts.* 309/9. Willoughby had himself been "locum tenens thesaurarii." for instance in Dec. 1295 (*R.R., 24 Edw. I., Mich. T.*, No. 138) and in April 1303; *I.R., 31 Edw. I., Easter T.*, No. 114. Willoughby died chancellor of the exchequer.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 309/11, f. 38. As another instance of the close personal relations of the two offices we may note that Droxford was one of Willoughby's executors; *I.R., 35 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 136.

[4] *Exch. Accts.* 370/9 (*prestita* of wardrobe for 35 Edw. I.) contains a large proportion of such. In *ib.* 370/12 are some of these treasury mandates. They are sealed on the face or back with Langton's privy seal, an oval-shaped stamp with the figure of an eagle with outspread wings and the inscription, "Secretum Walteri de Langeton." It is curious that as bishop he still kept a secretum with his personal name on it. Red wax is always used, as for other wardrobe mandates. Its shape differentiates it from the king's "secretum." Sometimes the personal seal of the wardrobe officer concerned is also appended.

One result of the plan of supplying the wardrobe by means of block grants from the exchequer was that it became possible to calculate from the issue and *liberate* rolls some approach to the amount of wardrobe income from the exchequer in the years in which no complete wardrobe accounts are preserved.[1] A complete list of the sums authorised to be drawn can be obtained from the *liberate* rolls, and the issue rolls show us that these sums, or tallies representing them, were really paid out of the exchequer, as well as the dates of the payments. As we may assume that the proportion of exchequer to "foreign" receipt was not very different in the unknown years to what it was in the years when the totals are known, we may thus make rough guesses of the approximate amount of wardrobe income for all the later years of Edward's reign. This method, with all its limitations, is at least better than that derived from attempts to add up the partial accounts of these years which still survive with great copiousness in the exchequer accounts. I have spent a good deal of time in attempting to make calculations of the revenue of the missing years from these accounts with very indifferent results. This is mainly because we can never be sure that the surviving aggregate of partial records is complete. Take, for example, the years 31 and 32 Edward I. (November 20, 1302 to November 30, 1304), for which there survives an elaborate account book of receipts.[2] The details

[1] The *issue rolls* of the double-columned and more elaborate type afford the readiest means of ascertaining both of these points. The *liberate rolls* are easy to handle and supply some gaps in the issue rolls. Besides the *liberate rolls* proper, which are chancery enrolments of the writs of great seal, ordering payments from the exchequer, the exchequer itself drew up rolls of "breuia de liberate persoluta" which are in effect a series of what may be called exchequer *liberate rolls*. Naturally this list of "writs paid" is not always identical with the chancery list of "writs issued." Thus in Michaelmas term 1 Edw. I. the "breuia persoluta" were only five in number and amounted to only £179 : 10 : 8½; *Exchequer of Receipt Lib. R.* No. 29. The chancery *liberate roll*, No. 49, of the first year records the issue of so many writs that they cover six closely-written membranes.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 365/6, "Recepta garderobe annorum xxxi^{i} et xxxii^{i}." I have roughly calculated the receipts for the 31st year, enumerated in this book, to amount to £40,144 : 19 : 7¾, and those of the 32nd year to £41,550 : 8 : 10¾. On the other hand, the issue rolls show that, in the exchequer year 31 Edw. I., the

given are very minute because the receipts dribbled in in small amounts, but the sums are not added up, and it is clear, by a comparison of the totals, that the amounts do not represent the whole receipts of the years, so that the books are only rough memoranda of partial receipts for certain portions of those periods. A further difficulty is that many items in these receipt books are cancelled, and of these some are clearly struck out as errors, while in other cases there is a thin line drawn through them, which in other rolls usually indicates simply that the items have been entered into some more definitive book or roll. Unluckily, it is very difficult to determine in each individual case which sort of cancellation is meant, so that any total reached is only conjectural.

Some interesting points, however, arise from the study of the receipt books of these two years of war, 1303 and 1304. The most important is that large sums of general taxation were now again paid directly into the wardrobe.[1] We have in particular considerable receipts from the new customs, handed in by the Frescobaldi, the farmers or collectors of these customs. Another point is that the crusading tithe, granted by Boniface VIII. to Edward I., was perhaps the most important single source of royal income in these years devoted mainly to the systematic reconquest of Scotland.[2] After this come the new customs. Large sales of royal stores and property; considerable sums from the issues of Gascony; a substantial amount from Scottish escheats and a surprisingly large contribution from the Irish exchequer all

exchequer paid the wardrobe £53,370 : 19 : 4; *I.R.* Nos. 112 and 114. The divergence between the exchequer and wardrobe years, amounting to less than three months, would certainly not account for so great a difference.

[1] Professor Willard has suggested to me the possibility that certain taxes were normally paid into the wardrobe and others into the exchequer. I do not feel very certain about this, but it is a line of investigation that might well be worth working out.

[2] There is much correspondence on this subject in the close and patent rolls. Boniface had granted half of the tenth to the king absolutely and the other half on the event of the pope's death, which soon followed. But Edward had difficulties in its collection. Moreover, its employment for this purpose seems to have involved a breach of faith on Edward's part. In Feb. 1303 the king ordered the collectors of the papal tenth to hand over the sums they had collected to keeper Droxford, notwithstanding a royal letter, assigning the papal subsidy to certain nobles of Gascony in payment of the king's debts to them. Apparently Edward broke his word to the Gascon nobles and used moneys promised to them for the conduct of the Scottish war.

swelled the royal income of that period.[1] Another important result followed from the method of accounting, rather than collecting, through the exchequer, namely that the old distinction of "foreign receipt" and "receipt from the exchequer" plainly lost a great deal of its meaning.[2] A large proportion of ordinary revenue clearly went straight into the hands of Droxford's officers, and the exchequer regarded it as "foreign," because it did not issue from it, though, under the older system, it would have passed through the exchequer. Now, however, it seems only to have been calculated as exchequer revenue for the purposes of the final account.[3]

Returning to the exchequer records, we can, as we have seen, calculate from the issue rolls the wardrobe receipt from the exchequer for the years for which we possess no wardrobe accounts.

[1] Thus in 25 Edw. I. there was £3027 : 15 : 10 from the Irish exchequer paid directly into the wardrobe (*R.R., 25 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 141). In 31 Edw. I. there were £658 : 4 : 2¾ "de eschaetis Scotie," and £1366 : 5s. from the "issues of Bordeaux," including Gascon customs (*Exch. Accts.* 365/6). In 32 Edw. I. there were £1440 : 5 : 9 from the exchequer at Dublin, and £1600 : 19 : 4½ from the issues of Scotland. The maximum Irish receipt that I have noticed is, however, the huge payment of £11,267 : 4 : 5, by tally, directly into the wardrobe in Easter term, 33 Edw. I. "de exitibus Hibernie"; *R.R.* No. 152.

[2] These considerations, with those mentioned in note 2, page 109, above, make it necessary to receive with extreme caution the figures of the "foreign receipt" of the wardrobe for 31 and 32 Edw. I. given by Sir James Ramsay in *Dawn of the Constitution*, p. 543. As far as I understand *Exch. Accts.* 365/6, only £8082 : 9 : 10 in 31 Edw. I., and only £4966 : 11 : 11 in 32 Edw. I. are entered as "recepta de thesaurario et camerariis," but there are numerous other items, including large sums from the papal tenth and such normally "foreign receipts" as pleas of the hall, issues of the great seal, fines and sales which are not entered as foreign receipt. This only begins on p. 9 and goes on for twenty-nine pages. Under it come many items which in earlier rolls would not be classed as "foreign," such as sheriffs' ferms. Moreover, most of these entries are marked "postea in onere scaccarii anno presenti." I incline to think that "recepta de thesaurario" mean the sums received in cash directly from the exchequer, and that the rest with its much larger total includes what the wardrobe collected itself, with or without tallies. But the satisfactory solution of the little problem would take far more time than it is worth.

[3] Further light might also be thrown on the receipts and issues of the wardrobe for part of 31 Edw. I. from *MS. Ad.* No. 35, 292; "Jornale garderobe de receptis et exitibus ciusdem, incipiens vii° die Aprilis, anno xxxi°." This is a day-book in two columns, headed respectively "recepta" and "exitus," giving with dates and places the details of each day's expenditure. It is doubtful whether any satisfactory results could be obtained from the weary labour involved in adding it up. Fairly complete information as to the "hospicium" expenses of 32 Edw. I. is easily obtainable from *ib.* No. 35, 293, a controller's book. Compare the not dissimilar "Jornale contrarotulatoris" for 34 Edw. I. in *ib.* No. 37, 655, which is limited to the accounts of the "hospicium."

They show a moderate and fairly uniform annual total, ranging from £30,000 to £50,000, a sum which corresponds pretty accurately to the known *recepta de scaccario*, in the neighbouring years for which accounts are preserved. Only for the broken last year of Edward I. was this sum exceeded. Between November 20, 1306, and the winding up of Edward I.'s accounts, soon after his death on July 7, 1307, the exchequer paid into the wardrobe £64,118 : 4 : 5.[1]

In the early and middle years of Edward I.'s reign, it is exceptional for the wardrobe expenses not roughly to balance its income, though income and expenses fluctuate very widely. Years of serious warfare were of course those of the greatest financial strain, and extraordinary military charges particularly affected the wardrobe. The exchequer held its sessions at Westminster or in some other fixed spot. Its seat might be moved from London to Shrewsbury or York at a period when the king's attention was mainly directed to Wales or Scotland, but it remained an immobile as well as a rigid and traditionalist body. The wardrobe, which followed the court, was less hide-bound by forms and was more directly under royal control. It was, therefore, a much more effective organisation for financing a campaign. Accordingly, we find the main strain of the wars of Edward I. thrown upon the wardrobe.[2] Thus the first Welsh war of 1277 involved in the fifth year of Edward I. a wardrobe receipt of more than double of that of the fourth year, and, as the revenue was not sufficiently elastic, the king was compelled to increase its amount to £35,700 by borrowing nearly £22,500 from the Lucca bankers. In this year the war expenses were distinguished in the accounts from the ordinary "mises."[3] They amounted to over £20,200, so that the loan

[1] *I.R.* Nos. 135 and 136. The writs of "liberate" in favour of the wardrobe issued for the last twelve months of Edward's life are worth enumerating. They were, Farnham, May 16, 1306, £20,000; Lanercost, Oct. 4, £20,000, Nov. 24, £10,000, and Feb. 1, 1307, £10,000; and Carlisle, April 1, £20,000, and July 28, £20,000. Total, £100,000. Of the last writ only £2813 : 5 : 2 was received by July 22; but further liveries, amounting to nearly £672, were made up to Aug. 8, "by letter of the executors of the deceased king." £4000 were also paid to Walter Reynolds, Edward II.'s treasurer, towards Edward I.'s funeral expenses.

[2] See for more details later, Section VI. pp. 131-145, "The Wardrobe in War Time."

[3] *Pipe, 7 Edw. I.* m. 23.

from the Italians was more than sufficient to cover them.[1] That the strain on the king's resources survived the year of actual fighting was shown eloquently by the fact that the very moderate expenses of the wardrobe of the succeeding sixth year could only be met by borrowing over £18,000 out of the £19,000 expended in all.

The second Welsh war of 1282–4 involved a much more prolonged effort than the campaign of 1277. The unprecedented sums now dealt with by the wardrobe led, as Sir James Ramsay has pointed out, to the receipts and expenses being recorded in special war accounts, and one of these, fortunately preserved and accessible in print, covers the whole of the second Welsh war from March 1282 to November 1284. The very instructive[2] figures of this account of William of Louth show that, within this period of less than three years, £102,621 were paid into the wardrobe on this special account only. Of this barely £6400 were transferred from the exchequer, so that nearly £95,000 were never touched by the exchequer officers at all. Revenues from every source contributed to make up this huge sum, including a small amount from the sheriffs' ferms and other ordinary revenues of the crown, just as it might have been paid into the *camera curie* of Henry II. The greatness of the total, however, depended almost entirely on its containing three great items of revenue. Of these the first was a sum of nearly £23,000 from the great customs on wool and leather, which on many occasions figure neither in the exchequer nor the wardrobe accounts, being directly paid over to Edward's Italian creditors, who in practice farmed them, just as the modern creditors of a corrupt Oriental

[1]

Summa misarum	£15,534 19 3½
Summa misarum de tempore guerre . . .	£20,241 18 6½
Summa utriusque . . .	£35,776 17 10

[2] "Compotus W. de Luda de receptis et misis in expeditione eiusdem regis in partibus Wallie super Lewelinum filium Griffini," etc. It begins, not as usual with Nov. 20, but with Palm Sunday 1282, the day of the commencement of hostilities. It is printed in the appendix to *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, pp. 326-336, R.S., from *Chancellor's Roll, 19 Edw. I.* mm. 1 and 13. It is also in *Pipe, 19 Edw. I.* m. 31, No. 136. For the following corrections of the printed text I am indebted to Professor Willard; p. 331, line 4, for "Lancastrie" read "Lincolnie," line 25, for "mmm ccc lxxj li" read "mmm cccc lxxj li."; p. 332, line 6, for "dxiij li." read "dxxxiij li." These details hardly affect Sir James Ramsay's analysis of the figures in *The Dawn of the Constitution*, p. 544.

despot, or a bankrupt South American republic endeavour to collect part of the revenues of the debtor states into their own hands.[1] The next item was a sum of over £36,000, derived from a parliamentary grant of one-thirtieth. The third item was a sum of £16,500, contributed by divers persons, for the support of the Welsh war, "as a means of obtaining the king's goodwill,"[2]

[1] The Italian bankers, who had since 1266 farmed the traditional customs duties (*Liber de antiquis legibus*, p. 109), collected the "great customs," set up in 1275, from the very beginning. See in *C.P.R., 1272–81*, p. 84, the appointment on March 27, 1275, of Luke of Lucca and the society of the Riccardi, merchants of Lucca, to take a custom called "the new aid." After 1290 the Riccardi cease to take the lead in financing Edward. Accordingly, in the last years of Edward's reign the Frescobaldi of Florence take the Riccardi's place as farmers of the customs and general bankers of the king (H. Hall, *Customs Revenue of England*, ii. 130, and R. J. Whitwell, *Italian Bankers and the English Crown* in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s. xvii. 175-234). This farming the customs did not necessarily prevent some parts at least being accounted for at the exchequer. In particular the "new customs" figure as sources of receipt in many wardrobe and exchequer accounts. There is also the question of special parliamentary grants and the extent to which these were included in the exchequer rolls. That this was the case to a considerable extent is certain. For instance we have included in *R.R., 19 Edw. I., Mich.*, No. 116, "recepta de quintadecima concessa de termino purificationis beate Marie, anno xix°" (1290). However, in all this roll the "recepta de quintadecima" are carefully distinguished from the "magna recepta," though the sum of the roll includes both, the fifteenth accounting for £8965 : 0 : 5½ out of a total receipt of £23,132 : 19 : 2½. Of course this only represents part of the receipts from the fifteenth, whose collection was spread over many terms. In the same way clerical grants were included in the receipt roll, as in *R.R., 19 Edw. I., Easter*, No. 117, where £1732 : 1 : 8 is received "de decima a clero concessa." In both cases one is left with the impression that "great receipt" normally means ordinary revenue, and that some grants do not figure on the exchequer roll. The extraordinarily difficult problem of Edward I.'s gross revenue from all sources cannot be solved simply by adding to the receipt rolls the "foreign" receipt of the wardrobe. Fortunately its determination is quite outside the scope of this work, which only aims at showing the relation of the wardrobe to the exchequer. It may be noted, however, that the usual title of the receipt roll, "rotulus magne recepte," almost suggests other sources of even exchequer income than this "great receipt."

[2] App. to Oxenedes, p. 332, "Et de . . . receptis a diuersis de subsidio regi facto in guerra sua Wallie . . . pro voluntate regis habenda." Besides the particulars of receipt contained in the roll, there is attached to *Pipe Roll, 19 Edw. I.*, a schedule numbered mm. 29 and 30, but consisting of much narrower skins than the ordinary membranes of the roll, containing additional particulars of the special receipt for the Welsh war. M. 29 contains "particule de receptis magistri Willelmi de Luda, quondam custodis garderobe regis Edwardi, filii regis Henrici, de subsidio eidem regi concesso ad sustinacionem guerre sue versus Lewelinum filium Griffini, principem Wallie, et Dauid, fratrem eius, anno decimo eiusdem regis, sicut continetur in particulis compoti dicti Willelmi de eadem garderoba." The sums are from towns, monasteries, the collectors of the subsidy and a few individuals. Among the contributory towns are Carmarthen with £153 : 6 : 8 and Cardigan with £66 : 13 : 4. The second schedule, m. 30, is entitled "Particule de receptis magistri Willelmi de Luda . . . de finibus pro seruicio eidem regi debito in exercitu Wallie, anno decimo." The gross total is £2959 : 2 : 2, and most of the fines are from abbeys, bishops, ladies and a few men incapable of military service in person.

very much after the fashion of the "benevolence" of a later period.

The same roll also contains the details of how the money was spent. All practically went in paying the costs of the Welsh war, and of the fortress-building and other operations subsidiary to it. The details of the payments are exceedingly interesting, but cannot be examined in detail here. Our business is neither with the Welsh war nor with the finances and armies of Edward I. But it is necessary to emphasise the fact that the heavy expenses of the special roll did not represent much more than half of the wardrobe expenses for these years of the conquest of Gwynedd. The ordinary wardrobe accounts for the period November 20, 1282, to November 20, 1284, have to be taken into consideration, as well as those of the war account from March 22, 1282, to November 20, 1284. The aggregate receipt of the two rolls shows a wardrobe receipt of £204,573 : 18 : 1 for the two years and a half. Moreover the ordinary roll, though including the normal household and other routine expenses of the court for these years, also included considerable charges that might almost be regarded as war expenses.[1] Never was the volume of wardrobe transactions again to become so great until we reach the stormy years that followed the great crisis of 1295.

We have seen how the long visit of Edward I. to Gascony between 1286 and 1289 involved, as on earlier occasions, the removal of the wardrobe there. The chief results of it on the ward-

[1] *Pipe, 13 Edw. I.* No. 130, m. 5 and 5 d. A study of this ordinary roll shows how entirely independent it is of the special war roll. While the whole Welsh roll was controlled by the counter-roll of the dead Gunneys, represented throughout by his clerk, Walter Langton, this is testified by Gunneys' counter-roll till Aug. 15, 1284, and afterwards by that of William of March. The inference is that Langton was specially set apart for the business of the Welsh war. More important is the fact that the expenses are here digested under the ordinary "tituli," "eleemosyna," "hospicium" and the rest. But a great many items of ordinary Welsh expenses are included in this roll, as for example the fee of the justice of Wales, Otto of Grandison, of the "chancellor of Wales," Adam de Wetenhale, and considerable military expenses, as for example a payment of £1489 : 7 : 1 to William of Preston for divers works, mainly castle building, in Wales. The roll also includes large payments of debts to Florentine merchants, and also to royal ministers and magnates.

robe accounts were that they were swollen to amounts at least as large as those of the first Welsh war in 1277; the two years' account from 1288 to 1290, covering the latter period of the king's absence, amounted to the heavy sum of £140,000. A wardrobe receipt of £70,000 for two consecutive years had hitherto been unprecedented in times of peace. A small share of this increased expenditure was due to the higher charges for the *hospicium*, doubtless the result of constant travelling with large armed escorts. This by 1290 had attained the unprecedented level of over £13,000. On the other hand, large amounts of Gascon issues now swelled the wardrobe receipt, without adding to the burdens of the English taxpayer.[1] The partial accounts of expenses, especially those for 15 Edward I., surviving in what seems the earliest of the wardrobe books, as opposed to rolls, give much useful detail as to the disbursements of this period.[2] Many of them, such as the expenses of the foundation of the new *bastides*, were purely Aquitanian in their scope. Yet they were not only paid for from the wardrobe, but wardrobe officers such as Louth and Langton superintended their execution.[3]

The wardrobe accounts between 1286 and 1289 show that the wardrobe was once more the travelling treasury of the king. Without its aid Edward could neither have administered Gascony, nor carried through his comprehensive diplomatic schemes. The exchequer at Westminster, under John Kirkby, the only minister of state left in England, had its work cut out in paying the costs of the government of England, including the heavy expenditure involved in suppressing the revolt of Rhys ap Maredudd. It was not able to supply the king in Gascony with sufficient sums for his needs, and the Gascon treasury, though energetically

[1] For instance in 17-18 Edw. I. there was a receipt from the issues of Aquitaine, "rege tunc agente in partibus illis," amounting to £44,191 : 2 : 8 chipotenses, or £8071 : 8 : 9½ sterling; *Pipe, 21 Edw. I.* m. 26. See above, pp. 7 and 89.

[2] *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 201. A well-kept, though imperfect, volume of 15 and 16 Edw. I., where the beginning of each titulus is marked by a parchment tag overlapping the margin for ready reference. The detailed "tituli" included in the book are "necessaria," £6029 : 14 : 6, "calciamenta," £36 : 3 : 8, "vadia clericorum," £135 : 11 : 3, "vadia et feoda militum," £1143 : 8 : 11, "vadia scutiferorum," £1377 : 11 : 6, "robe," £491 : 18 : 6. It is misdescribed on the back of the modern binding as "necessaria 10 Edw. I." See for the question of the change of wardrobe rolls to wardrobe books above, I. 47.

[3] See above, II. 64-65.

directed by Itier Bochard of Angoulême, the vigorous constable of Bordeaux, was not in a position to supplement it adequately. Accordingly Edward was, as we shall see later, forced to rely mainly on huge advances from his Italian bankers and especially from his old friends, Orlandino di Poggio and the company of the Riccardi of Lucca. All these loans were negotiated by Louth the keeper,[1] and it is to be hoped that he was able to keep his promise to pay them back before Easter. It is certain that the revenues of Aquitaine, charged with their repayment, were inadequate to such a burden.

Even before the special difficulties of his Gascon period, Edward had been compelled to make special terms with the Riccardi. Orlandino di Poggio, who had remained with Edward since his crusade and homecoming, had continued a loosely attached member of the wardrobe staff,[2] and was in Gascony all through this period. He was the "king's beloved merchant";[3] he and his partners were quit of all tallages in Gascon towns as members of the king's household.[4] Soon they were receivers of the customs at Bordeaux.[5] As "receiver of our revenues in the duchy of Aquitaine"[6] Orlandino was associated with the constable of Bordeaux in their disbursement.[7] Before long he also farmed out the ducal mint at Bordeaux.[8] But Orlandino, like the treasurer of the exchequer, was simply the source from which the moneys came. Their disbursement and administration rested mainly in Louth's hands, so that the king's treasurer of the wardrobe, with no other treasurer nearer than at Westminster, was the real financial minister of the crown. Louth kept the Gascon treasury in strict control. He was appointed jointly with

[1] "Per manus magistri Willelmi de Luda, custodis garderobe nostre, ad expensas nostras inde faciendas"; *R.G.* ii. 336. Louth is often simply "nostre tresorer"; *ib.* ii. 338.

[2] In the ordinance of 1279, "Orlandin quand il vient a la curt" shared with eight other "garderobarii" the coveted privilege of "lying in the wardrobe." Later, p. 163.

[3] "Dilectus mercator noster"; *R.G.* ii. 300.

[4] "Tanquam familiares hospicii nostri"; *ib.* ii. 454.

[5] *Ib.* ii. 308, 370.

[6] "Orlandinus de Podio, Lumbardus, receptor reddituum nostrorum ducatus Aquitanie"; *ib.* ii. 302. But Itier of Angoulême was "receptor superior"; *ib.* ii. 360. The designation of a Tuscan as a Lombard throws light on the origin of Lombard Street as a name for the banking street of the city of London. Leone of Milan is more correctly called a Lombard in *L.Q.G.* p. 159.

[7] *R.G.* ii. 302.

[8] *Ib.* ii. 374.

Burnell himself to audit the accounts of the former seneschal, John de Grailly, and of the former constable, Raymond de Mirail, and probably also of their successors.[1] As the constable of Bordeaux was normally bound to account to the exchequer, we have here another distinct usurpation of the wardrobe on the province of the most ancient office of the English state. Altogether, the wardrobe took as big a place in Edward's administration of Gascony in 1286–89 as it did in the days of his slow homecoming, or in the period of the Welsh wars. Its elasticity, adaptability, and close relations with the king made it the only instrument at all adequate for financing a crisis. It is perhaps a significant result of these large borrowings that the years following Edward's return are first characterised by that heavy excess of wardrobe payments over wardrobe receipts that was to mark most of the later years of the reign.

The final wars of the reign were almost as completely financed from the wardrobe as were the Welsh wars. The first abnormally large wardrobe account of the second half of the reign was that of 23 Edw. I., 1294–5, when trouble was beginning with France, Scotland, the church and the barons, and when the expenses of the expedition to Gascony bulked very largely in the roll.[2] A great effort was made to raise revenue to meet the new demands for expenditure and the result was the greatest wardrobe receipt of the reign, namely, £124,792 in a single year. Even this large sum did not balance the still larger expenses of £138,255. This marks the beginning of a series of years in which both expenses and receipts were enormous. But in nearly all them we find that the expenses exceeded the receipts. Of one of the years, 25 Edward I., 1296–7, we are lucky in having full details, both of receipts and expenses. The former are £106,356, while the latter exceed £119,000. The chief cause of the excessive expenditure incurred was the king's expedition to Flanders, between August 1297 and March 1298. Though only four months of this

[1] *R.G.* ii. 379. Compare *Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 201, p. 15. "Pro expensis magistri W. de Luda, thesaurarii garderobe, et quorundam aliorum de curia, morancium Burdigale circa necessaria domini regis ibidem facienda, et ad audiendum compotum constabularii Burdigale, per xxviij dies, xx li. iij s. iiij d. ster." Compare *ib.* p. 24. *Ib.* p. 16 speaks in 1276 of "scaccarium nostrum Burdigale," meaning the constable's department.

[2] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* m. 20 and 20 d., afford good material for these.

period were covered in the roll, the cost of it seems to have been extraordinarily heavy. Much less large, but still conspicuous, were the expenses of the fleets sent from Plymouth to Gascony. It is curious that the cost of dealing with the Scottish revolt, which had just won its great triumph at Stirling bridge, hardly came into the roll. The details of these accounts are worthy of special study, for they show, more completely than any wardrobe accounts before those of Edward III. in the Netherlands between 1338 and 1340,[1] how entirely the whole administration of the expedition was conducted by the wardrobe staff, who paid, horsed and equipped the armies, purchased and distributed supplies, financed the king's allies and the king's fleet at Plymouth, issued letters both of great and privy seal, went on diplomatic expeditions, and still provided the daily expenses of the household, down to the minutest particulars of fruit purchased for the king's table.[2]

Next year's account, 1297–98, lesser in amount, showed a far worse adverse balance, the huge sum of £78,549 for expenses being set against £39,826 of receipt. The figures for 1298–99 cannot be precisely determined,[3] but those for 1299–1300 are accessible in

[1] See later, in Vol. IV. pp. 104–5.

[2] It is in *MS. Ad.* No. 7965: the heads of the "tituli," and amounts under each, are "eleemosyna," £1144 : 7 : 4½; "necessaria et vadia quorundam qui non sunt ad vadia in rotulo marescalli, cum calciamentis diuersis," £6799 : 18 : 6½. "Victualia et staurum pro guerra Flandrie," £11,741 : 17 : 4½, besides a large sum, amounting to perhaps £42,000, but neither added up nor included in the accounts, under the head of "compotus in grosso factus . . . de bladis et aliis victualibus, tam de empcione quam de prouidenciis . . . quorum precium non computatur hic, nec allocatur ad opus regis pro guerra Flandrie." "Dona," £2386 : 12 : 1½, "vadia militum," £3675 : 11 : 7, "vadia balistariorum et seruientium ad arma," £1039 : 3 : 10, "vadia peditum, sagittariorum et operariorum," £7046 : 4 : 8½, "vadia nautarum," £5586 : 19 : 3 (of this £2093 : 3 : 7 for the Gascon fleet), "vadia nunciorum," £120 : 15 : 9½, "vadia falconariorum et venatorum," £339 : 12 : 11, "robe," £694 : 10*s.*, "jocalia," £1487 : 12 : 7½, the great wardrobe, wines, king's family, chancery, etc., £12,482 : 10 : 8½, of which the great wardrobe took £8718 : 17 : 5. "Moneys delivered to the counts of Flanders and Holland, the duke of Brabant, and other allies," £40,970 : 1 : 10½, "titulus de denariis liberatis et aliis diuersis . . . de quibus regi respondebitur pro sua voluntate," £12,808 : 2 : 8, "hospicium," £11,194 : 7 : 11½—grand total, £119,519 : 9 : 4½. Save the "hospicium," alms, and the trifling amounts for falconers and huntsmen, and part of the gifts, robes, jewels, great wardrobe, wines, and royal family, this is all *national* expenditure.

[3] In this year Richard of Bromsgrove accounted for £3001 : 19 : 6 received for victuals at Berwick; *ib.* No. 37,654, "Compotus Ricardi de Bremesgraue," as to "recepta victualium apud Berewicum de diversis vicecomitibus et balliuis,

print and show nearly £6000 on the wrong side. The accounts for 1300–1, another year of war, are among the worst. Here there was a receipt of £47,550 and expenses amounting to £77,291.[1]

The expenses continued constantly in excess of the receipts till the end of the reign. It is unlucky that we have not precise figures of either the receipts or expenses from all sources in such critical years as 27 Edward I., the year of Falkirk,[2] as

anno xxviio." Later, Manton the cofferer received expenses for being at Berwick, Nov. 20 - Dec. 24, 1300, "pro compotis de garnisturis castrorum eiusdem marchie faciendis"; *ib.* No. 7666, A. f. 29.

[1] Some of the figures of the expenses grouped under the more important "tituli" are again worth giving. "Alms, £943 : 7 : 3½. Necessaries, £8256 : 14 : 5. Victuals and stores, £8195 : 11 : 7½. Gifts, £5518 : 16 : 5. Restitution of horses, wages of knights, £8611 : 17 : 2. Wages of English archers, sergeants and esquires, including those of the Prince of Wales' household, £1409 : 14 : 3. Wages of foot soldiers, archers and workmen, £15,746 : 9 : 3½. Wages of seamen, £567 : 10 : 10; messengers, £83 : 8 : 6," etc. etc. Sum of payments under the above "tituli," £67,721 : 0 : 0½.—Total, including expenses of hospicium, £77,291 : 7 : 8½; *MS. Ad.* No. 7966 A. The excess of gross expenditure over revenue was, as in earlier parts of the reign, met by loans from the Italian bankers, who continued to collect the customs by way of security for repayment. The result of this is that, though receipts from the customs appear as revenue, either in the exchequer or the wardrobe accounts, we can never feel sure that they all appear there. We must note, however, that the wardrobe incurred most of the expenses which the loans were contracted to meet.

[2] In 27 Edw. I. we have the "recepta garderobe de onere scaccarii" of the whole exchequer year given in *Exch. Accts.* 355/9, those of Michaelmas term amounting to £9310 : 9 : 3, and those of Easter term to £10,848 : 10 : 7½. The latter figure is confirmed to a halfpenny by *I.R.* No. 77. This makes a total of only £20,158 : 19 : 10½ for the year, a sum smaller than that of any year since 21 Edw. I. To this, however, the receipt of Michaelmas term "anno xxvio finiente" must probably be added, the total of which is not added up in the roll. No complete accounts are preserved, but there are in *Exch. Accts.* 355/9, 10, 17, 18, 22, 27, and in *ib.* 356/1-9, 11, 18 and 28, a large number of small rolls, dealing with the portions of the receipts and expenses of the year. They are too fragmentary to make it possible to base any generalisations upon them, but *ib.* 356/11 gives the "expensa hospicii," month by month, and makes them amount to £11,600 : 8 : 8 for the year, though the items given only add up to £11,044 : 2 : 5; apparently, however, some days were omitted, as the twelfth month is given as only including three weeks and five days. That an account for the year was tendered in good time at the exchequer, we know from *Exch. Accts.* 355/27, which records that Droxford received at York expenses, between June 11 and 27, 1300, "morando pro compoto suo reddendo ad scaccarium una cum clericis garderobe ibidem existentibus, occasione compoti predicti." The king was at York, preparing for the Carlaverock campaign, and the exchequer was located there for that period. Droxford came from London for the account, having been "extra curiam" May 27 to June 10 (*ib.* 355/27, cf. *ib.* 356/28, which shows that, after the king's "recessus," he had stayed in London between April 22 and May 4, and then rejoined the court at Canterbury, and that part of the "ordinacio compoti" was not at York but at "Clifton juxta York," which, however, is only 1½ miles out of the city). It is certain, however, that the expenses were far greater than

31 Edward I., when the reconquest of Scotland was definitely undertaken,[1] and as 33 Edward I., the year of its apparent completion. It seems probable, however, that, though Edward now regularly spent more in the wardrobe than he received, none of these years represented so mighty an effort as that indicated by the figures of the 23rd and 25th years. Every effort was, however, made to finance the wardrobe from any possible source. Thus in 33 Edward I., the acquittance, issued to the sub-collectors of the tenth, imposed by Boniface VIII., with the king's consent, for three consecutive years on the English clergy, shows that a sum nearly approaching £10,000 was, up to that year, received from the sub-collectors by the hands of keeper Droxford.[2] But the bow was once more stretched to the utmost by the strenuous preparations, made in the last few months of Edward I.'s reign, to put down the rising of Robert Bruce, which made the broken 35th year of Edward I. one of the most expensive years of the reign for the wardrobe. But things had now long been in a bad state. Not only the constant excess of expenses over receipt, but the cessation of the enrolment of wardrobe accounts, the dilatory presentation of these accounts at the exchequer, the virtual abandonment of exchequer control, and the levying and expenditure of income by the wardrobe show that the last years of Edward I.'s reign were a period of unthrifty housekeeping. But the violent and arbitrary character of the last efforts of the old king to carry through designs too great for his resources gave

the modest receipts, and that the account was not passed at that period, for *ib.* 356/28, which dates from the early years of Edward III.'s reign, shows that even then it was not settled. The roll is entitled "calumpnie super compotum Johannis de Drokenesford, nuper custodis garderobe, de anno xxvijo regis Edwardi, *aui regis nunc*, videlicet in titulo de necessariis eiusdem anni, que terminari non possunt sine auisamento thesaurarii et baronum." These "challenges" are all of details, mainly concerning the personal expenses of the clerks "extra curiam." The accounts for the years 24, 25 and 26 Edw. I. were "ordered" together, and kept the clerks at work from Dec. 18 to March 18. Then followed the account for 27 Edw. I., which produced so many challenges. See further details as to the presentation and passing of the accounts of these and subsequent years later, pp. 128 and 129.

[1] On the difficulty of collecting precise figures as to expenses for all these years, see later, p. 127 and notes 1 and 2 in reference to the accounts of this year, contained in *Exch. Accts.* 364/13.

[2] The detailed acquittances are contained in schedules, attached to the patent roll, *C.P.R., 1301–7*, pp. 292-301. I make its total £9878 : 1 : 11½. The accounts are precisely kept.

their chance to the officers of the wardrobe. And for us the troubles of the last years of Edward I. are of special moment because they allowed the wardrobe to assume the greatest share it ever took in the direction of the policy and finance of the English state.

The repeated wardrobe deficits in the later part of the reign could only be met by constant loans. If these loans were larger in amount than those of earlier periods, at no time did Edward I.'s finances allow him to do without frequent borrowings. Once more then we note the large reliance of the king on the Italian bankers. At all parts of the reign a large share was taken by the wardrobe in the negotiation and payment of these loans. This state of things began from the moment of Edward's accession. His slow return to England to occupy his throne, after his costly crusade, made him dependent almost entirely on the Italian merchants, and especially on the Riccardi of Lucca. Between his arrival at Trapani on November 4, 1272, and his return to England in August 1274, "it was found that the said merchants had at divers times delivered into the wardrobe £23,364 : 4 : 2 sterling," besides a sum approaching £8000, which they had given to Robert Burnell, "who was then carrying on the king's affairs in England during his absence."[1] In addition to this the same merchants paid into the wardrobe, between October 18, 1274, and January 13, 1276, when Edward was in England, a sum slightly in excess of the large amount advanced to him when beyond sea. The result was that in a little more than four years a single firm advanced to Edward more than £54,000. It illustrates the temporary nature of this accommodation that by January 1276 more than £41,000 had already been paid back, and that Edward promised to pay the balance within a fortnight after the ensuing Easter.[2] From our

[1] *C.P.R., 1272–81*, pp. 131-132. See also page 4, above.

[2] *Ib.* p. 132. This temporary character of a mediaeval king's borrowings is worth noting, because it follows from it that it is misleading to add up, as is often done, the large amount of aggregate temporary advances made in such fashion as to suggest that the total sum represents his gross indebtedness. For instance, the late Mr. W. E. Rhodes has proved that Edward I. and II. borrowed at various times more than £420,000 from Italian bankers; *Manchester University Historical Essays*, p. 168 (1907). It would not, however, be legitimate to infer from this that these kings at the worst period of their finances were ever at any one moment in debt for more than a small fraction

point of view the important thing is that the wardrobe, and not the exchequer, had the sole control of these very extensive financial transactions, and that the wardrobe's monopoly of them, necessitated by circumstances when Edward was abroad, was allowed to continue after the king had returned to English soil.

For the twenty years that succeeded Edward's coronation the wardrobe continued to take the preponderating part in negotiating and receiving the loans required by the king. All the great loans, necessitated by the two great Welsh wars, the long Gascon visit and the obligations of Edward's early foreign policy, were paid into the wardrobe.[1] We are fortunate in having the details of the large loans, negotiated when Edward was in Gascony between 1286 and 1289. During those years Louth, the keeper of the wardrobe, received from Orlandino di Poggio and his society of the Riccardi of Lucca a sum which, apart from any sums repaid, amounted on the eve of the king's return home to more than £107,000 sterling.[2]

The wardrobe was equally active in managing a large number of the smaller advances.[3] We owe to the researches of Mr. Whitwell the establishment of the interesting fact that not a single advance from the Italian financiers was enrolled on the receipt rolls of the exchequer before Michaelmas term 1294–95.[4] It does not, however, necessarily, or even probably, follow from

of this sum. Except when the state was in the most extreme distress, it was always paying back its loans from the proceeds of the taxes as it collected them. Permanent funded loans were unknown. A loan was a temporary advance, like a banker's overdraft, and it was expected that it should soon be repaid. In itself the mediaeval prohibition of usury was an effective bar to a permanent system of funding. Distrust on the part of the financiers of the state's good faith was another.

[1] See, for instance, Whitwell *u.s.* p. 220 and Rhodes *u.s.*, especially the tables on pp. 158-166.

[2] The exact sums owed on Aug. 12, 1289, were £380,609 in "black money of Tours" and £12,632 : 19 : 6 in sterling; *C.P.R., 1281–92*, p. 318. Assuming that the rate of exchange was still that of 1279, namely, £4 black *livres tournois* for £1 st. (*ib., 1272–81*, p. 304), these sums jointly amount to £107,784. Up to June 27, 1289, Edward was in debt to the Riccardi £353,424 : 14 : 4 *t.n.* and £11,898 : 2 : 2 st. respectively; *R.G.* ii. 336.

[3] Mr. Rhodes's tables are especially helpful in regard to these. The exact references given by him immensely lighten the labour of those following in his steps.

[4] Whitwell in *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.* n.s. xvii. 219.

this fact that all sums, previously received from the Italians, had been paid into the wardrobe, though, as we have seen, a large proportion of them had been undoubtedly so rendered. In many cases we do not know where the loans were paid in. It would have been a lucky thing for historians if matters had been so simple that all sums, not paid into the exchequer, were paid into the wardrobe, but unfortunately things were much more complicated than that. Above all, it must not be forgotten that many of these loans were never paid in at all to any state department. The office of each of the leading banking firms was in effect an additional treasury, and it often happened that the king discharged an obligation by sending a mandate to some Italian society to pay a debt directly. We open almost at random a volume of the calendar of patent rolls, and find within the limits of two pages mandates to Lucca merchants to pay small sums to the king's spigurnel for the purchase of wax; to "Francis of Bologna, professor of laws," for his yearly salary; to the warden of Cinque Ports for the support of himself and the garrisons under him; small gifts to various envoys, and a foreign prince, and a very large sum on account of the marriage portion of the king's daughter about to be married abroad.[1] Such loans might or might not be recorded in the proceedings of the two great financial offices, but they had never need to figure on either exchequer or wardrobe accounts at all. The Italians commonly repaid themselves from the customs which they collected, or got the money from some fifteenth or similar grant which went to them directly from the collectors. With loans as with taxes, wardrobe and exchequer combined did not necessarily cover the whole field.

What the Riccardi of Lucca did in the early and middle years of Edward I., the Frescobaldi of Florence did, on even a larger scale, during the troubles of the great king's declining years. The result was the strong reaction against the alien financiers which came to a head early in the next reign. After 1294, however, large loans began to be paid into the exchequer, even though their repayment still came out of the customs or other revenue assigned *ad hoc*. A loan of £10,000, made by the

[1] *C.P.R., 1272–81*, pp. 298-299. "Francis of Bologna" was of course the famous jurist, Francesco Accursi.

Riccardi in January 1294,[1] was the last large sum of borrowed money, paid into the wardrobe in this reign, that is recorded on the patent rolls. Perhaps it had borrowed as much as it could procure.

The abundance of wardrobe documents at the end of Edward's reign allows us to illustrate the expedients to which the king was reduced to pay his way, and the part played in the wardrobe both in his extraordinary and ordinary disbursements. Despite all efforts, debt steadily accumulated, as floating debt often renewed tended to crystallise into something like permanent loans. Between 27 and 35 Edward I. the debts of the wardrobe, including those of the prince of Wales, amounted to £60,109 : 7 : $3\frac{1}{2}$,[2] all of which remained unpaid when the old king died. Edward owed money to his tradesmen, his courtiers, the clerks and officers of his wardrobe,[3] his high-born magnates and ministers, his soldiers and sailors, his crossbowmen, and his Welsh spearmen. The humbler members of his household were in arrears for wages, robes and shoes; royal gifts were promised but not paid; everything was in utter disorder. Various expedients to shift the burden were made. Sometimes the sheriffs of a district, especially when the king was quartered there, were called upon to pay, from the issues of their bailiwicks, debts which rightfully should have been defrayed by the wardrobe.[4] Very often a creditor was put off with an acknowledgement of his debt called a "wardrobe debenture." This was a little strip of parchment, sealed with the personal seal of one of the wardrobe clerks, and briefly recording the name of the debtor and the nature of the debt. Hundreds of these wardrobe debentures are preserved in the exchequer accounts, and the fact that they got to the exchequer shows that the obligations must ultimately have been faced, for they could only have been surrendered by the recipient to wardrobe or exchequer in return

[1] *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 59. It was a loan for the expenses of the household, and was to be repaid within two months.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 357/15, "Debita garderobe de tempore J. de Drokenesford," 27-35 Edw. I.

[3] *Ib.* 354/11.

[4] For example, *ib.* 367/10, "Indentura de nominibus diuersorum creditorum regis quibus vicecomes Lincolnie soluere assignatur de exitibus balliue sue." This was during Edward's stay in Lincoln in Dec. 1304 and Jan. 1305. The debts were all for household expenses, including parchment.

for the sums mentioned upon them. The large proportion of wardrobe debentures that are made in favour of *soldarii*, mercenary soldiers, at this time, shows that the wardrobe was still the pay office of the royal army.[1] The recipients of such letters could raise money on them by pawning them to the foreign bankers, who, if the debentures were not redeemed on a specified day, were authorised by the pledgers to sell them at what profit they could make. This selling at a profit was forbidden by Edward I. on October 28, 1304, apparently because it savoured of usury.[2]

The more one attempts to study and arrange in order the fragmentary records of the accounts of this period, the more one is baffled by the hopeless disorder and confusion of the finances of a king who was habitually overspending his income and postponing the day of settlement. It is true that the wardrobe officers drew up every year some sort of account. Thus the account for 27 Edward I. is endorsed *quintus compotus*, as if Droxford had sent in an annual statement for each of the five years of his keepership.[3*] We know also that the accounts of 28 Edward I. were tendered at Haddington, those of 30 Edward I. at Shene,[4] those of 33 Edward I. at Westminster,[5] and those of 34 Edward I. at Bray and Easthampstead.[6] Yet not one of these accounts was finally disposed of during Edward I.'s

[1] There are many hundreds of examples of wardrobe debentures in *Exch. Accts.*, especially among the documents subsidiary to wardrobe accounts. The simplest formula is as follows: "Debentur in garderoba regis Johanni de Corbrigg, soldario, de vadiis suis in guerra Scocie annis xxxi° et xxxii° . . . xvij li., xvij s., viij d." *Ib.* 367/14. [Seal.]

A more elaborate type is in *ib.* 360/2: "Debentur in garderoba regis Stephano de Stanham, tam pro denariis solutis per eundem pro officio coquine apud Lincolniam mense Februarii, anno xxix°, quam pro denariis sibi debitis pro pisce empto de eodem, per compotum secum factum in presentia magistri Johannis de Ardern per Walterum de Bedewynd, clericum garderobe dicti regis, liiij li. x s." Here there is no apparent trace of seal. The seal, however, is usually found. It is sometimes affixed, as above, to the end of the document, and sometimes attached *en simple queue*. The great majority bear the seal of John de Weston, clerk, but a fair number have the punning heron seal of Robert Heron. The seals are all in red wax, the wardrobe or privy seal colour. Weston was the paymaster of the army in Scotland, "clericus assignatus ad vadia equitum et peditum municionibus ville et castri de Berewyco super Tuedam, castrorum de Rokesburg et Geddesworth et aliorum castrorum Scocie"; *MS. Ad.* No. 35, 293, f. 30

[2] *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 187.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 355/27.

[4] *Ib.* 364/13. [5] *Ib.* 367/16. [6] *Ib.* 369/11.

lifetime. It looks as if the preliminary statements, drawn up by the wardrobe officers, were not in a condition in which they could be presented to the exchequer with any hope of their being accepted by that body.

It was not difficult to calculate receipts, but so few of the payments due were actually paid that precise calculation of the expenses became almost impossible. Let us take as an example the elaborate book of wardrobe payments of 31 Edward I., which contains over 200 pages, and but for occasional blank spaces seems carefully kept. The early entries are regular enough. The sums "allocated" to the various offices are sedulously detailed, and the sums actually spent are put beside them.[1] Before long, however, we get to the vague *titulus unde respondebitur* which soon degenerates into a long list of *prestita*, which seems incomplete and is never added up. We are forced to the conclusion that, despite its detail, no general view of expenses is derivable from the book. It is perhaps an evidence of the sense of unreality which those responsible for it must have felt, which led the clerk who drew up the volume to amuse himself by scribbling coarse or profane jests in the blank spaces.[2] It is no wonder that so slipshod a statement should only reach its final settlement in the reign of Edward III. Even a preliminary list of private *prestita* for the last twelve years of the reign was only tendered to the exchequer in 1315.[3]

[1] See for this especially *ib.* 364/13, ff. 1 d, 6 d, 16, 26 d, 30. A summary of the entries of the allotted and actual expenses of the "hospicium" for this year is as follows:

	Summa allocata in rotulo hospicii anni prioris.	Summa soluta.
Officium paneterie et buttilario .	£2,617 8 11½	£2808 13 9¾
Officium coquine . . .	4,366 3 1½	4276 4 8
Officium stabuli . . .	2,107 12 11	1088 3 7
Vadia	1,660 8 6½	1072 3 5½
Eleemosyna . . .	36 8 0	115 12 11
	£10,788 1 6½	£9360 18 5¼

[2] For instance, on *Exch. Accts.* 364/13, p. 103, is written: "Quicunque vult saluus esse ad tabernam debet esse seruare luxuriam"; and on *ib.* 359/14: "Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen Johannes erat. Inter natos mulierum non surrexit maior Johanne." Cf. later, p. 128, note 1.

[3] *Ib.* 354/10, "Prestita priuata facta in garderoba" 24 to 35 Edw. I. The sum was £6291 : 14 : 6, and the book was delivered to the exchequer in 1315 by Bedwyn, the former cofferer of Droxford.

It was nearly a generation after Edward I.'s death before the wardrobe accounts of the last years of his reign were finally passed and done with. All through the intervening time efforts were made to grapple with them, whenever comparative peace at home and abroad allowed the opportunity. Such attempts were made first during the period of the triumph of the ordainers, and again after the victory of the Despensers in 1322. The work was not, however, terminated until the period of general settlement which followed the fall of Mortimer in 1330. The accounts of the last full year of Edward's reign, that of 34 Edward I., were only presented in the exchequer on November 12, 1322, and were only finally passed, some time after the accession of Edward III., probably after November 1334. We still have extant the admirably arranged and beautifully written volume which represents the complete statement of Droxford for the whole of that year. On the face of it it is one of the most complete and interesting wardrobe books of this period. The more, however, we meditate over the method and date of its composition, the less we feel disposed to pin implicit confidence to all its contents.[1] The most casual inspection shows that the

[1] It is preserved in *Exch. Accts.* 369/11, and is entitled "Recepta et expensa garderobe de anno xxxiiij°." The title is endorsed "hunc librum continentem xxi quaterniones liberauit ad scaccarium Walterus de Bedewinde, attornatus domini Johannis de Drokenesford, xii° die Nov., anno regni regis Edwardi filii Edwardi xvi°." As in 1315, Bedwyn seems also to have had the main share in the work in 1322. His principal, Droxford, bishop of Bath and Wells in 1309, who joined the lords ordainers and was generally in opposition afterwards, died in 1329. In a slip at the end of *ib.* 369/11 is the following significant notice: "Libri compotorum garderobe tempore J. de Drokenesford, annis xxvij, xxviij, xxix, xxx, xxxj, xxxij, xxxiij, examinantur per Adam de Lymbergh et quosdam barones, et calumpnie inseruntur in quibusdam cedulis; onus tamen garderobe ad scaccarium de toto tempore illo non examinatur. Liber garderobe de anno xxxiiij° non examinatur plenarie, et sunt ibidem calumpnie annotate in quadam cedula. Libri garderobe de anno xxv° aui regis nunc, et anni secundi regis Edwardi patris, non examinantur. Item memorandum de onerando garderobam de tempore illo de receptis suis de custuma vinorum, de decima triennali et de aliis receptis suis forensecis." On the dorse of this are written the following: "A son cher amy munsire Otes de Graundisoun, cher fiuz," and "quod testimonium dant in celo, quod testimonium dant in celo, quod testimonium dant pro Spiritu et Filio." The latter seems a jest, based on the long time the accounts have taken to mature. Compare above, p. 127, note 2. The date of these last notes is hard to determine, but the mention of Adam of Lymbergh in connection with the barons of the exchequer inclines me to believe that the date must be subsequent to the accession of Edward III. Lymbergh, who was one of the remembrancers of the exchequer from 1311 to 1321, became constable of Bordeaux in the latter year, and was absent from England at the time when this account was presented to the exchequer. He was afterwards chancellor of Ireland, and keeper of Edward III.'s privy seal. He was made a baron of the exchequer on Nov. 9, 1334, and it almost looks as if his action in relation to these accounts was subsequent to that date. The point is not, however, at all certain.

account could hardly have satisfied the most perfunctory auditor.[1]

Thus tamely and ingloriously the great king's reign came to an end with broken-down finances. The very officers of a precise and orderly king dared no longer deal in a businesslike fashion with his debts and expenses, and all the checks which prudence and jealousy suggested were disregarded. One result of this confusion was, however, favourable to the wardrobe, for it was now frankly uncontrolled by any other service of the state. Just as in our own times we have seen the financial control of the House of Commons vanish amidst the rush and confusion, the heroic efforts and stern sacrifices of a mighty war, so the wars and troubles of the end of Edward I.'s reign soon resulted in the removal of that exchequer control which meant to the financiers of those times much what parliamentary control used to mean to our older statesmen. To save the form of exchequer audit, the wardrobe accounts were hung up for a quarter of a century, so that to trace their final fate we have to anticipate the history of the next two reigns. Even then the belated exchequer scrutiny was restricted and formal. All that in effect could be done was to write off bad debts and let bygones be bygones. The accounts of Edward I.'s last year were never examined at all. The substance of those of earlier years was left as it was presented, while trivial "challenges" of details

[1] A large number of the totals of the various "tituli" have been erased and others substituted for them. Generally the variation is trifling, but in some cases it is very considerable, as when on f. 21 d. the "summa recepte forinsece et preter scaccarium" was first given as £5932 : 12 : 2¼, and afterwards £14,118 : 3 : 1 was substituted for it. Again in the concluding general sum, the amount of "prestita," first given as £3142 : 0 : 6¼, is corrected to £3028 : 11 : 8¼, yet the "summa omnium expensarum" at the end still remains £80,460 : 16 : 4½, which is the sum of the erased total of "prestita" plus the unaltered "summa omnium expensarum," namely £77,318 : 15 : 10¼. If the correction in the "prestita" holds good, the "summa summarum" should be £80,347 : 7 : 6½. As the receipt was only £64,128 : 3 : 1½, there was a large deficit. But the years were badly confused. Thus the elaborate costs of the king's hunting establishment, on ff. 111-136, includes the whole period 28-35 Edw. I. It is clear that no estimate of expenses for 34 Edw. I. can be deduced from all this.

occupied to little purpose the time of the exchequer auditors. The wider moral of this collapse can only fully be drawn when we have studied the more open clash of prerogative and constitution, monarchy and aristocracy during the next reign.

SECTION VI

The Wardrobe in War Time

In the two preceding sections we have had frequent occasion to observe that the ordinary functions of the wardrobe were considerably enlarged, whenever war threw a special strain upon the administrative and financial resources of the English state.[1] This has been particularly the case, when in the discussion of the place of the wardrobe in Edward I.'s financial system we indicated the swollen wardrobe statements brought about by war conditions, and suggested the virtual subordination of the exchequer to the wardrobe as a result of the long series of crises of the later years of Edward's reign. But in times like those which we recently lived through, when the whole machinery of the state has been revolutionised in order to make possible the focussing of the national resources on the conduct of a world war, it may not be amiss to put together, at the risk of some repetition, a survey of the work of the Edwardian wardrobe in war time. If the directly financial aspect of this problem has been suggested already, something still remains to be said as to the administrative and more directly military work of the war wardrobe.

War was more chronic under mediaeval than under modern conditions, but, partly because it was so usual, it involved a much less exceptional strain on a nation than the vast national wars of modern times.[2] This was more the case since the purely professional military element was small, almost infinitesimal so far

[1] This is certainly the case under Edward I. Materials are insufficient to make it an equally certain generalisation under Henry III., though on certain continental expeditions we know that the wardrobe of that king played a part not unlike that played under Edward I. On the other hand the few surviving exchequer accounts relative to army and navy under Henry III. show the paymasters for troops and stores accounting directly to the exchequer, as, for instance, *Exch. Accts.* 3/2, 3/3, both of 48 Hen. III. I can find no evidence in *ib.* 3/1-10, of wardrobe responsibility, which begins rather with the Welsh War of 1277, *ib.* 3/17, and, quite conclusively, with *ib.* 3/30.

[2] I have worked out these ideas in "Mediaeval and Modern Warfare," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. v. Nos. 3-4, also separately published by the Manchester University Press, 1919.

as the profession of arms was a profession in the technical sense of a means of livelihood. The majority of those who cultivated the art of war did so as an incident of their social position rather than from any utilitarian or professional motive. But normal mediaeval conditions were disorderly to a degree that can hardly be understood in modern days, and a certain amount of martial equipment and discipline were the necessary obligations of the responsible citizen. Accordingly, it is harder to draw the line between war and peace in the middle ages than it is now. Though all organised warfare depended on improvised armies and improvised administration, the chronic riots and confusions compelled a policing of society that was fundamentally military in its character. Thus the wardrobe in peace slides imperceptibly into the wardrobe in war. But when serious war came, the wardrobe became extraordinarily important, both in controlling the improvisations and in disciplining and equipping the normal levies of the nation. We have seen one result of this in the increased expenditure of Edward I.'s wardrobe during his wars in Wales and Scotland, in Flanders and in Gascony.

Mediaeval resources were inadequate to carry through either such long-continued organisation of the national strength for war as has characterised modern Germany, or the splendid improvisations which in a year or two have made great military powers of the British and American states. But all serious warfare involves exceptional effort, and no mediaeval king ever took war more seriously than Edward I. It was lucky that Edward had in his household system a basis for such expansion of his administrative and military resources as war required. It was not that the king's household alone was called upon to extend itself to meet war conditions. Every baronial household was also expected to undergo a similar transformation, so that the *comitiua* of each earl or baron could, in proportion to its master's resources, play its adequate share in the great game. As the modern statesman prepares for war by the mobilisation of the nation, so did the statesmen of the fourteenth century make ready for battle by the placing of their domestic establishments on a war footing. Just as in peace the king and the great barons ruled, each over his own domains, through his normal household, so in war the magnates, chief among whom was the king, equipped, disciplined,

paid, and drilled their armies through an expansion of the same machinery. What the barons could do in this direction is only imperfectly revealed to us in the indentures or contracts of service in which, since Edward I.'s time, the magnates bargained in return for fixed rates of pay to put their followers at the service of the crown. What the royal household could do is more fully to be studied by sorting out from the details of the wardrobe accounts in seasons of war the large proportion of those which dealt directly with military expenditure and organisation.

Despite their abundance of detail, the material for Edwardian warfare afforded by the wardrobe accounts is intractable and difficult. In particular it is almost impossible to disentangle from the elements of expenditure items that only occur in war, since we find them inextricably mingled with elements that are common to war and peace budgets alike. Moreover, the whole point of view of the household clerks remains that of the service of the household, even when they are really dealing with war and not with domestic economy. It is, therefore, entirely inadmissible for the modern historian to make distinctions, important to him, but unintelligible from the point of view of those responsible for the accounts on which he has to work. The contemporary point of view is not only an absolute inability to distinguish between the services rendered to the nation and the services rendered to the household. It is based on the particular conception that the levying of war was to a peculiar extent the function of the king's household officers, and that the king's army was essentially the household in arms.[1] The beginnings of a threatened revolution in the art of war and the method of levying military forces emphasised this view. The country had now attained a stage which was fast outgrowing the feudal conception of warfare in which the army was made up from the military tenants who contributed to the crown, as the consideration on which they

[1] Thus the herald's poem, *The Siege of Carlaverock*, regards the "host" and Edward's "grant maisnie" (maisnie=familia) as synonymous (p. 2, ed Nicolas):

> "Dedems le jour que leur fu mis
> Fu preste tout le ost banie.
> E li bons roys, o sa grant maisnie,
> Tantost se vint vers les Escos."

held their lands, the gratuitous service of themselves and the quota of knights and men-at-arms which they were bound by their tenure to furnish. But we are still a long way off the full modern notion of the nation in arms, of a condition in which the state called upon every individual it had need of to play his part in the defence of his country. In this intermediate stage feudal and national military elements jostled each other, side by side, in the Edwardian army. How these armies were mainly composed is well known, and there is no need to repeat here what may be found excellently explained in the work of Dr. J. E. Morris and elsewhere. But the part played by the wardrobe in bringing together the various elements of the Edwardian army has not been sufficiently emphasised, even by those who have found in the wardrobe accounts the chief materials for the study of the armies of the fourteenth century.

In examining, even in outline, the main services of the wardrobe to the military policy of Edward I. some important distinctions have to be made. With the feudal levies themselves the wardrobe had very little or nothing to do. The part played in war by earls and barons and their *comitiue* lies practically outside its ken. Each magnate had the ordering of his household and retinue, just as the king had the ordering of his own. It was only when, under Edward I., military tenants began to accept the king's pay,[1] or when barons held some military offices under the crown, that they came, even in part, under the ken of the wardrobe clerks.[2] On the other hand, there was in every army a very large contingent supplied by the king from the resources of his household, whose small standing military element, when "mobilised" for war, became considerable in numbers and perhaps even more formidable in quality than in numbers. With the bringing up the household of the crown to a war level the wardrobe had almost everything to do. It was concerned, but only to a less extent, with the process of bargaining through which barons and knights of military tastes enrolled bodies of troops, and contracted by indenture to maintain them for specified

[1] Dr. J. E. Morris in his *Welsh Wars of Edward I.* has demonstrated the results of the acceptance of pay by the barons in bringing them under royal control. See also P. Dubois, *De Recuperatione Terre Sancte*, p. 123.

[2] See, for instance, the curious entry in *L.Q.G.* p. 201, as to the position of the constable, the earl of Hereford.

times, and at specified rates of pay, in the king's service. It had something to do even with the more distinctively national element of the army, that element which was neither feudal, nor household, nor *contractual*. This was the element provided by the levies, mainly of infantry and archers, compulsorily furnished by the shires, boroughs, and liberties, and set in motion by the sheriffs, mayors, and bailiffs of those districts in obedience to royal writ. But when the popular local levies were thus arrayed, the wardrobe might step in and undertake the responsibility for their pay, discipline, and conduct, at least until they had reached the place of muster. The result was that, while mainly responsible for some aspects of the king's army, the wardrobe might have something to do in dealing with every element of the royal forces. As the armies on sea and land were hardly yet differentiated, it had the same obligations to the navy as to the army. But, except as regards the household forces, it was not the sole authority, but rather worked concurrently with some of the other offices of the state available for such service. Let us consider these various aspects in turn, and, having dealt with the distinctively military work of the wardrobe, we can later consider more summarily its influence on war administration in general.

We must begin with the household forces. There was always a military element in the royal household, even in the times of the profoundest peace possible under mediaeval conditions. There were always a certain number of "bannerets" and knights of the household, each with a modest train of followers, equipped and prepared to protect the sovereign and his court when occasion arose. But the knightly element in the household was not there to fight, but to administer, though being military by habits and training and in this case also by profession, it could always use its swords if the need arose. Given adequate occasion, even the clerks of the household could bring their followers to the field. We must, however, throw the main stress on the small professional element of soldiers whose position in the household was not primarily to administer, but to guard and, if necessary, to fight. There was a little standing force of cavalry in the *seruientes ad arma*, the sergeants-at-arms, who in the Ordinance

of 1279 were twenty in number,[1] and by 1318 had mounted up to thirty.[2] This was the bodyguard, the horse-guard, of the sovereign, the element from which the "household cavalry" of more modern history arose. Each of these troopers was a personage of importance. In 1279 the authors of the Ordinance of Westminster thought it worth while to specify each of the twenty by name, and to prescribe that, when the stewards ordered the sergeants to provide three horses apiece, each sergeant was to receive as wages a shilling a day, but that, when merely two horses were required, eightpence a day only was to be allowed to each man. In 1318 the same wage still prevailed, and the obligation to provide three horses, a "barbed horse," a travelling horse, and a "sumpter horse" was generally imposed on the trooper.[3] The special duty in peace for these sergeants was to "ride armed each day before the king's person, when he travels through the country, unless they have other orders from the king or steward." Save for four, told off in turn to assist the usher of the chamber, who were to lie outside the chamber, as near to it as they could, the rest were to sleep in the hall, so as to be ready if the king had business with them.

Besides this little troop of household cavalry, there was an equally modest establishment of household infantry, whose origin goes back even earlier than that of their mounted comrades. The *Constitutio Domus Regis*, which gives no specific information as to the existence of sergeants-at-arms, assigned the high wage of fivepence a day both to the "archers who bear the king's treasure chest," and to "other archers" whose duties are not explained.[4] In 1279 they are not mentioned, but in 1318, there were twenty-four foot archers, bodyguards of the king, who were to go before the king as he rode through the country, and were to receive the wage of threepence a day.[5]

[1] Later, p. 163. [2] *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 281-282.

[3] "Vn chiuall d'armez, vn hakene et somer." The war horses were apparently issued from the wardrobe, because if any of them were "reuenuz en garderobe" or "moerge en le seruise le roi," the sergeant using them was only allowed 8*d.* a day wages. But the obligation of providing a fresh horse was imposed on him, and he was compelled to procure it by a day appointed by the steward and keeper of the wardrobe. If he failed to do this, his wages were to be stopped altogether; *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 282.

[4] *R.B.E.* p. 813. [5] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 304.

These troops were often Welsh, after the conquest of Gwynedd, and notably so throughout the reign of Edward II. They were the predecessors of the "yeomen of the guard" of the sixteenth century, and of the foot-guard of the modern British army. A constant semi-military element of the household was also found in the guards and watchmen told off for protecting the wardrobe and the other offices. These might, or might not, be the same as the yeomen already mentioned. A final permanent element of professional soldiers, paid and equipped through the wardrobe, was the garrisons of the royal castles, whose equipment, stores, "artillery," and munitions were always chargeable to the wardrobe resources. These were technically a part of the household, however far away from court they were stationed.[1] They were important as a small, though substantial, nucleus of professional soldiers which might be indefinitely extended if war arose.

The officering and disciplining of these modest elements of a standing army were determined by the ordinary household officers. It was natural that the stewards and the marshals should have more to do with such work than the wardrobe clerks. The stewards were responsible for their administration; the marshals kept the roll of their numbers and were responsible primarily for their discipline. The difficulty of two stewards sharing in the direction of the household forces may well have been a determining reason in leading Edward I. to reduce the number of stewards from two to one. Anyhow, the creation of the single steward happened to coincide with the time of the outbreak of the constant hostilities of the last twelve years of Edward I.'s reign. We must not, however, overstress the steward's position. We know too little of the actual military command of the household troops in war time to be able to feel certain as to his position in this relation. Moreover his colleague, the keeper of the wardrobe, shared with him even the administrative control of the king's guards. But there was no real differentiation between the military and non-military elements of the household, and all alike depended in the last resource on the joint authority of the steward and the keeper. They looked to the latter for

[1] *L.Q.G.*, p. 150, shows this for the Roxburgh garrison.

their pay and equipment; they may perhaps have looked to the steward for more military direction.

Both in officers and men the military nucleus of the household was small, but it provided *cadres* which might be indefinitely extended. We can illustrate this conveniently by referring to the only wardrobe account accessible in print, that of the regnal year November 1299 to November 1300. This represents a year of warfare, the year of the abortive winter campaign in the south-east of Scotland, and the almost equally unsuccessful summer campaign in Galloway, of which the least inglorious episode was the siege and capture of Carlaverock. For us the success or failure of the armies is a matter of indifference; the share of the household in their equipment and direction is the all-important matter. As we turn over the pages of the wardrobe account, we realise the immense efforts that were made, and the large share which the wardrobe clerks had in directing them. We discern much warlike effort in the title *de necessariis*. While ordinary wardrobe accounts profess only to include the "expenses of the household," this account is professedly in some places *expensa hospicii et exercitus regis*.[1] We find little else than army expenses in the *titulus de victualibus et stauro et garnistura castrorum*, wherein was set down to wardrobe account a large part of the provisioning and other expenses of the garrisons of the strongholds through which the king strove to keep down the Scots in uneasy obedience. The title *de donis et restauro equorum* curiously combines the gratifications to deserving warriors with their compensation for horses lost in the campaign. Above all, the titles dealing with wages and fees show how the knights and bannerets, each with their armed following, the skilled cross-bowmen, employed mainly in garrisons, the sergeants-at-arms, the squires and other mounted troopers, the infantry, the archers including those from Scotland or Ireland, the workmen, the sailors and others, employed on the lines of communication and in necessary transport and munitions work, were taken by thousands into the king's wages and swelled the little company of peace-time guards into the dimensions of a small army.

[1] *L.Q.G.* p. 104. There was a similar expansion of the prince of Wales' wardrobe in war time. See *Exch. Accts.* 360/16, "compotus de expensis garderobe . . . et de expensis exercitus sui in guerra Scocie."

Calculations as to numbers are difficult, perhaps impossible, for the mediaeval host varied from day to day, as alternating streams of recruits poured in to take the places of the laggards whom even the king's wages would not tempt to desert their homes and business for a long campaign. All ranks from the mighty banneret to the humble Welsh archer and the bricklayer or tent-maker were included in the lists. And all alike looked to the wardrobe clerks for direction, for pay, for equipment and support.

Of the two chief expeditions of the year 1299–1300, the winter campaign, based on Berwick, was waged by an army gathered together by contract,[1] while the Carlaverock campaign was mainly provided for by the feudal levies, more meticulously brought together on that occasion than for any campaign since the Welsh war of 1282.[2] The wardrobe accounts[3] show that the household contributed more fully to the latter than to the former movement. For the Berwick muster in December 1299, 22 bannerets and 44 knights of the household received their winter fees, amounting in all to £327.[4] But for the Carlaverock expedition not only did the slightly increased number of 22 bannerets and 53 knights receive "wages of war," but in addition each of these 85 captains was attended by a retinue of varying size, whose wages the wardrobe also paid. Thus the bannerets had a paid following of 64 knights and 265 esquires,[5] while the simple knights, receiving pay as principals, accounted along with their subordinate knights and squires for 185 more.[6] To these must be added the wages of nearly another 150 "cross-bowmen, sergeants-at-arms, and esquires, belonging to diverse

[1] Morris, *Welsh Wars of Edward I.*, p. 79, "the largest force raised by contract in this reign." Dr. Morris puts this campaign in 1297–8, but the date suggested in Bain, *Calendar of Documents of Scotland*, 1272–1307, p. 267, cannot be earlier than 1298–9. I have followed Sir James Ramsay, *Dawn of the Constitution*, p. 471, in accepting 1299–1300. But the question remains doubtful. In either case the military historian should combine Dr. Morris's remarks on p. 79 with those on p. 298.

[2] Morris, p. 298.

[3] Unluckily Dr. Morris has not used the *L.Q.G.* at all.

[4] *L.Q.G.* pp. 188-192. From the total of £590 on p. 195, the wages for later periods, on pp. 192-194, must be deducted. My arithmetic is only approximate.

[5] *Ib.* pp. 195-202. There were also eight Gascon "pedites" in the retinue of Amanieu of Albret.

[6] *Ib.* pp. 202-210. All these numbers are rudely approximate. As the details of each retinue show, the followers of each little company varied in numbers almost week by week.

retinues with 'appreciated' war horses."[1] Accordingly the sum of men-at-arms of the household, or at least in household pay, must have been something approaching 750, and the cost in "wages and fees" between eight and nine thousand pounds. The same tale is told, if we study the wages of the inferior categories. For both campaigns alike the infantry retained at the king's wages were largely marshalled and paid by officers accountable to the wardrobe. The natural inference from the whole figures is that the disciplined retinues of the contracting magnates for the winter campaign required less stiffening with household troops, also under good discipline, than did the miscellaneous levies resulting from the obsolescent process of the feudal array. But both armies alike required infantry support.

The use of the household organisation in supplementing any particular method of levying troops leaps to the eye. In war, even more than in peace, the wardrobe co-ordinated and balanced the various offices of state. It gave the *cadres* which could be swelled out by mobilisation into a force as disciplined as an improvised army can ever be.

Dr. Morris has deduced from a horse inventory, which he thought was our only source of information, a total of 522 mounted troopers of the household engaged upon the Carlaverock campaign.[2] He has made it clear also that the normal number of mounted men-at-arms which the Edwardian army attained was about two thousand. He therefore concludes that the household cavalry were roughly about a quarter of the whole number of men-at-arms, mustered upon this occasion. If my

[1] *L.Q.G.* pp. 216-240. I have deducted the large element of garrison troops from these entries. Considerable allowance should perhaps also be made for double entries. But there are many names on the list that do not occur in the other categories, including such famous youths as Peter of Gaveston and Gilbert of Clare (*ib.* pp. 229, 217).

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 8/23; Morris, pp. 299-300. Dr. Morris fully recognises what has escaped some historians, namely that the "Army, Navy, Ordnance, Nuncii," and other categories of "Exchequer Accounts" are as much "wardrobe accounts" as those described as "Wardrobe and Household." These misleading categories seem due to Joseph Hunter. Dr. Morris has given the only adequate account of the place of the household contingent in Edward I.'s armies in *Welsh Wars*, pp. 84-87, and has shown its steady growth between 1277 and the Scottish wars at the end of the reign; *ib.* pp. 115, 155, 272-273. It was no part of his scheme to show the part played by the wardrobe in controlling these troops or in dealing with the other elements of the army.

calculations from the *Liber Quotidianus Garderobe* are approximately right, I should put the household element at nearer a third than a quarter. However this may be, it constituted a very appreciable element in the whole array. Perhaps we may safely conclude that these proportions represent the maximum extent to which on mobilisation the "horse guards" of the crown could be extended. It is a far cry from the score of troopers whose wages were provided for in 1279.

It might be possible, but it would be very laborious, to make a similar calculation as to the proportion of infantry, equipped by the household, but the proportion would be inconsiderable, and the figures at best highly conjectural. On the other hand, special troops, who were useless without training, such as crossbowmen, artillerists, engineers, were all substantially amalgamated with the household service. These categories were regarded as mechanics, not as soldiers in those days. The only exception was the *balistarii*, who were largely foreign mercenaries.

The very clerks of the household took their share in the actual military struggle. I have spoken already of the military exploits of Manton the cofferer, who was more than a paymaster of the forces, and whose fighting energies soon led to his tragic death.[1] The chief wardrobe clerks each provided his *comitiua* of armed men, though personally they do not seem to have served. Thus Droxford's retinue included at its maximum six knights and twenty-two esquires,[2] Manton's some five or six esquires.[3] In 1303–4 Benstead served *tanquam banerettus* with one knight and thirteen squires.[4] On various occasions even the king's tailor, and the king's physician had horses appreciated for the war.

The warrior wardrobe clerk was not at his best before the days of Edward III. Military organisation was his primary function, not fighting. A hundred records show his ubiquity and energy in this relation. Thus we find Droxford

[1] Above, p. 22. [2] *L.Q.G.* pp. 202-203.

[3] *Ib.* p. 225. In the "Falkirk Roll of Arms" both Droxford and Benstead are said to have borne their banners among the contingents of Edward I.'s own "battle"; Gough's *Scotland in 1298*, p. 149. The roll is only known from late manuscripts of which the oldest only goes back to the sixteenth century.

[4] *MS. Ad.* No. 8835, f. 57. He had the banneret's "vadia guerre" of 4*s.* a day.

"under the inspection" of Beauchamp the steward, supplying the constables of Stirling, Edinburgh, Jedburgh, Roxburgh, and Berwick with every kind of stores, from ornaments and accessories of divine worship in the garrison chapels, to corn, beef, salt, and fish for the maintenance of the soldiery manning those fortresses.[1] The single job of "appreciating" the horses for which the crown was responsible, and of ascertaining those which were killed or "restored to the wardrobe," must have involved an immensity of detailed labour which fell exclusively on the wardrobe staff. For instance the Falkirk "roll of horses," fortunately accessible in type, contains forty-five pages of close print, dealing only with the horses of the household troops.[2] It is followed by another roll of over thirty pages, containing the list of appreciated and lost horses of those not belonging to the household, for which the wardrobe was equally responsible.[3] We must add to the quasi-military functions of the wardrobe the purchase of horses at home and abroad, the numbering of the slain and wounded soldiers, the transmission of orders, the conduct of diplomatic missions, the paying and mustering of the troops, the conduct of the infantry contingents of the shires to the place of muster, and a multitude of similar avocations. Besides these were the supply of clothing and stores which was the duty of the great wardrobe, the provision of arms and armour, now beginning to be the specialised work of the

[1] Stevenson, *H.D.S.* ii. 299-300, 307-328. These are all in 1298. The documents are indentures between the constable of the particular castle and the keeper or steward, or some agents acting on their behalf. Other records show the exchequer furnishing the money, *e.g. ib.* 401-402, but the sums are to be paid into the wardrobe; *ib.* p. 402. See also *Exch. Accts.* 8/1, "Compotus Ade de Blida de auena recepta" for 27 Edw. I., which accounts in detail for oats, beans, and other stores. Of all of these items it is noted: "intrantur in rotulo de hospicio regis de stauro." It is "pro prebenda equorum hospicii regis." The "*titulus de stauro*" looms very large in such accounts as that of *L.Q.G.* The "indentures" for provisions and stores under Edward I. are very similar in form to the "indents" that are still in everyday use in our armies of to-day, and quite as usual.

[2] Gough's *Scotland in 1298*, pp. 161-205 from *Exch. Accts.* 22/20. The household troopers' horses are just short of 800, of which some 95 were "interfecti apud bellum de Faukirke." The details as to marks, colour, etc., are most elaborate. The incompleteness of the entries, both as to identification and price, show where the system could not be carried through in all details.

[3] *Ib.* pp. 206-237. Here 564 horses are appraised. Only 19 of the "equi forinseci" were killed at Falkirk. Both rolls are exceedingly well and carefully kept.

"wardrobe of arms" that was to become before long the "king's privy wardrobe." Thus in war time the wardrobe was to a large extent both war office and admiralty, as well as the body ruling the household and state. It was even more specifically the army pay-office, the central ministry of recruiting and national service, the clothing and stores department, the ministry of munitions, the board of ordnance and the controller of such engineering, mechanical and technical services as then existed, the army service corps, and the ministry of information. Moreover, all that it did for the army it also did for the navy, though for wars waged within Britain against enemies who had little or no sea power the navy was little more than a means of transport and supply. If the scale on which these operations were conducted seems insignificant to us who have recently emerged from the greatest world war in history, it was hardly so in proportion to the resources of the nation at the period, or as compared with previous military operations. The magnitude of the military efforts of Edward I. as far transcended those of his predecessors as the war which has laid low German imperialism transcended the Napoleonic wars, or the Napoleonic wars the war of the Spanish Succession.

It must also be noticed that it was just in these years of almost continued war that the chancery and exchequer stood most in the background, or at least co-ordinated their efforts most completely with those of the wardrobe. Accordingly, the functions discharged by the wardrobe in peace time were carried on with exceptional energy and on a larger scale in days of war. It was in war that the wardrobe received and distributed the greatest proportion of the national revenue, that it became the body most nearly corresponding to the foreign office and the diplomatic service; that it was in a fashion a sort of "war cabinet." It was then that the wardrobe most fully undertook the work that the treasury and Bank of England now perform for the issue of floating loans and the maintenance of the national credit. It had even those sinister relations with foreign capitalists which have caused some to see the "hidden hand" of the alien controlling our modern policy. It was in war times that the most copious stream of writs of privy seal and other wardrobe documents imposed duties on, and made known the king's will

to, all sorts and conditions of his subjects. It was when the king was with his army in Wales, Scotland and Flanders that such anomalies as charters under the privy seal are most frequently to be found. Edward ruled his realm as well as his household and host from his quarters in the field. He could not have done all that he did, but for this free, elastic and energetic instrument of his supreme will.

We must not suppose that any of the functions above enumerated were the exclusive province of the wardrobe, or that the half score, or less, of wardrobe clerks were capable of assuming all these responsibilities in person. If in ordinary days of peace the wardrobe staff had to call in chancery clerks and others for the arrangement of the annual accounts, it was even more urgently in days of war compelled to extend its staff by calling in officers from other departments, or helpers from outside the government service. Thus we find that for such a matter as the arraying of the infantry levies and their conduct to the place of muster, though the general responsibility, including the whole financial burden, was with the wardrobe, it was seldom that a wardrobe officer could be spared to conduct the operation in person. In the wardrobe accounts of 1299–1300[1] we find that sometimes the constables, who on their armed horses acted as commanding officers of the infantry units, were directly accountable to the wardrobe for the expenses and wages of their contingents until they had come up to the fighting line. As often, however, a clerk was assigned to discharge these duties of mustering and payment. A large proportion of these specially appointed clerks were chancery clerks, who now helped the wardrobe in its military aspect as they helped it in its secretarial aspect in peace.[2]

[1] *L.Q.G.* pp. 241-270, "titulus de vadiis peditum," etc.

[2] Among such chancery clerks conducting infantry levies to Berwick for the muster of December 1299, *ib.* pp. 242-243 shows Hugh de Burgh responsible for 625 "sagittarii pedites" of Westmorland and 446 of Cumberland for 7 days; Roger de Sutton, 112 from Notts and 116 from Derby for 11 days; John de Selby, 940 of the bishopric of Durham for 7 days (these were the men whose mutiny spoilt the campaign; Morris, *u.s.* p. 296, G. T. Lapsley, *County Palatine of Durham*, p. 128, Harvard Hist. Studies, 1900); Adam de Brome (the future founder of Oriel College, Oxford), taking 2 knights, 23 constables, and 3494 archers of Yorkshire to Carlisle for 2 days. Burgh on other occasions brought up other Westmorland levies (*L.Q.G.* p. 253), and other Yorkshiremen were under the charge of a fifth chancery clerk, Thomas of Cornwall (*ib.* p. 253). They often acted by the "view and testimony" of the knights, or chief constables, who had military command of these units; *ib.* p. 243.

We have seen how the exchequer closely co-operated with the wardrobe in the financial aspect of all these matters. And the stream of wardrobe writs and letters was supplemented by copious torrents of writs of chancery and writs under the exchequer seal. The local officers, especially the sheriffs, all did their part also. But the wardrobe seems to have been, here as elsewhere, the unifying and connecting link. Thus what in our own days has been done by multiplying government offices was done under Edward I. by the strengthening of the resources and personnel of the wardrobe. Though no exclusive claims can be set up for it, it is not too much to say that the wardrobe supplied the machinery through which it was made possible to administer the wars of Edward I. As is inevitable, the period of war witnessed a great increase in bureaucratic control, and an improvised bureaucracy, gradually learning its special business, often did its work badly and was in constant danger of breaking down. But it carried things through somehow, though at the expense of the dislocation of its ordinary machinery, of the confusion of the national finances, and of the creation of a strong feeling of resentment of household and wardrobe control which is one of the characteristic features of the reign of Edward II. Yet, despite all this, there was no other possible alternative. This is clearly seen when we find Edward III. administering the early stages of the Hundred Years' War by exactly the same methods as those adopted by his grandfather in the conquest of Gwynedd, the attempted conquests of Scotland, and the only continental campaigns in which Edward I. took a personal part.

SECTION VII

THE WARDROBE IN ITS RELATIONS TO COUNCIL AND PARLIAMENT. THE BEGINNINGS OF OPPOSITION TO THE WARDROBE.

The history of administration has up to now run through channels parallel to, yet independent of, the ordinary courses of constitutional history. We have, accordingly, been able to study in detail the administrative history of the reign of Edward I. without in the least troubling ourselves with what is to most scholars the central fact of the period, the development of parliamentary institutions. The essential point of the great councils, and of the parliaments which grew out of them, is that they were occasional and intermittent phenomena. The essence of the administrative machinery is that it is always in existence, continually at work. Even in modern times parliaments, whose chief ostensible function is to pass new laws, may perhaps in the long run exercise less influence on national development than does the administrative machinery by which this legislation is executed. In mediaeval days, when the idea of novel legislation was repulsive to the common mind, this was still more emphatically the case. What availed the parliament, which met at the best for a few weeks in the year, as compared with chancery, wardrobe and exchequer which were always at work?

The popular parliaments of Edward I. grew out of the feudal great councils, of which they were an "afforced" and representative development. The great council of magnates in its turn was but an aspect of the *curia regis*, the royal household strengthened and enlarged by the magnates who went to court on great occasions or at seasons of special necessity. The root, then, of the popular parliament was the household, just as much as the household was the source of all the offices of the administration. The primary business of councils and parliaments was to give the king advice; the fundamental duty of the administrative offices was to embody in action the will of the king. But in

practice the advisory and the executive functions must necessarily overlap; most of all must they overlap in a political system so fluid as that of the middle ages. We are bound, however, to make distinctions that come to little in practice. It is only by such a process we can make any distinctions at all in mediaeval institutional history.

The advisory and the executive functions approach most nearly in the permanent king's council which was always at his side to help him in dealing with problems of government as they arose. The royal council, the privy council as later ages called it, is often treated as itself an executive body. This view is true enough of the last century or so of the middle ages when everything was preparing the way for the system of "government by council" perfected in Tudor times. It is unfortunate, however, that even the latest and best of the historians of the council has to some extent followed the fashion of the lawyers, who see history as a plane surface, subjected for all time to the legal system in which they have been brought up. They have read the Tudor conditions into the history of the thirteenth- or fourteenth-century council, just as peerage lawyers have read the hereditary house of lords and the ridiculous doctrine of abeyance into the history of the reign of Edward I. They cannot help regarding the council as an executive office, as a branch of the administration. But the real function of the council was to give advice. If the king took the advice, he generally associated the council with him in responsibility for the resulting action. But the decision was the king's alone, and any consequent executive acts came, not from the king in council, but from the ordinary administrative machinery. Such an act might be embodied in a writ of great seal, and so become an act of chancery. It might be translated into a writ of privy seal and thus become a function of the wardrobe. If it mainly concerned finance, it was very likely to result in a writ under the seal of the exchequer, and accordingly the executive agent was the exchequer. But in no case did the council, as such, act, though often enough the council figures in the marginal annotations of the chancery rolls as the sole source of warranty of an executive act embodied in a chancery writ. There was also, as time went on, an increasing tendency for the council's advice to materialise into writs of privy seal;

but it is quite wrong to regard the privy seal as in any special sense the seal of the council.

Professor Baldwin has rightly emphasised the unity of the council in all its forms. He refuses to distinguish between the various designations of the council of "great" or "ordinary" or "privy" or "continual."[1] He might even have gone farther and maintained the identity of idea between council and parliament. But true though this doctrine is, it must not be pressed too far. To the practical historian there is all the difference in the world between the permanent council, which was always at the king's side, and the occasional great councils and parliaments, summoned by special writ and going home as soon as their work was done. Though the one shades into the other, they were as different in their outward shape as the acorn is different from the oak.

The executive offices and the council are, then, different in kind, and the only real problem for us is the extent to which the former had influence on the latter. This means in effect the extent to which the officers, forming the staff of the administrative departments, participated personally in the councils and parliaments of their time, and also the degree to which they influenced the deliberations of these assemblies. Naturally their influence was more intimate on the smaller ring of permanent councillors than on the great councils, which were essentially aristocratic in their origin, and ultimately also became widely representative in character. But the early Edwardian parliament was not composed of the "three estates," the lords, commons and clergy of later times. It was essentially a single body, in which the initiative and power rested with a limited circle of men, accustomed to politics and affairs. It was an assembly which, save when moved by great gusts of passionate opposition, was content to be guided by the king and his advisers. We must not be satisfied, therefore, in stressing the well-known facts that all the chief officers of the crown, clerical and lay, were sworn in the king's council,[2] and that, parliament being an enlarged council,

[1] J. F. Baldwin, *The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages* (1913), notably p. 111, where he remarks: "In spite of great diversities of membership and responsibilities there was but one sworn king's council, whether it be called secret, continual, wise or great."

[2] The keeper and controller of the wardrobe, the steward and chamberlain, were always members of the council. The chief chancery and wardrobe clerks, the barons of the exchequer and justices of the two benches were generally councillors also. But the council could always be strengthened in any particular direction, if the need for special advice arose.

they naturally took their places in every parliamentary gathering, whether specially summoned or not.[1] It is more to the purpose that a large proportion of the initiative and the discussion in all parliaments lay with them, and that the magnates only could withstand their influence. They had, therefore, a weight quite out of proportion to their numbers. But numbers in a mediaeval assembly mattered little. We have not yet got to the stage where decisions were arrived at in large bodies by a counting up of votes for and against a measure.

Professor Baldwin has well emphasised the exceptional difficulty of determining the stages by which the "king's counsellors" became the "king's councillors," the process by which a fluid and ever varying number of advisers crystallised into something approaching an organised royal council. That process had certainly made great strides by the reign of Edward I. We have seen that in his days there was a definite king's council,[2] with oaths and obligations, and a specific, though still fluctuating body of members. This council could be broken up into sections; part could attend the king abroad or on a campaign; another part could remain at home at the seat of government and give advice to the regent, just as the itinerating council could give advice to the king. But the king was not more peculiar in having a council of advisers than he was in having a household administration and a wardrobe. Just like the king, the great magnate had his council, and if our period saw a great development in the organisation of the king's council, it witnessed an even greater consolidation of the councils of the more important feudatories.

[1] See Introduction to *Mem. de Parl.* summarised above, pp. 82-83, as a striking illustration of the importance of Droxford, Benstead and their peers in the important and characteristic parliament of 1305. They seem to me as much "members of parliament," if you will "members of the house of lords," as any of the summoned magnates, even if the terms of their summonses to attend the council may vary in phraseology from the summonses directed to the "barons" or knights or burgesses.

[2] The clause of the household ordinance of 1279, enacting that the treasurer of the wardrobe, one of the stewards, and "vn del conseil le rei sil vnt" (below, p. 161) should examine the accounts of the great wardrobe, shows both the recognition of a defined class of "councillors" and the intimate relation of the council to even a subordinate branch of the wardrobe.

The reasons for both processes were partly the universal development of administrative machinery, and partly the accentuation of the conflict between monarchy and aristocracy which followed the aristocratic reaction that attended the collapse of the Angevin despotism.

The composition of the royal council fluctuated with the ebb and flow of the aristocratic tide. The king's view was that he might take counsel with whomsoever he liked, and that in the long run the wisest counsel came from the loyal officers of his household, who spent their lives in his service, who had learnt by long practical experience the art of government, and who considered his interests above all other things.[1] On the other hand, the baronial view was that the earls and barons, the archbishops and bishops, were the natural-born advisers of the crown, and that, if the king would not listen to their views, it was their duty to impose them upon him by threats and, if need be, by violence. The barons allowed the great officers of state to be councillors, for they were almost invariably magnates. They saw no evil in the *ex officio* councillorships of the judges of the two benches, for they were unlearned laymen and needed the technical skill of the "sages of the law," who already, before the end of a successful career, might well aspire to swell the baronial ranks. But the chief clerks of the chancery and the barons of the exchequer were also councillors, and, lower down than these, were the councillors, clerical and lay, of the royal household. But to the barons the king's *familiares* were courtiers, adventurers, men on the make, with no natural stake in the country and with little to lose if their advice led the nation into disaster. There were thus two conflicting theories as to the composition and functions of the king's council, the curialist view and the baronial view. Neither view prevailed wholly for any length of time, and the practical compromises,

[1] An interesting illustration of the extent to which Edward I. identified "consilium nostrum" and "familia nostra" can be read in *R.G.* iii. 307-308, a patent of June 13, 1289, in which the king, when about to leave Gascony, gave Itier of Angoulême, constable of Bordeaux, power "retinendi de consilio nostro seu familia nostra personas illas quas viderit expedire," and of assigning to them an appropriate fee for their services. This power was given both to Itier and his successors as constables. Thus Edward in 1289 regarded the Gascon council at Bordeaux as an integral part of the "familia regis," and assumed that this view would be permanently held.

which were made between them, were adjusted upon occasion in accordance with the comparative strength of king and magnates at the moment. We have seen how great were these fluctuations under Henry III. At the end of his reign the royalist tide flowed strongly, and Edward was able to reap the fruits of the victory which he had done so much to win.

Edward I. was every inch a king, and at every stage of his reign regarded the feudal magnates as his natural opponents. But his personal friendliness with some of the greater earls, the fairness and moderation shown in most of his dealings with them, and, above all, his absorption in great military and diplomatic adventures made it easy for king and magnates to work together with surprising harmony for nearly a quarter of a century. The latent opposition of interests comes out at times in such matters as the *quo warranto* enquiries; but both the patriotism and the interests of the barons combined to make them support loyally the king's general policy. They had their recompense, not only in the large share given to them in its execution, but also in the new marcher principalities which rewarded their services against the Welsh and in the enormous grants to English magnates of Scottish lands forfeited by "disloyal" native owners who favoured the local rivals of Edward's claim to rule directly over Scotland. In practice Edward I. was shrewd enough to remember earl Warenne's famous dictum that as the Norman Conquest of England was the joint work of king and barons, and consequently the land had to be divided between them, so now in the distribution of the spoils of victory in Wales and Scotland the magnates must have a full share of the spoils. The king was only from one point of view in opposition to the magnates. From a very practical aspect his interest, as the greatest of the magnates, was that of every large landed proprietor. Both socially and politically the relations of king and magnates were not those merely of lord and vassal, of master and servant. The king was simply regarded as the greatest of the magnates. King and barons were, in short, joint partners in a common enterprise. That enterprise was none other than the governance of England.

Under such conditions the *familiares* and the magnates might well sit together in the councils and ministries of the sovereign

and have very little consciousness of any opposition of interests between them. It followed that there could be no hard and fast line drawn between the household and the public officers of the crown. Under Henry III. neither the king nor the opposition barons had made any such distinction, and even the Provisions of Oxford regarded household reform as a subsidiary matter that might be postponed indefinitely. The systematic co-ordination of the public and domestic offices by Edward I. was but the working out of the same principle in a more thorough-going fashion.

With the failures of Edward I.'s policy and the revival of baronial opposition in the early 'nineties, the situation gradually changed. The king, as we have seen, relied more than ever on wardrobe clerks, and made the wardrobe more and more the central directing force of his whole administrative system. With the aid of his household servants, Edward renewed his systematic attacks on the lands and the franchises of the magnates. Already a royal official, like Adam of Stratton, had shamefully united spiritual and mundane terrors to secure for the crown the rich lordships of Holderness and Wight, the inheritance of Isabella of Fors. Before long Edward and his wardrobe-trained ministers were to avenge the *Confirmatio Cartarum* on the earls of Hereford and Norfolk by coercing them into the surrender of their estates and dignities to the crown and the acceptance of a regrant for the term of their lives only. The spiritual magnates, Bek and Winchelsea, were driven into banishment after an even ruder fashion. For the last dozen years of his reign, there was fierce rancour between Edward and his magnates, and, violent as were the old king's measures, he managed in the long run to hold his own position, despite all baronial efforts to dislodge him from it.

Under these circumstances the king's council became more and more bureaucratic in composition. The balance between aristocracy and bureaucracy in earlier days disappeared, and the scales were weighed down heavily on the official side. And among the officials the wardrobe officers and the wardrobe-trained officers of state took the most conspicuous place. Parliaments became more unmanageable, as the king depended more and more on his official council.

Thus there arose a profound difference of principle between the old king, with his circle of advisers, trained in the traditions of household service, and the fierce aristocrats who claimed to rule England by hereditary right, and the magnates of the church who closely co-operated with them. It was in the course of this struggle that political results followed from the widened constitution of parliament, in the growth of which Edward had personally so great a share. The popular parliaments made themselves the mouthpiece of the opposition. The knights, burgesses and lower clergy, instead of backing up the king against the aristocracy, cheerfully followed its lead against him. Many complaints were now formulated as to Edward's fashion of government, and it is important for us that grievances as to the operations of the wardrobe officers hold a definite, though a small, place among them. It is of no great moment that the "prises" and "purveyances" of the great wardrobe were complained of, for they were always going on and were always detested. A much more specific matter for us is the demand that the "small seal" should not be used so as to deprive men of their legal rights. Requests such as this find no part in the demands of the baronial opposition which, in 1297, wrested from Edward the *Confirmatio Cartarum* with the additional clauses. They were first formulated in the longer and more desperate struggle which in the succeeding years strove to make the concessions of 1297 effective. It is then that the seal of the wardrobe first appears as an instrument of prerogative, dangerous to those traditional forms and technicalities that the barons hoped to be again able to use in their own interests. Routine, which in an earlier age had been worked out to give effect to the will of an autocrat, was already beginning to be regarded as a safeguard against the personal caprice of king and courtier.

This view first assumed legislative shape in the sixth clause of the *Articuli super Cartas* of 1300.[1] It takes its fullest form in the document which seems to be a preliminary sketch of the demands of the barons upon which the statute was based. This draft lays down that "writs under the petty seal are not to issue so frequently as before, for they often issue out of common

[1] The best text of "Articuli super Cartas" is given in Bémont's *Chartes des libertés anglaises*, pp. 99-108.

law, and concerning things which by course of law pertain to the great seal to the grievance of king and people. And writs often issue under the petty seal, contrary to law and against the great seal and against Magna Carta which the king is sworn to observe."[1] In the official version of the law the same facts are more tersely put in the sentence: "Under the little seal let no writ issue henceforth which touches the common law."[2] Another article, already referred to, strengthened this prohibition by providing for the continued itinerating of the chancery, and therefore of the great seal, with the court,[3] thus setting up the chancellor and his clerks as a continual check on the clerks of the household. Yet the *Articuli* recognised the legitimacy of the privy seal within its own sphere. In one long article purveyance was elaborately limited, and purveyors were required to carry with them the warranty for their action, and show it, upon demand, to all on whom they sought to levy their unpopular exactions. This authorisation might be issued either under the great or the little seal, and the steward and treasurer of the household were to examine all complaints.[4] Moreover, purveyance for the great wardrobe from town and ports was regulated by requiring a warrant under the great seal, and the affixing of the seal of the keeper of the wardrobe to all receipts and to all statements of what prises had been taken.[5] These provisions are more important in relation to the next reign than for the moment, for the *Articuli super Cartas* were never carried out, and their careful drafting in a form unusual for laws may perhaps suggest that they were never meant to be carried out. Yet we must not ignore the significance for our subject of a great constitutional document, largely concerned with checking the abuses of the household and wardrobe. It was for this reason

[1] *Hist. MSS. Commission, Sixth Report*, i. 344, from a roll preserved in the MSS. of Sir A. Acland-Hood at St. Audries, Somerset, analysed by Mr. A. J. Horwood. Compare Bémont, p. 99.

[2] Bémont's *Chartes*, p. 104, "Desutz le petit seal ne isse desoremes nul bref qe touche la commune lei."

[3] *Ib.* p. 104. See also above, p. 75.

[4] *Ib.* pp. 101-102, "E qe touz tieus prenours le roi, purveours, ou achatours, eient de ci en avant leur garant ovesqes eus, du grant seal ou du petit seal le roi, contenant leur poer et les choses dount il frount prises ou purveaunce, lequel garant il mustreront as ceus des quieus ils frount la prise." Another long article, *ib.* pp. 103-104, limits the jurisdiction of the steward's and marshals' court.

[5] *Ib.* p. 102.

that Edward so bitterly resented the insult involved, even in its limited and compulsory acceptance by him. Even more than the forests, the household was the special preserve of unrestricted prerogative.

The complaints against Edward I.'s wardrobe and wardrobe seal touch only the fringe of the subject under the conditions that prevailed under his reign. An act of the wardrobe, a writ of privy seal, was only more oppressive than the regular writs of the chancery and exchequer because the elasticity of the household offices and their lack of restrictive tradition enabled the king's household agents to have a freer hand than those representing the more traditionalist departments of state. The harmony, both for evil and good, of the household and state departments of Edward I.'s government was continued to the end. This was the more easily effected so long as the king's chief minister was an old wardrobe clerk, like Walter Langton. It was only when the barons of the opposition began to get power into their own hands, and fill the dignified offices of state with their own nominees that a king, debarred from ruling as he would wish, through chancellor and treasurer, could, like Henry III., entrench himself in his household and consciously fall back upon the ministers of the wardrobe, as more submissive agents than the great ministers of state. It is this consideration which makes the reign of Edward II. more important to us than even that of his great father. But it is significant that the first rumblings of the storm began during the declining years of the old king.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VII

THE HOUSEHOLD ORDINANCE OF WESTMINSTER,[1] 13TH NOVEMBER 1279

LE ORDENEMENT DEL HOSTEL LE REI, FET PAR LE COMANDEMENT [LE REI] A WESTMUSTER, LE JUR DE SEINT BRICE, LAN DU REGNE LE REI EDWARD SETIME, DES SENESCHAUS E DES AUTRES MINISTRES EN SUN HOSTEL.

Chanc. Misc., Bundle 3, *No.* 15.*

Seneschaus—

Mon sire Huge le fiuz Otes demurt seneschal, e ne prent du rei fe ne gages, ne fein, ne aueine, car li rei lui ad purueu en l liuerees de terre de garde.

Sire Robert le fiuz Jon, lautre seneschal, prent par an x m. pur fe, et viij mars pur robes, e xxv liueres de garde du dun le rei a orc.

Mareschaus—

Sire Richard du Bois prent par an x mars pur fe, e viij mars pur robes.

Sire Elys de Hauuile.

Submarescalli—

Thomas de Maydenhach, Reymund Ernald, } submarescalli aule; quorum quilibet capit per diem vij d. et ob., et iij marcas [per annum] pro robis.

Hostiarii—

Baldewinus le Flemmieng, Brianus de Foxecote, } hussers de la sale; e chescun prent par le jur vij d. ob., e iij m. [par an][2] pur robes.

Asseurs—

Thomas de Bikenore, Henri le Lumbard, } dunt chescun prent par le jur vij d. e ob., e iij m. [par an][2] pur robes.

[1] Words within square brackets are not in the manuscript, but there is no space or erasure in the MS.

[2] An erasure.

Paneters—

Mestre Robert le Normant, Robert de Salesbury, Mestre Willem le pestur, } dunt chescun prent le jur vij d. ob., e iij m. et demi pur robes.

Butelers—

Maheu de Columbers, Druet, } Nichil.

Achaturs—

Jon Maupas, qui prent le jur vij d. ob., e iij m. et demi pur robes.

Robert Poterel, ke prent le jur iiij d. ob., e iij m. e demi pur robes.

Cuisiners de la quisine le rei—

Mestre Thomas, ke prent le jur vij d. ob., e iij m. e demi pur robes.

Willeame de Werewelle, [cuisiner] del diner, nouel home.[1]

Cuisiners de la quisine de la mesnee—

Mestre Brice, ke prent le jur vij d. ob., e iij m. e demi pur robes.

Jon Sauuare, ke prent le jur vij d. ob., nouel home.

Naper—

Jon le naper, ke prent le jur iiij d. ob., e prent iij m. pur robes.

Porter—

Alisandre le porter, ke prent le jur vij d. ob., e iij m. pur robes.[2]

De la quisine—

Water le poleter, Henry lesqueler, } dunt chescun prent le jur iiij d. ob., e iij m. e demi pur robes.

Thomas le Herbeiur, ke ren ne deit prendre, fors iij m. pur robes.

Asseur devant le rei—

Willem le fiuz Warin, ke prent vij d. ob. le jur, e iij m. pur robes.

Salser—

Mestre Rauf le Sauser, ke prent vij d. ob. le jur, e iij m. e demi pur robes.

Hussers de la Chambre le Rey—

Jon le Husser, Henri de Greneford, James de Stafford, Willeme de Feltoun, Adenet le Taillur, } dunt chescun prent vij d. ob. le jur, e iij m. pur robes.

[1] The line in the original probably suggests that Werewelle received the same wages and allowance as Master Thomas.

[2] A short erasure, perhaps of " e demi."

Clers des offices—

Richard de la Linde, clerc de paneterie e de butelerie, } dunt chescun prent vij d. ob. le jur, e iiij[1] m. e demi pur robes.
Sire Rauf de Wateruile, clerc de la quisine, }

Jon de Maidenstan, clerc de la mareschaucie, ke prent fein e aueine a ij chiuaus, e iiij m. e demi pur robes.

Nicole Fermbaud,[2] susclerc de la mareschaucie, ke prent fein e aueine a vn chiual, e iij m. pur robes.

Jon de Gillingham, gardein des charettes, ke prent fein e aueine a ij chiuaus, e iij m. pur robes.

E la garderobe le rei—

Mestre Thomas Beke, tresorer } ke rens ne prent, fors ke viij m.
Thomas de Gonneys, contrerodlur, } pur robes.

Vn clerc[3] de suz le tresorer, ke rens ne prent du rei.

Mestre Willeme de Lue, ke rens ne prent, fors ke viij m. pur robes.

Sire Esteuene, } ke rens ne prent, fors ke viij m. pur robes.[4]
Willeme de Blithburge, } dunt chescun prent vij d. ob. le jur, e iij m. pur robes.[4]

Clers de la garderobe—

Mestre Simon le Cirugien, ke prent xij d. le jur, e viij m. pur robes.

Mestre Willem de Seint Pere, fisicien, ke prent vij d. ob. le jur.

Jon de Rede, husser de la garderobe, ke prent iiij d. ob. le jur, e iij m. e demi pur robes.

Jakemin le Chaundeler, ke prent vij d. ob. le jur, e iij m. pur robes.

Clers de la chapele le rei—

Sire Jon le Chapelein, ke rens ne prent, mes ke viij m. pur robes.

Sire Nicole le Chapelein, } dunt chescun prent vij d. e ob. le jur, e vj m. pur robes.
Mestre Nicole de Araz, }

Sire Richard de Salesbury, ke rens ne prent, mes ke vj m. pur robes.

Robert le clerc de la chapele, ke prent iiij d. e ob. le jur, e iij m. e demi pur robes.

(Dorse.)

Ordene est e comande ke les seneschauls, ou lun, si amedeus ni pussent estre ensemblement, od le tresorer, ou od le contreroudlur, si le tresorer ni pusse estre, e lun des mareschaus de la sale, e les

[1] The reading may be " e iij," but is more probably as in text.

[2] Or Ferinbaud.

[3] " Le coffrer " was first written and then struck out. Compare above, p. 39, notes 1 and 2.

[4] These entries contradict each other. The latter is probably the true reading, as regards both Stephen and Blyborough, the former line having been carelessly repeated.

clers e les serganz des mesters seient chescune nuit a la cunte del hostel ; e la seient examine les mes de la sale, par le tesmoigage les hussers de la sale. E par le numbre des mes seient examine les issues de panetere, de botelerie, e de la quisine. E sillia vtrage, seit amende, e les serganz respris. El marge del roudle del ostel seit chescune nuit escrit le vin kest despendu le jur, issi ke par le tesmoigage de cel roudle, ke porte recort en lostel, pussem oir la cunte des toneus de vin deus foiz ou treiz foiz par an. Derechef la seient examine les gages des serganz e des esquiers e des garzons, si cume est acustume. E silia nul trespas presente a la cunte, ke led ne seit de vilein par quei il le coueneit mostrer al rey, seit la amende par la discreciun les seneschaus e le tresorer par subtractiun de lur gages, ou en autre manere solunn ceo kil veient ke bon seit, issi ke le seignur ne seit esmeu de chose ke par eus pusse estre amende.

Le tresorer, apelle a lui lun des seneschaus, oe chescun an, vne foiz ou deu foiz par an, la cunte des chamberleins des vins, issi kil clerement sace cumben des peces venent de chescun port e de chescun I nef, e des nuns des persones de ki les vins sunt pris, tuit par parceles, e cumben dacat e cumben de prise. E issi seit cest acunte oi e examine par le tresorer e lun des seneschaus, ke le tresorer pusse cel acunte presenter en summe en sun acunte a la feste seint Edmund le rey,[1] kant il rendra sun acunte.

En meme la manere face le tresorer del acunte de la graunt garderobe. E ausi apele a li lun des seneschaus e vn del conseil le rei sil vnt, e seit issi oi e examine, ke le tresorer pusse cel acunte rendre en summe chescun an en sun acunte. E fet asaueir ke le tresorer face desormes par vn certein hom fere achater a treis feires par an totes les choses ka partenent a la graunt garderobe, e cedlui seit gardein de la graunt garderobe, e voit as feires pur fere les achaz ; e cedlui seit jure le rei especiaument de cel mester. E le husser de la garderobe seit contreroudlur a cedlui, e voit od lui as feires e veie les achaz e les liuerees tesmoigne a la cunte. E endementers ke lusser seit issi hors, le tresorer mette aucun certein honne en sun lu ke pusse e sace respondre de sun mester. E leuantdit gardein rens nachate ne liuere a nulle sanz especial comandement le tresorer, e ceo en la presence le contreroudlur ; e sil le fet, rens ne li seit alue. E si le rei le commande nulle liuere a fere de buche, si le die tauntost al tresorer e prenge de lui sun garaunt e puruee ensi ke le contreroudlur le sace.[2]

[1] The feast of St. Edmund, king and martyr, was on November 20. It was the day on which the " regnal year " of Edward I. both began and ended.

[2] After this a short paragraph was marked out on the manuscript, but left blank.

Lusser de la garderobe deit chescun jur fere peser la cire e le liminon, au fere e au reteiner, e peser hors la liuere chescune nuit, e repeser lendemein ceo ke murt, issi ke par cel peis pusse sauoir les despens de chescune nuit, e a la fin del an la summe del tuit. E memes cel husser, qant il auera la chaundeille resceu, ensuit par peis le mette en sauue garde en en[1] la sue e deliuere al chaundeler despens de chescune nuit. E le chaundeler rens neit en sa garde fors les despens dez nuiz, si come lusser le liuera.

E pur ceo ke couenable chose est ke lostel madame seit guie sulum le ordenance dèl ostel le rei, ordine est ke le seneschal madame, ou cedlui suuens[2] ke sert sun hostel, seit chescune nuit a la cunte del hostel le rei, ensemblement od le paneter, le buteler, le mestre cu, et le mareschal de sa chambre. E ceus seient jure del acunte e a sauuement garder e curteisement despendre al honur e al pui del seignur, e de la dame, e de sauuer ou arere rendre ceo ke demurt leaument. E silia nul de la gent madame ke trespassent en wastant les choses madame, ou en autre manere, seient mandez a le cunte e seient repris e chastiez ausi come la gent le rei selom le discreciun des souereins de la cunte en semblement al le seneschal madame, si le trespas ne seit si notable kil couent mustrer au rei ou a la reine.

Ordene est derechef ke le mareschal, ou vn de eus, chescune meis del an, facent le cerce[3] del hostel, e le nettissent de ribauz e de ribaudes e des chiuaus a ceus ke ne prennent fein ne aueine ne gages, ou plus souent sil veient mestrer. E ausi le facent del hostel madame. E[4] prennent ausi garde les mareshaus de la sale e les husser, ke la sale seit ben nettee des genz estraunges e des ribauz ke manger ne deiuent. E ke la sale seit ben seruie e comunaument. E ke nul chiualer neit mangant en sale mes kun esquier.

La liuere al seir de vin e de chaundeale isse tuit par la gent le rei ausi ben al hostel madame come aillurs. E purueent le tresorer e les seneschaus ke nul liuere foreins ne seit liuere a nulli fors en du lu, ne de pain ne de vin ne de chanadeale ; e chescune nuit examinent les liuerees ausi ben del hostel madame cume des autres lus e del hostel le rey.

(*Membrane* 2.)

Derechef il est ordene ke nul gise en garderobe fors ke le tresorer, sire Thomas de Gonneys, Mestre Guilleme de Lue, le clerc le tresorer,

[1] The second "en" seems a careless repetition.
[2] Or "seruens," but the text seems to give the less intelligible reading.
[3] Or "certe."
[4] "ausi" is here struck out.

Mestre Simon le Cirugien, Orlandin quant il vient a la curt, Willem de Blithburge, sire Esteuene de sein Jorge, Jon de Rede, kest chef husser de la garderobe, et vn vadlet a pe desuz luy, e nuls autre.

E est ordene ke nul clerc kad ben fet du rei ne prendra gages du rei desormes. E est ordene ke nul ne maniuce en garderobe fors le suthusser, e le chamberlein le tresorer, e tuz les autres chamberleins en sale, sil ne seient loinz de la curt herbege.

Del cariage le rey est purueu ke a la garderobe le rei seient treis lunges carettes.

A la paneterie vne lunge carette, e vne curte ke portera la flur demeine e les moles de la salserie.[1]

A la butelerie vne lunge carette e vne curte.

A la quisine vne lunge carette e deus curtes.

Des serganz darmes sunt esluz xx ; cest a saueir Jon Ertaud, Michel de seint Eadmund, Robert de Clopton, Willem de Hertfeud, Gerard de Broil, Jon le Conuers, Robert de Vilers, Nicole Ertaud, Guyot de Valery, Willem le Engleys, Thomas de Irpegraue, Guarsoun, Gailard de Morlans, Peres de Byly, Eble de la reine, Willem le Mareschal, Puche, Arnald de Clarac, e Carbonel. E chescun prendra par an treis mars e demi pur robes.

E fet a sauoir ka chescune foiz ke le seneschal comande as serganz kil teignent treis chiuauls, il les tendrunt e prendrunt xii deniers le jur. E quant le seneschal les comandera outer le terz, il lousterunt, e ne prendrunt ke viij d. le jur.

Derechef ordene est ke chescun esquier prenge par an xl s. pur robes, e chescun vadlet de mester vn marc. E chescun garzon ke prent ij deners le jur pur ses gages, si prendra x s. pur robes. E chescun garzon ke prent iij mailes le jur e tuiz les autres ke robes deiuent prendre, si prendrunt demi marc.

(*Endorsed*) Ordenances del Hostel le Roy.

[1] "le' mole' de la sals."

CHAPTER VIII

THE REIGN OF EDWARD II.

1307–1327

SECTION I [1]

The Wardrobe and Household of the Prince of Wales

Edward of Carnarvon was not the first heir of the throne to possess an elaborate household with an organised wardrobe, but he was the first as to whose wardrobe organisation detailed particulars survive. The records of its operations before his accession throw such light upon the development of his policy as king that some study of them is a desirable preliminary to the history of the household administration of his reign.

We start from the strictly dependent wardrobe which Edward I.'s policy had imposed upon all the members of the royal family possessing separate establishments of their own. As neither queen Eleanor nor queen Margaret were allowed the self-sufficing household, enjoyed by Eleanor of Provence, it was natural that a severe control should be imposed upon the households of the king's infant children. Accordingly we find that Edward of Carnarvon, though provided, like his elder brother, with a household of his own from infancy, was entirely dependent on his father for all supplies. When only four months old, his brother Alfonso's death made Edward heir to the throne. Nevertheless he remained included in the "household of the king's children dwelling in Windsor Castle." Of this establishment the veteran Giles of Oudenarde became keeper from November 20, 1285, to February 21, 1290.[2*] It was sufficiently organised to

[1] The early pages of this section need to be modified in the light of *B.J.R.L.* vii. 384-420; and *Bull. Instit. Hist. R.*, ii. 37-45.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 352/8, m. 2. Compare "Rotulus necessariorum" for 18 Edw. I. in *Chanc. Misc.* 3/22.

include a "great wardrobe."[1] In 1290 the death of his mother made the young Edward count of Ponthieu and Montreuil, but his accession to hereditary lands of his own involved no further development of his household, and his new possession was administered quite independently of it. A new keeper, William of Blyborough, the trusty wardrobe clerk who had carried subsidies to Edward the father when in the Holy Land,[1a] first appears as acting from November 20, 1292.[2] Up to now the establishment was called indifferently "the household of the king's children," or "the household of the king's son,"[3] his sisters being evidently included within their brother's *familia*. This household, like that of the queen, only functioned fully when the royal children were *extra curiam*. Nevertheless its receipt amounted in 1292–3 to the large sum of £3634 : 17*s.*,[4] and in 1293–4 Blyborough received £3785 : 0 : 10½[5] on behalf of the young heir and his sisters. He rendered its accounts to the king's wardrobe up to November 20, 1295.[6]

A first step in the direction of independence was made at that date, when Blyborough, who still remained keeper, was instructed to render the future accounts of the wardrobe of the

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 352/16. [1a] *See also* C. V. Langlois, *Textes rel. à l'hist. du parlement jusque 1314*, p. 103.

[2] *Ib.* 350/5. He was also acting in 1293–4; *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* m. 20.

[3] It was so called even earlier in 1289–90; *Chanc. Misc.* 3/22.

[4] *Pipe, 22 Edw. I.* No. 139, m. 6. In the roll, as summarised in Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer, Hen. III.-Hen. VI.*, pp. 106-113, the expenses are £3896 : 7 : 6½. It was a grievance when the members of another dependent household stayed too long at the expense of their kinsman. A four-days' visit of John of Brabant, who was affianced to his sister, and of his cousins, Thomas and Henry of Lancaster, to Edward of Carnarvon provoked this comment: "Adhuc morantur, et est ista dies onerosa"; Burtt in *Camden Miscellany*, ii. xiii. The visit involved costly entertainments, which were unwelcome to the frugal managers of the household of Edward of Carnarvon.

[5] *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.* No. 144, m. 20. This was "in expensis hospicii domini Edwardi filii regis, perhendinantis extra curiam regis per vices in diuersis locis, una cum expensis filiarum regis, sororum suarum et Johannis de Holand, dum fuerunt in comitiua ipsius Edwardi, et in aliis necessariis ipsius Edwardi, preter pannos, vina, ceram, et alia diuersa de diuersis officiis hospicii regis per idem tempus." There was a separate account "in expensis hospicii filiarum regis extra comitiuam predicti domini Edwardi," for which William of Waterville accounted.

[6] *Ib.* "De quibus Willelmus de Blyburgh, custos garderobe predicti domini Edwardi, reddidit compotum in eadem garderoba regis." Compare *ib. 30 Edw. I.* No. 147, m. 48. This had also been the case when Pampsworth was in charge of Alfonso's household; *C.C.R., 1279–88*, pp. 225-226; compare *Exch. Accts.* 350/15.

king's son to the exchequer.[1] Responsibility to the exchequer involved financing from it, for during the next four years the king's son's wardrobe was practically dependent on the exchequer for its supplies.[2] The average income was over £1300 a year, a smaller sum than his expenses had normally reached in previous years, and yet not an ungenerous sum for the heir and his two sisters, though the elder of these, Margaret, was growing up and already in 1290 nominally married to the son of the duke of Brabant. There was this difference made between Edward and his sisters, that his expenses were henceforth chargeable to his wardrobe whether he was in court or out of court, while those of Margaret and her sister Elizabeth were only included when the girls were in their brother's company.[3] But the expenses of the period were more than double the receipts, so that the separate housekeeping of the heir began somewhat inauspiciously.[4] As, however, Edward was for part of this time nominally acting as regent

[1] *Pipe, 30 Edw. I.* No. 147, m. 48, "Compotus Willelmi de Bliburgo . . . a xx° die Nov., anno xxiiij° incipiente, quo tempore rex precepit et ordinauit quod compotus garderobe predicte redderetur ad scaccarium, et non in garderoba ipsius regis, prout moris erat."

[2] *Ib.* Of the total receipts for the four years, amounting to £5264 : 8 : 6, £4836 : 16 : 1 came from the exchequer, and £394 : 2*s.* only from the king's wardrobe. The small remainder was made up by amercements, gifts and fines. The revenues of Ponthieu were accounted for separately by receivers, who were responsible to Edmund, earl of Lancaster, the guardian of the county. From 1294 to 1299 Ponthieu was in French hands; see for this Miss H. Johnstone, "The County of Ponthieu, 1279–1307" in *E.H.R.* xxix. 435-452 (1914).

[3] *Pipe, 30 Edw. I.* No. 147, m. 48. The preamble runs on (from the beginning in note 1, p. 167, above), "Ipso filio regis agente tam extra curiam regis per vices diuersas per idem tempus, simul et (compotus) de expensis Margarete filie regis, ducisse Brabantie, et Elizabethe, filie regis, sororis sue, perhendinacium in comitiua fratris sui predicti, diuersis vicibus per idem tempus." The point is, however, not clear. For instance, *Pipe, 27 Edw. I.*, has accounts for 22 Edw. I. headed "Expensa hospicii domini Edwardi, filii regis, perhendinantis extra curiam." See also *Exch. Accts.* 357/28, a roll of wages for 28 Edw. I., which shows how even at later dates the wages for the queen's and prince's household were paid in the king's wardrobe, *e.g.* on April 13, 1300, "quo die aula vacauit ex toto per statutum factum apud sanctum Albanum," "wages," in lieu of board in the hall, were paid to the "familia regine" and the "familia domini Edwardi." Compare *ib.* 360/10, m. 2, "expensa domini Edwardi, filii regis, euntis extra curiam regis pro corde comitis Cornubie sepeliendo apud Asserug et morantis extra curiam a ij° die Jan. usque ad xxij^{m} diem eiusdem mensis." These were charged to the king's wardrobe. The whole question of the interrelation of the payments of the prince's and queen's wardrobes to those of the king needs careful examination.

[4] *Pipe, 30 Edw. I.* m. 48. The "summa misarum et prestitorum" was £10,812 : 18 : 2, leaving an adverse balance, or "superplusagium," of £5548 : 9 : 8.

for his father, it is probable that his expenses were swelled on that account. Anyhow there was nothing wonderful in the son's finances suffering the same ill-fortune that ruined those of his father.

Even after direct relations to the exchequer had involved some measure of independence, traces remained of the simpler system of the wardrobe of earlier infancy. The controller by whose view and testimony the accounts were tendered to the exchequer was Sir Geoffrey Pitchford the Shropshire knight, who, as keeper of Windsor castle and forest, had the ultimate responsibility for the safeguard of the royal children when at their usual abode.[1] As time went on Pitchford's place was taken by his clerk, Peter of Abyton or Abingdon, at first as his superior's lieutenant, but later on as controller in his own right.[2] Perhaps the transfer of the controllership from lay to clerical hands was another step in the road towards wider autonomy. A feature in the lists of officers of the king's son is the appearance of names among the lord Edward's household staff which were to remain in his service for the rest of his life. Notable among them were Walter Reynolds, the keeper or buyer of his great wardrobe,[3] and Henry of Canterbury, the clerk of his privy seal.[4]

Blyborough's accounts do not survive after 1295, but it looks as if he remained in control of Edward's wardrobe until its second great transformation, as we find him allowed expenses, in January 1301, for going to London to fetch money for his lord's use. He was, therefore, probably responsible for the little roll that gives, between January 2 and 22, 1301, a complete itinerary of the lord Edward from Langley, already a common place of abode for him, to Lincoln,[5] where, on February 7, Edward

[1] Pitchford was nominally responsible till November 20, 1299, but he died before July 18, 1298; *C.P.R., 1292–1301*, p. 356; compare *Cal. of Inq.* iii. 435.*

[2] He is still described as Pitchford's clerk when he tendered this account, but he remained in the lord Edward's service, and was, as we shall see, controller in the new wardrobe of the prince of Wales.* See p. 171 below.

[3] Reynolds was "emptor" from 1297 onwards, succeeding John Husthwait. Guy Ferre was already in Edward's household.

[4] *Pipe, 30 Edw. I.* m. 48, "Scribens litteras secretas filii regis," from 24 to 27 Edw. I.

[5] *Exch. Accts.* 360/10. The itinerary was January 2, Newport Pagnell; Jan. 3, Leighton Buzzard; Jan. 4, Edlesborough; Jan. 5-10, King's Langley; Jan. 11-13, Ashridge; Jan. 14, Leighton Buzzard; Jan. 15, Passenham (Stony Stratford); Jan. 16-18, Northampton; Jan. 19, Lodington; Jan. 20, Edmondthorp; Jan. 21, Grantham; Jan. 22, Navenby, 7 miles south of Lincoln. The shortness of some of the stages is remarkable. The stay at Ashridge was for the burial of the heart of Edmund, earl of Cornwall, Edward's cousin.

was solemnly made prince of Wales and earl of Chester in the famous Lincoln parliament.[1] This event involved a still further development of the independence of the *familia* of the young prince.

The reorganisation of the new prince's household followed his accession to a position similar to, and in some ways exceeding, the status held by his father before he came to the throne. We are lucky in having henceforth fairly continuous accounts of the glorified wardrobe of the prince of Wales up to his accession as king.[2] From them we can collect a pretty detailed picture of the administration of Edward's household between 1301 and 1307. It is the more important since this domestic government was now closely connected with the government of the large appanage now ruled by him as prince of Wales and earl of Chester.

Let us take the local administration first. This was simply the system, already devised on the model of all great feudal establishments, for the government of Edward I.'s acquisitions of territory outside the limits of the ordinary shire system. The three units were the old Cheshire earldom, that is Cheshire with Flintshire; North Wales, that is the "three shires of Gwynedd," Anglesea, Carnarvon and Merioneth; and West (or South) Wales, the shires of Carmarthen and Cardigan. Each of these groups was ruled by a justice,[3] its judicial and military head, whose residence was in the castles of Chester, Carnarvon and Carmarthen respectively. For each unit was a chancery, whose operations can be traced with difficulty, and an exchequer, presided over by a chamberlain, whose accounts afford us the chief information

[1] *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 160.

[2] The following partial accounts are extant: April 11–Nov. 20, 1301, *Exch. Accts.* 360/16; Nov. 20, 1303–Nov. 20, 1304, *ib.* 365/12; Nov. 20, 1304–Oct. 9, 1305, *ib.* 368/4 (a *rotulus hospicii* only, but affording complete itinerary). The fullest accounts are Peter of Abyton's controller's roll for 31 Edw. I., Nov. 20, 1302–Nov. 20, 1303, in *ib.* 363/18, and Reynolds's roll for 35 Edw. I., Nov. 20–July 7, 1307, in *MSS. Ad.* 22,923.

[3] The plea rolls of the justice's court in Cheshire and Flintshire are very copious from 10-12 Edw. I. onwards. See also *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, No. IV., Plea Rolls, pp. 82 and 87. There are a few others enumerated in *ib.* p. 125, and some of North and West Wales enumerated in *ib.* p. 165.

we possess as to the working of these arrangements, and whose court, like the English exchequer, ultimately exercised judicial as well as financial functions. These were the central offices for each of the three "palatinates," corresponding to the central offices of the English crown. Under these was the machinery for the local administration of the subdivisions of each unit, the sheriffs of the shires, the bailiffs of the lordships or hundreds, the escheators, coroners, mayors, constables of castles and the other minor officials who went back to the days of administration by the Welsh princes and the independent earls of Chester.[1] Into the details of this system it is not our business to enter.[2] It is enough for us that there was no attempt to establish any organic union between the three self-sufficing units. Even when, as during Edward of Carnarvon's reign as king, a single justice was set over North and West Wales, it involved no sort of common administrative system. Each unit went on, exactly as before, under its own officers, just like two shires which happened to be ruled by a common sheriff. What unity of control there was came from the prince's chancery and wardrobe, which had therefore the double task of governing the prince's household and of controlling the local administration of his appanage.

It was necessary to reconstitute the central offices of the king's son to meet the wider duties now thrust upon it. The veteran William of Blyborough relinquished the keepership in order to assume the higher dignity of the lord prince's chancellor.[3] Walter

[1] For the extant material for the history of the local administration see *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, No. V., Ministers Accounts.

[2] I have given some details in *Pl. of Edw. II.* pp. 374-384. The most copious printed materials for the more complete study of the Cheshire-Flintshire earldom are in R. Stewart Brown's *Cheshire Chamberlains' Accounts, 1301–60*, Rec. Soc. for Lancashire and Cheshire, 1910; and in A. Jones's *Flintshire Ministers Accounts, 1301–1328*, Flintshire Hist. Soc., 1913. Some of Mr. Stewart Brown's studies, notably his "Advowries of Cheshire," in *E.H.R.* xxix. 41-55, are valuable. Miss Margaret Tout, M.A., has in preparation a study of the administration of mediaeval Cheshire, which aims at working out this subject with greater particularity. Mr. J. G. Edwards's *Early History of the Counties of Carmarthen and Cardigan* in *E.H.R.* xxxi. 90-98 (1916) gives a good account of the purely local subdivisions of those shires. It is a chapter of a Manchester M.A. thesis on "Wales after the Edwardian Conquest," which will, I hope, soon be published, since the writer has now returned from military service. The chamberlains' accounts of North and West Wales have still to be studied in the Public Record Office.

[3] He is called "the prince's chancellor of Chester" in Brown, p. 24. But he was certainly not merely a local chancellor. See pp. 178-180.

Reynolds, who had been keeper of Edward's great wardrobe since 1297, stepped into Blyborough's place and was designated keeper, or treasurer, of the lord prince's wardrobe. Peter of Abingdon continued controller until 1304, when he was replaced by William of Melton, who in his turn had been in 1301 transferred to the local service of the prince as chamberlain of Chester.[1]

Both Reynolds and Melton remained as chiefs of the prince's wardrobe for the rest of the old king's life and retained the confidence of the heir after he became sovereign. Other clerks, like these two, destined to be notable in the next reign, gathered round them. Such were John of Leek, the prince's chaplain and almoner; William of Boudon, the *ostiarius* who was also keeper of the prince's great wardrobe;[2] Henry of Canterbury, the sometime clerk of his privy seal;[3] Ingelard of Warley;[4] Henry of Ludgershall, who was from 1301 to 1307 clerk of the prince's pantry and buttery;[5] and Nicholas of Huggate. Altogether there were fourteen clerks acting at one time.[6] Side by side with these were the knights. There were the prince's successive stewards, Sir Roger of Wellesworth, Sir Robert of Haustede, and Sir Miles of Stapleton.[7] There too were Roderick of Spain, his chamberlain, his kinsman on his mother's side,[8] and Guy Ferre, a Frenchman born, but unswervingly faithful to the land and lord of his adoption, who had served him continually since 1295. Equally French were his mother's Ponthieu kinsfolk of the house of Fiennes, and his cousin Henry of Beaumont, the near relative of the kings of France and England. Magnates of high degree gladly became his knights, as for instance Sir

[1] Melton was a Yorkshire man who was "newly created as king's clerk" on June 24, 1297; *C.C.R., 1296–1302*, p. 37. He was cofferer of queen Margaret in 1299–1300; *L.Q.G.* pp. 355-358.* His Cheshire accounts as chamberlain range from Sept. 30, 1301, to Sept. 29, 1304; Jones, pp. 3-49.*

[2] I infer this from *Exch. Accts.* 363/18, ff. 28 and 28 d.

[3] "Scribens litteras secretas filii regis de annis xxiv°, xxv°, xxvi° et xxvii°;" *Pipe, 30 Edw. I.* m. 48.

[4] He first appears as the prince's clerk in 1305; *Chanc. Misc.* 5/2, m. 10. See Wilson, *Liber Albus Wig.* (Worc. H. Soc.) especially, pp. 17, 19, 21

[5] *Exch. Accts.* 361/8. [6] *Ib.* 360/17.

[7] Wellesworth was acting on April 16, 1303, but was succeeded by Haustede before Sept. 12; *ib.* 363/18, ff. 25, 25 d. Haustede was soon replaced by Sir Miles of Stapleton, who acted until 1306, when Haustede again became steward, remaining in office till the old king's death. Haustede was admitted to the king's fee on Christmas Day 1290, on which day he was knighted; *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5 m. 35.

[8] *Ib.* 363/18, f. 21 d.

Robert Clifford.[1] Conspicuous among the English followers who made a career in his service was the Shropshire squire, John of Charlton, successively his yeoman, squire and knight, of whom we shall have much to say later. Along with Edward's English and French *familiares* came some Welshmen of distinguished birth who showed on every occasion devoted loyalty to their prince. Conspicuous among these was the famous Sir Gruffydd Llwyd, who, when not acting as recruiting agent or discharging administrative duties in North Wales, served successively as a yeoman, an esquire and a knight of the prince's household.[2]

Another element in the household was the "wards in custody," the high-born youths attached to the prince's household for their education. Chief among these was Edward's own nephew, Gilbert of Clare, the future earl of Gloucester.[3] In Reynolds's first account for 1301 ten *pueri in custodia* are specified, with Gilbert at their head. Nine of the ten each had their *magister*, their tutor, and the only one who had no *magister* was Peter of Gaveston. But the noblest of them took their "wages" and their allowance in place of dinner in hall, just like the humblest messengers, *coquini* and grooms. Many when they attained man's estate remained in the household, as did Gaveston himself, as yeomen, squires and knights, one after the other. They were the natural associates and intimates of the young prince, and some of them, notably Gaveston, began early to exercise an undesirable influence over him.

Below these distinguished persons was a swarm of minor household officers, 47 yeomen of offices, 10 palfreymen, 21 sumptermen, the coquins, pages, grooms and their like. There

[1] *Misc. Exch.* 5/2 m. 12.

[2] See for Sir Gruffydd Llwyd another article of Mr. J. G. Edwards, in *E.H.R.* xxx. 589-601, where the career of this imagined hero of Welsh independence is shown to have been that of a competent and successful official of king and prince, but specially devoted to the lifelong service of Edward of Carnarvon. His identity with Gruffydd ap Rhys, grandson of the famous Ednyfed Fychan, is also satisfactorily established. To Mr. Edwards's facts may be added the circumstances that Gruffydd was admitted as a yeoman of Edward I.'s household in August 1283 (*Chanc. Misc.* 4/2 m. 9), and readmitted to the household on August 20, 1289 (*ib.* 4/4 m. 3 d). In 1301 and in 1306 Gruffydd attended two Scottish campaigns "in familia principis," accompanied by three yeomen. For his crowning service to Edward II. in 1322, see later, p. 209.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 357/28. Gilbert was first admitted to wages on July 18, 1300.

was also an armed guard, both horse and foot. The former included 58 esquires and sergeants-at-arms, and among the latter the Welsh archers were always prominent.

Even in peace time the prince's *familia* was a large and motley crew, requiring strict discipline and not always obtaining it. Quite early in the lord Edward's career, his followers were almost as much of a terror to the countryside as had been the household of his father in the bad days before the Barons' Wars. Thus in 1294, when Edward was only ten years old, and when his establishment was but a mere skeleton of what it became later, the long stay which the little prince made at Langley, already a favourite residence, and at St. Albans caused "enormous losses" to the markets at Dunstaple and the neighbouring market towns as well as to the district as a whole. Two hundred dishes of meat would not satisfy the daily requirements of the lord Edward's kitchen. To supply the needs of the prince's household his ministers seized everything they could lay their hands upon. They impounded all the victuals exposed for sale in markets; they took for their use the cheese and eggs which they found hidden away in private houses, and made difficulties in giving even tallies in exchange. They robbed bakers of their bread, and alewives of their beer, and sometimes compelled them to bake and brew at their orders.[1] Thus formidable in peace, in times of war the *familia* of the prince swelled, like that of his father, to the dimensions of an army.[2]

The finances of the prince's wardrobe show some remarkable developments. In Reynolds's first accounts from April to November 1301 there was a "receipt" of over £10,000, more than nine-tenths of which was advanced directly from the king's wardrobe.[3] This was, however, an abnormal year, including the expenses of the prince and his army in the Scots war, and therefore the war budget of the western wing of the English

[1] *Ann. Dunstaple*, pp. 392-393.

[2] See, for instance, *Exch. Accts.* 9/23, 13/7, and *ib.* 360/16, where Reynolds's first account is not only "de expensis garderobe principis," but "eciam de expensis exercitus sui in guerra Scocie."

[3] *Exch. Accts*, 360/16. The "receipt" was £10,199 : 13 : 6½. Of this £9459 : 9 : 4 came from Droxford, keeper of the king's wardrobe, and £739 : 4 : 2½ from the sales of stores and other oddments. It is of course always to be understood that the "receipt" means the turnover, not necessarily the cash actually received.

force in Scotland, directly commanded by the prince, and consequently inflated by national expenditure, as much as were the corresponding royal accounts, both of wardrobe and exchequer. In the next account, 1302–3, a more normal year, the "expenses" only amounted to £5600.[1] Further relief now came from the revenues of the prince's domains. Thus between Michaelmas 1301 and March 1302 the chamberlain of Chester paid over to treasurer Reynolds £1007 : 6 : 11¼, and for the next year 1302–1303 the sum of £1696 : 16 : 3, and for 1303–4, £1514 : 18 : 5½.[2] Though these large sums were not kept up, they show the importance of Cheshire in the household economy of Edward of Carnarvon, bringing in, as it did, sums nearly equivalent to the expenses of his *hospicium*. Edward got less from Wales, North and West, and from Ponthieu, which, after 1299, when the peace restored it to his keeping, was under the receivership of the banking firm of the Frescobaldi.[3] The end of Edward I.'s reign found Edward of Carnarvon in almost as much pecuniary embarrassment as his father. His household was never self-sufficing, and the failure of the prince's lands to meet even his normal peace expenses left him always dependent upon doles from the royal exchequer. The independence, suggested by the reforms of 1301, thus became little more than nominal.

In many other ways besides making it dependent on his exchequer for its income, the old king kept a tight hand over his son's household. To begin with, all important appointments in it were virtually made by the king, even when the pretext was made that the prince chose his own servants. In practice

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 363/18, "hospicium" expenses, £1740 : 4 : 8½; "summa omnium titulorum," £3912 : 18 : 9—total, £5653 : 3 : 5½. Among the "eleemosyne" was "Ricardo de Nottingham et Thome Duns, scholaribus missis ad scolas Oxonie per preceptum regis de dono et eleemosyna principis," 6*d.* a day each with allowance for robes, etc.—total, £4 : 4*s.* Such grants prepare the way for the king's scholars at Cambridge, whose later organisation into the King's Hall established the chief of the foundations, reconstituted by Henry VIII., as Trinity College.

[2] Brown, pp. 12-13, 26 and 45. The mass of the balance in 1301–2 was delivered by the prince's mandate to his wardrobe in London on November 29, 1302. The money was in ten baskets, carried on 5 hackneys, escorted by 12 horsemen and 16 yeomen on foot, who took 8 days going and 6 in returning; *ib.* p. 12.

[3] Their accounts are in *Exch. Accts.* 156/1, 2, 3, 16, 17, 18, 19; 157/15, 16; 159/14, 15; 160/9, 10; 161/1, 18. See Miss H. Johnstone in *E.H.R.* xxix. 448-449.

the chief posts were limited to the king's clerks and knights, lent temporarily, so to say, to the prince, but still bound by moral and pecuniary ties to the king, their ultimate master, receiving, for instance, robes and allowances from the royal household. When thus appointed, they were kept under severe control. Their supervision could even be delegated to the king's chief ministers. Walter Langton as treasurer not only doled out the income of the prince; he exercised authority over the prince's servants. At the king's special command Langton removed unprofitable *familiares*, not only from the household of the prince, but from those of the queen and of the king himself. Others of less demerit the treasurer docked of their wages.[1] We have the prince's own word that Miles of Stapleton was "charged by the king" with the direction of his household as steward. Consequently, without his father's permission, he dared not lend Miles's services to so faithful a minister of the crown as the earl of Lincoln when that chief instrument of royal policy requested the prince to allow Stapleton to manage the establishment with which the earl went on an important mission to the papal court.[2] In the same way the laws of the royal household automatically operated in that of the prince, so that, for example, after the statute of St. Albans *de aula non tenenda in hospicio*, the prince's servants received as a matter of course their allowance for diet.[3] Again, when the prince happened to go to his father's court, all his household "offices" became at once chargeable, with insignificant exceptions, to the king.[4] The king was always dictating to his son what he should do even in the merest trifles. It looks as if the prince's officers hardly dare record an unusual disbursement without the king's command. A trifling "exhibi-

[1] *Foedera*, i. 956 (letter of Edward to Boniface VIII.), "cum . . . praefatus episcopus tam de domo et familia nostra quam reginae et principis Walliae—*de praecepto nostro disponens*, quosdam domesticos et familiares, quam nobis quam eis inutiles, non improvide amovisset, quibusdam aliis sua . . . vadia non solvisset."

[2] *Misc. Exch.* 5/2; Deputy Keeper's *Ninth Report*, p. 249.

[3] For instance, see *Exch. Accts.* 357/28 (king's roll), and *ib.* 360/10 (prince's roll).

[4] For instance, *ib.* 368/4, "rotulus hospicii principis" (33 Edw. I.). In this year whenever the prince was at court, his "offices" cease to be paid from his resources, and there is a marginal note "omnia officia de rege preter vadia scutiferorum." This was so Dec. 23, 1304–Jan. 2, 1305, and again from Feb. 28 to March 28, April 6-25, May 12-19, June 13-17, and so on.

tion" to two poor Oxford scholars is solemnly registered as paid in obedience to his father's order.[1] When treasure was sent from the prince's appanage to support his state, a royal officer accompanied the escort to arrange quarters for the cavalcade.[2] The king could upon occasion impose on his son the support of a magnate and all his *familia*.[3]

The absolute control of the king over the prince resided in the fact that the prince's lands did not yield enough revenue to support even his ordinary disbursements, and that, both in war and peace, the prince was called upon to incur extraordinary expenditure as part of the duties of his position. To some extent the old king recognised that his son had a right to have his public charges defrayed from his father's purse. But any grant in this direction was clogged with onerous and exceptional conditions. Thus, when in October 1304 the prince was sent * overseas to do homage for Aquitaine to Philip IV. at Amiens, the king sent with him Florentine bankers with instructions to dole out what was necessary to support the prince's state. But these advances were only to be spent with the approval of a special commission, appointed to act with the officers of the prince's household. The commissioners were instructed to "apply such diligence and care in this matter as to merit the king's commendation."[4] The effect was to give them the control of the prince's household.

The prince naturally resented the king's constant interference with his liberty, and perhaps was especially resentful of the control that was exercised through the action of the treasurer. We have seen already one instance of Langton's intervention. It was followed by others of the same sort. At last Langton's refusal of supplies to the prince's wardrobe led in 1305 to the famous quarrel between the heir and the all-powerful treasurer. The prince hurled coarse and bitter words against the minister,[5]

[1] See above, p. 174, note 1. [2] Brown, p. 12.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 365/12, Dec. 12, 1303, "venit comes de Ros cum tota familia sua in omnibus ad sumptum principis per preceptum regis."

[4] *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 222; *Foedera*, i. 967. The commissioners, John of Brittany, earl of Richmond, Aymer de Valence, and Guy Ferre, were, I imagine, the real ambassadors. Blyborough and Reynolds were subordinated to them. A little earlier the king had ordered the prince to charge himself with the expenses of Humphrey, earl of Hereford, and six others attached to the embassy; *C.C.R. u.s.* p. 174.

[5] *Abbreviatio Placitorum*, p. 257.

but the game was all in Langton's hands. Nor need we regard it as merely a personal quarrel between the heir and the treasurer. Edward's action was natural enough in a petulant young man, chafing against his state of dependence and supported by his household in a desperate effort to assert himself. But the king at once took up Langton's quarrel, forbade the presence of his son or of any of the prince's household at court, and stopped all supplies until his surrender.[1] Before long the king denied the prince's followers all access to their lord. It needed the intercession of queen Margaret to procure their return to his court. It required a further entreaty from the prince to his step-mother to permit him to enjoy the society of the two best beloved of his household, Gilbert of Clare and Perot of Gaveston.[2] Though this quarrel was patched up for a time, it was never properly healed. It flared out again in 1307 when the king banished Gaveston, and the defiant son established his friend in state at Crecy in his own land of Ponthieu.[3] It led at last to the ministerial changes after the old king's death. In all this we should see not merely personal antipathies, and the uneasy relations of an over-exacting father and a frivolous and self-seeking son, but rather the conflict of the two rival households, each with its strong organisation, vigorous corporate feeling and conflicting loyalties to its master. Against the most deeply rooted of mediaeval sentiments, the attachment of servant to lord, and against the sense of solidarity, which was natural to each unit of a powerful organisation, the elaborate precautions of the old king were of absolutely no account.

[1] A privy seal letter of the prince to Walter Reynolds vividly brings out the situation; *Misc. Exch.* 5/2, m. 4, "A sire Wautier Reignaut saluz. Pur ceo qe nostre seignour le roy est si corouce deuers nous per reson del cuesq de Cestre, qil ad defendu qe nous ne veignoms en son hostel ne nul de nostre meisnee, e ad aussint defendu a ses gentz de son hostel e del escheker, quil ne nous doignent ne prestent riens, pur la sustenance de nostre hostel, vous mandoms qe vous mettez conseil de nos cnuoier deners en grant haste pour la sustenance de nostre hostel. E ne mustrez rien des busoignes qe nos touchent al evesque de Cestre ne a nul de ceux del escheker en nule manere. . . . Done souz nostre priue seal, etc." These events occurred on June 14. This writ is now printed in Conway Davies, pp. 564-565.

[2] *Ib.* m. 9. "Car verrayement, madame, si nous eussons ceux deux a les autres, nous seroms molt conforte et allege del angoisse qe nous avoms endure e soeffroms encore par lordinaunce nostre dit roy et piere." This was on Aug. 9, two months after the outbreak of June 14.

[3] Miss Johnstone has brought this out in *E.H.R.* xxix. 452.

As the king strove to regulate his son's household, so did the prince's wardrobe in its turn control the prince's local administration. We have seen how a high officer like William of Melton might be transferred from the local to the central machine. The brain of this latter was the prince's council. In this were included the chief lay and clerical officers of his establishment. On it too sat upon occasion the governors of the prince's domains, notably John of Bakewell, the London citizen who was from 1299 to 1305 seneschal of the prince's county of Ponthieu.[1] The accounts show that the prince's council was an active and energetic body, busily engaged in the work of general direction and initiation of his affairs. Thus it was "ordained by the earl's council" that a special advocate be retained to defend the rights of the earl in the county courts of Chester and Flint in 1302–4,[2] and that a yeoman of the prince should be present in the sessions of the bench and exchequer at York to expedite his business there.[3] It was as a deputation of the council that the auditors of the domain revenues acted.[4]

Edward of Carnarvon loved London little, and seldom resided there. But the surplus of the income from the prince's domains was so constantly sent to his wardrobe in London that we are tempted to believe that there was with the prince, as with the king, some sort of standing wardrobe establishment, or treasury, in the capital. It is on record that there was a prince's chancery in London, though its relations with the wardrobe are hard to discover, and it looks as if they were not clearly distinguished from each other. Over this chancery the veteran William of Blyborough presided. Up to his master's accession to the throne the precedence always given to Blyborough over Reynolds suggests that the prince's chancery was higher in status than was his wardrobe. Like the wardrobe, it was certainly a body exercising jurisdiction over the whole of the prince's household and domains and not a mere colligation of the local chanceries at Chester, Carnarvon and Carmarthen. Sometimes, however, in the early years of Edward's rule over Cheshire we find Blyborough established at Chester, directing repairs of Cheshire castles,[1] and on one occasion at least the Cheshire Accounts describe him as "chancellor of Chester."[2] But Blyborough's normal duty was attendance on the prince's person, co-operating with Reynolds in the administration of his affairs. Thus Blyborough and Reynolds went with the prince to France, in 1304.[3] They were with him in 1307 in Scotland, so that they were both near to hand when the old king's death made the prince king of England.[4]

Blyborough's Cheshire visits can largely be explained by the fact that he was always a member of the committee of the prince's council,[5] periodically appointed to examine the accounts of the three local chamberlains of Cheshire, North Wales and West Wales. This body performed for the accounts of these districts the functions of the exchequer for the national accounts but did its work locally in each case. The expenses of its members were borne from the prince's general revenue, and they took their duties very seriously. Their prolonged visits gave opportunities for much interference with the local administration, and perhaps secured the substantial sums by which the domain revenue swelled the wardrobe accounts of Edward of Carnarvon.

The local auditors of accounts were first nominated by the prince on May 1, 1303. The letters patent specified on this occasion John of Havering, knight, William of Blyborough and Thomas of Cambridge, clerks.[6] All three were at work at Chester from June 24 to September 4, when Blyborough returned to London, while Havering and Cambridge remained

[1] Thus in 1302–3 Bakewell, Blyborough and Reynolds are specified as the most important of the prince's council; *Exch. Accts.* 363/18, f. 4.

[2] Brown, p. 41.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 363/18, f. 8.

[4] See later, p. 179, notes 5 and 6.

[1] Brown, p. 43. Repairs were ordered for Beeston Castle, the Castle on Beeston Rock, as it is called in the accounts.

[2] *Ib.* p. 24.

[3] *Foedera*, i. 967.

[4] *Ib.* i. 1018. Blyborough seems after this to have retired. He held no office under Edward II. and died before March 6, 1313. The inclusion of Blyborough manor in Lindsey among the estates recently acquired by him suggests his Lincolnshire origin and the proper modern spelling of his name; *Cal. Inq.* v. 208.

[5] *Exch. Accts.* 363/18, shows clearly it was a council committee. Its expenses were those "quorundum militum et clericorum de consilio principis, auditorum compotorum." Compare *Cheshire Plea Rolls*, No. 35, m. 6, where a "day" was postponed "usque ad aduentum consilii domini comitis hic."

[6] Brown, p. 13. The commission was to audit and receive the accounts of all chamberlains, sheriffs and other ministers in Cheshire, North Wales, West Wales, Montgomery and the land of Haverford. The audit of the 1301–2 accounts of Cheshire took place on August 22, 1303, at Chester.

in Wales till October 24.[1] A later commission in 1307 nominated Blyborough, Reynolds, Cambridge and Sir John Foxley.[2] The layman was perhaps appointed to look after the king's interests, for Havering had been king's justice of North Wales and seneschal of Gascony. Foxley, who replaced Havering when he resumed the latter office in 1305, was a knight and man of business who, as steward of the abbot of Westminster as early as 1286, was not likely to be a *persona grata* to the prince who had no love for the monks of Westminster.[3] He was already acting in 1305 with Cambridge as an inspector of castles in Wales and Cheshire.[4] In 1322 Richard Amory, Thomas of Cambridge and Nicholas Huggate were auditors and accused of unjustly burdening the chamberlain.[5]

All this shows that the financial system imposed on Edward of Carnarvon was both comprehensive and effective. There is little doubt, too, but that his secretarial departments were as elaborate as his financial offices. He had of course his chancery and great seal, kept by Blyborough his chancellor, which issued charters, letters patent and close, and other writs as efficiently and as formally as the royal chancery itself. This chancery, like that of the king, was showing a tendency to have headquarters at London, though it doubtless still on occasion itinerated with the prince. But its records at any rate seem to have been kept normally in London.[6] The prince had also his local chanceries in his three capitals, or four, if we include Abbeville, the chief town of Ponthieu. And for the direct affairs of his household

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 363/18, f. 11. The total expenses "quorundam militum et clericorum de consilio principis, auditorum compotorum" amounted between April 13 and Oct. 24 to £241 : 13 : 4. It also took Reynolds sixty days to draw up the prince's wardrobe account of 30 and 31 Edw. I. He was allowed for this, and for examining the accounts of Cheshire, Wales and Ponthieu in London £42 : 15s. as expenses; *ib.* f. 15.

[2] *Ib.* pp. 27 and 77. The commission was dated Lambeth, May 10, 1307.

[3] *Westminster Abbey Mun.* No. 24,491. Foxley was already a knight by Sept. 29, 1307; *ib.* No. 580; and consequently my statement (*Pl. Edw. II.* p. 342) that he was a knight "before Feb. 2, 1315" needs to be pushed back nearly ten years, indeed to before Nov. 1306. I am indebted to the bishop of Worcester for this correction and the references to the Westminster records. Foxley became baron of the exchequer in 1309.

[4] *Exch. Accts.* 13/12.

[5] *Cheshire Plea Rolls*, No. 35, m. 3.

[6] *Exch. Misc.* 5/2, m 18, shows that "estreats" under the seal of Edward of Carnarvon's exchequer at Chester "sount en la garde nostre chaunceler a Loundres."

and his private correspondence, he had had from an early period his privy seal. It is clear that both his letters under the great and privy seal were enrolled after a similar fashion to those of the king's chancery and wardrobe. If we have no extant enrolments of the prince's chancery, we are lucky in having a fairly complete roll of the letters of the prince's privy seal for a portion of the year 1305.[1] This is a unique document of its sort, for though we know the king's letters under the privy seal were enrolled, hardly so much as a fragment of such an enrolment has survived in the case of any single mediaeval sovereign of England.[2] It shows also how completely French was the current language of business in the household of an illiterate prince. All the devices of the royal household were at his command. The prince, like the king, wrote under his privy seal to his chancellor ordering him to embody his commands in writs under the great seal.[3] He too issued "obligatory letters," sealed by his wardrobe keeper, in lieu of tallies and the other more ancient substitutes for cash payment. He too was forced to get his promises honoured by the Frescobaldi, and to recoup them by orders directed to his chamberlain of Chester. The many illustrations of Edward's personality and habits which the roll supplies are not to our immediate purposes. We must, however, be on our guard against too readily giving as evidence of personal tastes what are common features in all great mediaeval establishments.

No other subject in England had a household establishment

[1] This has long been partially known since 1848 from the summary of it by F. Devon in Deputy Keeper's *Ninth Report*, ap. ii. pp. 246-249. Devon justly adds, "it would be reasonable to infer the existence of a complete system of registration of the private letters of the prince," and remarks on the absence of any similar record as regards both kings and other "distinguished personages." The original is given in *Misc. Exch.* 5/2, and is headed "rotulus literarum domini principis Wallie de anno tricesimo tercio." It is clear on inspection that it is an enrolment of privy seals of the prince. Though only extending over one year, it abstracts some 700 letters, written in French with a few exceptions mainly limited to those addressed to the papal *curia*. I should not now quote it, as I did in 1889 in the *D.N.B.* in my article on Edward II., as evidence of the "careful drilling" of the young prince in business, but rather as proof of the completeness of the organisation of his wardrobe. It is curious that though we have no extant roll of privy seal letters of the crown, we should have this complete roll of those of the prince of Wales. See also in the next volume for similar books of the letters of Edward the Black Prince.

[2] See, however, above, pp. 80-81.

[3] Edward to Blyborough, "Et vous mandons qe vous en fatez faire execucion souz grant seal."

as elaborate as that of the prince of Wales. But every magnate in proportion to his resources had such a household as he could afford, and even the humblest baron had his clerks, his knights and squires, his council, his seals and his wardrobe. The simplest type of baronial household can be represented by the ordinance drawn up about this time for the administration of that of the lord and lady of the considerable Lincolnshire barony of Eresby.

There was a common establishment for the lord and his wife, presided over by a steward, who was a knight, for whom two possible deputies were provided. The chief clerical officer was the "wardrober," who jointly with the steward examined every night the daily expenditure of the household, which was only to be "engrossed" when the steward and his chief deputy were both present. The wardrober was also the chief auditor, or controller, of the steward's account. He too has his deputy, the clerk of the offices. Besides these there was a chief buyer, a marshal, two pantrymen and butlers, two cooks and larderers, a laundress, a saucer and a poulterer, two ushers and chandlers, a porter, a baker, a brewer and two farriers. Nearly all these officers had each his boy (or in the case of the woman her girl) attendant, and when an office was duplicated, one of the holders was to remain in the household, and the other to follow the lord. An important personage was the chaplain and almoner, who was, when required, to give help in writing letters and other documents and act as deputy of the wardrober in his absence, by serving as controller of the expenses of the household. When the lord was away from home, the chaplain was to examine the expenses of the household and account to the wardrober before the steward. His deputies as chaplain were to be "the friars with their boy clerk." A knight of the household was to have 2*s.* 6*d.* a day, when absent on business from the household. A clerk or squire was to receive 1*s.* 6*d.* under similar circumstances, if he had two horses, and 1*s.* a day if he only possessed one horse. The lesser officials with one horse had each 4½*d.* a day. The expenses of both household and wardrobe were to be surveyed four times a year by the "high steward."[1] Here we have the bare minimum of organisation,

[1] *Chanc. Misc.* 3/33. "L'ordenance del hostiel monseignur et madame, le v jour de Janvier a Eresby, lan xij." This is probably 12 Edw. I., so that

but this establishment included both household and wardrobe, an incipient secretariat and a system of control and registry.

Much more elaborate arrangements prevailed in the greater households, but these are rarely revealed to us for the early fourteenth century. Some small light is thrown upon the organisation of a great establishment in the case of the prince of Wales's cousin and future rival, Thomas of Lancaster. With regard to this we have many details of the Lancaster household for some of the years during which Thomas and Henry, his brother, were infants under royal wardship, since their dependence on the king, luckily, resulted in several of their household accounts being preserved in the exchequer. They can be usefully compared with the more abundant information which we possess as to the household of the prince of Wales. Technically these accounts fall into the category of those emanating from the dependent wardrobes of the king's kinsmen. The establishment was the larger since for several years the Lancaster brothers kept house in common with John of Brabant, the son and heir of duke John I. of Brabant, who was, in 1279, contracted in marriage to Margaret the daughter of Edward I., and in 1285 was sent to England to be brought up there, being about fifteen years old at the time. The Lancaster brothers were mere children of about seven and four,[1] but

the date is Jan. 5, 1284. The lord of Eresby then was John Bek and his wife was Eva, niece of Walter Grey, archbishop of York. John Bek received licence in 1276 to crenellate his manor of Eresby, Lincs.; *C.P.R., 1272–81.* p. 158. He was the brother of bishop Anthony Bek of Durham and bishop Thomas Bek of St. David's. On his son Walter's death without issue in 1310, his chief heir was his sister, Alice, to whose son, Robert Willoughby, Eresby passed. Robert died before April 1317, leaving as his heir his son John, then aged 14; *Cal. Inq* vi. 45. Accordingly in 12 Edw. II. John Willoughby was only 16, and could not have been the "lord of Eresby" of this ordinance. From him sprang the line of the Willoughbys de Eresby. Mr. Conway Davies is therefore, I think, premature in describing this ordinance as concerning the household of "Lord and Lady Willoughby d'Eresby"; *Baronial Opposition to Edward II.* p. 62. Extracts from it are in *ib.* p. 569.

[1] Thomas of Lancaster was probably born in 1278, Henry in about 1281, and Margaret in 1275. It shows the difficulty of calculating birth-dates of mediaeval personages that the various "post mortem" inquests on Henry, earl of Lincoln, whose daughter and heiress, Alice Lacy, married earl Thomas, give Thomas's age as "32 and more" or "33," while Alice's is made to vary from 24 to 32; *Cal. Inq.* v. 153-164. The most circumstantial makes her born on Dec. 25, 1281, and therefore 29 years of age at the time

considerable state was required for the household of the heirs of the greatest of English earldoms and of the son of the duke of the greatest Netherlandish duchy, the nephews and the future son-in-law of the English king.

The earliest extant accounts of the household of John of Brabant begin in 1285, and those of the Lancaster brothers go on, with considerable breaks, until 1297, when Thomas and Henry were dubbed knights, and set up their own housekeeping. John of Brabant remained with them after his marriage to Margaret in 1290 and only went home on his accession to the duchy of Brabant in 1294, but Margaret, who after her husband's departure remained in England, had now her own establishment.[1] After this the Lancaster brothers lived alone. Naturally the more important records are those contained in the latest accounts, and especially those of the year 1296–7, when their tutelage came to an end on their joining as knights in the king's expedition to Flanders in that year.[2] But even then the sums mentioned are trifling as compared with those of the receipts and expenses of the prince of Wales. But just as they become really instructive, they come to an end, because Thomas received his earldoms and Henry his lordships. Henceforth both brothers kept house on their own account. Neither were technically of age, but knights who could fight could apparently manage their own lands.

Only tantalising glimpses of earl Thomas's establishment are revealed after he became the lord of five earldoms and the

[1] Mrs. M. A. E. Green's *Princesses of England*, ii. 363-401, gives very careful details of this lady's career from the wardrobe accounts. Mrs. Green was one of the first, and remains one of the few writers who have fully utilised the material contained in wardrobe accounts for biographical purposes.

[2] The earliest "counter-roll of the expenses of John of Brabant" ranges from 14 to 17 Edw. I. (Nov. 1285–Nov. 1289); *Exch. Accts.* 352/6. The next extant accounts of the three are in *ib.* 353/4. Richard of Loughborough, clerk, was the accounting officer. These accounts for 1292–3 were printed by Joseph Burtt in *Camden Miscellany*, ii. 1-15 (1853). The roll extends from Nov. 8, 1292, to the end of May 1293, but entries concerning Thomas and Henry only begin from April 13. The corresponding roll of Edward of Carnarvon, summarised by Devon, *Issue Rolls of the Exchequer*, i. 106-113, show that the three young men were together before this date, being entertained in Feb. to a tournament and to dinner on several later occasions. The roll from Nov. 21, 1296, to Dec. 19, 1297, is in *Chanc. Misc.* 3/28. Richard of Loughborough tendered the account, which was duly audited by the steward and treasurer of the king's wardrobe.

greatest man in England after the king. The most important of these we owe to the accident of its preservation by John Stow.[1] It shows us that between Michaelmas 1313 and Michaelmas 1314 earl Thomas's household expenses amounted to nearly eight thousand pounds. This was the more remarkable a sum, since in this year of Bannockburn, when Thomas was content to send the bare minimum of his *debitum servitium* against the Scots, military expenditure was reduced to a low rate.[2] The great mass of disbursements was for the food, administration and clothing of an enormous household, making the direct *hospicium* expenses amount to over £5230. Equally significant is the "great wardrobe" account for cloth and furs and other stores exceeding £1000. Thomas had already married Alice Lacy, the heiress of the earldoms of Lincoln and Salisbury. A significant item is in the separate account of the countess's expenses for *hospicium* and wardrobe, amounting to £439. She kept house by herself at Pickering. Comparing these items with those of Edward as prince, the totals of the earl are only slightly smaller.[3] Comparing them with those of Edward as king, the household of the subject may well have been a third or a quarter as costly as that of the monarch.[4] Thus the greatest of subjects had a household organisation that was fairly comparable with that of his sovereign, especially as the calls upon it for extra-domestic purposes were infinitely less.

The earl's household had, too, its orderly array of officers. The account already quoted was presented by H. Leicester, the earl's wardrober, who was doubtless a clerk, as was Michael of Meldon, Lancaster's faithful steward. But in the records of Edward II.'s reign the knights of Lancaster's household loom more largely than his clerical *familiares*, undertaking in many cases clerical functions and winning on the whole a scandalous notoriety for their disloyalty and treachery to their lord. Typical knights of Lancaster's household included Robert of Holland,

[1] *Survey of London*, i. 85–87, ed. Kingsford. *See E.H.R.* xlii. 180-200.

[2] Fees of earls, barons, knights and esquires amounted to £623 : 15 : 5; and horses lost in the earl's service, £8 : 6 : 8, suggest the cost of discharging the "servitium debitum" to the Scots campaign, but the earlier and larger item is probably only very partially wages of warriors.

[3] The prince's receipt in 29 Edw. I. (see above, p. 173) was £10,199 : 13 : 6½, that is roughly in the proportion of 5 to 4 of that of Thomas.

[4] See for details of these later, pp. 235-238, 240-241, and 273-278.

the Lancashire knight who laid the foundations of the greatness of the house of Holland in Lancaster's service. Many years his receiver [1] and chief confidant, by whose direction Lancaster was greatly influenced,[2] Holland deserted his master in the crisis of 1322 and died a traitor's death in 1328. A better reputation for loyalty was obtained by John Bek, the knight who conducted for earl Thomas the Sherburne conference, very much as a chancellor would preside over the debates of a parliament. Several other well-known knightly *familiares* of Lancaster were traitors as much as Holland.[3] Such was Adam Banaster, Holland's rival for power in south-west Lancashire, who perished in the Lancashire rebellion of 1316 of which he had been the cause. Such too was Roger Belers, the Leicestershire knight who deserted Lancaster for the court in 1322, and died five years later as a chief baron of the exchequer.[4] And there were other traitors too, like the anonymous knight who in 1317 was brought to the earl at Pontefract with proofs of his treasonable dealings with the Scots. When he discovered that he was a recent deserter from his household Lancaster at once put him to death, "for there is no worse plague than a faithless *familiaris*." [5] The anonymous hymn-writer, who claimed for Thomas the crown of martyred

[1] "Quem praeposuerat gazis suis"; Malmesbury, p. 267; "miles creatus et nutritus a comite"; *Ann. Paulini*, p. 342.

[2] I am now inclined to think that Higden meant Holland when he said that Thomas left "cuncta agenda sua ad nutum unius *nominis* secretarii sui"; *Polychronicon*, viii. 314. Compare Knighton, i. 424. A recent book on the Holland family, which is not very helpful for this period, is that of Mr. Bernard Holland, *The Lancashire Hollands*, 1917. My pupil, Miss May Walker, B.A., has carefully collected materials for the biography of both Banaster and Robert Holland in an unpublished thesis.

[3] Lists of Lancaster's "familiares" might be made from the constant attestors of his charters. Thus in *C.P.R., 1317–21*, the following attest a grant of May 12, 1319, to Belers: Robert of Holland, Nicholas and Stephen Segrave, John Bek, knights; William Trussel, John Kynardsby, Michael Meldon, and Ellis Stapleton, clerks.

[4] My pupil, Miss Dorothy M. Broome, B.A., has put together the life of Roger Belers in an unpublished thesis. Miss Broome shows that, though Belers was already working in the king's interest in the parliament of York in 1318, he strove to please both king and earl until the catastrophe of 1322 brought him over entirely to the winning side. Her ingenious suggestion that Belers was a member of the standing council, set up at Leake, as Lancaster's banneret, is, however, made improbable by the fact that Belers's knighthood seems subsequent to that date.

[5] Cont. Trivet. p. 24; compare Wals. *Hist. Angl.* i. 152, "Paulo antea de familia comitis fuerat specialis."

sanctity, enumerates among his chief sufferings his betrayal by a crowd of traitor knights.[1]

Both Edward and Thomas had in common not only organised households, but a disposition to leave the conduct of their affairs to their followers. Hence the political conflict of the reign was not so much a strife between the king and the earl as between the household of the king and the household of the earl. How profoundly this circumstance affected the political history of the reign we shall have abundant opportunity to discover later.

[1] Wright, *Political Songs*, pp. 270-71.

"Pro dolor! acephalatur plebis pro juvamine,
Suorumque desolatur militum stipamine,
Dum dolose desiandatur per sudam Hoylandiae."

The English song in *ib.* pp. 237-240 shows that the aristocratic households had their disorders equally with that of the king.

SECTION II

General View of the Political and Administrative History of the Reign of Edward II.

In a recent work I have dealt at some length with the general place of the reign of Edward of Carnarvon in English history, and have aimed at showing that its importance has upon the whole been unduly minimised.[1] The failures of those twenty years are obvious enough. The collapse of Edward I.'s imperial ambition of a united Britain, the slowness of the further growth of the parliamentary institutions which had made such progress under the old king, the general mediocrity of talent and public spirit—all these bring out the patent contrast between the reign of the father and that of the son. But that contrast has been pushed too far, and the admission of its general truth should not preclude us from recognising that Edward II.'s reign has an interest of its own as witnessing important developments upon lines of which traditional history has taken little account. In particular I have claimed for the reign of Edward II. that it is a time of peculiar importance in the development of the administrative machinery by which the central government was carried on. In the course of those twenty years reforms were devised which deeply affected every branch of the administration. They profoundly modified both the great traditional offices of state, the chancery and exchequer, and the household executive offices, with which we are more specially concerned. If many of the projects of reform remained unrealised, if many of the schemes were carried out on paper rather than in practice, the net result was a real strengthening and consolidating of an already strong machine. The Edwardian reforms were so far operative that they left comparatively little for future generations to work out.

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* 1914. The publication in 1917 of Mr. J. Conway Davies's important *Baronial Opposition to Edward II.* adds much new information with regard to the administrative history of the reign. I have found it of great value in revising not only this section but the whole of the chapter on the reign of Edward II.

They make the reign a real turning-point in administrative history. The machine of state, as left by Edward II., retained its general shape for the rest of the middle ages.

The credit for this process may be divided between statesmen, conscious of a desire for reformation, and the efforts of the offices themselves, and of the officials working in them, to remove abuses and to bring about improvements suggested by experience. The leaders in the changes were not always the men whose names loom largest in the annals of the time. In particular, little credit for reforming zeal can be ascribed to the baronial opposition, whose stolid conservatism was content with repeated efforts to remedy glaring abuses of the royal power. There was more of the radical spirit among the courtiers than among the nobles. Yet of Edward's chief friends only one, the younger Hugh le Despenser, can be regarded as a real reformer. Even in his case the generous principles by which Hugh was inspired were too often vitiated by the greediness and self-seeking that marred their effectiveness and ruined his career. The real reformers were rather to be found among the official class, the permanent civil service as we should call it,[1] set free by the weakness both of the king and magnates, to work out their own ideas upon the lines suggested by their practical experience and with a minimum of external control. It was by reason of the remoteness of administrative reform from the clash of party strife that its work was the more effective and permanent.

Some limitations must be set to this generalisation, for it was one of the new features of the reign of Edward II. that the problem of administration became for the first time mixed up with the general political conflict of the reign. The withdrawal of the firm hand of Edward I. let loose, as under the weak reign of Henry III., a storm of conflict between the only strong political forces in mediaeval England, the king and the baronage. Such a battle had raged for a generation under Henry III., but it had, as we have seen, had little effect on the course of administrative development. Neither barons nor courtiers had an

[1] I have attempted to sketch the position of this class at this period in my lecture on *The English Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century* (1916, Manchester University Press), reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, iii. 185-214.

administrative policy of their own, but both alike contributed towards the improvement of a machine which both parties accepted as necessary and sought to control in their own interest. Edward I., a strong king, loving efficiency but dominated by very conservative instincts, strove to weld the administrative system into a coherent whole which would enable him to exercise to the uttermost his supreme authority. There could be no question then of any reforms not coming directly from the crown and directed to promote the interests of the crown. Even the parliamentary system grew up in obedience to the royal will. It was no yielding to a people crying for liberty, but the shrewd device of an autocrat, anxious to use the mass of the people as a check upon his hereditary foes among the greater baronage.

Under Edward II. conditions seemed to revert to those which had prevailed under Henry III. There was soon opened up a free field for that renewed conflict of king and barons which had begun during the declining years of Edward I. On its higher side this struggle represented the clash of the conflicting ideals of autocracy and aristocracy;[1] on its lower a series of constantly fluctuating personal rivalries and hereditary feuds. It was seldom that these lower considerations allowed opportunity for a conflict of principle, for it was rarely the case that each side could marshal all its forces for a straight conflict. Strong loyalties, traditions of honour, community of sentiment, and to a large extent common ties of blood bound large sections of the baronage to the crown. Similarly the natural supporters of the crown, the courtiers, bureaucrats and officials, were always liable, when they had made their careers, to drift towards the baronial policy. The knight of the household, raised to baronial status by the rewards of service, was ever inclined to drift towards the point of view of the higher social class which he had attained. The clerical civil servant, when endowed by a bishopric, became, as often as not, a new recruit to the spiritual aristocracy whose normal attitude was absolutely the same as that of the lay magnates. And behind the narrow circles of barons and bishops, courtiers and officials, who were the permanent governing classes, lay the great masses of the smaller landed proprietors and of the

[1] Compare Conway Davies, p. v: "It was a conflict of principles, contradictory and irreconcilable."

traders of the towns, who, if still unable to lead, were now competent to take a side. For their support both parties to the main conflict eagerly competed at every great crisis. We are now getting to the period when these lesser folk were almost in a position to turn the scale. But the natural antagonism of the small landlord to the mighty baron, and the whole-hearted pursuit of material interests by the commercial classes long made these fresh elements in political life gravitate more naturally to the crown than to the aristocracy.

The last years of Edward I. were eminently critical, yet the king could seldom rely upon whole-hearted national support in the external troubles which beset the concluding period of his reign. Under Edward II. the absorption of king and barons in internecine conflict made each alike indifferent to national honour, and careless as to the progress of the Scottish war of independence. Yet it was only gradually that the special features of the new reign manifested themselves. At first the omens pointed to the diminution rather than to the embittering of the feuds that had raged for years between the old king and the baronial leaders. Both contemporary chroniclers and later historians have imagined great changes in policy and personnel as resulting from the accession of the young king. But they wrote after the course of events had later worked out in that direction.

The immediate results of the young king's accession were the elimination of the strong personality of Edward I. and the fall of his chief minister, Walter Langton, who lost his office, property and liberty, not so much because he was the agent of the late monarch's policy, as because he had been involved in sharp personal conflicts with the disobedient heir. But the strife between Edward I. and his son was but a trifle compared with the old king's furious hostility to the barons and bishops. This struggle had already been marked by the humiliation of the earls of Gloucester, Hereford and Norfolk, and the exile of Winchelsea and Anthony Bek. The fall of Langton meant the reconciliation with the crown of the sons of the chief baronial victims of Edward's policy and the return home of the rebellious prelates from their banishment. Such a termination of ancient feuds involved a strengthening not a weakening of the crown.

How willing the earls were to rally round the new occupant of the throne is clear from the fact that seven earls, including the old earl of Lincoln, the chief lay supporter of Edward I., and the young earls of Lancaster and Hereford, the future leaders of the opposition, united in witnessing the charter which made Edward's favourite, Peter Gaveston, their peer as earl of Cornwall.[1] It is not impossible that the gradual relinquishment of the Scottish campaign, generally set down to the discredit of the new king, may have been equally the result of the aversion of the baronage to imperialistic adventure and to a general wish to break from the ruinous enterprises of the dead monarch. Yet continuity with the old régime was kept up by the nomination of so characteristic a supporter of Edward I. as John Benstead as keeper of the new king's wardrobe, and by the appointment as chancellor of bishop John Langton of Chichester, who had spent a long official life in the chancery of the old king. The only really new element in the new administration was composed of the personal servants of Edward as prince of Wales. With Walter Reynolds, the keeper of the prince's wardrobe, as treasurer instead of Walter Langton, with the bodily transference of most of the prince's wardrobe, headed by William Melton, into the new royal wardrobe, it looks as if the new administration was to be formed by a judicious combination of the best servants of Edward I., the leading *familiares* of his son and some representatives of the former baronial opposition, now rallied to the crown.

These fair prospects were soon clouded over. One great reason for this was the personal ambition and vanity of the new earl of Cornwall, who insulted the magnates and inspired his master with his own aversion to them. Yet we must not follow too implicitly the chroniclers' purely personal interpretation of the new situation. Now that he was on his father's throne, Edward II. had natural reasons for keeping the earls at a distance. And perhaps a more potent element still in wrecking hopes of reconciliation was the ruinous load of debt and administrative confusion which showed the breakdown of the over-ambitious

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 2. The seven were Henry of Lacy earl of Lincoln, Thomas earl of Lancaster, John Warrenne earl of Surrey, Humphrey Bohun earl of Hereford, Edmund Fitzalan earl of Arundel, John of Brittany earl of Richmond, and Aymer of Valence earl of Pembroke.

and over-costly policy of Edward I. The constant ministerial changes in the first few years of the reign are symptomatic of the deep unrest. Only Walter Reynolds remained permanently in office, moving from the treasury to the chancery and neglecting, it would seem, the work of each of these offices. After three years John Langton quitted the chancery and went into opposition. Benstead deserted the wardrobe after a year, and with it threw off his clergy and became a knight, a judge and a married man. Droxford, another leading *garderobarius* of Edward I., tried his hand at the wardrobe for a year. He then went back to his bishopric and soon drifted, like John Langton, into the opposition. Neither Droxford nor Benstead could present accounts that the exchequer could accept, and the king fell more and more into the hands of the foreign bankers, Italian or Gascon, who exploited his necessities as ruthlessly as they had exploited those of his father. No wonder that the old ministers of Edward I. deserted his son's service and openly rose up against his policy.

It was the same with the secular magnates and particularly with the mass of the earls, whose tendency was now to act in a body in such a fashion that they might well have become, like the German electors, a separate "estate" of the higher nobility.[1] The indignation of the earls was the more bitter since the kinsfolk of the Gascon favourite were sharing in the exploitation of the royal revenue, and managing the earldom of Cornwall in their own interests. The result was the reconstitution of the baronial opposition in such irresistible strength that everybody, save the court camarilla, was soon on its side. Against a united

[1] The right of the earls to speak for the nation is strongly emphasised by the author of the *Mirror of Justices*, probably Andrew Horn, chamberlain of London, who so often reflects the ideals of the opposition to Edward II. See for instance p. 155 (ed. Selden Soc.): "E ou *les ordenaunces se duissent fere du comun assent del roy e de ses countes*, la se funt ore par le roi e ses clercs e par aliens e autres, qi nosent contrevenir le roi." It is not necessary to regard this with Maitland as an anticipation of later anti-clericalism (*ib.* Introd. pp. xxviii-xxx). It is the Englishman's cry for the earls to save the state, threatened by the curialistic clerks who seemed likely to be its undoing. Sometimes the *Mirror* gets shrewdly near the mark. Its statement that of the "two knights" and the "two clerks" or "lettered men" who hold pleas in the exchequer, the two knights only are called "barons" (p. 36), seems wild enough. But it is curious that the proportion of lay to clerical barons of the exchequer under Edward II. was exactly twelve to eleven; *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 336. Was this accident, or does the statement in the *Mirror* suggest a policy of equal division between clerks and laymen?

aristocratic opposition Edward II. was powerless, and in 1308 he was forced to consent to the second exile of Gaveston. But the removal of the favourite made matters no better, for the court party had now consolidated itself, and was firmly entrenched in the royal household. It inspired the king to crafty and successful devices to break up the opposition, but the return of Gaveston could only be purchased by the royal concessions contained in the Stamford Articles of 1309, which were in substance a repetition of the *Articuli super Cartas* of 1300 and therefore of importance to us as embodying the policy of the purging of the royal household, which had already been faintly voiced under Edward I. However, Gaveston had learnt nothing by his exile in Ireland, and renewed disgust at his impertinences soon united the barons, whom the king had induced to consent to his recall, with the stalwarts of the opposition who had rejected the Stamford compromise. The result was the reconstitution of a united opposition and the second surrender of the king. From this followed the appointment of the lords ordainers in 1310, and the promulgation in Oct. 1311 of the long series of ordinances which provided not only for the permanent exile of Gaveston and the foreigners, but also for a careful review of the whole administration of state and household.

The ideal professedly before the ordainers was efficiency on conservative lines. The king was still to govern, but his ministers were to be chosen by the baronage in parliament, and he was to do nothing of importance without their advice. It was an anticipation of the Whig ideal of a constitutional king whose authority was in practice wielded by a united aristocracy. This change of direction did not in itself influence the current of administrative history. The ordainers, like Edward I., regarded the administrative machine as a unity. Each branch of it was to be kept strictly to its traditional work. The exchequer was to have the complete control of finance. The chancery was to be responsible for administration, and for the issue of all writs, administrative or judicial, whereby the national policy was framed. But the exchequer was no longer to hear common pleas, or issue under its seal writs that usurped the functions of chancery writs. Even the household departments were allowed their natural sphere, but they were to be strictly limited to

household affairs and sternly warned off usurping the authority of the constituted offices of state. Thus the wardrobe was to continue its proper work of ruling the royal household, but it was to depend on the exchequer for its supplies, and was no longer to pose as a rival office of finance. Its infringements of the jurisdiction of the chancery and the law courts by writs of privy seal were no longer to be tolerated, but the strictly domestic secretariat was to go on, though it was to be made more responsible by setting up a special officer to keep the privy seal. And all the chief officers of the household, like the heads of chancery, exchequer and the two benches, were to be appointed by the baronage in parliament. The "estate of the household," like the "estate of the realm," was a matter of national concern, and the last word was to be with the assembled baronage.

However little revolution was intended, the acceptance of the ordainers' programme involved a drastic constitutional and administrative readjustment for which neither Edward nor England generally was prepared. The king had little intention of carrying out honestly the policy involved in his surrender, and the barons had good reason for not allowing him to exercise without control even the limited authority still left to him by the ordinances. Accordingly a confused period followed in which court and baronage were each playing at cross purposes, and the national policy varied from day to day as the one or the other impulse proved the stronger.

At first a certain show of carrying out the ordinances suggested that the king had acquiesced in the policy forced upon him. But the numerous minor changes effected in the few following weeks, though ostensibly made to please the barons, could not all have been agreeable to them.[1] It was something that Gaveston took ship for Flanders, though he overstayed his allotted time in England for three days and sailed from the Thames, and not, as prescribed, from Dover.[2]

[1] They are detailed in *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 94-95.

[2] The movements of Gaveston at this time are exceedingly mysterious. The ordinances had decreed that he should leave Dover on Nov. 1 for places beyond sea outside Edward's power. His original destination seems to have been Brabant, for on Oct. 9 Edward wrote to duke John of Brabant and his wife Margaret, the king's sister, asking them to receive him favourably; *Foedera*, ii. 144. Malmesbury (p. 174) says simply, "clam propter adversarios secessit in Flandriam, omni fere populo ignorante ad quas partes divertisset." *Ann.*

But there were no changes at all in the household staff, and the purging of the king's *familia* was to the barons the root of the matter. Perhaps their greatest step in the direction of reducing the amount of domestic administration was taken in the writs, issued between November 4 and 10, by which the keepers of the forfeited lands of Langton and the Templars were associated in their commission with prominent ordaining partisans, such as Henry Percy and John Botetourt, and ordered to render their future accounts to the exchequer, and not as hitherto to the chamber.[1] The actions of a parliament of barons and commons, which sat at London from November 12 to December 18,[2] gave force to the ordainers' resolution and compelled the king to make larger concessions. Further changes were made and some satisfactory new appointments secured. It is significant that, during the period of the parliamentary session, many acts were enrolled in chancery as done "by the king with the assent of the ordainers," or "with the assent of the magnates in parliament."[3] We are the more grateful for these memoranda, since the contradictory mandates on the chancery rolls of this

Paul. (p. 271) says he went to Bruges. Trokelowe (pp. 68-69) declares that he first went to France, but was driven out by Philip IV. and fled to Flanders. *Chron. de Lanercost* (pp. 217-218) says he went to Flanders but was driven out by the French king's influence. The Canon of Bridlington (p. 202) tells us that he sailed on Nov. 3 from the Thames and stayed for a short time "inter Rutenos." All agree that he was back about Christmas time. The patent, issued on Nov. 30 under baronial pressure (*Foedera*, ii. 151), repeats as a rumour that Peter, "adhuc latitat, discurrit, et vagatur de loco in locum, de castro in castrum, de fortiletio in fortiletium, infra comitatus Cornubie, Devonie, Sumersetie et Dorsetie," and appoints Hugh of Courtenay and William Martin to search for him. This throws some light on Malmesbury's further statement that he soon returned and "caute ambulabat, nunc in camera regis, nunc apud Walyngford, nunc in castello de Tyntagel latere putabatur." There is no doubt of his joining Edward at Windsor before Christmas.

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 148, from fine rolls. This was a stiffening of a mandate of Oct. 9, which directed the old keepers of those lands to answer at the exchequer; *ib.* p. 144. *C.F.R.* ii. 110-114, which summarises all the writs of this type, slurs over the essential part by neglecting any reference to the transference of accountability from the chamber to the exchequer. For more details see later, pp. 317-318, 321-324, 338-343, and 349-354.

[2] This parliament was summoned for Nov. 12, and writs for expenses were issued on Dec. 18; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 448.

[3] For instances see *C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 408 and 409. It is also clear that the writ of Nov. 25, transferring the former chamber manors to the wardrobe (*Foedera*, ii. 150), is of courtly, and that of Nov. 30 ordering the search for Gaveston (*ib.* p. 151) is of baronial inspiration. Such efforts to enforce the ordinances are all prior to Dec. 19, when the parliament broke up.

period are indifferently inspired by the court and by the opposition, and it is well to have concrete evidence of their real source.

Edward was not, however, playing the game fairly. After the briefest of exiles Gaveston reappeared in England, and the rumour reached London that he was wandering secretly from castle to castle in the south-west, apparently in those of his old Cornish earldom.[1] On November 30 a proclamation was issued against him in the name of the king,[2] entrusting two of the lords ordainers with his arrest. But it had no result. The king had already begun to throw off the mask. On November 25 he had appointed a new set of keepers of the sometime chamber lands, and directed them to answer for their issues in the wardrobe.[3] Afraid to indulge in many such gross breaches of the ordinances, Edward strove to evade the demand that his ministers of state should be appointed by the baronage in parliament by dispensing altogether with a chancellor and treasurer. He perhaps thought it would be easier to get his own way by working through temporary keepers of the chancery and treasury, appointed from the staffs of those offices.[4]

These acts of defiance and evasion roused the barons to further action. It is probably within a few days of the issue of the writ of November 25 that the remarkable document

[1] Malmesbury, p. 174.

[2] *Foedera*, ii. 151. Hugh Courtenay, a Devonshire lord, and William Martin of Kemmes, a South Welsh marcher, were the two executors of the order.

[3] *Ib.* ii. 150.

[4] This seems the best explanation of the following facts. Walter Reynolds, who had never devoted much personal attention to the affairs of the chancery, almost ceases to be called chancellor from this period. On Dec. 11 he surrendered the great seal (*C.F.R.* ii. 118), which was subsequently kept by a commission of chancery clerks, at whose head was Adam Osgodby, "keeper of the household of the chancery," save on the occasions when, as usual, it was deposited in the wardrobe under seal. Moreover, John Sandall, the treasurer, whose sympathies were with the barons, was on Oct. 23 ordered not to meddle further with his office; Madox, ii. 48. The veteran baron of the exchequer, Richard of Abingdon, was made "locum tenens thesaurarii"; *C.W.* 82/2413. But he was absent from London, and Walter Norwich, another baron, was put in his place. I take this opportunity of correcting my list of treasurers in *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 332. It is strange, however, that the subsequent appointment of Walter Langton as treasurer, on Jan. 23 and March 14, 1312 (*C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 412, 441), should have been accompanied by mandates to Sandall, as well as to Norwich, to surrender the office to Langton. Moreover, on March 27, it was believed at the court of York that Sandall was dead and his ecclesiastical goods in the diocese of Durham were sequestered to pay his debts to the exchequer; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 412.

was drawn up called the "second ordinances of the earls." [1] This not only reiterated the original demands of the ordainers, but specified a large number of individual courtiers who were to be removed from court, including in this number all the household officers that the king specially trusted. Conspicuous among these were Charlton the chamberlain,[2] Warley, keeper of the wardrobe, and John Ockham the cofferer.

The significance of the personal changes that followed the new baronial demonstration is difficult to work out. But it looks as if, by way of a last effort to conciliate the barons, an attempt was made to keep out of the way the most hated of the household leaders. Chance favoured the king in compelling Charlton to quit the court to wage war against the Welsh kinsmen of his wife in Powys.[3] But more significant is the fact that, some time in December, Warley was replaced as keeper by a less notorious wardrobe official, named Peter of Collingbourn. The meaning of this change will be discussed elsewhere,[4] but if it were a concession to the opposition, it was the last one that Edward made. Soon after parliament was dissolved on December 18, Edward betook himself to Windsor, highly indignant that his barons should have presumed to interfere with his domestic arrangements. He complained that he could not

[1] They are printed in *Ann. Lond.* pp. 198-202 and in *Mun. Gildhallae Londoniensis, Lib. Cust.* II. ii. 82-90. Mr. Conway Davies (p. 382) notes that there is a manuscript copy in the cathedral library at Canterbury (*MS.* K. 11, dorso).* It is superinscribed "Declaratio quorundam articulorum ordinationum suprascriptarum." Mr. Davies's "committee of the ordainers" puts in rather too formal a fashion the essential fact that two earls took it upon themselves to speak on their behalf. The date of the second ordinances may be nearly fixed by internal evidence. They were probably prior to Nov. 30, for Gaveston is still considered to be abroad. But they must be subsequent to Nov. 25, since there is a specific complaint that some of the Templars' lands which had been entrusted to certain keepers to answer, according to the ordinances, at the exchequer, had been regranted to those who held them before the ordinances. This must surely be a reference to the writs of Nov. 4-10 and 25, already quoted (pp. 196-197). The date then is probably between Nov. 25 and 30.

[2] For the date of Charlton's becoming chamberlain see Conway Davies, pp. 215-216. I incline to the view that the entry under Feb. 22, 1310, in *Issue Roll*, No. 150, practically proves he was in office before the ordinances. See also later, pp. 208, 225, 241, 319 and 322.

[3] Trouble began when Edward refused Gruffydd of Pool redress on Oct. 28; Conway Davies, p. 571. Some time before March 23, 1312, Charlton was besieged by Gruffydd in Powys Castle; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, pp. 456-457.

[4] See Sect. III. pp. 232-233 and 241-242.

follow his wishes as regards appointing a single member of his household. He was treated like a fool or a madman, when his whole household was dependent on the will of others.[1] Full of rage, he called Gaveston to his presence, and the favourite, who had already worked his way as far eastwards as Wallingford, joined his master at Windsor where they kept Christmas together.[2] His next move was to get the great seal in his hands. Since Reynolds's retirement, this instrument had been kept by Osgodby and his colleagues. Up to December 29, they had sealed writs at Westminster [3] under the eye of the barons. The last of these included a mandate to the keepers of the lands of the Templars and Langton to account for their issues to the exchequer, "as they would wish to avoid our indignation and their own loss." [4] But this was the last word of concession. On the very next day, December 30, the complacent officials took the great seal to Windsor, surrendered it to the king,[5] and returned to the capital.

Early in the new year Edward and Gaveston started from Windsor for the north, accompanied by the household officers who had defied the barons' power. On their way they despatched the sheriff of Nottinghamshire to summon the chancery to go with all haste to York.[6] This message reached the chancery in London on January 7, and was at once obeyed. On January 20 the chancery clerks appeared before Edward at York, and were shown the great seal in a bag "still sealed with their seals," and were bidden next day to execute chancery work in the church of St. Mary's outside York Castle. But their proceedings showed that timid officials, waiting on events, were likely to evade responsibility. When called on to seal a proclamation testifying to Gaveston's loyalty, drawn up in unusual form and dated on January 18, two days before their arrival, they cautiously recorded on the roll that the writ was issued in a form made by the king himself and sealed by his express command.[7] The

[1] Malmesbury, p. 174.

[2] Malmesbury is in error in making the king keep Christmas at York.

[3] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 411.

[4] *Foedera*, ii. 153.

[5] *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 448.

[6] *Ib.*

[7] *Foedera*, ii. 153. Contrary to custom this writ was drawn up in French, and it may have been the irregularity of using the vernacular that gave a pretext for the clerks' protest, though they used French in their protest also. Anyhow it was irregular to seal a writ, dated two days earlier, and, clearly from its form, drafted in the wardrobe. The more formal writ of restitution to

strenuous support of the household officers alone enabled Edward to govern the north.

Edward still strove to prevent the exchequer at Westminster from falling entirely under baronial control. Walter Norwich and his colleagues were as timid as Osgodby and his brethren, though the lieutenant of the treasurer had his permanent position improved by his nomination as chief baron on March 3.[1] Edward took a bold step to establish his hold over them when he made peace with the imprisoned Walter Langton, and, a few days after his release from custody, nominated him treasurer of the exchequer. A January appointment failing to elicit any response from Westminster, Langton was reappointed in March, and the barons and chamberlains were sternly ordered to receive him as treasurer. With something of the ancient daring that had once inspired him to beard the clergy and baronage in the cause of Edward I., Langton returned to the lion's den in London in the hope of vindicating his position by presiding over the Easter session of the exchequer. On the very day that the exchequer met, the Monday after the close of Easter, April 3, Langton took his seat. Thereupon three magnates of the opposition, the earls of Hereford and Pembroke and John Botetourt, burst into the hall and drove Langton away by threats of violence.[2] Langton's nerves were no longer strong enough to face the crisis, and he weakly withdrew, betaking himself soon afterwards to Avignon on ecclesiastical business. The king ordered Langton to continue to act, and instructed the barons of the exchequer to obey him.[3]

Gaveston, dated Jan. 20, was in Latin, but was accompanied by a similar memorandum that it was dated "de precepto suo (*i.e.* regis) sub gravi forisfactura emisso." I do not understand how the writ, dated Knaresborough, Jan. 8 (*C.P.R.* p. 414), can have been really sealed or drafted in chancery at that time and place. It is probably another instance of a writ sealed after its real date of composition.

[1] *C.P.R.* pp. 433, 437.

[2] See the dramatic picture of the appearance at the exchequer of the three lords, drawn up next day by the barons of the exchequer in the letter in which they reported these proceedings to the king, in *M.R.*, *K.R.* No. 85, m. 52, and *ib. L.T.R.* No. 82, m. 45. It is now printed in Conway Davies, pp. 551-552. It is interesting to note how the officials at Westminster strove to keep on good terms with the king, just as the officials of chancery at York sought to plead duress to the baronage for their compliance with the king's orders. The official left high politics to king and magnates, and wished simply to carry on his official routine.

[3] *Foedera*, ii. 164.

But on May 17 Edward, despairing of utilising so broken a reed, closed the incident by bidding Norwich to continue as lieutenant of the treasury.[1] It was after this triumph that the barons made their appeal to arms by which they soon established their position against the king. The north was overrun; Gaveston was forced to surrender at Scarborough, and his murder, at the instigation of Lancaster and Warwick, removed the upstart who was thought to have been the cause of the differences between the king and the lords.

Events soon showed that the issues between the magnates and their king were not merely personal. The base treachery by which Warwick and Lancaster had broken their pledge to Pembroke and Warenne had produced a schism in the baronial ranks which in substance outlasted the reign. The profound indignation of Pembroke and other barons at the violation of the pact of Scarborough, to which they had been parties, made it impossible, save for short periods in 1314, 1318 and 1321, for the baronage to confront Edward with a united opposition, like that which had secured the passing of the ordinances. The angry king naturally made every effort to revenge the death of Gaveston, and could count upon the support of a large section of the ancient opposition in attempting that purpose. Hence the threats of war, the intrigues, negotiations and compromises that filled up the latter part of 1312 and nearly the whole of 1313. When a sort of peace was at last patched up, it proceeded not from the victory of one party over the other, but from sheer despair of forcing an issue, complicated by the terror and disgust which the successful establishment of Robert Bruce over all Scotland had aroused among patriots. It was now the king's game to pose as the leader of all England to punish the audacious Scots. But the Bannockburn campaign was the crushing answer to that policy. The military historian may easily show that the victory of Bruce was the triumph of good generalship and wise tactics over an ill-led and disorderly army. The historian of administration will rather explain the battle of Bannockburn by the imperfect reconciliation of the rival factions which sent the king to the fight, unaccompanied by Lancaster and the fiercer lords of the opposition, who ostentatiously withheld all but the bare

[1] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 459.

minimum of vicarious service which feudal obligation required. The discontented barons voiced the general feeling when they told Edward that he had failed to conquer the Scots because God was not on his side. Bannockburn was to them the judgement of heaven against the perjured king, who had forsworn the ordinances, who retained in his household the evil counsellors whom the ordainers had sought to remove, and had striven with their help to raise an army in defiance of the wishes of the natural leaders of the nation.[1]

From this point of view Bannockburn represents a last despairing effort to evade the execution of the ordinances. Had Edward won the day, he might well have turned his victorious army against the stalwarts of the opposition. His defeat, involving, as it did, severe personal losses, both to his courtly following and to the patriotic barons who attended him, left him helpless in the hands of Lancaster and his friends. For one brief moment it seemed as if the ordinances were at last to be executed in their rigour. In the autumn, at a parliament at York, the purgation of the household was for the moment effected and the offices of state, great and small, were filled with baronial nominees. The opposition had become the government.

The baronial leaders failed to make the best of their opportunities. They were still uncertain of their aims and too jealous of each other to maintain a united front against the king. The old feuds about the death of Gaveston were still unhealed, and there were astute courtiers who knew how to keep ancient sores open. But the greatest difficulty in the way of the barons was the personality of Thomas of Lancaster. As frivolous and idle as the king, he let everything be decided by his own household councillors, and they in their turn were more incompetent and more treacherous than were their counterparts in the household of the king.[2] Earl Thomas might, if he had wished it, have become the virtual head of the government, but he preferred to continue the policy of opposition, suitable to his old rôle as critic of the king. From Bannockburn onwards he showed some activity in affairs;[3] but he soon relapsed into his ancient

[1] Malmesbury, p. 208. [2] See for this Sect. I. above, pp. 185-187.

[3] Conway Davies (pp. 396-400) illustrates the comparatively conspicuous participation of Thomas in affairs of state in 1314 and 1315.

habit of absenting himself from councils. The king then began to recall his friends to his domestic service, and the confusion was worse than ever. Famine, civil war, Scottish invasions, complicated the situation. The soundest element in the government between 1312 and 1317 was earl Aymer of Pembroke, who took an active and conspicuous part in the administration.[1] But Pembroke was hardly firm enough to hold his own against Lancaster. At last, despairing of earl Thomas, the lords in 1315 chose earl Guy of Warwick as the king's principal councillor, but Guy died before he could effect anything, and the only hope of the baronage was now to strengthen earl Thomas's hands.

Accordingly in 1316 the parliament of Lincoln formally besought the earl of Lancaster to become the king's chief councillor. Lancaster hardly condescended to accept the office. He never fulfilled its duties, for he continued to play his purely personal game. As his incompetence became more patent, the king plucked up courage to call back to his household and state the last of the victims of 1314. Meanwhile the Scots brutally devastated the northern counties, and well meant but futile attempts of peace-making on the part of John XXII., the new pope, proved abortive. Politics centred more and more round the ineffective struggles of the households of king Edward and earl Thomas. Things went from bad to worse, until a desperate effort was made to undermine the power of the king and earl alike. With the beginnings of this new movement, we reach the chief dividing point in the reign.

The process, which bade fair to remedy for a time the chaos into which the state had fallen, began with a coalition of some of the wiser members of the baronial party with some of the more far-seeing officials of the court. The more intelligent barons saw the impossibility of successful leadership under Lancaster, and the equal impossibility of getting rid of him without the

[1] Mr. Conway Davies (pp. 110-112 and 322-331) brings out in a novel and convincing way the prominent share Pembroke took in the council and in administration during these years, especially between 1312 and 1314. He prints numerous letters of the king to Pembroke under the privy and secret seals, mainly from *Ancient Correspondence*. Perhaps it is going too far when Mr. Davies (p. 111) says that Pembroke was "virtual head of the administration." The point was that the administration was headless.

support of the court. The household officers, we may well believe, were as conscious of the helpless imbecility of the king as the reformers were of the ineptitude of the great earl. Not only good government, but the personal prospects of the discontented partisans were in each case imperilled by the continuance of the preponderance of the incompetent earl. It was, accordingly, both to their personal interest and for the welfare of the state that the courtiers and the opposition chiefs should alike bestir themselves to put an end to the power of both Edward and Thomas. With this object a middle party of discontented patriots and courtiers gradually formed itself in the latter part of 1317.

Aymer of Valence, earl of Pembroke, was the soul of this new movement. He had never forgiven Lancaster the Deddington outrage, and experience had long cooled the fierce enthusiasm which he had shown for the ordaining cause before Gaveston's death. His bitter experience of the ineffectiveness of the government, in which he had done his best to play his part, must have convinced him that a more constructive policy was necessary to remedy the evils from which the state was suffering. He now struck up a close association with the Kentish baron, Bartholomew of Badlesmere, the son of Guncelin of Badlesmere, for many years justice of Chester under the old king. This baron began his career as a knight of the earl of Gloucester's household, having married a kinswoman of that magnate. Like earl Aymer, he had had close associations with earl Thomas, but had now become utterly disgusted with him. Before the end of 1317 Aymer and Bartholomew had become leaders of a party whose policy was to induce the king to be governed by the advice of Pembroke and Badlesmere and to trust their counsels more than any other men on earth. Great men joined their ranks, including Roger of Amory, Hugh of Audley and Hugh Despenser the younger, the husbands of the three Gloucester co-heiresses, who thus had affinities with Badlesmere's wife, a lady of the house of Clare. Among the earls the new party found support from Warenne, now engaged in a fierce private war with Lancaster. To these were added Edmund Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, an ancient ordainer closely allied by marriage to Warenne and Despenser, and Humphrey of Hereford,

up to now the bitterest opponent of his royal brother-in-law. The two Roger Mortimers of Chirk and Wigmore brought with them to the middle party all the fierce lords of the March of Wales. There was almost an equal measure of episcopal support, and, most surprising of all, the chief officers of the royal household, John Charlton, the chamberlain, William Montagu, the steward, Northburgh, the keeper of the privy seal, united with John Hotham, bishop of Ely, the treasurer, in supporting the new party. The weak king was soon hopelessly in their hands.[1] If he still remained in tutelage, his tutelage was now of a milder and more respectful character.

The real problem was how to coerce Lancaster. It looked as if civil war was about to break out between the friends and foes of earl Thomas, but the earl's bark was worse than his bite. Lacking courage to fight things out, he entered into tortuous negotiations which resulted in his virtual surrender in the treaty of Leake of August 9, 1318. That a single earl should be in a position to negotiate with kings, earls and baronage as an equal shows that, even in his decline, earl Thomas was a power to be reckoned with. But the terms of the treaty testify eloquently to his discomfiture. All that Thomas and his partisans could secure was a full pardon, and the ratification of the ordinances. Provision was also made for a standing council of government, like the fifteen of 1258, on which Thomas was to appoint a single representative, one of his bannerets. This body was to empower the king to act in such affairs of state as, according to the ordinances, might lawfully be dealt with by him without the co-operation of parliament. Thus Edward, even more than Lancaster, was to be at the mercy of the victorious coalition.

A full parliament met in York in October, ratified the proceedings at Leake, and passed in review the whole administration, approving some ministers, dismissing others as "not sufficient,"

[1] To the authorities cited in *Pl. Edw. II.* may now be added the interesting, though fragmentary, document, "A Political Agreement of June 1318," printed by Mr. E. Salisbury in *E.H.R.* xxxiii. 78-82. It shows clearly that the combination was definitely against Lancaster, a fact discreetly veiled even in the well-known indenture of Nov. 24, 1317, by which Roger Amory bound himself to persuade the king to be governed by Pembroke and Badlesmere; *Parl. Writs, II.* ii. ap. p. 120. Mr. Conway Davies works out in detail the genesis of the middle party in his *Baronial Opposition*, pp. 425-443.

and securing prominent official positions for the leaders of the new party. Nor was the coalition content with personal changes. From this time onwards administrative reform, suspended since 1314, again began in earnest. The first great step was the appointment of a committee to draw up a scheme of household reform. The result was the Household Ordinance of York of 1318, of which we shall have later much to say.

The reform of the household in 1318 was the second great administrative change of the reign. Though there had been a certain amount of indirect administrative reform in the wardrobe, notably in 1314, yet the changes effected were more largely personal than organic, and were not very complete, as we have seen, even from this limited point of view. The great innovation had been the beginnings of an office of the privy seal, so far marked off from the general wardrobe staff that it tended from the beginning to a certain measure of independence of it. But all these reforms had been inspired by the barons, and the barons' chief purpose in improving the wardrobe was to erect it into an office of state, subject, like chancery and exchequer, to aristocratic control. Consequently, so far as they succeeded, they destroyed household administration, as it was understood by the king and courtiers. Now that the triumphant coalition had king and courtiers on its side, there was no motive for it to strengthen the household as an instrument of government. The men now in power regarded the household mainly as the machine for the regulation of the king's domestic establishment upon an economical and business-like footing. Even within this restricted sphere, it was to be subject to baronial control. Still more was it to be brought under baronial supervision, so far as it remained an instrument of state. From this point of view the development of the privy seal office into a political office was now the most obvious step to be taken.

Wardrobe reform thus remained limited in scope. Of conscious reform in exchequer and chancery there is as yet but little trace, though the ordinances restored to both these offices those traditional powers which the policy of Edward I. had already threatened. The king was not, however, baffled by the development of the baronial theory of the constitution. If one line of defence was yielding, he could construct another series of trenches,

nearer the heart of the citadel and less open to enfilade from the baronial position. The true answer to the baronial claims to control chancery, exchequer and wardrobe was that remarkable resuscitation of the king's chamber as an instrument of government which we shall have, before long, to work out in detail. It is enough here to note the development of a strong administrative chamber, with its special revenue, its staff of knights and clerks, its landed estate of chamber manors, emancipated from exchequer control, its elaborate book-keeping and account-keeping, its secretarial office, constituting a new domestic "chancery," issuing writs and mandates, and its special seal, called the "secret seal," devised to give the king a new personal instrument now that the privy seal was slowly becoming part of the public service. The incuriousness, or scrupulousness, of the ordainers had left the chamber, as it was in 1311, under the personal control of the king. Their failure to control it after Bannockburn had allowed it to reconstitute itself in the period between 1314 and 1318. All that they did in 1318 was to give it a head whom they trusted in the person of the younger Despenser. In after years they were punished for their supineness by the skill and method by which this new instrument was employed against them.

The reorganisation of the wardrobe in 1318, the beginnings of the office of the privy seal in 1312, and the evolution of the administrative chamber between 1307 and 1318 represent the chief administrative developments up to this critical stage of the history of Edward II. The breakdown of the coalition, which aimed at combining satisfaction for the king with influence for the less thoroughgoing baronial leaders, soon turned these reforms to the advantage of the crown rather than to that of the baronage. The policy of the treaty of Leake and the parliament of York held the field for less than three years. It was the most prosperous period of the reign. It saw the relief of the north from Scottish invasion, the cessation of civil war, the end of the famine, the return of economic prosperity, and the establishment of a comparatively respectable and efficient form of government. It witnessed also further attempts at administrative improvement, notably in the exchequer, where the epoch-making treasurership of bishop Stapeldon began the long series of exchequer reforms

whose value and importance have long been recognised by historians.

There were from the beginning elements of instability in the new situation. The baronial element in it was hardly strong enough to take up a firm line after the defection of Lancaster and his friends. Those who were most honest in their desire for good government, like Aymer of Pembroke, showed a weakness and want of character such as middle parties, based on compromise, are always likely to develop. The king again began to grasp at the power which had escaped him, and found willing helpers among both the baronial and clerical champions of the Leake compromise. Hugh Despenser, the chamberlain chosen by parliament in place of John Charlton, became a courtier, a favourite, a successor, in the popular eye at least, to Gaveston himself. Though always a reformer and always open to ideas, he was primarily moved by vast schemes of personal ambition. His dearest wish was for the revival of the Gloucester earldom in his own favour and the erection of a mighty Despenser palatinate in southern and western Wales. More was to be gained in the furtherance of these plans by an unlimited acceptance of the curialist standpoint of his father than by the continuance of his alliance with the Pembrokians. The result was the gradual throwing off of the trammels of aristocratic control, the reversion of the half-converted wardrobe clerks and courtiers to their former subservience to the prerogative and the promotion to office of new men, such as Robert Baldock, without even the pretence of obtaining the assent of the baronage to their appointment.

In 1321 the aggressions of the Despensers in south Wales involved them in private war with a coalition of hostile marchers, who saw in the growth of the younger Hugh's territorial ambitions in Wales the permanent disturbance of the balance of power between the lords marcher and the destruction of the traditional franchises of the march of Wales. Edward backed up his new friend to the best of his ability. But nearly every great baron was a marcher lord, and the attack upon the Despensers soon led to a general revival of the aristocratic opposition to the crown. While the marcher barons destroyed the Despenser power in the west,[1] earl Thomas, who had eagerly seized the opportunity of

[1] To the materials for the study of the war in south Wales in 1321–22, enumerated in *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 138-143, must now be added the careful working up of the subject in Mr. J. Conway Davies's "Despenser War in Glamorgan," in *Trans. R.H.S.* Third Series, ix. 21-64 (1915).

showing that he was still a man to be reckoned with, put himself at the head of the barons of the north and made common cause with the marcher insurgents. Thus the situation of 1310–11 was unexpectedly revived. Again the crown went down before a united baronial opposition. The Despensers were banished; the king was again muzzled; the cry for the ordinances was again raised.

The new opposition coalition of 1321 was as ill-cemented as the old coalition of 1318. It collapsed in a few months through the jealousies of Lancaster and Badlesmere, the vacillation of earl Aymer, the unwonted energy of the king and the skill, determination and intelligence of the returned Despensers and their courtier allies. The marcher rebels were forced to surrender after a bloodless winter campaign in the Severn valley. Any chance that they might have had of holding their own was frustrated by the opportune revolt of Sir Gruffydd Llwyd. This Welsh curialist called Gwynedd to arms to protect its prince-king from the chief of the marcher party, Roger Mortimer of Chirk, the justice of Wales.[1] Threatened by the king from one side and by Gruffydd's Welshmen on the other, Mortimer and his nephew, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, tamely submitted to Edward at Shrewsbury. With them the marchers went out of the war. The northern lords were then attacked with such energy that they were overwhelmed at the defeat of Boroughbridge. Hereford perished in the fight and Lancaster and Badlesmere on the scaffold. At last the York parliament of 1322 annulled the ordinances, proscribed the baronial leaders, and put all power in the hands of the king and the Despensers. These remained in control from 1322 to 1326, only to succumb in their turn after four years of power. They fell as signally and ingloriously as

[1] See for the "revolt" of Gruffydd Llwyd, J. G. Edwards in *E.H.R.* xxx. 592-594. Mr. Edwards makes it clear that Gruffydd was no rebel against Edward II. on behalf of Welsh independence, as tradition has maintained. But he has hardly emphasised sufficiently what I cannot but regard as of extreme importance, namely the decisive effect of the marshalling of the Welsh forces on the side of the king against his viceroy. Gruffydd's action at last affords an intelligible explanation of the miserably poor fight put up by the marchers against Edward's victorious advance.

every other government of the reign had broken down, when tried by the touchstone of office.

These years of the royalist restoration under the Despenser auspices are for the administrative historian the most important of the reign. Even the curious "constitutionalism" of the younger Hugh, which distinguished between the person and the office of the crown,[1] and claimed for the three "estates" a right of participation in all fundamental legislation, still remained unrepudiated, and with all its insecurity and precocity marked a real advance of principle. But the most important thing for us is that the lesson of the collapse of 1321 taught the younger Despenser to moderate his personal ambitions to the limits of the attainable, and to throw a good deal of his energy and curiosity into administrative reform. The intense conservatism of the barons and of the ministers of their choice had long been the chief obstacle to constructive changes in the state. Now their power was at an end, men with broad views, like Despenser, and reforming specialists, like Baldock and Stapeldon, were free to work out their ideas without let or hindrance.

By the time the parliament of York met, a whole programme of reform was drawn up.[2] Though the ordinances were repealed, the undoubted good points contained in them were expressly to be continued by law. The improvements in the forest laws, the limitations of household jurisdiction, the definition of the sheriffs' powers and of the method of appointment prescribed at Lincoln were all expressly kept on. There were proposals for the better preservation of the peace, for the remedying of the abuses caused by criminals escaping from one jurisdiction to another, for sumptuary legislation, for common standards of weights and measures, and for the protection of heirs from violent hands being laid upon their property.[3] The statute embodying these

[1] Conway Davies (pp. 22-27) shows that the "doctrine of capacities," which distinguished between the officer and his office, was by no means new to England, and had already been applied to the crown under Edward I. See also above, p. 60, note 1.

[2] This is contained in a remarkable document in *Parliamentary and Council Proceedings* (*Chancery*), 5/10, to which Mr. Conway Davies kindly directed my attention. Mr. Davies has now printed this paper in *Baronial Opposition*, pp. 582-583.

[3] See the document referred to in the preceding note. An interesting suggestion in it was that the chattels of felons should be levied "si come autres seigneurages les lieuent," that is that the crown should borrow an improvement

proposals[1] showed that the majority of them were not mere projects.

Plenty of wider reforms were also attempted. It was now that Stapeldon carried out in his second treasurership his drastic and well-devised reform of the exchequer. So much was the spirit of change in the air that, after his retirement, the veteran *garderobarius*, William Melton, since 1317 archbishop of York, went back to official work and, as treasurer, inspired the last of the series of reforming ordinances which set up the exchequer in its permanent later form.

Besides the authorised programme, there were other abortive exchequer changes, notably the scheme of the renegade Lancastrian partisan, Sir Roger Belers, to divide the exchequer into two courts, charged respectively with northern and southern affairs,[2] which was abandoned in 1326 when the exchequer ordinance of archbishop Melton restored the unity of the exchequer.[3] Analogous to this was another plan of even wider decentralisation which followed upon the break up of the two great escheatorships for north and south of Trent into eight local escheatorships, each limited to a small group of neighbouring counties, carried out in 1323–24, but, like Belers' division of the exchequer, not surviving the revolution of 1326. And there was not only decentralisation, but a conscious effort to transfer the chief national trade from foreign to native hands in the ordinance of Kenilworth of 1326 which abolished the single foreign staple, set up in 1313 at Saint Omer, as an indirect result of the ordinances, and replaced it by fourteen fixed staple centres in English, Welsh and Irish towns, a plan which, we know, was devised by Hugh Despenser himself. Along with this was the first deliberate

from the methods adopted by the lords of franchises. Staple reform was already envisaged and also the encouragement of cloth-making in England. The end runs thus: "le roi voet qe chescun sage de son conseil sen pense de ces points qe peussent amender la ley."

[1] Conway Davies, pp. 492-494.

[2] See for this the writ of June 16, 1324, ordering the division of the exchequer, printed from *M.R., K.R.* No. 97, by me in *E.H.R.* xxxi. 461-464, and by Conway Davies in *Baronial Opposition*, pp. 562-563. This supplies the documentary confirmation of the Westminster *Flores Hist.* iii. 231-232, which was lacking when I treated of this subject in *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 200-201.

[3] The text of the formal abolition of Belers' dual exchequer is to be read in the final exchequer ordinance, issued during Melton's treasurership on June 30, 1326; *R.B.E.* iii. 930, "qe leschequier des accountes *soit un*, come auncien temps fut establi."

attempt to encourage the growth of the cloth trade in England, with which Hugh may also confidently be associated.[1] The spirit of reform even affected the chancery, the office least swayed by change during this reign, and most influenced by the tendency to reaction which on several occasions had revived for a season the old conception of a chancery, worked by the chancellor for his own personal profit. Robert Baldock, the last of Edward's chancellors, strove to set his office in order, and, promoted *garderobarius* though he was, seems to have aimed at the subjection of the privy seal to the chancery so that England, like France, might have a single great chancery wherein all the secretarial work of administration could be executed by a single staff, dependent on a single minister.

The household offices were reformed as well as the offices of state. As the wardrobe reforms of 1318 had proved ineffective, a fresh wardrobe ordinance of 1323 sought to make them more practical and operative. Moreover Stapeldon's reforms of the exchequer also involved considerable changes in the wardrobe, notably in the proposed modifications of the fashion of enrolling its accounts, in its straight subjection by it to the control of the exchequer, and in the tendency towards limiting its sphere to the domestic affairs of the household. Moreover the chamber, whose development was slightly checked between 1318 and 1321, received a new impetus after the political changes of 1321–22. For the moment schemes were devised which arrogated for the chamber a sphere of influence which would have made it the chief mouthpiece of domestic administration and a serious rival of the exchequer, and perhaps eventually even of the chancery. These were not, however, persevered in for more than a few months. There seemed less reason for a new constitution of a machine for personal government when chancery, exchequer and wardrobe were alike emancipated from aristocratic control. A centralised unified executive, with large local devolutions of authority, making little distinction between the court of the king and courts of the state, seems to have been the permanent ideal of the Despenser régime. Yet there was still found room

[1] This plan was already in the air in 1322, "lestaple des lenes et de ordener qe draps soient faitz en Engleterre"; *Parl. and Council Proceedings (Chancery)*, 5/10.

for a strong administrative chamber on the lines first devised in the early years of Edward II. This also lost most of its authority when the conservative reaction after Edward II.'s fall destroyed, with much which was evil, some portion of what was good in the administrative reforms of Edward II. In the result the changes were minimised and the continuity of administrative tradition was substantially vindicated. Such permanent alterations as survived were modifications and improvements of the traditional order rather than thorough-going innovations.

The same continuity reflects itself in the administrative personnel under Edward II., though there was in this respect one characteristic difference between the reign of Edward II. and that of his father. Under the younger king the great offices of state and household were no longer held, as under Edward I., for considerable periods of time by ministers who remained in office until their death, disability or promotion. During thirty-five years Edward I. was served by seven chancellors, by six treasurers of the exchequer, and by five keepers and six controllers of the wardrobe. During a reign of less than twenty years Edward II. saw seven chancellors, nine treasurers of the exchequer, seven keepers and seven controllers of the wardrobe. On the average, then, Edward II.'s officers held their posts about half as long as those of his father. The reasons for these more rapid changes must mainly be found in the fact that while Edward I. only removed one high minister, William of March the treasurer, for political reasons, there was under Edward II. a sufficiently close connection between place and politics to force a large number of ministers to go out of office because they were not in harmony with the prevailing political tendency. For the greater part of the reign the magnates' clamour that the ministers should be appointed by the baronage in parliament compelled Edward, despite reluctance and delays caused by reluctance, to eject his best friends from the posts which they held. Contrariwise, when the restraint of necessity was renewed, the king was naturally eager to remove from power his unsympathetic or hostile servants. Ministers "nominated by the king in full parliament," or "deemed sufficient" after baronial scrutiny, gave way to those appointed "by the king." The very words of the patents of appointment enable us to discriminate between the politics of the chief

ministers of the reign. Thus in the fourteenth, even more than in the twentieth century, ministerial responsibility to parliament involved frequent ministerial changes. And the caprice of a king like Edward II. provided even less likelihood of permanence than the goodwill of the baronage. The alternation of both these systems led to the worst results of all.

Yet even among the higher ministries there was some element of continuity. With few exceptions, Edward II.'s chief officers were men of exactly the same type and training as the ministers of Edward I. had been. The good civil servant, the promoted king's clerk, was the normal clerical minister of state. Save Ralph Baldock, bishop of London, who was removed in a few weeks, and John Salmon, a Benedictine monk promoted at a ripe age from the priorship of the cathedral monastery of Ely to the see of Norwich, who owed his appointment to the goodwill of the barons, Edward II.'s chancellors were all of the official class. One, John Langton, a promoted chancery clerk, carried into the new reign some of the traditions of the previous one. Reynolds and Baldock, the most characteristic chancellors of the reign, had been clerks of the wardrobe of Edward of Carnarvon either as prince or king, while Sandall and Hotham had had their training in the exchequer. The treasurers of the exchequer, with the possible exception of Walter Stapeldon, had all been king's clerks before obtaining that high office. Three of them, Langton, Reynolds, and Melton, had been leading wardrobe clerks; another, Sandall, started his official career in the wardrobe, but was soon transferred to the exchequer[1]; two others, Norwich and Hotham, were trained in the exchequer. Walwayn was the confidential clerk of the earl of Hereford until his appointment as escheator in 1315 brought him into the king's service.[2] Stratford had been a civilian and a diplomatist, and therefore conjecturally a clerk of chancery. Stapeldon, though he had taken part in diplomatic missions, became head of the exchequer after he had gained experience as a Devonshire landed proprietor, a canonist, a bishop and a pious founder, but with no demonstrable permanent service in any public office. Consequently all but three of Edward's officers of state were promoted civil servants. And the wardrobe then, as earlier and later, regularly trained the ministers who were promoted to the chief posts within it.

[1] *Reg. Sandale*, pp. xx to xxi (Hampshire Record Soc., 1897). In 1295 he was appointed controller to Husthwaite, keeper of the great wardrobe. He was afterwards keeper of the exchanges, chamberlain of Scotland, and brought into exchequer work as chancellor of the exchequer in 1307. He was a clerk of the earl of Lincoln as well as of the king, *ib.* p. xxv.

[2] Conway Davies (pp. 355-356) brings out the close connection between Walwayn and Hereford. Yet, when Walwayn became escheator, he is described as "king's clerk"; *C.F.R.* ii. 232. His appointment was doubtless due to Hereford, but he remained for the rest of his life faithful to the crown, though transferring his services to Edward's enemies in 1326.

Not only did Edward II.'s ministers remain in office for shorter periods than those of Edward I. They were less firmly seated in the saddle, were less trusted, and less influential. In the former reign a strong king, with one well-trusted and confidential adviser, took all the initiative and had personally a great share of the work of administration. The more we examine the administrative records of the great reign, the more we are impressed with the energy, the hard work, the authority exercised by Robert Burnell and Walter Langton, who between them acted as "prime minister" for the whole of the reign. But in the reign of Edward II. there is not only a careless, lazy, and indifferent king; the ministers whom he chiefly delighted to honour were infected by some of his evil qualities. I have elsewhere worked out the curiously ambiguous relations in which Walter Reynolds stood to the chancery.[1] From 1310 to 1312 his own idleness and slackness, and from 1312 to 1314 the ill-will of the ordainers, made it the exception rather than the rule for him to be in personal charge of the seal. Nor were things much better when, after Bannockburn, a new chancellor was appointed in the person of the baronial nominee, the affable, harmless, and necessary[2] John Sandall. In 1318 Sandall in his turn was displaced by the astute but ignorant John Hotham, the curialist, who formed the chief link of

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 319-324. To the facts there given it may be added that Adam Osgodby, the chief chancery clerk and the head of the commissions who kept the seal, received the chancellor's fee of £500 for the year July 1312 to July 1313 as keeping the "hospicium pro clericis cancellarie regis" by order of king and council; *Exch. Accts.* 375/8. On Oct. 4, 1312, the exchequer was informed that Reynolds had been appointed lieutenant of the chancellor, and on Oct. 6 the seal was restored to Reynolds; Conway Davies, pp. 332-333.

[2] "Vir cunctis affabilis et necessarius communitati"; *Flores Hist.* iii. 174. This is the friendly testimony of the Lancastrian partisan, "Robert of Reading."

connection between the disgusted officials and the nobles of the Pembrokian middle party. And the worst state of things came between 1320 and 1323 when the worn-out Benedictine, bishop Salmon of Norwich, kept a merely nominal control over the chancery until in 1323 ill-health drove him from office. Of all Edward II.'s chancellors, Robert Baldock (1323–1326) alone habitually discharged in person the everyday duties of his office. He was the most competent of the king's chancellors, though as the chief instrument of the Despensers he left a sinister mark on the annals of his time. He never, however, attained a position of authority, like the great ministers of the previous reign. The chancellor, for whom the king could not even secure a bishopric, was a useful tool rather than an inspirer of policy.

It was almost the same with the exchequer as with the chancery. If the short-lived treasurers of Edward II. were more active than the chancellors in personally discharging their official duties, they flitted so intermittently over the stage that they seldom had the opportunity of leaving a deep personal impression on the office over which they presided. Walter Langton's first treasurership was abruptly ended by his complete disgrace and the ordainers were strong enough to frustrate his brief attempt to restore the traditions of Edward I., when he was put back in office in 1312. Reynolds' three years as treasurer (1307–1310) were quite uneventful; Hotham only held the office for a year (1317–1318), and John Walwayn (1318) for only five months. Of the significance of the short treasurership of John Sandall (1318–1320) and of the four stop-gap lieutenancies (1311–1312, 1312, 1319–1320 and 1321–1322), and the more prolonged treasurership (1314–1317) of Walter Norwich, we shall speak later. Here again we must wait till the end of the reign before we find strong ministers and even then these had little time to work out their plans. Great exchequer reforms are associated with the distinguished treasurerships of Walter Stapeldon and William Melton, but Stapeldon's first tenure of office (1320–1321) only lasted eighteen months, and his second and more memorable treasurership of three years (1322–1325) seems at the end of two to have been distracted by a dispute with the king from which Stapeldon only escaped by submission.[1] Archbishop Melton

[1] The language of the writ of privy seal, separating the exchequer into two

again (1325–1326), though for the most part continuing Stapeldon's policy of drastic departmental reform, was only fifteen months in office, when the revolution of 1326 hurled him from power.

In all these rapid mutations it was as impossible for any treasurer of Edward II. to play the part of a Walter Langton, as it was for any of his chancellors to dominate the times like Robert Burnell.

Among the causes of these fluctuations we may discern not only the chronic conflict of crown and baronage but the apprehensions natural to a weak and distrustful king. Like Henry III., Edward II. feared strong ministers almost as much as he dreaded the magnates. He saw in a submissive and obscure circle of household officers, unostentatiously discharging the duties of the great departments of state, the only effective way of upholding his threatened prerogatives. Thus king and barons alike exercised a control over ministers which combined to make it difficult for them to hold place for long periods, or to exercise their power freely during their tenure of office. In the fourteenth century, as in more recent times, continuity of tradition and authority could only be kept up by the permanent administrative class, by what we call the civil service. Now the professional official class remained as firmly established in their offices under Edward II. as under Edward I. The conflict of crown and baronage for supreme authority hardly touched their position and seldom threatened the continuity of their power. With very few exceptions, the worst punishment of the anti-baronial official was transference to another sphere of activity. The most drastic of reforms dealt gently with the vested interests of the official class. This was natural enough, for it was rarely that the court official was a political partisan with a personal view of his own. For those who had the least suggestion of efficiency, or impartiality, even for those possessing enough subservience to the

divisions, on June 16, 1324, shows extreme discontent on the part of the king and his intimate advisers with the inaction of Stapeldon and the barons in passively resisting this reform. It is a reiterated order to carry out the royal command, "si come entre vous touz voillez eschure nostre indignacion," and the delay is caused "par vous, tresorier, et des ouerours qe sont desouz vous"; *E.H.R.* xxxi. 462, Conway Davies, p. 562. Though just over a year elapsed before Stapeldon's removal from office, his chief activity was now in his diocese and in the defence of the south-western counties from French invasion (Stapeldon's *Register*, p. xxvii), after which he went on his ill-omened mission to France.

powers that were, substantial permanency was secured. After all, this was natural enough. Their business was not to suggest policy, but carry out orders. In a sense the fourteenth-century civil service was as non-political as that of our own days.

The briefest survey of the personnel of the official class will show to what a large extent the continuity of administrative tradition survived the revolutions of the reign. We shall see later that this was the case even in the wardrobe, the privy seal and the chamber, the household offices especially exposed to baronial assault.

Continuity was even more conspicuously the rule in the chancery and the exchequer, for in these offices the outlook was more professional and less personal. Accordingly, in the chancery and exchequer the permanent staff went on with its work, indifferent, it would seem, whether king or barons were supreme. There was absolute permanence assured for the faithful chancery clerk, and the short-lived and incurious chancellors of the reign put into the hands of their permanent staff nearly all the business of their office. Thus Adam Osgodby, keeper of the rolls of chancery from 1295, and keeper of the house of converts from 1307, retained both these offices until his death in 1316. Osgodby was also generally keeper of the household of the chancery, where the celibate clerks of the office lived together in a semi-collegiate life.[1] He was always the first named in the temporary commissions to which the custody of the great seal was frequently given. In the second period of the reign Osgodby's place was taken by William Airmyn, whose political activity is even more clearly traceable than that of his predecessor,[2] and who was powerful enough to win his way by intrigue into the bishopric of Norwich in 1324. It was only when an active chancellor was appointed in Robert Baldock that Henry Cliff, Airmyn's successor, has a less conspicuous position than Osgodby and

[1] For modification of this view *see* below, Vol. IV. 210, n. 3.

[2] *C.W.* 95/3739 gives a good instance of Airmyn's operations when a commissioner for holding the great seal. "Edward . . . a nos chers W. de Ayremynne, R. de Bardelby et R. de Askelby saluz. Nous vous mandoms qe vous soiez a nous a Crayk *od nostre graunt seal* y ce mardy, le xix^e^ jour de cesty moys d'Octobre, a nostre leuer. Et ce en nule manere ne lessez; et les clercs demoergent en pees a Euerwyk." (Privy seal—Crayke, Oct. 18, 1316.) The division of the chancery office, with the clerks at York, and the keepers with the king, is not without interest.

Airmyn. Normally, however, the office increases in importance while the official head recedes somewhat into the background.

The exchequer shows even more conspicuously than the chancery the development of these tendencies. Though treasurers succeeded each other with bewildering frequency, the office staff remained extraordinarily constant. Some occasional promotions from the wardrobe of new barons, when discredited by their curialist leanings or thought worthy of elevation to more dignified office,[1] are the only suggestion that politics had the least influence in determining appointments to the permanent staff of the exchequer, though treasurer succeeded treasurer with each fluctuation of the political tide. But however he came to Westminster, the baron once appointed remained in office till his death or promotion. Though in 1318 the York parliament ordered a review of the barons of the exchequer on the double ground that the number was too large, and the "sufficiency" of some not clearly apparent, I cannot find that any depositions resulted from this mandate. Death removed Warley from his chance of incurring expulsion, but his comrades from the wardrobe, the harmless Wodehouse and the actively mischievous Ockham, were both in due course pronounced "sufficient and necessary." This continuity was not broken even by the extensive organic reforms of the exchequer initiated by Stapeldon.

Within the exchequer, distinctions of rank began to establish among the barons a carefully graded hierarchical organisation. There was already a "chief baron" before Edward I. died, and his position was sufficiently prominent for the ordainers to demand his appointment in parliament. There was already by 1308 a "secondary baron," who sat next the chief and supplied his place in his absence. The ordinances may well have enhanced the chief baron's dignity, for in 1312 Walter Norwich was the first person appointed to that office by name, and before long he received a higher salary than his colleagues. His post is officially described as a place of "moderate labour," and his duties were "to supervise the business of the exchequer with the treasurer, and to attend the king's councils." It followed that he was the

[1] Warley and Ockham illustrate the former, Wodehouse the latter, cause of accession to the exchequer. Roger Belers' appointment as a baron in 1322 was doubtless the reward of his betrayal of Lancaster.

natural *locum tenens thesaurarii* in that functionary's absence, or the independent keeper of the office when there was no treasurer.

The career of Walter Norwich, the first formally recognised chief baron of the exchequer, best illustrates the continuity of office in that department. A Norfolk squire's son, he became a clerk of the exchequer under Edward I., and at the end of that reign was acting as the remembrancer of Walter Langton, the treasurer. Accordingly he fell from office with his master immediately after Edward II.'s accession. But by November 1307 he was again back in the exchequer as remembrancer,[1] and from that moment his connection with the office was permanent. So prosperous did he become that he took to himself a wife, and, renouncing his clerical character, became a knight not later than 1312. He had thus already made his career when, in 1311, he was first appointed a baron of the exchequer. In 1312 he became chief baron, having already acted, as we have seen, as keeper of the treasury during the crisis caused by Walter Langton's appointment. He was holding the same office on several occasions, and at last was nominated treasurer in the barons' interest in 1314. In 1317 he was removed from the treasurership and restored to the less laborious office of chief baron, remaining in that position for the rest of the reign and constantly acting as lieutenant to the treasurer for periods of varying length. The division of the exchequer in 1324 limited his power to the northern counties, and he had a colleague imposed on him for the south in the person of his previous subordinate, Roger Belers. Norwich, however, survived Belers' short-lived experiment, and before the king's fall enjoyed once more the position of sole chief baron. The same judicious pliancy that had enabled him to survive the fall of Langton in 1307, and to steer his career through the many crises of Edward II.'s reign, enabled Norwich to continue in office under Isabella and Mortimer, though he had presided over the trials of the two Roger Mortimers in 1322. When he died in office in 1329, this

[1] *M.R., K.R.* No. 81, m. 38 d. shows that Edward II. had been angry with him as a friend of Langton and had forced him out of office. His successor was Hugh of Nottingham, appointed on Sept. 26, 1307; *C.C.R., 1307–1313*, p. 2. He was, however, back again by Nov. 19, 1307. The account here corrects in some important particulars my summary of Norwich's career in *Pl. Edw. II.* The true facts are brought out by Conway Davies, p. 123.

successful civil servant had founded a baronial family, adequately endowed in the eastern counties [1] with lands which, on his son's death, passed with his daughter's hand to swell the estates of the earls of Suffolk of the house of Ufford. Thus the civil servant of Edward II. became the grandfather of a countess and the great-grandfather of an earl.

Even more than Osgodby and Airmyn in the chancery, Walter Norwich made his influence strongly felt in the exchequer all through the reign. Despite the plasticity of his opinions, he was strong enough to join with his colleagues in opposing the separation of the exchequer in 1324, cautious enough to continue to retain what he could, and resilient enough to rebound into his full rights when the separation scheme collapsed on Belers' death. Unluckily, we shall never know the respective shares taken by Norwich and Stapeldon in the great exchequer reforms towards the end of the reign. But while initiative might well be due to the magnificent and enterprising bishop, the detailed execution of such schemes must surely have been in the hands of the experienced and practised official. Certainly no man of his time approached Norwich in his experience in the traditions and lore of the exchequer. He is one of the most perfect types of the fourteenth-century administrator, whose resumption of laity made it impossible for his official career to be stopped by great ecclesiastical preferment. While Airmyn, his chancery parallel, had his professional service to the state ended by a bishopric, Robert Baldock, his nearest analogue in the wardrobe, had his ambitions cut short by a cruel death. It is to such a man as Norwich, and to his sometime rival, Belers, that we feel bound to attribute a large share of the reforms of administration, devised in the later years of Edward II.'s reign.

To these administrative reforms, or rather to such of them

[1] See for some, but not all, of his lands the list in *Cal. Inq.* vii. 169-170. John Norwich, the heir (see for his career *D.N.B.*), was in 1329 described as "aged 30 years and more." This would put back his birth into the end of the thirteenth century. Now Walter Norwich was still a king's clerk on Aug. 18, 1311 (*C.Ch.R.* iii. 183). I cannot find him described as a knight before Sept. 21, 1312 (*C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 551). As there is no question of John's legitimacy, the irresistible inference is that Walter was a "clericus uxoratus," long before Edward II. became king. The possibility of two Walters is excluded by the fact that the charter of freewarren of 1311 (*C.Ch.R. u.s.*) to Walter Norwich, king's clerk, included several manors, of which Walter Norwich, knight, died seized in 1329.

as are relevant to our main subject, we must now address ourselves. The line of division between the offices of state and those of the household was now drawn with such definiteness that there is no longer any need to study the changes brought about in chancery and exchequer, as was desirable under earlier reigns. What I have been able to say about the chancery and exchequer reforms, I have written already in my *Place of Edward II. in English History*, though I am bound to add that a more detailed study of them than was there attempted would be likely to yield good fruit, especially as bearing on the problem, not hitherto envisaged, of the extent to which the exchequer reforms were really carried out in practice. This limitation enables us to treat in greater detail of the narrower subject of household administration during this vital period of transition. This subject can profitably be studied under four divisions. I have already, by way of introduction, dealt in the first section of this chapter with the wardrobe of Edward of Carnarvon as prince of Wales, the examination of which throws a flood of light upon both the personal and administrative problems which beset Edward as king. In the third section the general history of the central wardrobe department, the "wardrobe of the household," as it will soon be called, will come up for review. This study will be simplified because the "great wardrobe" has already become, under Edward I., so clearly differentiated from the wardrobe proper that its history can be safely relegated to the general chapter on the great wardrobe which will find its place in a later volume. Similarly the early beginnings of the "privy wardrobe," to some extent reviewed in dealing with the chamber, will be considered as a whole in a similar chapter on the privy wardrobe which will follow that on the great wardrobe. Accordingly, we may proceed from the wardrobe section to the separate treatment in a fourth section of the history of the privy seal. This can now for the first time be definitely separated from general wardrobe history, since the creation by the ordainers of an independent keepership of the privy seal led to the establishment of a new sub-department, an "office of the privy seal" which even in this reign took a position of its own, and, under Edward III., began to drift out of all organic relation with the wardrobe proper. Finally, the most interesting aspect

of household administration under Edward II. must be scrutinised in detail in the fifth section. This will treat of the revival of the king's chamber which, though not continued permanently on the noble scale contemplated by the most exalted champions of curialism, remained, after wardrobe and privy seal had fallen under a large measure of baronial control, the last citadel of prerogative, the last sphere of activity for purely personal and household administrative activity.

SECTION III

The Wardrobe under Edward II.

In its beginnings the wardrobe of Edward II. did not differ materially from the wardrobe of Edward I. Drastic personal changes there inevitably were, when the new king's wardrobe was formed by the conjunction of the most faithful servants of the prince with the less hostile household officers of the old king. The disappearance, sooner or later, of some of Edward I.'s most conspicuous *garderobarii* had doubtless in it something of a political character; but the tasks and the difficulties before the wardrobe were the same after the old king's death as they had been during his lifetime. In particular, the arrears of unaudited accounts and the crushing burden of debt, inherited by the new monarch, called for some continuity of administrative personnel. Against this was the strong antagonism that had never altogether been allayed between Edward and his father, an antagonism that extended from the lords to their respective households. The readiness with which the mediaeval official accommodated himself to a new master did something to mitigate the force of this discordance.

The most significant changes concerned the lay rather than the clerical staff. Edward had found his chief comrades, alike in arms and in pleasure, among the knights and squires of his household. He naturally now advanced them to positions in the royal establishment in which they could still be retained by his side. Foremost among them of course came Peter of Gaveston. However, Peter's elevation, immediately after his return from exile, to the earldom of Cornwall made him too exalted a personage to remain a mere household officer. The legend of the next generation that he became Edward II.'s chamberlain is unsupported by contemporary evidence and unlikely on the face of things.[1] The first known chamberlain of the new king was the Shropshire knight, John of Charlton, who had already worked

[1] See for a discussion of this point my *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 12, note 2, and 352.

up his way to the position of knight in the prince's household. Unluckily there seems no positive evidence that he acted as chamberlain before 1310.[1] The stewardship, however, went to Miles of Stapleton, the Yorkshire knight who, up to 1306, had been steward of the prince's household. Many other ancient servitors of the prince now became knights and squires of the king.

John Benstead, a notable minister of Edward I., whose removal from the controllership of the wardrobe in 1306 suggests close employment in other charges rather than the withdrawal of the old king's favour, became the first keeper of Edward II.'s household. But new blood came in with William Melton, the wisest of the *garderobarii* of Edward of Carnarvon, who now took to the controllership of the royal establishment the experience he had gained in the same office of the prince's household. Along with him William of Boudon, Peter of Collingbourn, Ingelard of Warley, and Nicholas of Huggate were transferred to similar posts to those which they had held under the prince. Of these Boudon was soon made keeper of Queen Isabella's wardrobe, and retained that post for many years. Of Collingbourn, Warley and Huggate we shall soon hear again. The transference of clerks from the prince's to the king's household was made less complete by reason of the retirement from public life of Blyborough, the prince's chancellor, probably through old age and infirmity. Similarly Reynolds's elevation to higher dignity removed him from the daily personal contact with his master which he had long enjoyed as keeper of his wardrobe.

There was little permanence in the first arrangements. In 1308 Stapleton was succeeded as steward by Robert Fitzpain, who, in his turn, gave way to Edmund of Mauley in 1310. After a year Benstead quitted the keepership to become a justice of the common bench. By his renunciation of his clergy for knighthood and marriage he cut himself permanently adrift from

[1] The first approach to positive evidence I have found of Charlton's chamberlainship is on Feb. 23, 1310, when £60 was paid "Iohanni de Cherleton, militi, camerario regis"; *I.R.* No. 150. The extension is not quite certain, but I believe the one here given is the most likely to be true. He was already a banneret of the household; *MS. Cotton, Nero*, C. VIII. f. 36. He had previously been squire and knight of the prince's chamber; *MS. Ad.* No. 22,923. When the "second ordinances" petitioned for his removal from court, he was never called chamberlain, though he was certainly holding that office.

household service. But his successor was Droxford, even more closely bound up than Benstead with the wardrobe traditions of the old reign. When Edward II. had come to the throne, Droxford had become chancellor of the exchequer, and, as keeper of the wardrobe, combined his new office with his exchequer post. He also had enough of the keepership in a single year, and retired from both exchequer and wardrobe on becoming bishop of Bath and Wells. In the unsettled condition of the accounts, both Droxford and Benstead remained for years entangled with both their old and new accounts to the exchequer, and it was not until 1313 that Droxford's political preoccupations allowed him to reside in his diocese.[1] But the removal of Benstead and Droxford from office gave Edward II. the chance of putting over his domestic clerks an old servant of his own. This was Ingelard of Warley,[1a] who from the beginning of the new reign was the clerk of the king's chamber, and to whom we may confidently look as the leading spirit of those chamber reforms which others were to develop to much greater length.[2] In the wardrobe, as in the chamber, Warley soon made for himself an evil name by his unscrupulous activity and greediness in his master's service. It followed that the king kept him in office as long as the barons would allow him to do so. Similar qualities gave an equally secure tenure of royal favour to Sir Edmund Mauley, steward after 1310. Charlton's position as chamberlain was equally well assured. To these chiefs we must add Melton the controller. Another rising man of the same type as Warley was John of Ockham, an old clerk of both Benstead and Droxford, who was, after 1308, cofferer [3] Thus manned, the wardrobe of

[1] *Drokensford's Register*, p. 161, Somerset Rec. Soc.: "Political troubles having hindered our residence hitherto," he writes in Dec. 1312.

[1a] See Wilson, *Liber Albus Wig.*, Nos. 266-347, m. 22, letters about Warley.

[2] See later Sect. V., and especially pp. 316-319.

[3] Ockham had been Droxford's clerk on Jan. 26, 1305 (*C.P.R., 1301–1307*, p. 293), and Benstead's clerk in 1307–8; *Exch. Accts.* 373/19. He succeeded Peter of Collingbourn before June 11, 1308 (see later, pp. 232-233), as cofferer, and held that office (save from July 1309–Jan. 1311, when Wodehouse was cofferer, *ib.* 373/76, ff. 88-89) until after Bannockburn. Ockham's sharp practice extended to his private transactions, where it was sometimes relieved by a touch of humour. In one of the curious non-official marginalia, which the wardrobe clerks sometimes amused themselves with scribbling on the official accounts, we read the following: "Memorandum quod dominus J. de Okham accomodauit domino J. de Medburn librum suum qui vocatur liber dictaminis Petri de Vineis et Thome de Capua, a die lune, primo die marcii, usque ad diem lune octauo die eiusdem mensis, pro una auca soluenda eidem d. J. de Okham infra quindenam Pasche. Et si retineat librum predictum dictaminis, conueniatur inter eosdem ut soluat pro qualibet septimana unam aucam"; *Exch. Accts.* 373/26, f. 95. Here is heavy usury, payable not in money but in geese.

Edward II. equipped itself for defence against the sharp baronial attacks that were now to rain down upon it.

The first baronial opposition to Edward II. was frankly personal in its object, and was appeased in 1308 by the second banishment of Gaveston. But the terms of the compromise, by which, in 1309, the king was allowed to recall his favourite, show that the baronage still stood in the same attitude to the wardrobe as that which it had assumed under Edward I. The articles of Stamford of 1309 were but a reissue of the *Articuli super Cartas* of 1300. In both the complaints against household jurisdiction took the same shape. The royal rights of prisage and pre-emption were to be severely limited. The extension of the jurisdiction of the steward and marshal from the cognisance of household offences to that of cases properly cognisable by common law, the employment of writs of privy seal to remove suits from the common law courts, and the granting of protections and pardons that saved their holders from their legal responsibilities, were all once more forbidden. But neither in 1300 nor in 1309 was any real trouble taken to make the promised remedies effective. The result of this failure was the more detailed and drastic method of the ordinances.

The ordinances were the first constitutional document which put on the forefront of its policy the reformation of the king's household as of equal importance with the reformation of the kingdom. The very commission of the ordainers was "to ordain and establish the estate of the king's household and kingdom." The extent to which they distinguished between the *hospicium* and the *regnum* was measured by their profound conviction that the disorders of the former were the cause of the distress of the latter. Not content, like the barons of 1258, with recording their desire to amend the household of king and queen at some future date, the resolve to effect a drastic purgation of the royal *familia* is at the bottom of a considerable proportion of the forty-one ordinances of 1311. When, however, we set to work to distinguish between the domestic and the public reforms

envisaged by the ordainers, we encounter so much difficulty that we may well believe that the barons, like the king, were unable to make any distinction between household and realm. And such clauses as are clearly drafted with a view to household reforms suggest remedies that are neither novel nor, on the face of things, efficacious.

The negative attitude of the ordainers to the household needs emphasis. The word "wardrobe" only occurred in the ordinances as a definition of the title of its chief officers, and the king's chamber was not mentioned at all. But though no attempt was made to envisage the wardrobe problem as a whole, the ordinances dealt with some five points of definite wardrobe work in a fairly detailed fashion. Besides this, there were important clauses concerning the privy seal, which was still entirely the seal of the wardrobe. But for convenience the relations of the ordinances to the privy seal and the chamber will be considered separately. The other five points may be examined now.[1]

(1) The financial powers of the wardrobe were closely limited by the fourth ordinance of 1310, repeated and made more drastic by the eighth ordinance of 1311. These clauses laid down nothing new. They merely re-emphasised and extended the old doctrine of the Provisions of Oxford, that all issues of the realm were to be paid into the exchequer. Without so much as naming the wardrobe, these stipulations put a new legal barrier in the way of it acting as a rival treasury, co-ordinate with the exchequer. Among these issues the customs are specifically mentioned as cognisable by the exchequer. Their growing importance might in itself account for special reference to this source of revenue, but the customs were also emphasised because the ordainers laid down that the customs were no longer to be kept by aliens, but by men of the realm. The motive for assenting to the principle of a single office of financial receipt was that the treasurer and chamberlains of the exchequer should be able to deliver them for the maintenance of the king's household or otherwise, so that the king could live "of his own." The revival on a large scale of direct wardrobe receipt of taxes and loans

[1] The Ordinances of Oct. 1311 are printed in *Rot. Parl.* i. 281-286, and in *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 157-167. The six preliminary ordinances of March 1310 are also in *Ann. Lond.* pp. 172-174.

made this clause very necessary, if the unity of national finance and the reality of baronial control were to be preserved. At one stroke, it subordinated the wardrobe to the exchequer by making the latter the sole source of the former's supplies. So long as the wardrobe was suffered to receive revenue on its own account, it was practically independent of the exchequer, provided that it could satisfy the exchequer auditors that it had truly collected and adequately disbursed the sums it accounted for. Now that its income was doled out to it by the exchequer, the stringency of exchequer control was much increased. It was perhaps a concession that no regulations defined how the king was to expend the wardrobe revenue thus provided. But the scrutiny of the chancery, which issued the necessary writs of *liberate*, and that of the exchequer, which honoured them, involved real restrictions on household finance. It was one of the ordinances which directly made for a unity of administrative machinery, based upon something deeper than the personal vigilance of the sovereign.

(2) Closely connected with the refusal to allow the wardrobe to receive directly the produce of taxation was the limitation by ordinance 10 of the royal right of prise to the "ancient, due and accustomed prises." This was but a restatement of a principle, asserted in the Great Charter and reaffirmed in 1300 and in 1309. But the attempt in 1300 to make the officers of the wardrobe and great wardrobe responsible for infractions of the subjects' rights had broken down. It was now strengthened by the extension to all takers of prises of the obligation, imposed by clause 28 of Magna Carta on royal bailiffs and constables, to pay for all goods seized, and by authorising the raising of the hue and cry against prisors and their arrest as common robbers. Though not exclusively directed against wardrobe officers, this clause affected them very nearly. Unluckily the lack of definition of the vague term "ancient and accustomed prises" made effective execution difficult. What was really needed to secure this was a change in the spirit of household administration, and every effort was made, as we shall see, to obtain this.

(3) There was equally little novelty in the limitations of the judicial powers of the household in ordinances 26 and 27. Once more the courts of the steward and marshal were forbidden to

hear common pleas. Their jurisdiction was confined to trespasses of the household, to trespasses within the verge of the court, and to contracts and covenants between various members of the household. Aggrieved persons were to have a remedy by a writ of chancery, pleadable in the king's bench and by recovery of damages in that court. Similarly the jurisdiction over felonies, exercised within the verge by the coroner of the household, was to be employed in concurrence with the ordinary coroners of the shires concerned. Here the particularity of definition and remedy adds something fresh to the reiterated prohibitions: but as the judicial functions of the household involved only its lay officers, they need not be worked out at length by the historian of the wardrobe.

(4) The institution by ordinance 41 of a new commission, to be appointed in each parliament to hear and determine all complaints against the king's ministers, aimed at making permanent the machinery by which Edward I. had brought under review the misdeeds of his ministers in 1289–90. That the commission was to be chosen by the barons in parliament and not by the king was significant of the constitutional progress within the intervening period. A bishop, two earls and two barons, responsible to their peers, were likely to deal effectively with the oppressions of household officers, clerical or lay.

(5) The meagreness of the remedial clauses against household abuses is explained by the strong and detailed provisions relating to the appointment of the chief household officers. The vague clause that all evil counsellors of the crown should be removed (clause 13) was applied with special force to the "members of the king's household who are not suitable," for all the chief officers of the household were by now *ex officio* royal councillors. It was the hated *familiares* who were usurping the natural right of the magnates to take the lead in the king's council. Other clauses specifically demand the immediate exile of Peter Gaveston and the Frescobaldi. The king's knight, Henry of Beaumont, and his sister, the lady Vescy, were to be removed from court. As a remedy against evil counsel in the future, all the chief ministers of the king were henceforth to be appointed by the king "with the council and assent of his baronage and that in parliament" (clause 14). Casual vacancies, when the barons

were not in session, could be filled up by the king "by the good council which he will have near him," that is by the purged permanent council of the future. But such nominees were only to hold office until parliament assembled. Among the offices thus to be filled up were specially included the stewardship of the household, the keepership and controllership of the wardrobe, and the new charge of the keepership of the privy seal. All the chief household officers were thus, like the heads of the chancery, exchequer and the two benches, to be responsible to the assembled nobles. The only exception to this rule was the king's chamberlain and the officers, like the court marshals, appointed as delegates by hereditary magnates holding the corresponding arch-offices in fee.

In these provisions the barons, like the king, agreed in making no distinction between the household and realm, but while the king had wished to establish the equivalence of the two by treating all officers of state as members of his household, the barons strove to enforce their doctrine of equality by making all household ministers servants of the state. Edward, thus attacked, was forced himself to distinguish between the two types. While making various insincere attempts to change the administrative personnel of the central and local offices, he strongly resented the interference with a man's right to be master in his own household. If, in a moment of fear, he allowed the keepers of chamber manors to answer at the exchequer, and associated baronial partisans with the former keepers, he soon revoked that concession. His writ of November 25, removing from their custody opposition leaders, like Henry Percy and Botetourt, and bidding the old keepers make their returns henceforth to the wardrobe,[1] was a direct defiance to the ordainers. But a parliament of the three estates was already in session in London and, backed up by its support, the earls of the opposition presented to the king those "second ordinances" which underlined and emphasised the original demand for household reform.[2] All "insufficient" members of the household, hostile to the ordinances, were now banished by name from the royal service. Among them are several of the leading clerks of the wardrobe, including Ingelard of Warley, the keeper, and John of Ockham,

[1] *Foedera*, II. 150.

[2] See earlier, Sect. II. pp. 197-198.

the cofferer.[1] There were also numerous enemies of the ordainers among the royal knights and yeomen and even among the porters, carters, and inferior hangers-on of the household, like Robert Ewer the archer. It was against these that most of the condemnations were issued. The pointed omission of the name of the controller Melton shows that he was considered as sufficient. The even more pointed permission given to the steward, Edmund Mauley, to receive gifts, approved by the ordainers, suggests that his active co-operation with the barons was hoped for. The reiteration of the demands for the payment of all revenue into the exchequer, for the banishment of the Frescobaldi and Gaveston's kinsfolk, who still held on his behalf the castles and manors of his Cornish earldom,[2] and for the appointment of the chief officers of the state and the household by the barons in parliament, shows that in none of these respects were the ordinances as yet executed. The exclusion by name from court of four royal servants who had made prises against the ordinances, and the annulment of certain pleas of the steward and marshal, held contrary to the ordinances, show the completeness of the non-execution of the provisions touching the household.

Edward was mortally offended by the second ordinances. But the baronial pressure was irresistible, and he was compelled to change the clerical head of the wardrobe in deference to their fierce opposition to Ingelard of Warley. Warley was still keeper on November 28 and perhaps in the first part of December.[3] However, before January 2, Peter of Collingbourn, an old *garderobarius* of Edward I., who had acted as cofferer for a few months after Edward II.'s accession and later as a keeper of queengold,[4] appeared as Ingelard's successor as keeper of the

[1] *Ann. Lond.* p. 200. I do not know who was "Richard of the Wardrobe," against whom exclusion was also decreed. More laymen than clerks are mentioned by name, including for the first time John Charlton, whom we know to have been chamberlain. See above, p. 225, note 1.

[2] *Ib.* p. 200. The presence of Bertrand Calhau, Peter's nephew, in Cornwall gives another reason why the exile chose to land in his former earldom when he ventured to return to England.

[3] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 406. He was perhaps acting on Feb. 14; *ib.* p. 407.

[4] In my *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 356, I put down Collingbourn as cofferer for the whole of 1 Edw. II., on the evidence of *Exch. Accts.* 373/15, p. 5, but the same record shows that, though he was still in office on March 12, 1308, he had, before

wardrobe.[1] There seems no evidence to show whether Peter was nominated in the December parliament, like so many other officers, in accordance with the ordinances, or whether the king appointed him on his own initiative, as a concession to meet the ordainers' wishes. But there is no reason for believing that Collingbourn was less amenable to royal pressure than most of his kind, or that he in any real respect represented the baronial standpoint. His continuance as cofferer of John Ockham, only less obnoxious to the barons than Warley himself, shows that there was no real difference of policy between the two. Anyhow, within a few days of the appointment, Edward was on his road to York and there was no longer any question of conciliation. Collingbourn was still in office, as keeper, up to at least February 4, 1312 :[2] but next day, February 5, Warley was forbidden by the king to go beyond sea to prosecute his private business in the papal court,[3] and by February 25 was again acting as keeper and actively receiving into the wardrobe payments which, on ordaining principles, should have been received by the exchequer.[4] The absence of definitive wardrobe accounts for the whole of Warley's period deprives us of the light which under normal conditions would have illuminated this desperate and unsuccessful attempt to purge the wardrobe. But the partial and preliminary

June 11, given place to Ockham. Compare *I.R.* No. 102 (1 Edw. II. Mch. t.), m. 1, which also shows that Collingbourn was thus acting in the early part of 1308. Compare also *Exch. Accts.* 373/19, which gives an indenture between treasurer Reynolds and Benstead as keeper, "signata sigillo domini J. de Okham, coffrarii supradicti domini J. de Benstede." In March 1309 Collingbourn was keeper of "aurum regine"; *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 106.

[1] *I.R.* No. 160 (Mch. t. 5 Edw. II.). "Memorandum quod die dominica, secundo die Januarii, a. r. r. Edw. f. Edw. quinto, liberauit dominus Walterus de Norwico, locumtenens thesaurarii, domino Petro de Colyngbourne, custodi garderobe domini regis, per manus domini Johannis de Okham, eiusdem garderobe coffrarii, de prestito suo ad opus domini regis cc mm. sterl." etc. I have not mentioned Collingbourn's keepership in my lists in *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 355.

[2] He was acting on Feb. 1 and on Feb. 4, on both occasions at York, so that he accompanied the king to the north; *C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 394, 396. No chancery writs are recorded as sealed "on his information."

[3] *Ib.* p. 399. This is an interesting instance of a royal prohibition of an appeal to Rome "as the discussion of the matter belongs to the king only." The question was Warley's right to a prebend at Wells in the king's gift. The prescriptions of the constitutions of Clarendon were meticulously observed, it would appear.

[4] For instance, *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 469; compare *ib.* p. 441.

accounts surviving do not suggest any abnormal or unusual wardrobe activity.[1]

So long as the open conflict endured, Edward ruled the north, whence he collected his revenue and threatened the south through his household officers. The royal acts of the early months of 1312 are largely issued "on the information" of Mauley the steward, of Melton the controller, and, after March, of Warley the restored keeper. Charlton, the chamberlain, is not mentioned, but he was besieged in his castle of Welshpool by his wife's Welsh kinsmen, inspired to attack the unpopular court official by Thomas of Lancaster and the ordainers.[2] All the household clerks were in constant attendance. Ockham was busy as cofferer.[3] Even Northburgh, who was, or who soon became, keeper of the privy seal in deference to the ordainers' wishes, followed the king on his northern wanderings and became responsible for a considerable number of his acts. The only non-household functionary similarly quoted was Langton, and we have seen that Edward had striven to avail himself of the services of the bishop of Lichfield. Of Warley's renewed activity the best evidence is that, when the three lords of the opposition burst into the exchequer on April 3, one of their demands to the barons and chamberlains was that they should forbear, on pain of their own safety, from delivering treasure to any man through whom it might reach the hands of the enemies of the realm. This request was put more pointedly the next day, when the two earls and John Botetourt explained that what they meant by their threat was that no livery should be made to Ingelard of Warley or to any other person whom the ordainers had demanded to be expelled from office.[4]

[1] These include *Exch. Accts.* 374/2, 6, 7, 15, 16, and 375/1, 8. From this last "liber quotidianus de anno sexto" a good deal of information might be drawn. The records of income, however, seem on the face of it to be incomplete.

[2] Pool was still besieged by Gruffydd de la Pole on March 23; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 456; and on May 26; *ib.* p. 424, *Foedera*, ii. 170.

[3] Ockham, cofferer from June 1308 to July 8, 1309, was succeeded by Wodehouse, but apparently was restored to office by Feb. 16, 1311, as the "giornale garderobe" from that date is inscribed "per Okham"; *Exch. Accts.* 373/30.

[4] "Et lendemeyn venismes," wrote the barons of the exchequer, "a lescheqier, et comme nous feussons entrez en vostre petit escheqier por conseiller sour voz busoignes, les deux contes et le dit monsire Johan y vyndrent et rehercerent en partie ce quil auoient le jour deuant, et quant a ceo quil auient auant dit qe vostre tresor ne soit liuerez a tiel purqe il peusse deuenir en meyn del enemy du roiaume, il disoient qe ce est a entendre qe nulle liueree ne se face a sire Ingelard, ne a autre qi vous meismes, a la requeste des ditz ordenours, faites oustier des offices quil tyndront et dentour vous;" *M.R., K.R.* No. 85, m. 52. The whole of this "certification" is printed in Conway Davies, pp. 551-552.

Thus the ordainers, though unable to reform the household, were able to wreck its activity by cutting off supplies from the exchequer. The effect of this financial pressure may well have been to precipitate the fall of Gaveston and the humiliation of the king. Even after the favourite's death, wardrobe reform was still in the air. On November 17, 1312, a writ of privy seal ordered Aymer of Pembroke, the elder Despenser, and John Sandall to "consider and ordain how that our household may be better sustained so as to remedy the great complaints that have arisen among the people."[1] But nothing came of this attempt. The unreformed household remained too weak and unpopular to be able to do its work. The result involved so complete a drying-up of revenue that not even the split of the baronage, that followed the violation of the pact to respect Gaveston's surrender, enabled the king to carry on the struggle with the normal financial backing which a king of England might expect. Such figures as are obtainable for a period, when wardrobe accounts were seldom properly made up, and never adequately reviewed and audited in the exchequer, are sufficient to bring home this point to us, though they are too incomplete to enable us to dogmatise as to the exact finances of the crown in these years of crises. In the first year of Edward II., July 1307–July 1308, before troubles began, the wardrobe receipt was over £78,630,[2] a sum exceeding the whole receipt of the exchequer,[3] which, moreover, handed over nearly five-sevenths of its income to be spent by the wardrobe officers. In 1310–11, the year of the struggle for the ordinances, the recorded wardrobe receipt had apparently fallen to £15,257. This small sum still exceeded the modest sums of £10,215 and £8462, the respective wardrobe receipt of 1311–12

[1] Conway Davies (p. 594; compare pp. 536-537) prints this writ from *Ancient Correspondence*, xlix. 15.

[2] *Pipe, 16 Edw. II.* m. 50.

[3] The exchequer receipt of 1 Edw. II. was £69,640 : 3 : 4½, of which £49,648 : 7 : 10½ was handed over to the wardrobe.

and 1312–13.[1] But the positive injunction of the ordainers was so little respected that the proportion of "foreign" receipt to the constitutional receipt through the exchequer was steadily on the increase all through these times of trouble.[2] Though the gross receipt became each year more and more insignificant, the foreign receipt exceeded the receipt from the exchequer, both in 1311–12 and 1312–13. Though the barons could not prevent the king's ruling his wardrobe after his own way, they managed to reduce materially the volume of its operations. The result was that the king's capacity to do harm to the barons was proportionately reduced. Unluckily the net result was anarchy, since the paralysis of the royal machinery of administration was not compensated by the establishment of an adequate government under baronial auspices. Moreover, the basis of a real understanding did not exist, for, even after the nominal reconciliation of parties on 1313, the royal household remained hostile to the barons. There was little wonder that a typical constitutional member of it, Roger Northburgh, who in the course of 1312 was certainly made keeper of the privy seal, in compliance with the ordinances, was little seen at court, working with his staff for the most part in London under the eye of the magnates.[3]

Under such circumstances it was madness for Edward II. to attempt the chastisement of Robert Bruce in 1314. The Bannockburn campaign, financed and organised by the hated *familiares*, who still stood between the king and the ordainers, was foredoomed from the first. After the disastrous defeat of the king, the ordainers had no scruple in pointing the moral that the failure of the king was due to his neglect of the ordinances.

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 374/6 and /15 and *ib.* 375/9 give rather imperfectly these figures. In 375/1 some items of *recepta de scaccario* are obliterated, but it is unlikely that they much exceeded £3000. I feel pretty sure, however, that these sums only partially represent the receipt of the year. Thus *ib.* 374/2, the "onus garderobe" of 4 Edw. II., mentions writs of *liberate* of very large amounts, one for £20,000, which was paid off by Feb. 1, 1312; another, dated Berwick, Nov. 6, 1311, for £10,000, which was paid out by May 3, and another of July 6, 1312, for £20,000.

[2] See for items of "foreign receipt" of some of these years the Appendix to this Chapter later, pp 361-364. It is only fair to point out that over £18,000 of the nearly £29,000 of foreign receipt consisted of balances, paid over by former keepers. The real foreign receipt of the year was nearly £11,000, not far from the moderate figure of 20 per cent of the whole.

[3] See later, pp. 288-291. He was acting, we are told, "juxta ordinacionem consilii"; *Exch. Accts.* 375/8, f. 8.

But Bannockburn had decimated the royal household; Edmund Mauley was slain in the fight; Northburgh and his clerks of the privy seal were, with the seal itself, led captive by the Scots; Ingelard of Warley escaped capture, but the books and records, kept by Northburgh, the custodian of wardrobe archives, were taken by the Scots, a fact which will partly explain the absence of evidence of his wardrobe operations.[1]

Now that Edward was helpless in the barons' hands, the long-delayed execution of the ordinances dealing with the household was seriously taken in hand in the York parliament of September 1314. At last Ingelard of Warley disappeared from the service of the court and with him went his faithful cofferer, John Ockham, three years after their exclusion had been first demanded. Warley's successor was the controller William Melton, who had served in the household of Edward, both as prince and king, since 1301, and against whom the most hostile baronial criticism had nothing to say. Melton's housekeeping began on December 1, 1314, and he had under him new subordinates such as Robert of Wodehouse, his successor as controller, and Nicholas of Huggate, who replaced Ockham as cofferer. But neither was a newcomer to the office, for Wodehouse had been working in the wardrobe under Edward I., and Huggate, a Yorkshireman, had been a clerk of the wardrobe of Edward when prince of Wales. Similarly, though Mauley was succeeded as steward by John Cromwell, a Lincolnshire baron of ordaining leanings, who had obtained a footing in the north as a representative of the Vipont co-heiresses, John Charlton still remained chamberlain. The purgation of the household was therefore not very complete, but it was enough to restore it to some measure of efficiency in dealing with the more limited sphere within which it was now allowed to operate.

The first result of the change for the better was seen in the resumption of the drafting and auditing of wardrobe accounts. The account of keeper Melton's whole period of office, ranging from December 1, 1314, to February 1, 1316, was sufficiently

[1] *Rot. Parl.* I. 344, makes Northburgh's responsibility clear, and *C.P.R., 1334–8*, p. 227, shows that a debt of Edward II. for mutton was not paid till 1336, because the evidence of the debt was in "the books of I. de Warley which were lost in the conflict at Stirling in Scotland."

complete to be enrolled, five years later, on the pipe roll of 14 Edward II.,[1] being the first enrolled wardrobe account of the reign, for Benstead's account for 1307–8 was only completed by his executors in time to secure enrolment on the pipe roll of 16 Edward II., two years later. For the period of fourteen months precisely, there was a wardrobe receipt nearly approaching £60,000, a sum considerably less than the £78,600 of Benstead's year, but not substantially different, considering the extraordinary expenses that always attended the coronation of a new king. More significant than the reduction in amount was the changed character of the source of the income, for practically the whole came to the wardrobe through the exchequer, the "foreign receipt" being little more than £3000,[2] not much more than 5 per cent of the total, as compared with approximately 37 per cent in 1307–8. At last the ordinances were being observed in the vital particular of the subordination of the wardrobe to the exchequer. Public opinion, however, exaggerated the changes which baronial action had brought about in the household. The monk of Malmesbury boasts that, early in 1315, the baronage "removed from the court the king's superfluous household." And from their removal "the king's daily expenses were reduced to £10."[3] But the actual changes were, as we have seen, less drastic than those suggested. The expenses of the *hospicium* were very far from being cut down to £10 a day. Their daily amount was nearly £30,[4] and not materially altered from the similar charges of earlier times.

The better prospects were soon clouded over. When Melton resigned the keepership, on his election as archbishop of York, Roger Northburgh succeeded him and accounted from February 1, 1316, to April 30, 1322, continuing faithful to his post through the many revolutions of a distracting eight years. Wodehouse

[1] *Pipe, 14 Edw. II.* m. 29. Part of this period is illustrated in more detail by *Exch. Accts.* 376/7. This is Wodehouse's counter-roll, as controller, for 9 Edward II., one of the finest wardrobe books of the time, and exposed for that reason in the museum of the Public Record Office. It was a long business getting the accounts ready. Richard of Ferriby and other clerks were employed in London from Nov. 1316 to March 1317 on preparing the account, and were allowed expenses amounting to over £29; *Exch. Accts.* 377/5. See also later, pp. 278-279.*

[2] The exact figures are: Total receipt, £59,903 : 13 : 7½; receipt from exchequer, £56,707 : 19 : 1½; foreign receipt, £3195 : 14 : 6.

[3] Malmesbury, p. 209.

[4] See the figures in *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 103.

remained as controller till July 7, 1316, when he gave place to Master Thomas Charlton, the brother of John Charlton the chamberlain. Thomas's appointment gave occasion for a definite breach of the ordinances, inasmuch as he combined with the controllership the keepership of the privy seal, holding both offices until the crises of 1318.[1] The cofferership changed several times. Huggate had ceased to act by the end of 1315,[2] and was replaced by Henry of Hale, cofferer for the whole of 1316[3] and perhaps for longer. But by April 1317 Wodehouse had undertaken once more this inferior post, and retained it till 1318 at least. He was the good official, ever willing to undertake any charge to which he might be called, under any master, the most permanent, because the most unpolitical, of the prominent *garderobarii* of this generation.

Other glaring violations of the ordinances showed that baronial control soon ceased to have any efficacy. The victims of the reformers, Warley and Ockham, were well compensated for their displacement by appointment as barons of the exchequer. Walter Norwich, like a good official, quailed before the threatened storm and went back to his former easier and safer place as chief baron of the exchequer, leaving the treasury to John Hotham, Gaveston's former confidant and now by royal and papal favour bishop of Ely. His appointment "by the king" was in itself a breach of the ordinances, contrasting strongly with Norwich's former nomination "by king and council."

The collapse of the baronial government accounted for the revival of the royal hopes. Warwick, the "chief councillor" of 1315, died before the end of the year. Lancaster, solemnly nominated to the same office by the Lincoln parliament of January 1316, undertook the post grudgingly, and made no effort to play up to his new position. As in 1312 and 1313, there was no real central control. There were two rival governments,

[1] Charlton was controller after July 7, 1316, and was probably at the same time made keeper; anyhow he was acting on Nov. 15, 1318. I do not know who kept the privy seal from Feb. 1 to the time Charlton is known to have acted; perhaps it was Charlton himself.

[2] He was acting on Oct. 31, 1315, but not on Jan. 1, 1316, when he was "nuper coffrarius."

[3] Hale was acting between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1316; *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 548. Compare *ib., 1318–23*, p. 444. I have omitted him in my list of cofferers in *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 386.

one centring round the household of the king, the other based upon the *familia* of Lancaster. Both king and earl professed a great zeal for reform, but each alike was patently insincere.[1] Indeed neither of the two was able to keep the peace, and the great offices of state, though multiplying writs and orders, had little executive force behind them, and were content to mark time until it was clear wherein the ultimate authority resided. Meanwhile the state of the country became desperate. At last the middle party made a serious effort to grasp the nettle. With its triumph at Leake, repeated in the York parliament of 1318, there was made the most serious of all the many efforts to reform the household and enforce the ordinances. The standing council of 1318 supplied the directive force; the muzzling of Lancaster and the gilded slavery of the king remained the twin sources of trouble.

The changes in the wardrobe between 1314 and 1318 had not, like the troubles of 1311 to 1313, reduced its operations to insignificance. Northburgh's accounts were duly, though tardily, audited, and show that the scale of wardrobe activity remained much as it had been in Melton's time. The wardrobe revenue was £14,560 for the broken year from February 1 to July 7, 1316, £59,850 for the year July 1316 to July 1317, and £43,208 for the following year, ending on July 8, 1318.[2] On the other hand, the increase of the proportion of its foreign receipt showed that in another respect also the ordinances were increasingly neglected. In the first half of 1316 it rose from 5 to 40 per cent of the whole, and these figures, though lowered in the next two years to about 15 per cent of the whole sum, still contrast unfavourably with Melton's constitutional financing.[3] There is a similar improvement in expenses, for while in the first broken six months there was a huge deficit of over £8250, the tenth year saw expenses exceed income by some £1180, though in the eleventh year there was an overspending of £6500.[4] On the whole, the

[1] The interesting letters of Thomas to Edward, quoted in Bridlington, pp. 50-52, throws such light as is available on these proceedings.

[2] The exact figures are: Feb.–July 1316, £14,560 : 3 : 1½; July 1316–July 1317, £59,850 : 0 : 10¾; and July 1317–July 1318, £43,208 : 19 : 8¼; *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*) No. 2, m. 1.

[3] The foreign receipts for the three periods are £6018 : 16 : 11, £9386 : 7 : 1¼, and £5482 : 8 : 1¼; *ib.*

[4] The exact figures are: Ninth year (ultima pars) "summa totalis exitus, misarum et expensarum," £22,816 : 13 : 8¼ — exceeding the receipt by £8256 : 10 : 6¾; tenth year, issues, £61,032 : 9 : 11¾, excess £1182 : 9 : 1; eleventh year, issues, £36,723 : 17 : 8, excess £6485 : 2 : 0¼; *ib.*

[1] Gilbert of Middleton, the assailant of the legates in 1317, had been "valettus regis" and "de familia sua"; A. E. Middleton, *Sir Gilbert de Middleton*, pp. 10-12 (1918).

impression left by the accounts is better than that which is suggested by the chroniclers' narratives of the political history of those disturbed days. Yet there is overwhelming proof of the reality of the disorders in the household. And the conditions of the political situation made the times propitious for their recurrence.

Though the household servants of both Edward and Thomas ruled in their names, the ineptitude of king and earl was such as to convince the more intelligent of the followers of each that there was no salvation for them in faithful service to their masters All through his career Lancaster was betrayed by his trusted *familiares* one after the other. Edward, though perhaps a better master, was almost equally unable to secure his dependents' loyalty.[1] It followed that wardrobe reform was to be more easily secured from the victorious middle party by reason of the prominent share which the knights of the household and clerks of the wardrobe had taken in bringing about the combination of the better elements of the court and baronial parties which had secured the humiliation both of Edward and earl Thomas. We have seen how both the lay and clerical heads of the household had thrown in their lot with the victors. It was no longer as it had been in 1314, when household and ordainers were two opposing factions bitterly antagonistic to each other. By the time the treaty of Leake was agreed upon, there is evidence that the three most prominent household officers, William Montague, the steward of the household, John Charlton, the chamberlain, Roger Northburgh, the keeper of the wardrobe, were working with Pembroke and Badlesmere. Even Thomas Charlton, the chamberlain's brother, though he was combining the offices of controller of the wardrobe and keeper of the privy seal in direct defiance of the ordinances, was sympathetic with the same policy. And beyond the narrow circle of existing officials loomed men like William Melton, archbishop of York, in whose metropolitan city the parliament was to meet that consummated the revolution.

Melton knew from long experience the needs and the difficulties of household reform. Accordingly household reform became one of the chief cares of the important parliament that assembled at York on October 20, and remained in session there till December 9.

The first step towards household reform undertaken by the York parliament was the formulation of a "request and counsel" to the king to command amendment to be made, and to choose "those whom it should please him" to concern themselves with the execution of that matter. As the result of this a strong committee was appointed, headed by archbishop Melton, and including bishop Hotham of Ely the chancellor, bishop Salmon of Norwich, the earl of Hereford, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, John of Somery, and Walter of Norwich.[1] These were to sit continually until they had drawn up their scheme of reform. To the results of their action we shall have to return later. Meanwhile a systematic review of all the ministers of the crown was made, so that the "consent of the baronage in parliament," required by the ordinances, but ignored since the renewal of disturbances, might be given or withheld to their appointment, and so that, in the case of inadequate ministers, new ones should be established such as the barons approved of.

The household officers passed fairly well through this scrutiny. Though the two lay officers were changed, it was made clear that Montague's removal from the stewardship was not due to bad behaviour but to his transference to the more dignified office of seneschal of Gascony. His successor was Badlesmere, after Pembroke the chief originator of the triumphant middle party. Charlton had already been irregularly replaced as chamberlain by the younger Hugh Despenser, and the king, "at the request of the magnates," now allowed him to continue in office. Roger Northburgh remained keeper of the wardrobe, and Gilbert Wigton, controller since July 8, was also retained. Thomas Charlton

[1] Cole, p. 3. Compare *ib.* p. 12, which shows that the three bishops were nominated "per ipsum regem" and associated with Hereford and the four lay lords who presented the petition of the estates. Except Melton and Norwich, the members of the committee were also members of the standing council, imposed on the king by the treaty of Leake and the parliament of York. Hotham was chancellor and Norwich chief baron of the exchequer. Badlesmere, steward of the household, was now added to the others.

was apparently rewarded for his adhesion to the coalition by being suffered to remain keeper of the privy seal. It was enough to vindicate the ordinances by refusing to recognise the unconstitutional continuance of these two offices in Charlton's hands.

The only opposition to these proceedings came from earl Thomas himself, whose chief personal intervention in the proceedings of this parliament was excited by the appointment as steward of the household of Badlesmere, whom he regarded as a traitor to the ordinances. As the heir of the estate, title, and traditions of Simon de Montfort, earl Thomas was hereditary steward of England. Earl Simon in his days always showed a strong disposition to make the most of this hereditary office, and perhaps to claim for its holder a position analogous to that of the seneschals of France before the suppression of that office by Philip Augustus in 1191.[1] In 1308 Thomas received from the king a grant of the stewardship of England, "with all those things appertaining to the stewardship which Simon, earl of Leicester, and the other earls of Leicester, formerly had."[2] The circumstance that his chief associate in the opposition, earl Humphrey of Hereford, was hereditary constable, may have been a link of connection between them in the gradual development of a policy of using the traditions of the hereditary offices of state to control the administration from which they had become almost utterly dissociated, both through the king's jealousy of the magnates and the increased complexity of government. In the late twelfth century, both in England and France, nominee court officers had replaced the hereditary functionaries for nearly all the actual work of the latter in the household. As a reaction

[1] See for this L. W. Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward*, pp. 120-126. Montfort had been offered, if we can believe Matthew Paris, the stewardship of France by the barons during St. Louis' absence on the crusade of Damietta. His enquiries from a mysterious recluse of Hackington as to the rights appertaining to the stewardship of England recorded in the *C.R.* are extremely interesting. They are printed in *ib.* pp. 125-126. The general contention of Mr. Vernon Harcourt may be accepted, despite the fact that he overstresses parts of his case, ignoring, for instance, the circumstance that not only the hereditary stewards but the other hereditary offices of this time were pushing similar claims, and forgetting the very fluid and varied senses of the term steward or seneschal. It is quite outside the mark to say that the stewardship "implied viceregal power and precedence; it implied that Simon claimed to be in England what he had been in Gascony, etc." See also on this matter above, Vol. I. p. 310.

[2] The patent is printed in Harcourt, p. 163, and in *Foedera*, ii. 38.

against this, the hereditary dignitaries might once more claim to take their personal share in these matters. Either by nominating the working officers of the court or by supervising their acts, they might well supplement, or substitute, the parliament's control of the king by the personal control of a few privileged magnates. The extent to which the holders of hereditary sergeantries were still suffered to nominate their representatives to act on their behalf, both in the household and in the exchequer, gave plausibility to such a claim.

As Thomas found baronial parliaments increasingly indisposed to take their colour from him, he fell back more and more on his hereditary claims to office. In September 1317, when he and the king were on the verge of civil war in Yorkshire, Thomas found in his stewardship a pretext for guarding the bridges over the Aire and cutting off access from the south to Edward at York. "He claimed," wrote the monk of Malmesbury, "to do this by reason of his office of steward of England, whose business it was to look after the interests of the realm." [1]

At the moment of Badlesmere's appointment as steward of the household, Lancaster challenged the right of the king to grant, or his magnates to approve of, the nomination of any one to an office whose disposition belonged of hereditary right to the steward of England.[2] There was this much to be said for his claim that it was on all fours with the nomination of the chamberlain of the exchequer by the earl of Warwick, or with that of the marshals of the household by the earl marshal. The essential difference, however, was that, while an unbroken line of precedents sanctioned these latter appointments, there was no single clear instance of the nomination of the household steward by the hereditary official. But the ignoring of his pretensions only inspired earl Thomas to further efforts. He produced in parliament Edward II.'s charter of 1308, conferring his stewardship upon him, and claimed that he should enjoy his office in the

[1] Malmesbury, p. 230: "Et hoc asserebat se facere eo quod senescallus sit Angliae, cujus interest utilitatibus regni prospicere, et, si rex contra aliquem arma vellet assumere, senescallo praecipue deberet innotescere." This is almost as bold a claim as that contained in the fifteenth-century treatise on the stewardship: "Et sciendum est eius officium est supervidere et regulare sub rege et immediate post regem totum regnum Angliae et omnes ministros legum infra idem regnum;" Harcourt, p. 164.

[2] I thus interpret the corrupt text of Cole, p. 3.

accustomed manner. He was put off civilly by an order that search should be made in the records of chancery, exchequer, and wardrobe for evidence bearing upon his demand. In this fashion the matter was hung up for the time.

The case was virtually decided against Thomas by the household ordinance of December 6. Nevertheless, in the York parliament of 1319, Thomas more bluntly renewed his claim, petitioning that "the king should grant him the stewardship of his household which appertains to him by reason of his honour of Leicester." [1] He was told that he could still have, if he desired it, the writs ordering a search, which had been authorised in the last parliament but had never been asked for. Thomas accepted this as a final proof of the hostility of parliament to his pretensions. This is the last we hear about his claim.

Meanwhile household reform, as a whole, was being seriously dealt with. We have no information as to the doings of the committee appointed by parliament, but it seems likely that they were content to hand over the detailed working out of their ideas to a committee of the four chief household officers, Badlesmere the steward, Despenser the chamberlain, Northburgh the treasurer, and Wigton the controller of the wardrobe, though of these Badlesmere was the only person who was also a member of the parliamentary committee. Anyhow it was by these four officers that the Household Ordinance of York was drafted. It was then read and assented to by the king, in the presence of the three bishops on the parliamentary committee, and of the bishop of Salisbury and the chief justices of the two benches. After this it received the royal assent and was promulgated, on December 6, three days before the dissolution of the parliament. It happily symbolised to contemporary opinion the restored harmony between the king and the magnates, the more so since the chief source of evil counsel, the domestic family which had always been in opposition to the baronage, was now withdrawn from the court.[2] If the changes in the household were not so drastic as the Malmesbury chronicler imagined, there had been since the summer a defection of the old evil councillors to the Pembrokian party which, though involving some fresh dangers for the future, was at the moment a most hopeful augury of peace.

[1] Cole, p. 48.

[2] Malmesbury, p. 238.

The ordinance of York was no drastic attempt to embody a new policy of household administration. It was impossible that a scheme, drafted by the domestic officers themselves, should make any striking movement towards radical revolution. It was in substance little more than a detailed codification of the sounder customs of the previous generation with such additions and improvements as the working of the machine through many troublous years had suggested, and with the recognition of the greater complexity which the system had attained by 1318, as compared with the simpler scheme of household administration, laid down nearly forty years earlier by Edward I. in the ordinance of Westminster of St. Brice's day, 1279. But the spirit of administrative reform was in the air, and within certain limits the ordinance involved a careful revision of the methods of household finance and administration, and an energetic effort to purge the establishment of the long-standing abuses that had given the household its grievous reputation.

A comparison of the ordinance of 1318 with that of 1279 will best suggest what it attempted to do and what it left undone. To begin with, it is a much longer document than its predecessor was. This is partly because in the intervening period the household had become much more complicated, but partly also because much greater precision of definition was now aimed at. If corruption and incompetence had their large share in bringing about administrative confusion, a great deal of the trouble had also been caused by want of clear knowledge of the nature and functions of the household. In the preamble the chief mischiefs to be remedied were set out. Conspicuous among them were the arrears into which the accounts of the officers had fallen, the uncertainty under which the ministers of the household were under as to what were their duties and emoluments, and the consequent impossibility of bringing home to any of them their precise responsibilities. The remedy now sought was a rigid definition of the constitution and functions of the royal *familia*. Both the strength and the disorder of the household had arisen from the same source. This was the absence of anything corresponding to the traditions and precedents which had so long prevailed in the exchequer, the chancery and in the two benches. From it flowed the household's adaptability to meet new conditions, its freedom to adjust itself to circumstances, and its capacity for pursuing the king's interests by any means within its power. But the reformers of 1318 saw in this fluidity of the household organisation a danger to the supreme authority of the magnates, and an impediment to the orderly transaction of business. They had no wish to reorganise its constitution, but they had a strong desire to define its powers. The spirit of definition, which had already expressed itself in the ordinances of 1311, was now to be extended to the royal household. It was to be treated like the offices of state; it was to have its work clearly defined, and it was to limit itself to its own particular business. It was only after the duties of the household officer had been carefully ascertained that he could be called to account for any breach of trust.

Under such conditions radical innovations are not to be expected. Existing usage, roughly defined in 1279, but since modified by the ordinances of St. Albans and Woodstock and by the ordinances of 1311, was to be set forth in detail so that all parties concerned should know exactly where they stood. Accordingly each household office was taken in order. The dignity, emoluments, privileges, powers and control of each officer were elaborately described.

The ordinance of York is a measure dealing with the household as a whole, and those whose chief concern is with the wardrobe have to dissect out of it the portions relevant to their subject. But this separation must be done with caution, for the ordinance above all things stresses the unity of the household, and the prime feature of this unity is contained in its common subjection to the dual control of its two chief officers, the steward, who was not technically a wardrobe officer, and the treasurer, who was emphatically the treasurer, or keeper, of the wardrobe. Wardrobe control, then, is a feature of household unity, and is emphasised, time after time, in all the minute directions for auditing and account-keeping which occupy so much space in that lengthy document. But within the unity there is diversity, and the separate responsibility of the various departments of the household, each to its official chiefs, and all to the general household direction, is also brought home at every stage. There is, first of all, the fundamental distinction between the

officers of the hall and the officers of the chamber. The latter group will be studied separately when we reach the section dealing with the chamber at this period.[1] It is, however, a remarkable proof of the stride made towards household unity since 1279 that, while the ordinance of Westminster ignores the very existence of the chamberlain and the chamber, the ordinance of York includes in its long catalogue of officials both the chamberlain and the subordinate officers of the chamber. The chamberlain himself has his place among the great household dignitaries between the treasurer and the controller. If the mass of ordinary functionaries can be easily divided between the two great departments, there remain over other officers who may be detached for service in either, and others again who work equally in both. Hopelessly confused as the two categories are in the unsystematic and casual enumeration of the ordinance, they can be easily differentiated by attention to particular details of their treatment. All who receive their liveries of meat and drink, litter and fuel from the usher of the chamber belong to the chamberlain's department. All who obtain the corresponding allowances from the usher of the hall are members of the household in the sense that excludes the chamber from its purview. The separation is not, however, absolute. A man might belong to the former class and still, like the esquires of the chamber, take his meals in the hall. What we have to say of the former category will be said later on. At present we may limit ourselves to the latter.

The fact that large groups of household servants have again the right or obligation of dining in the king's hall shows that the ordinance of 1318 had been preceded by other reforms. We have seen that in 1300 the statute of St. Albans[2] had substituted pecuniary allowances for the free board provided in hall for a large proportion of the household staff. But early in the new reign the new system seems to have been given up as impracticable. The virtual abrogation of the statute of St. Albans seems to have been effected by the ordinance of Woodstock, which I am disposed to assign to May 1310.[3] In this the knights-marshal

[1] See later, pp. 334-335. [2] See above, pp. 49-51.

[3] *Pl. Edw. II*, p. 307 is the only positive reference. Its language suggests that it was passed under Edward II., and this is confirmed by the fact that Edward I. made no stay at Woodstock after 1300 in which this ordinance could have been issued by him. From April 29 to May 16, 1310, Edward II. was at

and the usher of the hall had imposed upon them the duty of seeing that only authorised members of the household, receiving robes, should sit in the king's hall, save on the days when strangers were "received and honoured as they ought."[1] This principle was now re-emphasised by the direction imposing on all sergeants, yeomen and others of the household the obligation of eating in hall, unless when they were blooded "by permission of steward and treasurer" or sick. This categorical order was confined apparently to the lower members of the staff, but many personages of importance had the right, with or without permission, of partaking of meals. And, besides the hall, with its two scales of feeding for gentle and simple, there was another table in the king's chamber, where the chamberlain and some other chamber officials ate in the king's presence. In all cases, however, there were allowances for those who by reason of sickness, periodical bleedings or absence from court on business were unable to share the common meals. Like the undergraduates of an Oxford college, the inferior members of the household were put under some compulsion to dine in hall, but the senior staff could exercise their own discretion in the matter. And for all who were dignified enough to be allowed a chamber and chamberlain of their own, either individually or as members of a common unit, there were commons of wine and beer, fuel and candles to be used in their private rooms. Abuse of the common table was to be minimised by the knight-usher of the hall seeing that none ate there who had not the right to do so.[2] The arrangement of places in hall for meals, according to rank and order, was the duty of one of the knights-marshal of the hall.[3]

The unity of the household was only to be obtained through diversity of its parts. Most important for our present purpose was the tendency to split up into separate sub-departments the functionaries belonging to the hall. The fundamental division

Woodstock; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, pp. 216, 258. Moreover, later in that year the keeper, Ingelard of Warley, Oct. 15–18, 1310, assigned Adam of Lymbergh, the exchequer clerk, to go to the king "pro quibusdam ordinacionibus et statutis hospicio ipsius regis de nouo editis legendis domino regi"; *MS. Cotton, Nero*, C. VIII. f. 60. Can these be the "ordinementz qi furent faitz a Wodestoke de lostiel le roi," mentioned in the ordinance of 1318? *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 307.

[1] *Ib.* p. 307. Compare *ib.* p. 282. [2] *Ib.* p. 282.

[3] *Ib.* p. 283. Compare *ib.* p. 307.

between the laymen and the clerks had always been there, and, if anything, was less absolute now than it had been under Edward I. And the laymen, though all subject to the joint jurisdiction of steward and treasurer, were in nearly all cases outside the membership of the wardrobe proper. But even within the still narrower limits of the clerks of the wardrobe, distinctions had now become real. The officers of the great wardrobe had long been in a category by themselves. The clerks of the privy seal had now become clearly differentiated from the mass of wardrobe clerks. Accordingly we shall deal with these groups separately, as we shall also treat later the position of the chamber officers. But, even more emphatically than in the case of the chamber, the subordination of the great wardrobe and the office of the privy seal to the general household organisation was strongly brought out by the ordinance of York. There were elaborate particulars how this subordination was to be effected. The king had lost largely in respect to great wardrobe commodities, owing to the fact that the "clerk purveyor," or keeper, of the great wardrobe did not render his daily account in the wardrobe before the steward and treasurer, as the other heads of household offices were compelled to do. The remedy was to make the chief usher of the wardrobe also act as "clerk of the spicery" and become the channel through which the deliveries of great wardrobe supplies were to be made. In each case the price of the goods was to be mentioned, and the clerk of the spicery was made responsible for them in the daily account to the steward and treasurer.[1] Similarly the tendency of the great wardrobe to drift out of court was checked by the assignment to its keeper of a chamber and chamberlain in the household, with allowances from the hall and the obligation to reside in court so far as his office allowed.[2] In like fashion the clerk of the privy seal had his chamber, his allowances from the usher of the hall, his status among the great clerks of the household, his esquire eating in hall and the like. Analogous though more modest allowances to the four clerks of the privy seal were also made, though it was clearly regarded as exceptional that they should take meals in

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 275. A second clerk of the spicery, or sub-usher, was appointed to aid the chief usher in carrying out this work; *ib.* pp. 275-276.
[2] *Ib.* p. 275.

hall. But the fixing of their wages, "until they be advanced by the king," by the steward and treasurer emphasised even more clearly their subordination to the heads of the household, and the principle of the unity of the *familia regis*.

We have now cleared out of the way the officers of the chamber, the great wardrobe and the privy seal. In the same way we may rule out the chaplains, the almoner, the confessor of the king and the whole staff of the chapel,[1] which in 1279 was regarded as part of the wardrobe. With them go also the medical and surgical staff.[2] All these chaplains, physicians and surgeons were only related to the wardrobe in the sense that all the rest of the household were, by reason of their common subjection to steward and treasurer. Their relations were in fact less intimate than those of the clerks of the offices of the household, who submitted their daily accounts and expenses to the nightly scrutiny of these two officials. Moreover, all wages paid and disbursements effected were under the direct cognisance of the wardrobe clerks, whose "wardrobe accounts" included the complete finances, both outgoings and incomings, of the whole household. The only branch of the household that was not directly responsible to the treasurer was the judicial branch, which the steward and marshal had in their hands. Nevertheless all profits of this jurisdiction came under the treasurer's purview, and were included in his receipt.

Let us now resume our comparison of the ordinance of 1279 with that of 1318. In the latter, as in the former, there was the small directive staff of knights and clerks, responsible either for the household as a whole or for some integral part of it. There were, however, some changes which strike the eye at once. The two stewards, as we know well, have become one, but the authority of the office was enhanced by its concentration into a single pair of hands. The steward was no longer one of two officers, called on indifferently by the treasurer to take part in the daily account, but acted as a matter of right. He was almost assumed to be a banneret, and in that case had, like the chamberlain, extra attendance and allowances. On the other hand, the two marshals, who in 1279 were mentioned next after the stewards, were not specifically mentioned in the ordinances at all, though we know

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 278-279. [2] *Ib.* pp. 279-280.

that these duplicate offices still continued.[1] The department of the marshalsea still figured largely, but the marshals of the hall, and the other minor functionaries of that name, discharged limited and restricted duties. Some of them were appointed by the earl-marshal, but others seem to have been chosen by the king. Though the marshal was still active as a coadjutor of the steward in the household court, though the marshalsea was for ever purveying oats and hay for the king's horses, though its prison was constantly filled with offenders, yet there seems some significance in the fact that the marshals were no longer enumerated among the chief household officers.[2]

[1] The phrase is generally "steward and marshals of the household"; for instances see *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 411; *ib., 1321–4*, p. 302. John de Weston, the younger, though "maimed in the king's service" (*C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 397), was the marshal before whom Roger Amory was tried for treason in 1322 (Harcourt, pp. 399-400), and still held office in 1323; *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 343. His lieutenant at one time was John of Haustede; *C.C.R., 1318–23*, p. 686.

[2] In 1279 Sir Richard du Bois, chief marshal, had 10 marks a year as fee and 8 marks for robes, that is to say, the same emoluments as those of the second steward. But in 1318 no marshal as such was mentioned, unless he were the knight, lieutenant of the earl-marshal, who, with a clerk under him, a second clerk to write his rolls, a sergeant to make attachments, a herberger and his assistant and a yeoman of the prison of the marshalsea were all appointed by the earl-marshal; (*ib.* p. 314. The earl-marshal also appointed the marshal of the exchequer). It is hard to reconcile this statement with another passage of the ordinance (*ib.* p. 312) in which the king commanded "his marshals" to purge the court of strangers, unless the latter be the "marshals of the hall" whom the king himself appointed. But both passages alike aim at restricting the excessive number of ministers of the marshalsea, and another provision (*ib.* p. 314) avowedly restored the "ancient custom" of Edward I.'s reign "in the days of the earls-marshal," that is, before Roger Bigod's surrender in 1301 or his death in 1306. After that the marshalship remained in the king's hands and temporary marshals were appointed when need for their services arose. But in 1316 Edward revived the earl-marshalship in favour of his brother Thomas of Brotherton, "with all thereto pertaining"; *C.Ch.R.* iii. 304. We are elsewhere told (*Pl. Edw. II.* p. 312) that the only officers of the marshalsea appointed by the king were the coroner and his clerk. But the two knights-marshal of the hall (*ib.* p. 283), the two sergeants-marshal of the hall (*ib.* p. 284), and the chief clerk of the marshalsea (*ib.* p. 297) seem also under the direct control of the king. The term "marshal" was, however, used in quite different senses, and there is a clear-cut division between the earl-marshal and his subordinates and the marshals of the hall. The marshals in the ordinance have restricted though important duties, sharing with the steward in household jurisdiction, but having nothing to do with the general direction of the household. It looks as if the extensive power of appointment to court offices vested in the earl-marshal was a reason for restricting the power of all the court marshals and of increasing the royal hold over them. The abeyance of the earl-marshalship from 1306 to 1316 made this process the easier to accomplish. The whole subject of the various marshals and their duties is worth working up in detail. See for material, Fleta, pp. 69-70, 79 and 80.

In any case no marshal of the household had such close relations with the clerical administrative staff as are analogous to those which compel us to go beyond our strict subject to consider to some extent the functions of the steward and chamberlain. But the marshals replaced the treasurer as colleagues of the steward in the judicial side of household work, wherein clerical competence was severely limited by canon law. They were the policemen, the gaolers, the maintainers of order, discipline and decorum over the household in peace, over the host in war. They were in charge of the royal stables and kept the rolls of men and horses, both in court and in camp. The officers of the household only owed to officers called marshals the arrangements of their seats at table, the exclusion of unauthorised visitors, the selection of their lodgings in their travels, and, at the worst, were brought before them as judges, and might be lodged in the marshalsea or court prison. But the king's chamberlain, on the contrary, as to whom the former ordinance was silent, had now his place in the household hierarchy immediately after the steward and treasurer. To him we shall return later.

The clerks of the household fell into similar categories to those represented by the clerks in 1279. At their head, even more clearly than earlier, were the chief clerks of the wardrobe. The treasurer (he is more often called treasurer than keeper) has precedence over all household officers save the steward, whose colleague he has frankly become in exercising supreme control over the whole household. The constant co-operation of steward and treasurer was involved in every detail of household administration. Every leave of absence from hall, every periodical permission to be "blooded," every writ of prisage or purveyance, every small disciplinary measure, was dependent upon their agreement to take common action. Moreover, they presided over the daily "account," so that the head of every department or office, every person who had the obligation of receiving, using and paying for supplies, was brought daily before their jurisdiction. The very name of treasurer, without any such qualification as "of the wardrobe," anticipates the latter usage under Edward III., when he became in common phrase the "treasurer of the household." He had substantially similar allowances with the steward and rather more than the chamberlain. As in 1279,

he had no wages, and herein lay the main difference between him and his two lay colleagues. While in 1279 he was to "lie in the wardrobe," he now had, like the other chief knights and clerks, a chamber and a chamberlain of his own.[1]

At the head of the second group of household servants came the controller.[2] His duties were defined with greater particularity than those of his three superiors; and showed him immediately responsible for all the details of domestic economy. His primary function was still the control of the treasurer's exchequer account by his counter roll. But he was to keep a sharp eye on every branch of the household. He was to be present when stocks of wine came in through the butler; he was to supervise all the "offices" of the household, the pantry, the buttery, the cellar, the larder, the spicery, the avenerie and the rest, and was to ascertain that the victuals and drink provided were good in quality and reasonable in price. Any falling away in quantity or quality he was bound to report to steward and treasurer at the next account. Every Monday he had to inspect all the offices, examine the remnants and compare them and the things expended with the articles received. He was to be in the kitchen when the meat was cut up and the fish distributed, calling to his aid, when necessary, the knight-usher and the clerk of the kitchen. Unless for due cause, he was bound to attend the daily account before steward and treasurer. He had wages of fivepence a day "until he be advanced by the king," besides allowances and chamber.

Next to the controller comes the cofferer.[3] He was still appointed by the treasurer, who was responsible for his sick allowances and for his other expenses at court. His liveries and chamber allowances were on the same scale as the controller's. His special responsibility was the drafting and writing out of all matters touching the wardrobe and its accounts, and he had under him, not only his personal clerk, but two "clerks of the accounting table," who formed the nucleus of a special accounting department.[4] Of the same status as the cofferer was the clerk of the privy seal, of whom we shall speak later. His staff, the four clerks of the privy seal,[5] had the same rank as the clerks of

[1] *Pl. Edw. II* p. 271. [2] *Ib.* pp. 271-272. [3] *Ib.* pp. 272-273.
[4] *Ib.* p. 273. [5] *Ib.* pp. 273-274.

the accounting table. While their masters have their chamber, the subordinates "lie in the wardrobe," as all the wardrobe clerks did in 1279. They required permission of the treasurer to dine in hall. This provision of separate chambers for the chief clerks of the wardrobe and their power at will to take their meals apart in them marked the development of their dignity much more than the growth of comfort and luxury at court and in society. Of the same status as the cofferer and keeper of the privy seal was the clerk of the great wardrobe,[1] but he was less closely attached to the court. Though he had his chamber, his duty was to "lie in the wardrobe," and his "chamber" perhaps meant in practice a separate bed.

Next came the subordinate clerks of the wardrobe, the chief usher and the sub-usher.[2] These were now dignified with the titles of clerk and second clerk of the spicery. As in 1279, the usher had the special duty imposed upon him of receiving and supervising the receipt from the great wardrobe, so that he formed the link between that office and the wardrobe. He also surveyed the expenditure of great wardrobe commodities within the household, notably the wax, the candles and torches for which he was responsible at the daily account before steward and treasurer. He had still, however, his former duty of superintending the transport of the wardrobe, its carts, carriages, coffers and the like, including the beds of the clerks of the wardrobe. He was of sufficient dignity to have his chamber. The sub-usher was his assistant in carrying out all these duties, and was the only wardrobe clerk who had no chamber allowance.

It follows that the clerical staff of the wardrobe remained much as it was in 1279 in point of numbers. The cofferer had now an assured status; the ushers' task was better defined, and the controller had much more detailed domestic supervision in return for being relieved from the secretarial and archivist work that had now gone to the only new officer, the keeper of the privy seal. Accordingly there remained five chief wardrobe clerks, and five only, for we may now safely separate from the office the heads of outstanding departments which have grown out of it. The increase of work was provided for by departmentalising, so to say, of each of their spheres and by assigning to every clerk

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 274. [2] *Ib.* pp. 274-276.

a staff of clerical and lay assistants, regarded as adequate to carry on their respective duties. Not many of these latter were dealt with in any particularity in the ordinance of York. The chief exceptions are the sergeant sub-usher,[1] who was directly responsible to the usher, and was the watchman and messenger of the wardrobe. He was the "herberger" of the wardrobe, who provided quarters and lodgings for the department on its travels. He was to "lie within the hutch of the wardrobe to guard safely all the things that are in it," being responsible, if trouble arose through his default. He was to seek the "liveries" or allowances for all the *garderobarii* from the kitchen, hall and other places, and to obey their orders. With him was mentioned the porter of the wardrobe,[2] whose function was to carry the coffers and other "harness" of the wardrobe to and from its carts and to load and unload them. During journeys his station was on the carts, and he was to keep watch when the carts were laagered for the night in the open country. In consideration of these arduous tasks his daily wage of twopence was to be raised to fourpence on occasion of watch and travel. The sergeant-chandler, with the high wage of sevenpence halfpenny a day, was to issue wax and candles, under the direction of the clerk of the spicery, every day in the wardrobe before meal-time. Under him were two yeomen who worked the wax into candles. There was a special laundrywoman for the wardrobe. How limited was its complete staff as compared with the household as a whole is seen in the fact that one "harbinger" (*herbeiour*) was enough to be sent before to prepare quarters on journeys for the wardrobe and all its clerks. There were, however, separate harbingers for the controller and for the cofferer, to which may be added the harbinger of the privy seal and its clerks.[3] There were the three, or, including that for the privy seal, four harbingers who provided lodgings for wardrobe officials. There were thirty-six harbingers for other departments of the household, so that the wardrobe was but little responsible for the monstrous crowd of riffraff, the hangers-on of the various offices, grooms, pages, boys, Welshmen, archers, messengers, women of ill-fame and the rest whose presence made the advent

[1] *Pl Edw II.* p. 276. [2] *Ib.* p. 276.
[3] *Ib.* pp. 311-312. The treasurer, like the steward, had no special "herbeiour."

of the royal household a terror to the countryside. The *garderobarii* were in comparison a limited and decorous body, bulking very small among the motley swarm, though taking their places with the rest at the huge table of the king's hall. Their leaders, past and present, had had the chief share in framing the reforming ordinance. If it were not altogether successful, it is unlikely that the chief blame fell on the wardrobe clerks.

Before leaving the ordinance of 1318 we must note one characteristic which it shares with that of 1279. It assumes that the whole sphere of duties of every household and wardrobe officer was limited to the domestic details of the administration of a great establishment. Though in the interval the ordinances of 1311 had assimilated the lay and clerical heads of the household to the position of officers of state, there is still no word as to those wider functions which gave the wardrobe its place in political and administrative history. If we had no other guidance, we should have to imagine a Benstead or a Melton, whom we know to have been prominent ministers of the crown, frittering away their lives on seeing meat cut up, fish apportioned, and discharging all the other routine domestic duties that seemed fully to take up the controller's time. But these duties were specific, and it was with the specific that the reformers had to deal. The higher work was optional at the discretion of the crown. The main reason for this silence is no doubt the same as suggested in 1279, but the omission is the more significant at the later date. It would be most rash, however, to see in it any deliberate delimitation of the court officers to purely domestic duties, but it is impossible to deny that circumstances were already tending strongly in that direction. For one thing there was no longer that concentration of the domestic administration in wardrobe hands that we witnessed under Edward I. With the beginnings of the separation of the privy seal office from the wardrobe, the domestic chancery was eliminated from the exclusive court purview, and bade fair to become, as the ordainers had desired, a minor chancery of state. With the revival of the *camera* a large share of the domestic financial work was, immediately and permanently, excluded from wardrobe control, and the setting up of a new secretarial office within the chamber did something more to emphasise the limitations of an administrative body which no

longer had seal or secretaries within its own society. Thus, all unconsciously, the generation which saw the height of wardrobe organisation saw the beginnings of its limitation to a narrower sphere of work. The king's wardrobe was tending to become the wardrobe of the household; the sometime rival to chancery and exchequer was drifting towards the position of a machine for ruling the king's house.

Other reforming acts in the years succeeding the ordinance of 1318 tended, while further improving the wardrobe in practical ways, to strengthen still further the tendency towards limitation and definition which generally comes at the end of a period of great expansion. This was the more the case since all these further measures came, after the revolution of 1322 had broken the power of the ordainers and had formally repealed the ordinances. The survivors of the middle party, with the Despensers at their head, had become a court party. Though they remained radical reformers, they felt no longer any need for encouraging the wardrobe at the expense of the chancery and exchequer, for all three offices alike were now equally under their control. Moreover, if any such strengthening of court offices were desired, it lay in the direction of the development of the chamber, whose prosperity, both directly and indirectly, limited the scope of wardrobe influence.

It is clear, however, that court politicians were now indifferent to the further development of the household system. This was now to receive a further series of blows as an indirect, but hardly unconscious, result of the reforming energy of Walter Stapeldon, whose return to the treasurership, on May 10, 1322, gave him an opportunity for carrying out much further the policy of reconstruction which he had already started in his first treasurership of 1320–1321. Stapeldon renewed his work some two months after Boroughbridge and the proscription of the contrariants, at the moment of the parliament of York and the repeal of the ordinances. To prepare for this the exchequer was removed from Westminster and ordered to hold its Easter session at York,[1] where it remained till July 1323. As the first

[1] The order, issued on Feb. 11 at Gloucester, was to hold the Easter session at York; *C.C.R., 1318–23*, p. 417. In 1322 the "morrow of the close of Easter" was Monday, April 19. But the move from Westminster only began on Monday, April 5. Grantham was reached on April 10, and thence the "caravan" of 17 "carette" (24 according to *Ann. Paulini*, p. 303) proceeded by Newark to Torksey, lower down the Trent, where it embarked in boats and made the rest of the journey by water. Details of the whole transference are in *M.R., L.T.R., 15 Edw. II.* No. 92, "adhuc recorda," m. 17. It required some confidence in February to transfer the exchequer to the heart of Lancaster's country. But the Burton-Boroughbridge campaign fully justified the optimism of the government. Moreover, the start from Westminster was only made three weeks after the decisive battle.

sign of Stapeldon's activity, there came in July 1322 that final establishment of exchequer control over the vast forfeitures of the "contrariants" which put an end to the boldest aggressions of the administrative chamber.[1] Next year, when the court was still in the north, came the first ordinance for the reform of the exchequer, issued on June 14, 1323, at Cowick.[2] In close connection with it was promulgated, before the end of the month, the second York ordinance for the "estate of the wardrobe and the account of the hostel."[3] Both ordinances are strictly correlated, and the second seems to presuppose the other. They had better, therefore, be considered together.

The Cowick ordinance was a lengthy document whose chief object was to facilitate the timely settlement of the normal business of the exchequer, the hearing of the accounts of the sheriffs and bailiffs, by restricting the trial of pleas in the exchequer, by the removal of the mass of hopeless debts from its accounts, by the creation of fresh officers to deal with new types of business, such as the administration of the contrariants' lands, and, above all, by distinguishing between the proper accounts, traditionally tendered to the exchequer, and the "foreign accounts" which now occupied so much of the time and attention

[1] See later, pp. 338-343.

[2] The Cowick ordinance is printed in Hall, *R.B.E.* pp. 849-907.

[3] The second York ordinance is printed in *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 314-318. It is simply dated "en le moys de Juin," but I think it improbable that it could have been issued before June 26. It is almost certainly posterior to the Cowick ordinance, and was published "en le presence le roy." But Edward, who had been staying at Bishopsthorp, quite close to York, with archbishop Melton from May 25 to June 8, was with the chancery and wardrobe at Cowick and Haddlesey from June 8 to 28, and no chancery writs were issued from York between June 6 and 26. Both Cowick, a chapelry in the parish of Snaith, and Haddlesey, a few miles to the west, are more than 23 miles south of York, and too far off to make the personal presence of the king in the city very likely between those dates. On the other hand, the "council" which passed the ordinance was composed practically of exchequer officials and the exchequer was at York all through this period.

of the barons.[1] The remedy adopted in this last matter was the complete removal of these "foreign accounts" from the great annual roll, which moderns call the pipe roll, and their engrossment by a separate staff on a new roll, exclusively devoted to their reception. First among such foreign accounts were the wardrobe accounts, which should, had the ordinances been strictly carried out, have disappeared from their accustomed place in the pipe roll. This is the only provision of the Cowick ordinance that directly affected the wardrobe, and its object was clearly not to mitigate, but to heighten, exchequer control over it by affording fuller opportunities for the consideration of its finances. In the same way another clause of the ordinance provided a special officer to keep the records of the contrariants' lands and castles, which were thus permanently provided for by the exchequer. Thus the most ancient of the government offices secured its tenacious grip over chamber and wardrobe alike.

The York ordinance did little more than work out in detail the provisions for the new method of dealing with the wardrobe accounts already determined on at Cowick. A comparison of the members of the king's council, who assented to this ordinance, with the advisers of the ordinance of 1318 will suggest that while in 1318 the instigators of legislation were men of the wardrobe, the act of 1323 was an act of the exchequer.[2] The only ancient *garderobarius* responsible for the act of 1323 was archbishop Melton, who forms the link between the two transactions. There results all the difference in the world between them. In 1318 the wardrobe was reforming itself. When this reform proved ineffective or ill-executed, changes were further imposed upon it in 1323 from an external and unsympathetic standpoint.

The scope of the two ordinances differed almost as much as

[1] For the exchequer reforms of Stapeldon see *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 191-200.

[2] The councillors mentioned were archbishop Melton, the treasurer Stapeldon, Walter Norwich, Roger Belers, and other barons of the exchequer, "and others of the king's council." No doubt the exchequer would bulk largely in any York council in 1323, but the common bench, the chancery and the wardrobe were also there, and there must have been some reason for stressing the responsibility of exchequer officers. In 1318 the draft, made by a purely wardrobe committee, was approved by a council of which four bishops, one of whom was the chancellor, and two justices are mentioned. Melton was the only name common to both lists. Of course the exchequer was at Westminster in 1318, and the only baron known to be at York was Walter Norwich.

their methods. The ordinance of 1323 had a strictly limited object. There is much less said about the "estate of the wardrobe" than about the "account of the household." It is clear that the speeding up of the account is the great motive of the ordinance, partly no doubt because the act of 1318 had failed to accomplish its purpose, but largely also because, without regularity and promptitude on the wardrobe's part, the exchequer reform could not be properly worked out. The need, therefore, for expedition in accounting runs all through the York ordinance. To secure this end, the keeper of the wardrobe is to be personally responsible for all purveyances or payments made for wardrobe account, since purveyances of doubtful warranty have often delayed the account. Despite the stress laid in 1318 on "daily account" before steward and treasurer, it is clear that it was very irregularly held, for the York ordinance tried to make it more practical by mitigating its severity. It ordered that the "daily account" was to be held at least every other day when the wardrobe was stationary; that if three days passed without an account, the steward and treasurer should pay its expenses from their own purses. It also imposed a similar punishment on the lesser officers, if they had shares in responsibility for the delay. This, though in form a mitigation of the tradition of the daily account, which thus became optional, was probably, by providing an adequate sanction, a very effective means of enforcing its spirit. Its harshness to the wardrobe officers suggests how much the provision was imposed on the office from the outside.

The same aim inspired the order that the "foreign ministers" who accounted in the wardrobe,[1] such as the chief butler and the purveyor of the great wardrobe, were all to hold three or four "views" of their offices every year, according to the discretion of the keeper of the wardrobe, under a similar penalty of personal liability for the expenses of their department. Under a similar penalty also the clerks of the offices were to account, month by month or quarter by quarter at the keeper's option. The object of all this was to ensure that the general wardrobe account should be made up quarter by quarter, before the conclusion of

[1] "Foreign" here seems to mean non-wardrobe, not non-exchequer. It is significant that by 1323 the exchequer looked on the great wardrobe as "foreign" to the wardrobe.

the quarter after the one accounted for. By this means it was anticipated that the final yearly account of the whole wardrobe could be rendered to the exchequer every year by February 3 in times of peace. As a further penalty against dilatory officials, ministers in arrears with their accounts were to be removed from their posts and grievously punished. Their names and seals were to be given to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer, who were empowered to seize their lands, chattels and persons, and sue them on the king's behalf as having broken the law and custom of the exchequer. As if this were not enough, he who was in arrears with his account was to be delivered to the marshalsea prison and detained there till he had made amends. Thus the double coercion of wardrobe and exchequer was imposed upon the unhappy *garderobarii*.

In other articles the heavy hand of the exchequer reformers was laid on the personnel of the wardrobe. The accounts of past years had been exceedingly diffuse, and had caused great delays, especially when swollen in war time by numerous purveyances of victuals and payments of soldiers' wages, all of which had to be verified. To minimise such delays the actual cofferer, responsible for these arrears, was ordered to take, if needful, additional assistance and concentrate his efforts on the "arrayment" of the accounts in arrear, up to the conclusion next month of the sixteenth regnal year. He was first to hear the accounts in the hostel itself, and then, after Michaelmas, if such were the pleasure of the keeper, was to take up his quarters at London to hear the foreign accounts, so that he could certify them to the exchequer on behalf of the officers who did not appear personally before it. A second cofferer was to be nominated whose charge was to follow closely the course already determined for the future expenses of the wardrobe. The effect of this was to make the cofferer more directly responsible to the exchequer for the accounts, and to compel him to separate himself for long periods from the wardrobe and remain in London to meet the exchequer's convenience.

The cofferer was not the only victim of the ordinance. In language reminding us of the ordinances of 1311, it was laid down that a suitable staff be appointed to the household, and that their names be delivered to the keeper and to the clerk of the

marshalsea. Similarly the officers of the household were to be suitable and sufficient, and "rascals were to be removed from each office."

The concluding clauses of the ordinance repeated, with greater particularity and insistence, the provisions of the ordinance of 1318 respecting the detailed duties of the chief household officers. The clerks of the offices were to be present when the keeper paid for purveyances on ordinary days. When wholesale purveyances were made, as in the case of oxen and wine on the occasion of parliaments and great feasts, and similarly when storeable provisions, such as salt herrings and other fish, were paid for in large quantities, the view of such purchases was to be made, if possible, by the steward and treasurer, and if not by the controller, the knight-usher of the hall, or in the case of meat and fish by the clerk of the kitchen, and in that of wine by the clerk of the buttery. The controller was not only to view the cutting up of oxen and taste all the wine; he was to examine prices and quantities; he was to authorise the slaughter of three oxen for feasts and parliaments, and to see that the three were to be of varying qualities and prices, and record in writing the weight of each beast. In another matter his control was no longer to be regarded as sufficient. This was in the case of royal gifts of large sums of money and precious jewels. These were to be further warranted by royal writ to the exchequer. The reason assigned was that the controller cannot always be near to the keeper. In the same spirit the staffs of the marshalsea and the bakery were to be controlled, though what was said about them was but the shorter repetition of the provisions of the earlier ordinance. Finally, the gifts and offerings, which the wardrobe was to supply to the king to offer in his chapel on the chief feasts of the church, were meticulously specified.

Further external changes were imposed upon the wardrobe by the second exchequer ordinance, issued at Westminster on May 6, 1324.[1] It was again an ordinance of king and council, and was concerned with the accounts to be received in the exchequer. It was mainly taken up with the reiteration and the amplification of the method of dealing with the wardrobe account, and therefore has a more intimate relation to our

[1] *R.B.E.* pp. 908-929.

subject than the Cowick ordinance of 1323. It recited once more the difficulties resulting from the "keeper of the wardrobe of our household,"[1] being charged with several "foreign accounts" of which he had no knowledge, and also charged with the receipt of large sums of money which had not come through his hands, and with purchases and liveries made by others, so that his account had been so delayed that no one could have knowledge of its particulars, to the great damage of the king. The remedies for these evils were then set forth. The first was a stringent restatement of the law that all issues should go to the exchequer in the novel form of prohibiting the keeper of the wardrobe from receiving any money from any other source than the treasurer and chamberlains, and this by warrant to those officers. The only exceptions were the amercements of the steward and marshals, gifts to the king, and the fines and amercements of towns, raised by the clerks of the measures—all purely personal and household receipts. Analogous prohibitions were extended to the clerk of the great wardrobe, who also was to be supplied with cash exclusively from the exchequer after royal warrant, and was to issue his supplies to the keeper of the wardrobe and all others by detailed indenture. But the drastic change here was the order that the clerk of the great wardrobe should no longer account to the keeper but directly to the exchequer.[2]

The same treatment was applied to the other autonomous branches of the main wardrobe stock. The king's butler, providing wines in many places and with the help of many subordinates, was necessarily only nominally under the control of the keeper. Henceforth he was to receive from the exchequer a sum of money fixed by the crown, and was to be checked by two of the most law-worthy and substantial burgesses of every "good town" wherein a purveyance was made, by whose testimony the prices were to be regulated, and by whose certificate, rendered at Easter and Michaelmas, the exchequer was to be informed as to the details of such prices. Moreover the butler's accounts were henceforth to be rendered directly to the exchequer, the keeper of the wardrobe being duly charged with the wines received by him on indenture between butler and keeper.

[1] See for this phrase later, p. 267.

[2] See later, in the chapter on the great wardrobe.

After the same way, all purveyors and receivers of victuals for garrisons, castles and other places in peace or war were to account henceforth at the exchequer, and the keeper of the wardrobe was only to meddle with such victuals as he received for the expenses of the royal household, by indenture with the purveyors and receivers. The keepers of the king's horses and studs, outside the court, were to enjoy an analogous independence and direct relations with the exchequer. The keeper of the wardrobe, "who cannot have full knowledge and power in matters relating to such 'foreign' (=non-household) horses," was not to concern himself with them or be charged with them. The only exception was on the part of "our great horses," for these were "as it were attendant on our person, and staying for that reason sometimes in our household and sometimes sojourning outside it near at hand, until we wish to send for them." * Likewise the hanaper account was to be tendered by the clerk of the hanaper directly to the exchequer. This was also to be the case with the accounts of envoys of high rank and other persons, sent on important missions beyond sea, who were henceforth to receive a lump sum, or a sum based upon an estimate of their expenses day by day, from the exchequer, to which the envoys were personally accountable within three months of their return. The reason was that the former issuing of wardrobe imprests to such persons had caused inordinate delay in the accounts, as they cannot be compelled to account to the wardrobe. Ordinary imprests or advances for wages and the like in times of peace were to be assigned for payment on a certain day, after which the money could be delivered at pleasure from the exchequer on the certificate of the keeper of the wardrobe.

Imprests for wages in peace time were forbidden, but all wages were to be paid every fortnight, month or quarter on the claimant's production of his account for fees, so that the wardrobe account should not be delayed for that reason. Power was reserved to pay beforehand a lump sum to those charged with executing commissions within the country, when there was need for it, but a day of accounting for such advances was to be fixed immediately after the return of the recipients to court.

Other restrictions concluded the ordinance. The clerk of the measures, who received the fines and amercements from

towns, still lawfully payable directly to the wardrobe, was to deliver the same to the wardrobe by indenture. A clerk or bailiff was to be assigned to receive the amercements made before the household court of the steward and marshals, and the proceeds from the chattels of felons, and to deliver them to the wardrobe by indenture. The indentures and copies of the records concerned were to be sent twice a year by the steward to the exchequer. A clerk was to be assigned by the exchequer to receive the above indentures and estreats. The yearly wardrobe account was to end on July 7 (the regnal year of Edward II.), and the keeper was to send in his account to the exchequer on the *quinzaine* of Michaelmas. To facilitate this, the butler's and great wardrobe accounts were to be handed in on the morrow of Michaelmas. In all future years, therefore, September 30 was the legal day on which the clerk of the great wardrobe and the chief butler were to appear before treasurer and barons to answer for their respective accounts, while the keeper of the wardrobe was due to appear on October 14.

The effect of these provisions was still further to subject the wardrobe to constant exchequer control. Specious reasons were of course assigned. The keeper could not be expected to be responsible for things he knew nothing about; the controller could not be supposed always to be at his side; there must be clear evidence of the king's wishes before either exchequer or wardrobe could act; orderly finance and regular accounting involved one source of supplies and the independent responsibility of heads of departments, who might regard the ordinance as a charter of freedom for their offices. But how much was gone of the old freedom of wardrobe officers, their untrammelled power of pursuing the king's interests without regard to precedent or tradition? A policy of administrative definition is incompatible with a policy of expansion on any lines approved by the king. And all the reforms of Edward II.'s reign, by applying to administration the policy of definition which Edward I. had already applied to the constitution, made household administration as "constitutional," as fettered, as traditionalist as the ways of the exchequer and the common law courts. The convenience of wardrobe officers was served by better business methods and clearer conception of the functions of each part of the household

machinery. In the ordered system which the administrative reformers had in their minds' eye, and which they strove to embody in their ordinances, the wardrobe secured its permanent place. But it was a limited and restricted position at the best. It was tied down to the household and practically to that part of the household which itinerated with the king. There is some significance that this restrictive ordinance, inspired by the departmental jealousy of the exchequer, spoke of the wardrobe as the "wardrobe of the household," the first time, so far as I have noticed, this phrase is used in an official document.[1] It is the more significant that the new phrase took on at once.[2] We have, in short, got to the beginning of the process by which we have not one wardrobe with various dependent branches; we shall soon be getting to the stage when men talk freely of the three wardrobes. If the transition was still slow, it was because these reforming ordinances were, after the fashion of mediaeval legislation, only imperfectly executed. And if carried out, they were, as the text suggested, most suitable for peace times. When war broke out, Edward's successor had still to go back to the wardrobe traditions of Edward I.

There were no further wardrobe reforms under Edward II. Before his resignation, or removal, from the treasury, Stapeldon had effectively laid down the lines of reform, though whether his plans were carried out is a different matter. It was still necessary for the wardrobe veteran, archbishop Melton, who succeeded Stapeldon in July 1325, to reiterate them once more. But Melton's exchequer ordinance, issued June 30, 1326, at Westminster,[3] adds next to nothing to the history of the wardrobe, unless it be in showing more elaborately what numerous "foreign accounts," besides those which were enumerated in the ordinance of 1324, were to fall under the exchequer's cognisance. It is a document of great importance in exchequer history, if only

[1] *R.B.E.* p. 908, "la garderobe de nostre houstiel."

[2] Keeper Roger of Waltham was called in a wardrobe account "garderober del houstiel le roi"; *Exch. Accts.* 379/17, m. 4. See later, pp. 275-276.

[3] It is printed in *R B.E.* pp. 930-969. Conway Davies (p. 532) points out that Melton's ordinance was also made by the advice of his predecessor Stapeldon, whose influence still continued to be felt at the exchequer and for whose opinion the king still had the greatest respect. Mr. Davies refers to a writ of privy seal in *M.R., K.R.* No. 102, m. 56, as illustrating the part played by Stapeldon in the arrangement of these ordinances.

because it restored the unity of the exchequer which Roger Belers had so rashly destroyed.[1] But some departure from this unity of organisation was involved in the provision that the foreign accounts were all to be rendered in "another house," provided for the purpose, adjoining the house where all sheriffs' and bailiffs' accounts were tendered. But this was a matter for the exchequer rather than the wardrobes, for it is hard to see that it in any way affected the reception of those accounts. The ambiguity of the ordinance made it not quite clear whether the wardrobe accounts were included in the accounts heard privately before special auditors, under the supervision of certain barons of the exchequer assigned for the purpose.[2]

There is nothing surprising in the fact that the restored monarchy laid little stress on the wardrobe now that baronial opposition had been for the time destroyed. Power was now again in the hands of the official class, and it was natural that the ideals of Edward I., when officials ruled in the king's name, should return with the revival of similar conditions. In truth the growing complexity of the administrative system made the undifferentiated household of Norman times no longer adequate for the government of a highly organised state. It needlessly complicated the machinery; it confused the king and his kingdom; it gave him opportunities of evading his responsibilities. Hence the ineffectiveness of the household system made it less essential to the crown; its prerogative character caused it to be looked upon coldly by the baronage. From different motives king and barons preferred to stress the recognised political offices rather than the household. Thus the exchequer was consciously reformed, while the chancery reformed itself. As a result they became more adequate for their respective tasks, and their efficiency left less need for the old-fashioned wardrobe to supplement their efforts. What reforming zeal was still devoted to the household threw itself mainly into the development of those recent offshoots of the wardrobe, which in becoming largely independent of it drifted into the position of minor offices of state. The king himself found in the chamber a better means of enforcing his prerogative, for the recognised chamber was an up-to-date institution much freer than the

[1] See above, *Sect.* II. p. 211. [2] *R.B.E.* p. 932.

wardrobe from the danger of baronial control. From the chamber came the prerogative government of the next generations. With it, as we shall see, was associated the newer varieties of the small seal, the secretaries, and all that this involved. The privy seal office was becoming a minor office of state. The great wardrobe, to which we may soon add the privy wardrobe, was well on its way towards an existence independent of the household. The result was the virtual hemming in of the wardrobe of the household into the narrower path on which it was henceforth to move. In the next generation the emergency of a great war gave it, as we shall see, another chance. But save in emergencies, it gradually lost its political importance.

The insignificance of the personnel and mediocrity of the work of the "wardrobe of the household" in the period 1318 to 1326 shows that the great instrument of Edward I.'s authority was no longer of vital account to kings or courtiers, and no longer a chief object of criticism and fear to the survivors of the baronial opposition. Before we can fully appreciate this personal side of the question, we must, however, consider from the beginning of the reign the chief individualities connected with the wardrobe of Edward II. We have seen already the many baronial assaults upon the wardrobe, notably those of 1311, 1312 and 1314. As a body the *garderobarii* were not unsuccessful in resisting them. Even when compelled to retreat, they left few victims on the field. The sufferers from the proscriptions of the ordainers were a few conspicuous individuals rather than the wardrobe clerks as a whole. The most hated of the class, Ingelard of Warley and John of Ockham, found indeed that the wardrobe was too hot to hold them. But like some unsuccessful servants of the state in modern times, they obtained a convenient refuge in another branch of the public service. For a time the hated Ingelard found it prudent to keep out of the way by going on pilgrimages beyond the seas.[1] But he remained a king's clerk, was employed as a justice in June 1316,[2] and on December 29 of that year was made chief baron of the exchequer.[3] This high position Ingelard had to yield up in the following May to the indispensable Walter

[1] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 198. Simple protection, dated Nov. 18, 1314, and lasting till Feb. 2, 1315, for Ingelard de Warley, going beyond seas on pilgrimage.
[2] *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 414. [3] *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 341 and 343.

Norwich, but he retained the rank of an exchequer baron, and died in that post in the summer of 1318.[1] Warley's successor as baron was his fellow *garderobarius* Robert Wodehouse,[2] who, though removed from the controllership of the wardrobe in 1316, had latterly been acting as cofferer of that department. John Ockham, again, after a similar interval of restricted activity, was made a baron of the exchequer in June 1317. It showed how gently the provisions of the reformers of the York parliament of 1318 were carried out that, when in January 1319 the king directed the barons to report as to whether the exchequer was, as the parliament thought, over-staffed, and to suggest which of their colleagues could be most easily dispensed with, they were informed that Wodehouse and Ockham were to remain in office in any case, as the king judged them "sufficient and necessary" in that place.[3] Ockham's official career was now almost at an end. He disappeared from the exchequer before 1323, though he had no higher ecclesiastical preferment than a canonry of St. Martin's le Grand, the church which was still the special refuge of the wardrobe clerks. But though appointed keeper of the deanery of St. Martin's in July 1325,[4] he vacated this post in April 1326. A new dean was appointed and Ockham disappeared from history.

When the victims of the opposition were thus gently dealt with, the rank and file of the wardrobe went on in secure enjoyment of their places until death or promotion removed them in the order of nature. The highest ecclesiastical posts were still within their hopes, as is shown not only in the case of Walter Reynolds, but even more strikingly in that of William Melton, the most respectable and distinguished man of his class. Melton, who worked in Edward's wardrobe as prince from 1301 to 1307, continued to serve him when king, first as controller and then as keeper, from 1307 to 1316, and only laid down the highest office in the wardrobe to become archbishop of York. Prominent among wardrobe reformers in 1318 and 1323, and treasurer of the exchequer until the eve of his master's fall, the archbishop still devoted his experience to the service of the state. Roger North-

[1] Madox, ii. 60. [2] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 193.
[3] *C.F.R., 1319–27*, p. 355.
[4] *C.P.R., 1324–27*, p. 246, *C.C.R., 1323–27*, p. 471.

burgh, again, was continuously having high privy seal and wardrobe posts until he also found his promotion by succeeding the old wardrobe clerk, Walter Langton, in the bishopric of Lichfield. But of the wardrobe clerks of Edward's earlier years Robert Wodehouse was the most conspicuous illustration of official continuity. A king's clerk of the end of Edward I.'s reign,[1] Wodehouse was clerk of Edward II.'s kitchen [2] until July 1309, when he became cofferer of the wardrobe under Warley.[3] Called from that office in February 1311 to act as escheator north of Trent,[4] he abandoned that post in February 1313 to become controller under Melton, under whom he served until July 1316.[5] He was acting from April 1317 to June 1318 as cofferer for the second time, though that was an office inferior to his previous posts.[6] It also involved him in joint responsibility with Ockham his successor for the accounts for Warley's time which were still not forthcoming when Ingelard died. The York parliament of October 1318 brought home to them this responsibility. However, in July 1318 he was, as we have seen, appointed to succeed Warley as baron of the exchequer, and the royal order to his colleagues to admit him was issued just before the York parliament met.[7] Though less significant than the emphatic declaration of his sufficiency and indispensability in the exchequer,[8] it shows that he was regarded with friendly feelings by the Pembrokian party. It was natural then that, as soon as Baldock was made chancellor of the exchequer, Wodehouse should be called back to the wardrobe. Reappointed controller * on July 8, 1323 he was raised to the keepership on October 20 * of the same year, and remained in office until after his master's fall.[9] The

[1] *C.P.R., 1301–7*, p. 458, shows he was king's clerk before July 1306, and *ib.* p. 514 his appointment to a living in the king's gift. For 1306 see *Exch. Accts.* 369/16, f. 25.
[2] *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 90, shows him so acting in Jan. 1309, and indicates that he was brother of Richard Wodehouse, engrosser of the exchequer at Dublin.
[3] *Ib., 1318–23*, p. 115, shows he was acting from July 8, 1309. Compare Cole, p. 27, where "quinto" seems a misreading for "quarto." But his appointment as escheator shows that he was not in office for all 4 Edw. II.
[4] *C.F.R.* ii. 77 and 162, show he acted from Feb. 2, 1311, to Feb. 3, 1313. By some unpardonable lapse I have omitted him in my list of escheators in *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 362. He was appointed Dec. 30, 1310; *C.F.R.* ii. 77.
[5] *Pl. Edw. II*, p. 355. [6] *Ib.* p. 356. [7] Madox, ii. 60.
[8] *Ib.* ii. 61. [9] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 355. *MS. Rylands, Lat.* No. 132, p. 1.

same complacent spirit which had made him serve the court in the days of the loudest outcry against the unpurged household and had thrown him into the Pembrokian coalition, made him accept without a murmur the deposition of Edward II. As "keeper of the wardrobe of Edward the king's son, keeper of the realm, the king being out of the realm," we find him receiving great grants from the exchequer to wage war in the king's name against the king's person.[1] In the next reign we shall find him working on till his death in the service of Edward III., mainly in the exchequer, whose treasurer he twice became. Wodehouse represents perfectly the permanent official of the stolid "non-political" class, ready to obey any master and accept the results of any political revolution. He was the chief survivor of the conspicuous wardrobe clerks of Edward II.'s early years who carried to the end of the reign, and beyond it, the traditions of the wardrobe of Edward I.

The solidarity of the wardrobe support for the middle party's policy in 1318 can be illustrated not only by Wodehouse but by most of his colleagues. It enabled them to survive the most searching review of unworthy ministers that the reign ever witnessed. All the chief officers, clerks and laymen, easily passed the scrutiny of the York parliament, not only Northburgh, Wigton and Thomas Charlton, but even more obviously Badlesmere and Despenser, the pioneers of the new programme. The declaration of the necessity of keeping Wodehouse and Ockham as barons of the exchequer was part of the same general whitewashing of the members of the old court party who had made common cause with the Pembrokians.

The wardrobe officers of the last years of Edward II. need not detain us long. Of Northburgh I have spoken already. Of his two controllers after 1318, Gilbert Wigton (1318–1320) was a man of little significance or favour, who was promoted backwards to the less responsible post of keeper of the great wardrobe when William Cusance, Despenser's personal clerk, found that office untenable. The other controller, Robert Baldock, was, as we have seen already, one of the personalities of the reign, the brain of

[1] The titles come from *I.R., 20 Edw. II.* No. 2102, pt. ii., which record his receiving from the exchequer on Nov. 6, on writ of liberate, £10,000, "ad negocia regis et dicti regni."

the Despensers, the negotiator of the Scottish truce, the administrative reformer, and all but the last official who combined with the controllership the keepership of the privy seal. But he abandoned the wardrobe for the chancery in 1323, and in that office seems to have set little store on the wardrobe traditions. Of Roger of Waltham, keeper from May 1, 1322, to October 19, 1323, there is nothing to be said save that he filled the gap between Northburgh and Wodehouse.* What little there is to tell of Robert of Holden, controller from October 20, 1323, to November 1326, will be said when we come to treat of the chamber.[1] But he was superior to Wodehouse in loyalty, or inferior to him in good fortune, for he disappeared from office in the course of the revolution of 1326. It is somewhat surprising that Wodehouse's last controller was Nicholas of Huggate, an old wardrobe clerk of Edward of Carnarvon when prince of Wales.

We cannot trace with precision the cofferers of Edward II.'s last years. Richard of Ferriby, previously a clerk of the privy seal, came under the censure of the reformers of 1323 for the delays and diffuseness of his accounts, but we do not find the name of the additional cofferer appointed to supplement his ineffective efforts. The increasing mediocrity of wardrobe work was then faithfully reflected in the character of Edward II.'s later wardrobe clerks. Similarly the lay chiefs, the stewards, show a similar falling off in influence and importance. After Badlesmere's dismissal in the summer of 1321, came four successors. These were Gilbert Pecche (1322), Simon Dryby (1322), Richard Amory (1322–1325) and Thomas le Blount (1325–1327). The first two were in office for periods too brief to leave any mark. Amory's family connexions and comparatively long tenure of place gave him some position in history, while Blount is remembered by his ceremonial renunciation of homage to his fallen master.

There only remains to return to the finances of the wardrobe. We have already said something in this relation up to the conclusion of keeper Northburgh's account for the year ending July 8, 1318,[2] a time coinciding exactly with the establishment of the Pembrokian compromise. The last nine years of the reign must now bespeak our attention. The accounts of the whole of this

[1] See later, pp. 345-348. [2] See earlier, pp. 235-238 and pp. 240-241.

period were duly, though tardily, audited by the exchequer, and give adequate evidence of the extent and character of wardrobe operations during these eight years. For the first half of the term Northburgh bore the chief responsibility.[1]

In a time of constant disturbance no great uniformity could be expected, but the fluctuations of the total amounts of wardrobe receipt follow a curiously regular line. Two of the four periods show receipts approaching £30,000, and two, alternating with the leaner years, receipts of over £50,000. In 1318–19 Northburgh's receipt sank to £29,514, a figure the more significant since the period was one of comparative peace and of the complete control of the Pembrokian party. The restriction of wardrobe finances confirms the impression that the policy of the coalition was unfavourable to the wardrobe discharging the functions of the offices of state. However, next year, July 1319 to July 1320, the wardrobe receipt ran up to £50,787, but, even under reforming rule, the military expenses of the abortive expedition for the relief of Berwick had enough effect on the wardrobe to account for this increase. However, in July 1320 to July 1321 the receipt was down again to almost the same figure as that for 1318–19. The Scottish truce explains the reduction, but it is interesting that neither the Despenser war in Glamorgan nor the proceedings which culminated in the banishment of the Despensers had any effect on wardrobe receipts or expenses. For all these years wardrobe receipt was on strictly constitutional lines. The bulk of the income came from the exchequer, about 18 per cent in the first, a little over 15 per cent in the second, and less than 9 per cent in the third year arising from "foreign" sources. This was the more satisfactory since, whatever was the case in other relations, each of the three years shows the ordinances increasingly respected, more regarded than we could have expected from the character of those years. There was an improvement also in the relations of expenses to receipts, for while in the twelfth and thirteenth years combined the latter slightly exceeded the former, in the fourteenth year there was a heavy balance in favour of the wardrobe, whose income was almost twice as much as its "mises and expenses." But these figures are fallacious, for a

[1] Northburgh's accounts from 9 to 15 Edward II. are in *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), No. 2, mm. 1-2.

solid mass of *prestita*, not apportioned among the various years of the account, showed that the wardrobe was still not paying its way, and that the vicious system of advances still prevailed to an extent incompatible with sound housekeeping. Still, as things went under Edward II., there was a real improvement.

The last period of Northburgh's account tells a somewhat different tale. It covered a few days less than ten months from July 8, 1321, to April 30, 1322, but the receipt swelled to £57,488, and of this increased sum, no less than £17,530 reached the wardrobe *aliunde quam de thesauro*, a proportion that nearly approximates to a third of the whole. It is clear from the figures that the civil wars of the period, the siege of Leeds, the winter campaign in the Severn valley, and the campaign against Lancaster, which culminated at Boroughbridge, involved an increase of the military household to something approaching real war strength. It is still clearer that the triumphant king was throwing over the trammels of the ordainers, even before the parliament of York formally repeated the ordinances.[1]

The next account is that of keeper Roger Waltham, covering the whole period of his responsibility from May 1, 1322, to October 19, 1323, a period approaching seventeen months. Waltham's total receipt was £76,971, of which £45,405 came from the exchequer and £31,565 from other sources, a proportion of foreign receipt narrowly approaching 40 per cent of the whole. The figures are somewhat larger than those of the preceding

[1] The precise figures of Northburgh's last four accounts may be thus tabulated:

Period.	Receipt from Exchequer.	Foreign Receipt.	Total Receipt.	Issues, Mises and Expenses.
12 Ed. II. July 8, 1318, to July 7, 1319	£24,539 7 10	£4,974 14 9¾	£29,514 2 7¾	£29,872 12 5
13 Ed. II. July 8, 1319, to July 7, 1320	£43,177 9 10½	£7,610 8 3½	£50,787 18 1¾	£48,795 2 0¾
14 Ed. II. July 8, 1320, to July 7, 1321	£26,982 10 2½	£2,674 9 3	£29,656 19 5½	£15,343 11 11¾
15 Ed. II. July 7, 1321, to April 30, 1322	£39,958 9 6½	£17,530 0 2½	£57,488 9 9	£45,949 1 11½

To the "summa exitus, misarum et expensorum" for the four years is to be added "summa omnium prestitorum," £55,912 : 3 : 7½, leaving a considerable net adverse balance for the period.

period, but the most material deviation from them is the increased proportion of the foreign receipt. However, after the repeal of the ordinances this method of replenishing wardrobe coffers was less obviously illegal. The expenses, including *prestita*, as usual exceeded the receipt, on this occasion by nearly £5500. This was not really a worse result than in Northburgh's days.[1]

Thus from 1318 to 1323 the wardrobe finances go on definite and fairly intelligible lines. It is puzzling, however, to account for the collapse of wardrobe finance in the last years of the reign, the greater part of the period of Wodehouse's keepership. It looks as if the exchequer reformers had now fairly got the wardrobe under their control, and that neither the king nor the Despensers had any objection to this drastic curtailment of the sphere of its operations. For the first time in its history the wardrobe is in substance limited to its strictly household sphere. It was now enough for it to receive a sum that paid for the expenses of the *hospicium*. National expenses were directly paid by the exchequer, and the chamber receipt was, as we shall see, some sort of compensation to the king's losses in money and in dignity. For the eight months, October 20, 1323, to July 7, 1324, Wodehouse's total receipt was only £4718, of which £1007 was the balance left behind by Waltham. Accordingly of a real receipt of £3711, £2045 was "foreign" and £1666 came from the exchequer, that is to say the foreign receipt exceeded the exchequer receipt. For the eighteenth year, a full year from July 8, 1324, to July 7, 1325, Wodehouse's total receipt was £19,431, excluding last year's "remnant" or balance, or £20,316 with it. But the proportion of foreign and exchequer receipt was reversed, for of the whole sum £18,552 came *de thesauro*, so that the foreign receipt was only £1764, not much more

[1] The exact sums are: "Recepta de thesauro," £45,405 : 12 : 3½; "Recepta forinseca," £31,565 : 11 : 2; "summa," £76,971 : 3 : 5½; "Summa *misarum et* liberacionum," £71,302 : 2 : 9¾; "summa liberacionum, misarum et prestitorum," £82,446 : 17 : 4; *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), No. 2, m. 20. The enrolment of this and Northburgh's accounts on a separate "foreign roll" shows that the provisions of the second wardrobe ordinance were carried out. The exchequer "receipt" for 16 Edw. II. 19, Michaelmas 1322 to Michaelmas 1323, was £117,108. Sir James Ramsay (*Genesis of Lancaster*, i. 182) omits the "recepta apud Eboracum." The same writer often omits also the "recepta medii temporis." His totals, therefore, must be used with extreme caution. But precision is extremely difficult in calculating the figures; interpreting their meaning is at the best conjectural.

than 8 per cent. Here we have both the reduced sum and the reduced foreign receipt, suggesting not only the acceptance by the court of its limited budget but its voluntary relinquishment of the once cherished privilege of collecting revenue directly without the intervention of the exchequer. The suggestion is strengthened by the study of a "book of particulars of foreign expenses of the wardrobe," compiled by Wodehouse and Holden for the seventeenth year of the reign, in which such normal charges as the expenses of *nuncii*, bearing letters of great, privy or secret seals to various destinations, such *necessaria* as the payment of the ferryman who took the king and part of his *familia* across the Mersey from the Wirrall to Liverpool, such gifts as small presents to a knight of the king of France, such alms as the entertainment of 200 poor on Christmas Day are meticulously set forth as "foreign" to the direct expenses of the *hospicium*, to which the keeper and controller now considered their obligations to be limited.[1] Here again we are faced by the reality of the work of the exchequer reformers, and the acquiescence of the ruling clique in a system which by reducing every department to subjection to the court, made the distinction of household and national finance immaterial.

The same tale is emphasised in Wodehouse's remaining accounts. For the nineteenth year, July 8, 1325, to July 7, 1326, the receipt is reduced to the extraordinarily small sum of £6175, of which £4624 came from the exchequer and £1551, or 25 per cent, was foreign. For the broken twentieth year in which Wodehouse accounted from July 8 to November 1, 1326, his receipt was £4684, of which £4105 was *de thesauro* and only £579, or 12 per cent, including the "remnant," foreign. The modest figures cannot be accounted for by the postponing of payments, because in each year the sum of mises, prises and "moneys delivered to the king" was lower than that of the receipts, being £6211 in the nineteenth and £4948 in the twentieth year. The

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 379/19. I extract one item. "Ricardo by the Wode, batellario de Lyuerpole, passanti dominum regem et partem familie sue ultra brachium aque de Mersee inter Wyrehale et Ins pro stipendio huiusmodi passagii sui per manus proprias apud Halton, ij die Nov., ij sol." There was also 6*s.* paid to a Liverpool boatman for taking the remaining part of the "familia" over the Mersey at Runcorn, and 1*s.* for a Runcorn boatman who ferried the king and part of his "familia" over the Weaver.

new formula *denarii liberati domino regi* suggests a further limitation of the wardrobe sphere, for the king, if he accounted for these at all, accounted in the chamber rather than the wardrobe, so that the wardrobe became largely a pipe through which money flowed from the exchequer to the chamber.[1] Something of the falling off may be ascribed to the difficulty of collecting revenue in a time of increasing disorganisation, but the exchequer receipt rolls for 19 and 20 Edward II., though showing a falling off, keep up much better than the wardrobe accounts.[2] A comparison between the two, though suggesting no royal road to ascertaining the total revenue of the crown, shows that the falling off of wardrobe operations was a matter of policy, not simply of inability to collect the money.

One point of continuity runs through all the vicissitudes of the wardrobe under Edward II. This was the extraordinary tardiness with which the wardrobe clerks tendered their accounts to the exchequer. Examples of this can be collected almost at random from any part of the reign. We have seen that Benstead's accounts for 1 Edward II. were not presented until 16 Edward II. At that time Benstead was dead and his widow and her two fellow-executors acted as representatives of the dead keeper.[3] Melton's accounts for 8 Edward II. were com-

[1] Wodehouse's accounts are in *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), 2, mm. 22-27. The exact figures may be tabulated as follows :

Period.	Exchequer Receipt.	Foreign Receipt.	Total Receipt.	Remnant.	Mises, Expenses and Prestita.
17 Ed. II. Oct. 2, 1323, to July 7, 1324	£1,666 13 4	£3032 2 6½	£4,718 15 10½	£1007 16 3	£3,833 6 7½*
18 Ed. II. July 8, 1324, to July 7, 1325	£18,552 4 9	£1764 10 9½	£20,316 15 6½	£885 9 3½	£20,006 18 2
19 Ed. II. July 8, 1325, to July 7, 1326	£4,624 1 8	£1551 5 8½	£6,175 7 4½	..	£6,211 18 8½
20 Ed. II. July 8, 1326, to Nov. 1, 1326	£4,105 5 0	£269 15 2½	£4,375 0 2½	£309 17 4½	£4,948 3 11½

* Excluding "prestita."

[2] *R.R. 19 Edw. II.* give a total "receipt" of £52,613 as compared with a total of £117,108 in 16 Edw. II. and £63,977 in 17 Edw. II. In 20 Edw. II. the receipt of Michaelmas term was only £1612, but it was the time of the revolution and a broken term also, including only a few weeks.

[3] *Pipe, 16 Edw. II.* m. 50. "Compotus Johannis de Benstede, nuper custodis garderobe regis, defuncti, Petronille, que fuit uxor eiusdem Johannis, Roberti de Asphale, militis, et Johannis de la Bataille pro eodem Johanne."*

paratively promptly completed and were actually enrolled two years before his predecessor's.[1] * But there is no record that Droxford's accounts for 2 Edward II. and Warley's accounts for 3 Edward II. were ever presented at all, though references to them crop up year after year in the chancery rolls, the issue rolls and similar official records.* The accounts of Warley for 4 Edward II. were delayed by the action of Wodehouse the cofferer, who was sharply denounced for his remissness by the chief baron, Walter Norwich.[2] In the end Warley evaded accounting altogether, and after his death in 1318 the York parliament made the delay a grievance and petitioned the king to burden his cofferers, Wodehouse and Ockham, with it.[3] Thereupon a mandate, dated Dec. 4, 1318, was issued to them to complete it,[4] but apparently with no result.* Later on, Northburgh's accounts for the years 1316–1322 were not delivered till 1331, nearly five years after Edward II.'s death.[5] Nor were those of his successors speeded up by the reforms of 1318 and 1323. The whole of Waltham's account was only delivered in the exchequer in 1329,[6] and Baldock's controller's roll for 14 Edward II. was only handed in in November 1331.[7] It was as bad with the later accounts for which Wodehouse was responsible.*

Despite these long delays the account books presented to the

[1] *Pipe, 14 Edw. II.* m. 29.

[2] See the angry letter to Norwich ordering Warley to send in the account in *MS. Cotton, Nero,* C. VIII. f. 72; "et je ay entendu qe le dit Rainaud est unqore delaiez de son aconte del an quart, par la raison qe sire Robert de Wodehous, qi fust adunqes vostre coffrer, ne le voet mye deliuerer vous." [London, April 4, 1312.]

[3] Cole, p. 27.

[4] *C.C.R., 1318–23,* p. 115.

[5] *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), No. 2, m. 1; compare *MS. Ad.* 17, 362: "Hunc librum [*i.e.* the accounts of 13 Edw. II.] liberauit hic [*i.e.* in scaccario] Henricus de Hale, attornatus Rogeri de Northburgh, Couentrensis et Lichfeldensis episcopi, nuper custodis garderobe regis, xxv° die Aprilis, anno quinto regis Eduardi tercii a conquestu."

[6] Of this his "rotulus expensarum hospicii," ranging only from July 8 to Oct. 19, 1323, was delivered on May 22, 1329; *Ms. Ad.* 36, 763. But his account from May 1, 1322, to Oct. 19, 1323, was delivered on May 2, 1329, by Waltham himself.*

[7] *Ms. Ad.* 1995, f. 1. "Hunc librum liberauit ad scaccarium Willelmus de Thymelby, attornatus Willelmi de Kirkeby, locum tenentis magistri Roberti de Baldok, contrarotulatoris garderobe, xviii° die Nou., anno regni regis Eduardi tercii a conquestu quinto." This representation of a dead person by his "locum tenens" is characteristic of mediaeval ideas of official responsibility.

exchequer were extremely carefully kept. Something of the reforming spirit extended itself to the useful innovations by which beautifully written, well-arranged and strongly bound volumes, of which Wodehouse's controller's book for 18 Edward II. is an early and good instance,[1] largely supplanted the cumbrous but traditional roll which was still adhered to by the more conservative exchequer and chancery. But the wardrobe could also turn out a most workmanlike roll, for example the enormous controller's day-book of expenses for 18 Edward II., put together after the so-called "chancery fashion" and beautifully neat and clear.[2] In extenuation of the delay it is only fair to the officials to point out that the wardrobe was habitually under-staffed, and that at all times of pressure clerks had to be borrowed from the chancery and other government departments. The business of writing the wardrobe books and accounts was now, however, separated from that of writing for the privy seal, but the enormously increased volume of secretarial work in both branches of the office prevented this being any real measure of relief. Indeed the worst pressure seems to have been on the privy seal office.[3] At last in the early years of Edward III. there took place, as we shall see, a great settlement of the outstanding account of the easy-going times of Edward II.

With November 1, 1326, the effective reign of Edward II. was considered to be over, and Wodehouse's accounts for the interregnum are combined with those of the first years of Edward III. At a later stage we shall see how under the same keeper, the political revolution involved a strong reaction from the wardrobe

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 376/7.

[2] *MS. Egerton*, 2814.

[3] A few examples can be cited. (*a*) *MS. Ad.* 995 (July 1320 to July 1321) f. 5 d. "Jacobo de Kyngeston, Hugoni de Bardelby, Roberto de Werdecop et Ade de Ayremynne, clericis de cancellaria domini regis, auxiliantibus ad litteras de priuato sigillo scribendis pro labore suo." (*b*) *MS. Stowe*, 553 (May 1, 1321 ? to Oct. 19, 1323). Titulo necessariorum, f. 25. "Hugoni de Nouo Castro et sex sociis suis, clericis de cancellaria domini regis, auxiliantibus ad scribendum litteras ad priuatum sigillum ipsius domini regis per vices, mense Junii, per manus Willelmi de Coleby, clerici de priuato sigillo ibidem, ii° die Julii, vii s. 6 d." (c) *Ib.* f. 26. "Johanni de Carleton, clerico de priuato sigillo, pro denariis per ipsum solutis Roberto de Keleseye et tribus sociis suis, clericis de cancellaria, scribendis ad priuatum sigillum pro cariagio de religiosis pro guerra Scocie etc. . . . per ix dies per duas vices mense Maii anno predicto per manus proprias apud Beuerlacum, xxix° die Junii, cuilibet per diem vi d., xviii s."

policy of Wodehouse's earlier years. At the moment it is enough to note that the impression of restricted wardrobe activity and indifference or approval of it on the part of the court, which have already been suggested by the study of the reforming ordinances, is fully confirmed by our examination of wardrobe finance. Thus even in their graves Thomas of Lancaster and the ordainers triumphed. The overgrown wardrobe, which had outwitted magnate control and enabled the crown to defy the national offices of state under baronial influence, had been abandoned by the victorious courtiers. As in the days of the Barons' Wars, we can draw the same moral. Despite all the tendencies to the contrary, administration and politics remained substantially independent of each other. The radical Despensers adopted the policy of the conservative opposition, just as the radical Montfortians and the restoration after Evesham combined to accept the administrative developments made under the personal rule of Henry III.

SECTION IV

THE PRIVY SEAL UNDER EDWARD II.[1]

We have seen already that the reign of Edward II. is the turning-point in the history of the privy seal. It saw alike the culmination of the doctrine that the privy seal was the special engine of prerogative and the baronial double answer to that view by upholding the rights of the great seal against it and by entrusting its custody to a baronial nominee. From this arose the beginnings of the office of the privy seal and its gradual separation from the court. From this, too, came the beginnings of its new status as a subordinate seal of state, possessing constitutional validity within its limited sphere. Finally, we shall have to note the acquiescence of the crown and baronage alike in this state of things. Let us now try to work out in detail the process thus suggested in outline, and at the same time attempt to separate the special history of the seal from the various other analogous questions in which it is necessarily embedded.

In the first few years of the reign the privy seal, both in its use and abuse, stood very much in the same position as in the concluding years of Edward I. It was still regarded as the instrument of the king's personal wishes, and it was still the seal of the wardrobe. These twofold functions are brought out clearly by the fact that under Edward II., when a writ of privy seal was found by the officers of the exchequer to be incorrect, it was returned by them either "to the king" or "to the wardrobe" for emendation.[2] Both formulae meant the same thing, but the latter is the more illuminating of the two. It was because of this character attributed to the privy seal that its use excited both baronial and popular resistance and that the extension of its sphere seemed so important to the crown.

[1] This section is an expansion of my *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 161 168.

[2] Conway Davies (p. 154) has first brought out these facts. He quotes from *M.R., K.R.* No. 82 the two characteristic formulae:—"Postea hoc breue remittitur domino regi ad emendandum" and "Postea hoc breue remittitur garderobe ad emendandum." The latter is the more common phrase.

The keepership of the privy seal was still one of the many duties of the controller of the wardrobe. Accordingly, when, as an incident of the ministerial changes brought about by the new king, William of Melton became, as we have seen, controller of the wardrobe, he therefore, as a matter of course, became keeper of the privy seal. Immediately the anonymity of the keepership, so carefully preserved in Benstead's days that it is only by inference that his keepership can be established, began slowly to disappear. Within three months of the new controller's entrance into office, an entry in a chancery roll for the first time describes Melton, whom we know to have been controller, as the keeper of the privy seal. On October 1, 1307, a memorandum on the dorse of the close roll records that a grant to the king of the manor of Melbourne by Thomas, earl of Lancaster, and two other documents relating to the same transaction were "delivered immediately after their enrolment (*i.e.* on the close roll) to William of Melton, keeper of the privy seal, to be kept in the wardrobe."[1] Moreover, on March 15, 1308, a similar memorandum records that Melton, *secretarius* of the king, delivered to the exchequer the small "seal of absence," used by Gaveston, as regent, in lieu of the great seal, when Edward II. had been absent at Boulogne.[2] It is significant that, like Benstead, Melton was controller, keeper and secretary. The three terms were, if not synonymous, three different ways of indicating the same office.

Not only did the custody of the seal remain the same; the complaints of the magnates as to its abuse were still those already formulated under Edward I. In the articles, drawn up in the Easter parliament of 1309 at Westminster, the barons once more made it a grievance that justice was often delayed, both in the king's bench and the common bench, by letters under the targe, that is, under the privy seal.[3] The king's answer, delivered in

[1] *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 42.

[2] *Ib.* p. 57, *Foedera*, ii. 29. The *I.R.* of 1 Edw. II., Mich. Term, gives an exactly similar entry, but describes Melton as controller; Devon, *u.s.* p. 118. The seal was in a purse, sealed with the privy seal of the chancellor, John Langton.

[3] *Rot. Parl.* i. 444, from *C.R.* of 3 Edw. II. There is no doubt of the identity of targe and privy seal. See the letter by a keeper of the privy seal in *Ancient Correspondence*, xxxvii. No. 93, "Et jay fait faire lettres a grant mischief desouz la targe." Compare *Rot. Parl.* ii. 397, which describes a king's "lettre desouz

the Stamford parliament of July, was that the ordinance as regards " writs of the targe," which was drawn up in the days of his father, should be maintained. It is clear that this " ordinance " was the provision in *Articuli super Cartas* relative to the privy seal.[1] Both in 1300 and 1309 the barons' grievance about the privy seal was mainly its employment in a legal process. Against this, it upheld the traditional rights of the great seal of the chancery. There is some suggestion of an antagonism between the office of the household and the office of state in this contest between the two seals.

The ordinances of 1311 repeated, with greater force and precision, the prohibition against writs of privy seal interfering with the course of the common law.[2] If anything were done in any royal court contrary to law by reason of letters of privy seal, it was to be regarded as void. Other articles of the ordinances show a similar tendency to limit the judicial operations of the privy seal. Thus forest indictments were to be under " writs of chancery," [3] and a similar recourse was to be had to chancery writs to limit the encroachments of the court of the steward and marshals of the household.[4] The administrative work of the privy seal was similarly checked by the clause that sheriffs

sa targe " as a " lettre du prive seal," and *Exch. Accts.* 383/7, an indenture testifying to the delivery by the exchequer into the wardrobe of certain vessels " par mandement le roi desoutz la targe." In the light of these and many similar passages the fantastic distinction in *Cont. Trivet*, p. 14 (ed. Hall), between privy seal and targe must be absolutely rejected. See also later, pp. 294, note 5, 295, note 4, and 324-325.

[1] *Rot. Parl.* i. 444. " Et quant as brefs de la targe le roy voet qe l'ordenance soit gardee qi en fust faite en temps le roy son pere, laquele est en chancellerie." In his summary of the statute of Stamford, Stubbs, *C.H.* ii. 338, omits all reference to the complaints against writs of the targe.

[2] *Rot. Parl.* i. 285. *Stat. of Realm*, i. 165. *Ordinances*, No. 32. " Pur ceo qe la lei de la terre et commune droit ount este souvent delaiez par lettres issuz desouz le prive seal le roi, a graunt grevance du people, nous ordeinoms qe desoremes la lei de la terre ne commune droit ne soient delaiez ne desturbez par lettres du dit seal. Et si rien soit fait en nule des places de notre court notre seigneur le roi ou aillours, par tieles lettres issues desouz le prive seal encontre droiture et lei la terre, rien ne vaille et pur nient soit tenuz." It should be noticed that " privy seal " here replaces the " petty " or " small seal " of earlier laws, and proves conclusively that petty seal was but a synonym for privy seal. Compare above, I. 152, note 1.

[3] *Ordinances*, § 19. " Et si le dit gardein [de la foreste] faire ne le voele, eit bref en chauncellerie qe auncienement fut ordeinee."

[4] *Ib.* § 26. " Et si le seneschal et mareschaux rien facent contre cest ordeinement, soit lour fait tenuz pur nul et qe ceux qe se sentiront grevez contre la dite ordeinaunce eient bref en chauncellerie," etc.

should receive their commissions under the great seal, so as to be responsible to chancery and exchequer, and not to the wardrobe.[1] The ordainers seemed indifferent to other abuses of the privy seal. Otherwise it would hardly have been likely that the ordinances themselves should have been in part distributed under the privy seal.[2]

In making such provisions the ordainers were working on traditional lines. Conscious that there was no finality in re-enacting in 1311 what had been already allowed to no purpose in 1300 and 1309, the ordainers made a real advance in laying down that there should henceforth be a " suitable clerk appointed to keep the privy seal," [3] and by including this officer with the other ministers of wardrobe and household who were to be appointed by the king with the counsel of his baronage in parliament. This was in effect the institution of a new office, the more so since the " suitable clerk " is mentioned separately from the controller of the wardrobe. It involved, in short, the removing from the work of the controller the custody of the privy seal and the transference of that custody to a special officer responsible to parliament for the use of the seal, and for drafting the letters to which the seal was affixed. It was natural that there should also be handed over to him that custody of the wardrobe archives which, as we saw in and before 1307, was already regarded as a function of the controller by reason of his custody of the seal.[4]

In October 1311 Melton was still in office as controller and keeper, and he was one of the few household officers against whom the most truculent of the barons had little to say. He was allowed to remain a wardrobe clerk through all the storms

[1] *Ordinances*, § 17. " Nous ordeinoms que viscomtes soient desoremes mis par le chauncellier et tresorer et les autres du conseil. . . . Et qe eux eient commission desouz le graunt seal." Here, perhaps, the alternative was in most cases the exchequer seal, not the privy seal.

[2] See a curious letter in *Ancient Correspondence*, xxxvii. 110: " Tres cher sire, Por ce qe iez obliay ben de vous enueer lordonnance faite par les ordenours, quant je vous enveay la lettre et la roule souz le priue seal, pur la grant presse quil y auoit entre nous, si vous envoy je meisme lordenance enclose deinz ceste lettre. Tres cher sire, nostre Seignur vous eit en sa garde. Escrit a Suleby, le tierz jour de Augst." If this is Aug. 3, 1310, the " ordinance " must have been the preliminary ordinances of March. Mr. R. L. Atkinson says the ordinances enclosed are Chancery, Parl. Proc. 4/8.

[3] *Rot. Parl.* i. 282, § 14. " Un clerk couenable par garder son priue seal."

[4] See above, pp. 36, note 2, and 283.

of the next five years, and then only abandoned the court to become archbishop of York. Nevertheless, the ordinance that the controller should no longer keep the privy seal was not allowed to become a dead letter. Perhaps within six months, certainly within a year, an independent keeper of the privy seal was chosen in the person of Roger of Northburgh.

Roger of Northburgh was already among the superior clerks of the wardrobe in the year immediately preceding the ordinances.[1] Up to their date his name figures but seldom in the chancery rolls, but, on and after March 1312, they record that a large number of royal writs were issued by the king "on his information,"[2] and show that he was enough of a curialist to attend the king on his winter flight from the barons to the north, and to remain constantly at his side, while Edward made in Yorkshire and Northumberland his last efforts to uphold Gaveston by force of arms. It would be very rash to infer that Northburgh's appointment as keeper coincides with his first becoming so copious a source of royal acts, for it is unlikely that Edward, when defying the ordainers to touch his household, would make an innovation in its established order to please them. But nothing is more likely than that when, after Gaveston's death, the king returned to London in July he found it politic to comply with their wishes. If we can, on this principle, hardly date his keepership back to March 1312, we may feel certain that he was in office by August. Even in this case scarcely a year elapsed between the promulgation of the ordinances and their execution, so far as relates to the institution of the independent keepership of the privy seal. And this guess is the more likely since we have record evidence that Northburgh was in actual possession of this office before September 18, 1312.[3] His appointment, then,

[1] In the wardrobe accounts of 4 Edw. II. (July 1310–July 1311) (*Exch. Accts.* 374/5), Northburgh is recorded as a wardrobe clerk, receiving a wage of 7½*d.* a day. Wodehouse and Wingfield at that time had 6½*d.*; Huggate and Sheffield, 4½*d.*

[2] The first such act is on Nov. 16, 1311. The next one in March 1312. Thence to Nov. there is a continuous series of such acts, namely, 8 in Mar., 8 in Apr., 4 in May, 7 in June, 2 in July, 4 in Aug., 5 in Sept., 2 in Oct., and 1 in Nov., recorded in the calendars of patent and close rolls. Northburgh was a pluralist benefice holder in 1308, though only in subdeacon's orders; *Calendar of Papal Registers, Letters*, ii. 37.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 378/8, f. 6. See the extract quoted later on p. 288, note 3. Compare *ib.* 376/7, f. 11 d.

was the first-fruits of the alliance between the king and the section of the ordainers which, under Aymer of Valence, had broken away from Lancaster after the murder of Gaveston. The result was the acceptance of the ordinances in an important particular, by policy rather than coercion. It prepared the way, in short, for the compromise of 1318.

Northburgh remained in charge of the privy seal until he received the keepership of the wardrobe on February 1, 1316.[1] The copious extant details as to his work between 1312 and 1316 establish four further points of importance in the growth of the privy seal. They show that there was some reluctance at first to distinguish Northburgh from his brother wardrobe clerks by the definite title of keeper. It was only in 1315 that he received his official designation in the wardrobe accounts.[2] Until then, he was still generally described as clerk of the wardrobe or king's clerk.

A more important point is that Northburgh always had under him a group of subordinate officers. Even before his appointment, there had been a certain number of clerical assistants assigned to Melton, his predecessor. Already, in the year July 1311 to July 1312, Walter of Sutton received a wage of 4½*d.* a day for the whole year, and Richard of Newcastle was paid at the same rate from July 8 to November 29 for "remaining in the wardrobe for writing letters for the privy seal," whilst Roger of Sheffield, himself a wardrobe clerk, was for the same period allowed for money expended on coffers for safeguarding letters and other memoranda of the privy seal.[3] After Northburgh's appointment Sutton and Newcastle became staff wardrobe clerks, like Sheffield, so that a result of the further organisation of the office seems to have been the conversion of supernumeraries into permanent members of a new branch of the wardrobe. After November 1312 there were four instead of three scribes who were put into a separate category as "clerks of the privy seal." Before that, they were simply spoken of as

[1] *Pipe, 14 Edw. II.* m. 29.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 376/7. See the extract quoted later, on p. 288, note 3.

[3] *MS. Cotton, Nero*, C. VIII. ff. 59 d. and 79. They are clearly distinguished from the clerks, such as Richard of Ferriby, who did the general secretarial work of the wardrobe. Ferriby is described as "morans in garderoba regis pro libris, rotulis et aliis memorandis *contrarotulatoris* eiusdem garderobe scribendis,"

"clerks of the wardrobe." Thus from the institution of the keepership flowed almost immediately the growth of a new sub-department of the wardrobe called the office of the privy seal. The first of these clerks were Thomas of Newhey, Roger of Sheffield, Walter of Sutton and John of Carlton. Of these Roger of Sheffield was already a wardrobe clerk in 1310–11,[1] and, like Sutton, had already experience in privy seal work.

It might well be considered that it was of the essence of the keepership of the privy seal that its holder should be in constant attendance at court to execute the private correspondence of his master. But mediaeval officials could generally do their work by deputy, and it was probably enough if, when business took the keeper away from court, some authorised subordinate took his place. We have seen how often Benstead had been out of court when he doubled the offices of controller and keeper.[2] It was easier for Northburgh, holding only one of these posts, to be absent from his master's side. It is, however, rather remarkable that the only passages in the wardrobe accounts which afford direct evidence of Northburgh's keepership should also testify to frequent and prolonged absences from court, expressly sanctioned by the council. The study of these passages[3] almost

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 384/5. His daily wage was 4½*d.*

[2] See above, p. 20.

[3] It is worth while extracting the passages referred to in the text. The earliest are from *Exch. Accts.* 375/8, f. 6, "Liber quotidianus thesaurarii garderobe"; a partial wardrobe account of 6 Edw. II., "Domino Rogero de Northburgh, *moranti apud Londonias, ad consilium regis* pro negotiis ipsius regis cum priuato sigillo ibidem—pro expensis suis et trium sociorum suorum, clericorum regis de sigillo predicto, morancium in comitiua sua inter diem xviii^{m} mensis Sept. et diem xxx^{m} mensis Oct., anno sexto, £viij, v s., 5 d." Compare *ib.* f. 7 "Domino Rogero de Northburgh, moranti Londoniis retro curiam per preceptum regis cum priuato sigillo ipsius regis, pro diversis litteris *juxta ordinationem consilii regis* ibidem scribendis et sigillandis, et pro aliis negotiis regis ibidem faciendis, pro expensis suis et Thome de Novahaya, Rogeri de Sheffield, Walteri de Sutton, et Johannis de Carleton, clericorum dicte garderobe regis, morancium in comitiua sua pro predictis litteris scribendis, per diuersas vices, mensibus Nov. Dec. Jan. et Feb. (1312–1313), £xx. xiv. iiij." *Ib.* f. 11 d shows that he was also in London for forty-seven days between Feb. 25 to May 15 along with the same four clerks. Northburgh is not specifically called keeper in 6 Edw. II., though the passage makes his position quite certain. The official title occurs, however, in another critical passage found on f. 11 d of "Contrarotulus de garderoba de anno ix^{o} Edwardi II.," *Exch. Accts.* 376/7. "Domino Rogero de Northburgh, *custodi priuati sigilli regis*, existenti extra curiam per preceptum regis cum sigillo predicto, tum apud Londonias quam apud Northampton, Lincolniam, et alibi, pro litteris juxta ordinationem regis et consilii sui scribendis et consignandis, pro *expensis suis* et *aliorum clericorum de garderoba regis* in comitiua sua existentium, et dictas litteras facientium et scribentium, per diuersas vices inter xiii^{m} diem Julii et x^{m} diem Oct. anno presenti [*i.e.* 1315]. Ut in pane, vino, ceruisia, carnibus, piscibus, sale, busca, litera, feno, auena, . . . et pro factura unius libri pro diuersis memorandis infrascribendis, unacum expensis diuersorum nunciorum litteras regis diuersis magnatibus deferentium, sicut patet per particulos in garderoba liberatos apud Clipstone, vii^{o} die Januarii, £xvi. xi s. ij d. et ob."

forces on us the conviction that the ordainers deliberately kept the keeper of the privy seal away from the king in order that the privy seal, like the great seal, should be under their control.

Not only was the keeper himself removed from court; the whole or part of the wardrobe staff specially appointed to help him were also, upon occasion, withdrawn with him, though the wardrobe as a whole continued to follow the king. Between September 1312 and May 1313 there were long periods when three and four wardrobe clerks were associated with the keeper out of court to write for the seal. As four was, even in later days, the maximum number of privy seal clerks, it follows that on these occasions the whole office of the privy seal was "out of court." On other occasions a single privy seal clerk might be delegated to discharge privy seal functions away from the household. Thus an interesting but mutilated letter, apparently by the keeper himself, was addressed to an unknown correspondent, in which he speaks of sending to him Roger of Sheffield, whom we know to have been one of the earliest clerks of the privy seal. It shows Sheffield despatched to an official established in the Tower of London, busy with departmental work, while the keeper was sending there diplomatic documents and "remembrances," which he was to despatch to France and Gascony. Incidentally it illustrates the way in which letters of privy seal were still employed,[1] and when it was politic to supplement them by letters of great seal.

[1] *Ancient Correspondence*, xxxvii. No. 93. "Jenvoie a vous Roger de Sheffeld, . . . coffres qui sont en vostre garde en la tour pur vous liuerer les escritz et autres remembrances qi y sont, qe vous verrez qe les messagers le roi qi irront prochement au roi de France et en Gascoigne deueront auer ovesq eux. Et je vous enuoy, sires, par li les roulles contenantz les nouns des abbez et autres, qui ont fait respons endroit del prest de vitailles dont le roi leur pria nadguere, sicome [sont] contenuz en meisme les roulles. Et *jay fait faire lettres a grant mischief desouz la targe* a chescun de eux, cest a sauer, a ceux qi en ont partie grantez, sicome vous porrez veer per meismes les roulles, de eux remercier de lour grant. Et qe celes choses il facent liuerer as viscontes des pays pur les faire

The result of this systematic separation of the privy seal and the wardrobe could not but be the erection of a separate office of the privy seal, only formally associated with the household, and therefore likely to grow into a state rather than a domestic office. Two or three generations earlier, a similar process had driven the chancellor with his clerks from the household, and set up the chancery as an office of state out of direct relation to the court. Now the ordainers profited by Edward II.'s weakness to claim also the control of the privy seal, just as the opposition to Henry III. had insisted on obtaining the command of the great seal of the chancery.

Another point of interest is the close connection between the privy seal and the council. This was apparently the result of the ordinances bringing the council more under baronial control. There are instances of writs of privy seal, directing the exchequer to make payments and endorsed *per consilium*, and *per assensum concilii*, so that the privy seal was becoming an instrument of the council, when that body was by no means always of the king's way of thinking.[1] Again it strengthens the impression of the growing estrangement of the seal from the wardrobe that a baronial body should compel the attendance of keeper and clerks far from the court, and that their presence should be desirable in London because the council happened to be there. Now Edward II. had no love of London, and in these years spent as much time as he could in the north out of the barons' way. Yet if the king tarried in his northern manors, London was the centre of baronial power. It was a

carier a Berewyk, sicome le dit clerc vous sauera plus pleinement dire. Et as autres qi sen sont excusez quil voillent performer la requeste le roi. Et e celes choses quil granteront facent liuerer as viscontes pur les faire aussint carier a Berewyk, et pur ce, sires, quil y sont uncore plus dautres qe nen ont donez nul respons, sicome hom purra examiner par les roulles qi sont en chancellerie, i contenantz touz les nouns de ceux qi auoient lettres autres fois. Sires, il serront bon, a ce qi me semble, qe hom feist faire lettres souz le grant seal a chescun de eux quil voillent acomplir la requeste qe le roi lour en ad faite, et qe les choses quil granteront liuerent as viscontes des pays, pur les faire carier a Berewyk, et as viscontes quil les retenient et les y fac[ent] carier si quil y soient a certeins jours, sicome il vous plerra ordener. Tres chers sires, nostre seigneur vous garde. Escrit a Helagh Park, le xiiii jour daugst."

[1] Conway Davies (p. 154) gives three references to the *Memoranda Rolls*, which prove this satisfactorily.

privy seal under some measure of aristocratic control that was so often in these days established in London.

Other important results followed from the growing separation of the privy seal from the king. Now that the keeper of the privy seal was often away from court and was in the habit of taking the privy seal with him, this instrument ceased to fulfil its original purpose of authenticating at any moment the personal correspondence of the king. It often became necessary for the king to communicate in writing with the keeper of the privy seal, and equally necessary for the king to issue written orders which could not be stamped with the privy seal by reason of its absence from the court. The result of this was the establishment of the secret seal as a fresh instrument of the personal royal will, and as fulfilling to a large extent the original purpose of the privy seal itself. The early history of the secret seal as an independent means of authenticating royal letters will be examined in a later volume at greater length. It is, however, important to notice here that the moment of its appearance is exactly that when the barons had, for the moment, captured the privy seal for their own purposes. Edward II.'s constant suspiciousness of his barons' action combined with the ineffectiveness of the leaders of the aristocracy to bring about the change. As the separation of the chancellor from the court had necessitated the institution of the privy seal, so the separation of the keeper of that seal from court involved the necessity for the secret seal. It was clearly no seal of the wardrobe, since payments from the wardrobe could be acknowledged by writ of secret seal.[1] Yet the spheres of the two seals were by no means as yet clearly differentiated. The privy seal was still so far personal to the king that in its absence he could seal a writ of privy seal with the private seal of a valet of his chamber.[2] The secret seal was already in sufficient use to make it worth while for it to be forged.[3]

It followed from the removal of the privy seal from the court that we can no longer be certain that the issuing of an act under the privy seal at a certain place implied necessarily the personal presence of the king there. Under Edward I. the writs of privy

[1] Conway Davies, p. 162.

[2] *Ib.* p. 154, from *C.W.* 1328/97.

[3] *Ib.* p. 161.

seal afford an almost infallible evidence of the presence of the king at the spot from which they were issued. Whenever a definitive itinerary of Edward I. is compiled, it will have to depend very largely upon the evidence afforded by acts of privy seal. It would lead to ever-increasing error if the compiler of the itinerary of Edward II. and Edward III. were to place implicit trust in the same evidence. We must return again to this subject when treating in detail of the reign of Edward III. and of the history of the secret seal.

The desire of the barons to remove the privy seal from the control of the court was the more natural since their utmost efforts had failed to purify the royal household. Seven years after the ordinances it still remained a stronghold of the courtiers and a scandal for corruption and violence. Northburgh himself seems to have put no obstacle in the way of carrying out this policy. Despite his close association with Edward and Gaveston in 1312, he was a prudent and moderate man, who seems gradually to have drifted into the confidence of the barons. From November 1312 to May 1313 he was almost constantly away from court.[1] His testimony ceases to be quoted as a warrant for royal acts,[2] though he figures as a witness to the attempted pacification between king and barons brought about by the moderate men on December 20, 1312.[3] Edward was now partially reduced to submission and Northburgh again appeared at his side. He accompanied the king on his journey to France, receiving on May 3, 1313, a safe conduct on going beyond seas in the royal service with the king.[4] He doubtless returned with Edward on July 16. It seems probable that he was also often absent from the king's side in the early part of 1314.

It was during Northburgh's constant absence from court that a grave scandal arose with regard to the safe keeping of the privy seal. In 1312 a certain clerk named John of Reading was arrested and imprisoned in the marshalsea for "counterfeiting the king's privy seal and for sealing letters therewith."[1] It was a few months after the death of Gaveston, and the obstinate adherents of the favourite were still in very bad odour. One of them was Edmund of Mauley, the steward of the household. The forger accordingly thought it good business to declare that he had bribed the steward to give him the king's privy seal on July 1 at Aukborough in Lincolnshire in return for "400 talents of gold."[2] The king bent before the storm. The steward was the president of the household court which dealt with the serious misdeeds of the king's *familiares*. Mauley could hardly preside over his own trial. Accordingly he was superseded by Hugh of Audley, the elder. On October 27 a special commission appointed Audley, the new steward, the marshal of the household, and John Wogan to try both Reading and Mauley for the offence alleged against them. A jury of twelve knights of the household, chosen from those present at Aukborough at the time of the alleged offence, was impanelled, but the case was heard as a "crown plea of the king's hall" in Westminster Hall. The result of the trial, preserved in an *inspeximus* of the record dated February 8, 1313, was to exonerate Mauley of all blame. John of Reading was convicted of felony, and his clergy did not prevent his being hanged for his crime. Thereupon Mauley was restored as steward, and things went on as before. The attack on him seems an unscrupulous attempt of Reading to get off the penalty of his crime by accusing an unpopular personage. It shows that, as steward, Mauley was thought likely to have access to the privy seal, and therefore throws a little light on the problem of its early custody. As the seal was kept in the household, it might apparently be got hold of by any of the chief household officers, clerical or lay.

This was the second case of forgery of the privy seal within a few years. In 1305 John of Berneville was imprisoned at

[1] See note 3, pp. 288-289, above.

[2] After Nov. 18, 1312, his only "informations" are two acts on Jan. 12 and 13, 1313. The next informations are one in Jan. 1314, one in Feb., and two in March. Then comes an isolated act of Nov. 22. Continuous informations are only renewed on Jan. 30, 1315.

[3] *Ann. London*, p. 225.

[4] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 575, 579.

[1] *C.P.R., 1307–1313*, p. 538. The *Ann. Paul.* (pp. 272-3) give a good summary. Here the accusation is "super falsatione parui sigilli regis."

[2] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 555, which is an "inspeximus" of the record of the trial issued on Feb. 8, 1313. It is printed at length in *Foedera*, ii. 200-201. It is unlucky that the surviving "placita aulae hospicii regis" do not include those of 6 Edw. II., though the pleas of the marshalsea of 10, 11 and 12 Edw. II. are still extant; *List of Plea Rolls*, p. 73, in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, No. iv.

York, and convicted as a felon by reason of forging both the privy seal of Edward I. and that of the prince of Wales. Early in the new reign, November 28, 1307, a pardon was issued to Berneville at the instance of Walter Reynolds the treasurer.[1] In this we can see no political significance. Forgery was very common in the middle ages.[2]

Along with the whole apparatus of the wardrobe, Northburgh attended Edward on his Bannockburn expedition, taking the privy seal with him, and being accompanied by two of his clerks, Roger of Wingfield and Thomas of Switon.[3] Writs of privy seal were issued up to June 14 at Berwick.[4] Ten days later Northburgh and his clerks were taken prisoners in the rout of Bannockburn.[5] The privy seal was captured with him, and many books and records preserved in the wardrobe under his care were at the same time "lost at Stirling."[6] On June 27 Edward addressed from Berwick a letter close to the English sheriffs, warning them that his privy seal had been removed from him, and instructing them to execute no act by virtue of an order under the king's privy seal.[7] This letter is warranted "by the king," "under the queen's privy seal." For the next month Edward constantly used Isabella's seal as the only accessible substitute

[1] *C.C.R., 1302–7*, p. 234.

[2] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 20; cf. *C.W.* 58/64. Later, in 1345, we learn that there were many men "in secret places of the realm with counterfeits of the king's great and little seals; *C.P.R., 1343–5*, p. 589, an order appointing a special commission to apprehend such malefactors. A short paper of mine on *Mediaeval Forgers and Forgeries* is about to appear in *B. J. R. L.* (*Collected Papers of T. F. Tout*, iii, 117–144 (1934)).

[3] *Cont. Trivet*, p. 14.

[4] *C.W.* 88 *passim*.

[5] *Cont. Trivet*, p. 14. "Clerici quoque . . . plures ibidem fuerunt occisi et capti. De quibus et dominus Rogerus de Northburge, custos domini regis targiae ab eo ibidem ablatae, una cum dominis Rogero de Wikenfelde et Thoma de Switon, dicti domini Rogeri clericis, pariter detinebatur ibidem." This is doubtless to some extent true, for *Rot. Parl.* ii. 79 (1334) speaks of a royal mandate addressed to Roger of Wingfield having been lost "entre ses remembrances en le bataille de Strivelin." The case was brought up through the exchequer requiring Roger Sheffield, the clerk of the privy seal, to pay again the sum, which he had handed to Wingfield, because the loss of this order had destroyed all evidence of the transaction. Here Wingfield is called receiver of the chamber. See as to this, Sect. V. pp. 317-319. Neither Wingfield nor his colleague are described in records as privy seal clerks. Wingfield was, as we shall see, a prominent clerk of the chamber, after having been, under Edward I., a wardrobe clerk and clerk of the kitchen.

[6] *Rot. Parl.* i. 344; *C.P.R., 1334–8*, p. 226. See above, p. 237.

[7] *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 104.

for his own.[1] However, on July 13 a new privy seal seems to have been made, for a letter close of that date is warranted by writ of privy seal,[2] and from that time references to the privy seal become once more frequent.[3] Another Bannockburn prisoner, Ralph of Monthermer, the stepfather of the dead earl Gilbert of Gloucester, soon brought the old privy seal back to England, but promised to Bruce, to whom he owed his early release, that it should not be used again.[4] Northburgh also does not seem to have remained many months in captivity, as on November 22 an act was once more issued on his information.[5]

Notwithstanding changes in the highest wardrobe officers, Northburgh continued to keep the privy seal as before. The witness of the acts done on his information shows that he was pretty frequently with the king in 1315, though he was allowed his expenses for a long absence from court between July 13 and October 10.[6] His appointment as keeper of the wardrobe on February 1, 1316, ended his connection with the privy seal. He held this new office for six years, and we shall soon see the important part he played a few years later in making permanent the separation of the custody of the privy seal from the controllership which had first been exemplified in himself.

[1] M. Déprez' inference from this loss that "Édouard II semble avoir été assez négligeant, peu ordonné," *Études de Diplomatique anglaise*, p. 18, seems unnecessarily hard on Edward, and ignores the recent catastrophe at Bannockburn. Moreover, this use was not "une innovation." In 1224 Henry III. issued an act under the seal of his justiciar "quia sigillum nostrum nobiscum non fuit"; *C.P.R., 1216–1225*, p. 444. Valuable specimens of letters under the queen's seal and other substitutes for the royal privy seal are printed in Déprez, pp. 19-22.

[2] *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 109.

[3] There are such acts on July 17, 21 and 22; *ib.* pp. 107-9. The next extant original after June 14 is dated Aug. 15 at York; *C.W.* 89/3142. A large number of documents on this file are half-destroyed and of very uncertain date. *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 226, speaks in 1318 of letters of an earlier date being "under the privy seal used at that time."

[4] *Cont. Trivet* adds "ob quod dominus rex cito postea fieri fecit sigillum, volens illud privatum sigillum appellari ad differentiam targiae sic, ut praemittitur, ablatae," p. 14. (For this fantastical statement, see Sect. V. pp. 324-325 later.) "Circa haec tempora nobilis vir, Radulphus de Monte Hermeri, cum ceteris Angliae nobilibus in Scotia detentus, gratiam in oculis Scottorum ratione cujusdam familiaritatis cum rege ipsorum, . . . in Angliam rediit, et targiam domini regis, modo quo praemittitur a custode ejusdem per Scottos amissa, ablatam secum reportavit, usu ipsius, ratione praevia, nihilominus ex toto interdicto"; *ib.* p. 16.

[5] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 200.

[6] See above, pp. 288-289, note 3.

When Northburgh became keeper of the wardrobe, Robert of Wodehouse was its controller, but vacated office with the end of the regnal year, being succeeded on July 7, 1316, by Master Thomas of Charlton,[1] the brother of John Charlton, the king's chamberlain. There is no evidence as to who succeeded Northburgh as keeper of the privy seal, but on November 15, 1316, Thomas Charlton is specifically described as holding that office.[2] We know that in France, as early as 1312, the king's secret seal was in the custody of the chamberlain. It is perhaps not too fanciful to mention this point in connection with the fact that the English chamberlain's brother and political ally was the keeper of the English counterpart of this instrument. And we have already seen that the chamber clerk, Roger Wingfield, was among the clerks of Northburgh taken prisoner at Bannockburn. The relations of wardrobe, chamber, and privy seal were still inextricably mixed up.

The most important point about Thomas Charlton's keepership is that, despite recent precedent and the tenor of the ordinances, he once more combined the custody of the privy seal with the controllership of the wardrobe. Whether he was definitely appointed to the two offices at once, is not on record. I have found no definite evidence of his acting as keeper before November, but it is hard not to believe that he was immediately appointed successor to Northburgh in July. This guess is corroborated by the circumstance that, beginning on March 1316, an enormous number of acts are entered upon the close and patent rolls as having been effected by the king "on the information of Master Thomas Cherleton."[3] Before this date Charlton's name occurs infrequently on the patent rolls, and merely to record his numerous appointments to prebends and livings. Before the same time his name is not found on the close rolls at all. If this inference be correct, it follows that the old combination of the two offices was obtained by simply appointing him to the vacant controllership in July when Wodehouse

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 376/7; *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), No. 2, m. i.
[2] *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 440.
[3] The numbers are, 1316 (from Mar. 30 on), 29 acts; 1317, 13 acts; 1318, 23 acts, of which the last is on Nov. 24. After this date he testifies to only 3 acts, one in Jan. and two in Mar. 1319. But his controllership in itself might well account for these.

yielded up his office. The fact is the more remarkable since this glaring breach of the ordinances occurred within a few months of the complete triumph of the barons in the parliament of Lincoln of January 1316, when earl Thomas of Lancaster became chief counsellor of the king on the understanding that nothing of moment should be done by the king without the consent of the council. But Lancaster took no effective steps to clear out the foes of the barons who remained strongly entrenched in the king's household. That Northburgh, as keeper of the wardrobe, consented to the breach of the law shows that he was not the man to stand up against the king's wishes.

We know that Charlton was still keeper of the privy seal on May 13, 1318, because on that date a letter of secret seal was despatched to him announcing that the king had given to the royal clerk, John of Broughton, maintenance in the abbey of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in place of Robert Conseye, deceased, and requesting him to let the aforesaid John have such letters as are appropriate, directed to the abbot and convent of the same. Charlton is not addressed as keeper, but as "our dear clerk, Master Thomas of Charlton," but there was no appropriateness in the letter being sent to him unless he still kept the seal.[1] But his appointment brought little comfort to the king, for both the Charltons went over to the middle party of Pembroke, which secured a complete triumph in the treaty of Leake and in the York parliament of October 1318.

Pembroke's ascendancy put an end to open breaches of the ordinances. After July 8, 1318, Charlton's controllership passed over to Gilbert of Wigton, but he still remained keeper of the privy seal. When the parliament of York carefully reviewed the whole of the ministry and deposed place men who were

[1] *C.W.* 1328/4686 (last number of file). "Edward, par la grace de Dieu roy Dengleterre, seignur Dirlaunde et Ducs Daquitane, a nostre cher clerc, mestre Thomas de Cherleton, saluz. Por ce qe nous auoms donez a nostre cher clerk, Johan de Broghton, une gareson qe Robert Conseye, qe est a Dieu comaunde, auoit en labbe de seint Austyn de Canterbirs, vous mandoms qe sur ce facez le dit Johan auer a labbe et couent de dit lieu tieles lettres come y apendount. Donez souz nostre secre seal a Ystelwerthe, le xiii jour de Mai lan de nostre regne unzisme (1318)." This act resulted in a letter close of May 15, dated at Westminster, and procured "by writ of secret seal"; *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 610.

"insufficient," Charlton was allowed to continue in office.[1] He may have remained keeper until early in 1320, but his influence was gone, and he was a most inconspicuous actor in the stirring events of 1318 and 1319. After March 1319 writs of chancery ceased to be issued "on his information." He took no part in the reform of the household in 1318. On January 8, 1320, he received protection, until Michaelmas next, as going abroad on the king's service.[2] For the rest of Edward II.'s reign there is not a single reference to him on either patent or close roll. It is worth noting that during the period of his keepership Charlton is described in royal letters, requesting John XXII. to promote him to a bishopric, as *dilectus clericus ac secretarius noster*.[3] The first two known keepers of the privy seal were also secretaries. Over and over again we shall find the two offices—if such they were—held by one man. If it is unsafe to say that the king's secretary was his keeper of the privy seal, we can at least affirm that the keeper of the privy seal was always one of the king's secretaries.

The York ordinance of December 1318 made permanent the ordainers' policy of treating the office of the privy seal as a semi-independent branch of the household.[4] In language reminding us of the ordinances of 1311, it provided that there should be a "sufficient clerk" as keeper of the privy seal. In dignity and emoluments this officer was slightly inferior to the controller and cofferer of the wardrobe. Like them he had an esquire

[1] Cole, p. 4. This is my interpretation of a very corrupt text: "Item il plest au roi par assent de toutz . . . mestre Thomas de Cherleton demoerge au dit." We may conjecturally supply "priue seal."

[2] *C.C.R.*, 1318–23, p. 411. He was appointed as one of an embassy to Avignon on Jan. 15; *Foedera*, ii. 415. He left the court at York on Jan. 10 and rejoined the king at Amiens on June 27, 1320. See for this *MS. Ad.* 17,362, f. 16:—"Magistro Thome de Cherleton, contrarotulatori garderobe regis, misso usque curiam romanam a x° die Januarii, anno presenti [1320], quo die recessit de curia de Eboraco, usque xxvii^m^ diem Junii, anno eodem, quo die recessit usque Ambianum ad regem." The description of Charlton as controller in the first half of 1320 is very mysterious, especially as this wardrobe roll speaks of Wigton as controller for the whole of 13 Edw. II., as does the enrolment of this account made in the exchequer; *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), No. 2, m. 1.

[3] *Foedera*, ii. 310 (Jan. 8, 1317), a general request for Charlton's promotion; cf. *ib.* ii. 319, 321, 328, 329 (Mar. 28 and 30 and May 6, 1317), reiterated requests to pope and cardinals for Charlton's appointment as bishop of Hereford. The bishop then appointed was Adam of Orleton.

[4] *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 273-274.

who ate in the king's hall, and similar allowances of wine, candles, litter, winter fuel, bread, beer and meat. As an alternative for robes, all three alike might receive eight marks a year in equal portions at Christmas and Whitsuntide. All three had the same "livery" for food when sick. But while the controller had fivepence a day and the cofferer no salary, the keeper of the privy seal was to have wages, of amount unspecified, "until he was advanced by the king." While the controller had one clerk under him and the cofferer two for his accounts, the keeper of the privy seal had four clerks under him "to write for the privy seal." These had the status of the two "clerks of the counting-house," who stood in a similar relation to the cofferer. They were clearly not expected to take their meals in the household, but if they did so "for any certain reason," the "livery" given to them was that of a "sergeant." They were to be paid wages, more or less, in accordance with their status, and at the discretion of the steward and treasurer, until they were advanced by the king. One "herberger" was to provide lodgings for keeper and clerks together.[1] This appointment of a special herberger in itself marked out the office of the privy seal as something distinct from the wardrobe, and of equal importance with it, for the ordinance also assigned a single herberger "for the wardrobe and all its clerks."

Though now a separate department of the household, the office of the privy seal had not advanced very far on the road to independence. The fact that the clerks' wages were settled by the two heads of the wardrobe showed that they were still treated as on the same footing as other household clerks, and were not even absolutely under the control of their own immediate chief.

If the keepership of Northburgh represented the triumph of the ordainers and that of Charlton became an emblem of the Pembrokian compromise, the next keeper stood once more for curialistic policy. This was master Robert of Baldock, archdeacon of Middlesex, already a well-beneficed wardrobe clerk, and probably a kinsman of Ralph Baldock, bishop of London, of whose will he was an executor. It shows the growing importance of the office that Baldock was the first keeper of the

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 311.

privy seal whose appointment is mentioned in a chronicle.[1] His appointment coincided with that of other new ministers whose names show that the king was beginning to assert himself once more in politics. Baldock had recently returned to York from a mission to Berwick, where he had been engaged in treating for a truce with the Scots, and on January 27 received the custody of the privy seal from the king.[2]

Baldock acted continuously as keeper of the privy seal from January 27, 1320, until July 7, 1323. It suggests an attempt on Edward's part to upset the ordinance of 1311 when we learn that Baldock soon became controller of the wardrobe as well as keeper of the privy seal. The reunion of the two offices began on July 8, 1320, the first day of the new regnal year,[3] and he ceased to be controller on July 7, 1323.[4] His confidential relations to the king stood a good deal in the way of the personal discharge of his double office. Thus, he kept his household and horses at Witsand from February 24 to March 25, 1320, awaiting the king's proposed journey to France, but recalled them because the visit was postponed.[5] In June 1320 he

[1] *Ann. Paul.* p. 287, "Anno domini mcccoxxo, et anno regni regis Edwardi xiiio; circa Natale episcopus Norwicensis factus est cancellarius Angliae; dominus Walterus de Stapletone, episcopus Exoniensis, thesaurarius domini regis; et magister Robertus de Baldok, archidiaconus Middlesexiae, custos privati sigilli domini regis."

[2] *MS. Ad.* No. 17,362, f. 9 d, "Magistro Roberto de Baldok, archidiacono Middlesexie, venienti de Londonia ad mandatum regis usque Eboracum, et eunti ulterius versus Berewicum super Twedam, una cum aliis nunciis domini regis, causa tractandi cum Scotis de treugis, pro expensis hominum et equorum suorum ab xio die Nou. [1319], quo die recessit de Londonia, usque xxviiumm diem Januarii [1320], *quo die admisit custodiam priuati sigilli ipsius domini regis*, primo die computato et non ultimo, per lxxvii dies per quos fuit veniendo usque Eboracum, cundo usque Berewicum, redeundo et morando apud Eboracum, percipienti per diem xx s. per ordinacionem consilii regis, per compotum factum cum magistro Ricardo, fratre suo, apud Westmonasterium, xxiio die Februarii, anno presenti, xiiio [1320], lxxvii li." Previous to this Baldock had been much occupied away from the court, having been, for example, in the "comitiua" of bishop Stapeldon on an embassy to France from July 4 to Aug. 19, 1319 (*ib.* m. 9). Baldock's family name was apparently Catel, but his usual description suggests his local connection with Baldock, Herts. His elder brother, Thomas Catel,* held property at Baldock; *Ann. Paulini*, p. 314. The latter was still prosperous in 5 Ed. III; *Coram Rege Roll*, no. 284, m.2.

[3] *Archaeologia*, xxvi. 319; *Enr. Accts.* (*W. & H.*), No. 2, m. 1.

[4] *MS. Ad.* 995, f. 1 d.

[5] *Ib.* 17,362, f. 12, "Magistro Roberto de Baldok, percipienti per diem, juxta ordinacionem consilii domini regis, pro expensis familie et equorum suorum, x s., a xxivo die Feb., quo die premisit familiam et equos suos usque Whitesand contra passagium domini regis, usque xxvm diem Marcii, quo die dicta familia et equi redierunt ad Londoniam, pro eo quod transfretatio domini regis prorogata fuit certis de causis illa vice, primo die computato et non ultimo, per xxx dies, xv li." He received letters of protection on Feb. 23 and March 6; *C.P.R. 1317–21*, pp. 419, 430.

accompanied the king abroad, delivering before his departure "the small seal of absence" to its keepers.[1] On September 15 of the same year, he was put on a commission appointed to treat with Robert Bruce.[2] On December 3, 1322, he received safe conduct as "going on the king's affairs to divers parts of the realm."[3] These frequent occupations away from court necessitated Baldock acting largely by deputy. William of Kirkby, one of the clerks of the privy seal, acted, for example, as his *locum tenens* as controller and keeper.[4]

It was one of the grievances of the Lancastrian lords, assembled at Sherburn in Elmet on June 28, 1321, that Baldock was still keeper of the privy seal.[5] In July their complaints against him were renewed in the articles drawn up against the Despensers.[6]

[1] *C.C.R., 1318–23*, p. 238; *Foedera*, ii. 428. A similar small seal, used by Edward I. when that king was in Flanders, was now broken by the king's order. Edward and Baldock were absent from England from June 19 to July 22, and on their return letters of privy seal instructed the keepers of the seal of absence to use that seal no longer, *ib.* p. 428; *C.C.R.* p. 317. The wardrobe accounts thus record Baldock's expenses: "Eidem moranti extra curiam in negotiis domini regis per xvii dies per vices, . . . et versus partes Francie a die xiio Junii, anno xiio [1320], et moranti in partibus illis in comitiua domini regis versus partes Francie usque ad xxiium diem Julii, anno xivo [1320], quo die rediit"; *MS. Ad.* 17,362, f. 12. He received letters of protection on May 21 and June 25; *C.P.R., 1317–1321*, pp. 449, 450, 589.

[2] *Foedera*, ii. 434.

[3] *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 221.

[4] *MS. Ad.* 995, f. 1, cf. *MS. Stowe*, 553, f. 35, which shows that Kirkby had to appoint a deputy in his turn in Richard de Nateby: "Ricardo de Nateby, clerico, moranti in garderoba et scribenti contrarotulos eiusdem garderobe sub Willelmo de Kirkeby, locum tenentem contrarotulatoris, pro vadiis suis per lxvi dies per quos dies dictus Willelmus fuit extra curiam in negotiis regis per diuersas vices, infra annum xvm, percipiendo iv d. et obolum per diem, pro equo et garcione ipsius, per compotum inde factum cum dicto Willelmo, xxiv sol. ix den."* In this roll of the sixteenth year Baldock is always called controller, and no keeper is ever alluded to, after the ancient fashion.

[5] Canon of Bridlington, pp. 62-3, "Item videtur, domini reverendi, quod illi qui officia receperunt per quae regnum debeat gubernari, videlicet cancellarius, thesaurarius, camerarius, *custos sigilli secreti*, escaetores et alii qui per electionem constitui debuissent, receperuntque officia predicta contra ordinationes saepefatas, sunt causae novitatum, malorum et oppressionum quibus populus nimium aggravatur; expedit igitur ut celere remedium apponatur."

[6] *Ib.* pp. 66-67, "Item iidem, ad satisfaciendum suae cupidini, exheredando

Baldock, however, survived these attacks, and the complete triumph of the king and the Despensers at Boroughbridge secured the continuance of his power.[1] Like his predecessors, Baldock is described as the king's secretary, though with less frequency.[2] His more usual style than either keeper or secretary is "king's clerk." Sometimes, however, he is "the clerk whom on a particular occasion the king appointed as his mouthpiece" [3] or as "the beloved clerk who is continually at our side." [4] The latter description is proved strictly true by the evidence of the records. From February 26, 1320, down to August 17 and September 20, 1323, we find an enormous number of royal acts, registered in the patent and close rolls, are done by the king on his information.[5] His strenuous adherence to the king throughout the crisis of 1322 was rewarded by much minor preferment and by grants of forfeited rebels' lands. He was even more closely associated with

et destruendo populum et magnates, *consiliarios et ministros bonos ex assessu communi deputatos amoverunt, et alios malos et falsos suae opinionis induxerunt, videlicet magistrum Robertum de Baldok, secreti sigilli custodem,* dominum Willelmum de Cusance, alienigenam, privatum clericum Hugonis filii, magnae garderobae custodem, et dominum Willelmum de Clyff, similiter ejusdem Hugonis clericum, de consilio regis fecerunt jurari." In these extracts "secret seal" clearly means privy seal.

[1] In *C.C.R., 1318–23*, p. 496, Mr. Henry de Cliffe is, probably by a slip, described in Sept. 10, 1321, as "one of the keepers of the privy seal."

[2] The only instance I have noted is *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 591, dated May 30, 1321, where he is "king's clerk and secretary." We must, however, still be cautious in regarding secretary as an official title. Very often the word means little more than confidant, one who is in the king's secret counsels. In this sense Baldock was still secretary in 1326, when the king fled to Wales "cum duobus Dispensatoribus et Roberto Baldok et aliis paucis *secretariis suis*"; Murimuth, p. 47. Avesbury (p. 280) also calls the younger Despenser "secretarius regi." On Feb. 15, 1322, William de Ayreminc is called "cancellarie nostre secretarius"; *Foedera*, ii. 476. This is, however, clearly quite a different thing from the king's secretary. The younger Despenser is also called secretary by the canon of Bridlington (p. 79) where the king on his flight from Byland to Bridlington is mentioned as being attended by "germano suo comite Cantie, Hugone Dispensatorio filio, Johanne de Cromewelle, et Johanne de Ros, sibi secretariis et familiaribus." Miss L. B. Dibben's article on "Secretaries in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," in *E.H.R.* xxv. 430-444, traces the process by which the "confidant" became a definite official with specific duties.*

[3] *Foedera*, ii. 422, April 16, 1320, "clericum suum quem idem rex ad hoc [*i.e.* admission of a new bishop] constituit organum suae vocis."

[4] *Ib.* ii. 476, Feb. 25, 1322, "dilectum clericum . . . qui nostro lateri continue assistit." Compare *ib.* ii. 518, "noster clericus familiaris," and *ib.* ii. 526, "clericus noster predilectus."

[5] *C.P.R., 1317–1321*, p. 428, for the first, *C.C.R., 1318–1323*, pp. 12 and 20, for the last two instances.

the younger Despenser, the chamberlain, than was Thomas Charlton with his own brother, John Charlton, the chamberlain of an earlier period.

During Baldock's keepership the privy seal was accidentally lost, under conditions that suggested for the moment the capture of the seal by the Scots at Bannockburn. In October 1322 the Scots suddenly broke into Yorkshire and drove the king in panic flight from Rievaux or Byland to Bridlington. In the confusion of the hasty retreat the seal disappeared, and on October 15 Edward, from his refuge at Bridlington, issued a circular to all the sheriffs explaining that the privy seal had been "accidentally lost," and warning them to give no credence to mandates that they might receive under it.[1] Within twelve days it was recovered, and another circular, issued from York on October 27, cancelled that of October 15, explaining not only that the seal had been found, but that it had been all the time under safe custody.[2] It is clear that in the interval it was feared that the seal had fallen into the hands of the Scots, though apparently all that had happened was that the person in charge took some time to regain the court. Anyhow Baldock and his seal escaped, probably narrowly, the fate of Northburgh and the same seal in 1314.

Baldock was perhaps the first keeper of the privy seal who took an important part in general political and administrative work. We must not forget, however, that he was also controller, and, holding the two offices, he was probably not more influential than John Benstead had been in the days of Edward I. Certainly he loomed much larger on the stage of history than his wardrobe superior, Roger Waltham. He had his reward in his elevation to the chancellorship on August 20, 1323,[3] an office in which he continued until the fall of Edward II. He thus obtained a position more commensurate with the importance of the chief fellow-worker of the Despensers.

There is a curious new departure in Baldock's relations to the privy seal after he had relinquished its custody. At first sight he seems to have been almost the most powerful influence during all this period in matters affecting the administration, and it is hardly an exaggeration to describe him as the brain

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 498. [2] *Ib.* ii. 498. [3] *C.C.R., 1323–7*, pp. 134-5.

of Edward and the Despensers. It is true that the privy seal was very little affected by the reforming ordinances which now made so deep a mark on the wardrobe and the exchequer. But the spirit of change was in the air, and a remarkable reversal in the policy, which had up to now controlled the development of the privy seal, may, without too violent a stretch of fancy, be set down to the new attitude of the wardrobe-trained chancellor to the office in which he had been brought up. At first sight he seems to have turned his back on the wardrobe. The only immediate evidence of his old sympathies was that he took with him to the chancery Richard Airmyn, the brother of the prominent chancery clerk, William Airmyn. Now Richard Airmyn had been for some years one of the four clerks of the privy seal,[1] and we shall see that he renewed his relations later with that office.

In more fundamental matters Baldock strongly reacted against what up to now had been the policy of the court of Edward II., the policy, that is to say, of maintaining the wardrobe and privy seal straightly separated from the chancery. The very plan of combining the keepership with the controllership of the wardrobe had tended to check the growth of the office of the privy seal, even as a separate sub-department of the wardrobe. But after Baldock went from the privy seal to the chancery, the old policy of the ordainers became, in effect if not in intention, the policy of the crown.* The privy seal was accepted as a seal of state. The separation between the keepership and the controllership became permanent. This had the natural effect of establishing the office of the privy seal as a semi-independent body within the household, specially charged with its secretarial work. More than this, there was a strong tendency to bridge over the gap between privy seal and chancery, and thus further promote its separation from the wardrobe and its erection into an office of state. The policy was now to assimilate the privy seal office with the chancery. The only clause of the reforming ordinances which directly affected it was the provision

[1] He was clerk of the privy seal from at least 1315 to 1323,* and latterly received higher wages than his colleagues, being substantially in the position of the "secondary" or chief clerk; *Exch. Accts.* 376/7, m. 87; *MS. Ad.* 32,097, f. 56; *MS. Stowe*, 553, p. 108 d. His last grant was for summer robes in 1323. I shall treat at length of the clerks of the privy seal in Vol. V.

in the exchequer ordinance of 1326, which ordered both chancellor and keeper of the privy seal to enrol fully and distinctly, each one for himself, all writs and mandates under either seal "ordering payments and outlays."[1] The motive for the provision need not concern us. It was simply to remedy the grievance of sheriffs and other receivers, who found difficulties in getting from the exchequer allowances of sums they had expended, without formal warranty or a special writ of authorisation. But as the chancery had long kept such a record in the *liberate* rolls, the only effective change was to force on the privy seal the keeping of a similar roll of mandates for issues on the lines of a chancery roll. Unluckily we have no evidence that the ordinance was ever executed. At least no such privy seal or wardrobe *liberate* rolls have been preserved in the exchequer archives that have come down to us. We have evidence that there must have been "rolls of the privy seal": but again no such rolls are forthcoming.

Up to now the keepers of the privy seal, like the other chief officers of the wardrobe, had been promoted wardrobe clerks. The four short-lived successors of Baldock had in no case any previous wardrobe experience. The first of these was master Robert of Ayleston, a man with a judicial rather than an administrative record, but who, as keeper of the rolls and writs of the common bench,[2] had that experience in the custody of archives which was desirable in the person responsible for the records of the wardrobe. He held the privy seal for less than a year,[3] being appointed, on May 21, 1324, baron of the exchequer, whence he was ultimately raised to the treasurership in 1332. Such promotion from wardrobe to exchequer was quite in accordance with precedent. Accidental as was Ayleston's connection with the privy seal, he is nevertheless coupled by the king with Hugh Despenser and a leading judge as "our secretaries, to whom we commit our most secret affairs."[4]

The next three keepers were all clerks of the chancery.

[1] *R.B.E.* iii. 950.

[2] He was appointed keeper of the rolls of the common bench on June 11, 1322, being already king's clerk; *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 133.

[3] He is mentioned as keeper of the seal between Oct. 3, 1323, and March 19, 1324; *C.C.R., 1323–7*, p. 46; *Parl. Writs, II.* ii. ap. pp. 244-8. See also *C.W.* 124/6699, 125/6744, and 126/6752. Two of the latter are printed in Conway Davies, pp. 578-9. Ayleston is mentioned as keeper of the privy seal on May 16, 1324, in Cobham's *Register* X, 95. [4] *Foedera*, ii. 541.

Though it was extremely common for clerks of the chancery to be called upon to write for the privy seal or wardrobe on occasions of pressure, it was a new thing to give them permanent wardrobe office. The first of these, William of Airmyn,[1] was a man of great personal importance, one of those capable, pushing and unscrupulous officials who were the characteristic politicians of the reign. He had long been a chancery clerk, and by 1311 was sufficiently prominent to be associated in numerous temporary keeperships of the great seal. After Adam Osgodby's death in 1316, Airmyn succeeded him as keeper of the rolls of chancery and keeper, in this case for life, of the *domus conversorum*, the house for converted Jews in Chancery Lane,[2] already becoming, from lack of its proper inmates, a customary place for the deposit of chancery records and a natural residence for the clerks of the chancery when they were in London. Later we find Airmyn, like Osgodby, taking the chancellor's place as "keeper of the household of the chancery," even when it was located at York.[3] As compiler of the new type of parliamentary roll, which recorded day by day the proceedings of the Lincoln parliament of 1316, he had shown some originality and resourcefulness.[4] As a captive to the Scots in 1319, he had proved that he could on occasion be a soldier.[5] When, between 1316 and 1322, the keeping of the seal was transferred to a commission of chancery clerks, he was always one of them, often the first on the list. His paramount position in the office is shown by such descriptions as "principal clerk of the chancery" and "vice-chancellor."[6] His confidential relations to his chief is shown in the designation of "chancellor's secretary."[7]

[1] I spell the name after the modern form of the village of Airmyn on the Humber, from which his family derived their surname. "Ayremynne" is the most usual contemporary spelling. The Airmyns were quite an official family. There was an Adam Airmyn, clerk of the chancery (*MS. Ad.* 995, f. 5 d.), who never did much, and Richard Airmyn, clerk of the privy seal, 1314–1322, of whose later career there will be much to be said. All were closely connected with Baldock.

[2] For his career see my *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 184-185, 324-330.

[3] *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 105 (Apr. 22, 1322).

[4] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 104.

[5] Murimuth, p. 30 (R.S.).

[6] *Ann. Paul.* p. 287, "capitalis clericus cancellariae." Compare Malmesbury, p. 284, where he is called "vir prudens et circumspectus, et, praecipue in hiis quae tangunt cancellariam regis, efficax et expertus."

[7] In Richard of Bury's letter-book, now at Brogyntyn, he is described by Badlesmere as "the king's spiritual clerk and the chancellor's secretary"; *Hist. MSS. Com. 4th Report*, App. pt. i. p. 383. "Spiritual clerk" is doubtless a slip for "special clerk," and "chancellor's secretary" for "secretary of the chancery" Compare Conway Davies, p. 227, and the other instances cited there.

It is hard not to see deliberate policy in the appointment of the leading clerk of the chancery to the keepership of the privy seal. It looks as if Baldock, as chancellor, wished to retain control of the privy seal when committing to this specialist in chancery lore the office in which he himself made such a mark. How important these consequences were we shall soon see.

Apparently William Airmyn took charge of the privy seal immediately on Ayleston's appointment in the exchequer, for five days after that event he resigned the rolls of chancery to his brother Richard, the old clerk of the privy seal, now Baldock's clerk as chancellor.[1] It is less significant that William retained the keepership of the *domus conversorum*, since the holder of that office was not necessarily a clerk of the chancery. He is mentioned as keeping the seal on August 8, 1324.[2] During this brief period of office we find Airmyn and Baldock in the closest co-operation. On August 7 they were jointly empowered to draw up a certain commission in terms that almost anticipate the constant co-operation of chancellor and keeper of the privy seal, as two leading ministers of state, from the next reign onwards.[3] Next day, when Baldock was going on a holiday, the king handed the custody of the great seal to Airmyn, bidding him "execute what pertains to the office."[4] Thus the great and privy seals were for a short time once more under the same custody. Airmyn was now to Baldock, as Benstead had been to the later chancellors of Edward I. He perhaps gave up office early in 1325, when he was elected bishop of Carlisle on January 7, though he failed to secure that see, since on February 13 the pope quashed his appointment.[5] A little later Airmyn was sent to Avignon to procure for his patron Baldock the see of Norwich.[6] He deftly

[1] *C.C.R., 1323–7*, p. 186.

[2] *Ib.* p. 306.

[3] *C.W.* 1329/6966. Airmyn is not called keeper of the privy seal in this writ of secret seal.

[4] *C.C.R., 1323–7*, pp. 306-307; *Parl. Writs, II.* ii. ap. p. 260.

[5] *C. Pap. Reg. Let.* ii. 242.

[6] He had protection on Feb. 26, 1325, and again on June 18; *C.P.R., 1321–4*, pp. 99, 127.

persuaded John XXII. to throw over Baldock and confer the see on himself. The violent breach between Baldock and Airmyn, which naturally followed, kept the latter in exile till he came back with Isabella in 1326.

Other hands now continued the new policy. Mr. Henry of Cliff, another leading chancery clerk, had been since 1318 frequently associated with Airmyn as a temporary keeper of the great seal.[1] He succeeded him as keeper of the privy seal, being in office to our knowledge on April 2 and May 25, 1325.[2] On July 4, 1325, he was also made keeper of the rolls of chancery, Richard Airmyn having apparently shared in his brother's disgrace. There may be some significance in the new keeper of the privy seal receiving, when keeper, the custody of the chancery rolls, which William Airmyn had relinquished when he was appointed to that office. It seems another step forward in the assimilation of the office of the privy seal to that of the chancery. However, Cliff soon gave up the privy seal, though he remained keeper of the chancery rolls for the rest of the reign. Another analogous step in the same direction was soon taken when on October 4, 1325, Robert Holden, controller of the wardrobe, took the custody of the house of converts, and retained it with his wardrobe post until the fall of Edward II. The wardrobe, like its offshoot, the privy seal, was to be closely correlated to the chancery, or rather all these three were to be regarded as different aspects of the same machine.

In other ways Cliff[3] kept on the new policy of subordination to the chancery. We may see progress in this direction in a letter of secret seal, addressed both to Baldock as chancellor

[1] The last occasion was before Baldock became chancellor, on Aug. 20, 1323; *C.C.R., 1318–23*, p. 689. Baldock was less often an absentee than chancellor Salmon, but in Nov. and Dec. 1324, Cliff, Richard Airmyn and William of Harleston were made keepers; *ib., 1323–7*, p. 328.

[2] *Ib.* p. 386. In *Ancient Correspondence*, xxxvi. 111, is a curious letter of William Trussel to Cliff, asking for attorneys for himself to be appointed. It is dated Oxford, the Sunday after the Ascension, that is doubtless May 20, 1325. A previous protection "under the targe" had omitted to mention the names of these attorneys, and Trussel now asked Cliff to remedy that error. Compare similar letters to Cliff as keeper of the great seal in *ib.* xxxvi. 94, "per Ricardum de Bury," and *ib.* 108. Sometimes such petitioners ask Cliff for a writ, without specifying which seal they wish it to be under, as in *ib.* 112.

[3] Cliff, more fortunate than Ayleston or his successor Harleston, has his modest place in the *D.N.B.* His tenure of the privy seal was first revealed by M. Déprez' book.

and Cliff as keeper of the privy seal, ordering them to make letters of privy seal for the arrest by the constable of Dover of all messengers who might come from abroad from queen Isabella or William Airmyn.[1] It is probable that Cliff did not continue in office long after his new appointment in July, for in that month the little crop of writs issued "on the information of Mr. Henry of Cliff" comes to an end.[2] In his later career he is again described as a chancery clerk.

The last keeper of the privy seal under Edward II. was another chancery clerk, William of Harleston or Herlaston, who, like his predecessors, had constantly acted as a temporary keeper of the great seal. He apparently retained office between October 1325 and October 1326, that is, as long as authority remained to Baldock and Edward II.[3] That Baldock persevered to the last in retaining his tight hold over the privy seal and wardrobe is shown from the fact that he deposited books of wardrobe accounts along with other valuables in the treasury of St. Paul's, London, when queen Isabella's invasion upset all his plans.[4] On his fall Harleston, like Cliff, went back to his post in the chancery. In the revolutionary period, when the boy Edward of Aquitaine was supposed by the lawyers to govern the realm in the name of his fugitive and captive father, we have a fresh experiment when the keepership of the privy seal between October 26 and November 20, 1326, was entrusted to Robert of Wyvill, clerk of queen Isabella, the real

[1] M. Déprez says of this (p. 75), "Dès Édouard II le mandement secret est réservé aux affaires personnelles de la royauté, celles où elle est directement intéressée." It would be hard to substantiate this statement, and harder to draw a line between such affairs and other business of the crown. Compare also *C.P.R., 1321–1324*, p. 250, where so formal a thing as a series of commissions of oyer and terminer is "by writ of secret seal" of July 23, 1322. It is not impossible, however, that this co-operation of chancellor and keeper may have been motived by a desire to distinguish letters of great and privy seal by reason of the type of business done, rather than as two different steps of the same business.

[2] *C.C.R., 1323–27*, pp. 279, 375; *C.P.R., 1324–27*, pp. 110, 112, 123. The last date is July 1 (*C.P.R., 1324–27*, p. 134).

[3] *C.C.R., 1327–30*, p. 291. Compare *Rot. Parl.* ii. 383, where an undated petition of Edward III.'s time, speaking of his predecessor, alludes to "sire Williem de Herlaston, qi porta ascun temps son priue seal." The dates in the text are suggested by the "informations" from him between Oct. 12, 1325, and Oct. 1, 1326; *C.C.R., 1323–27*, pp. 413, 616; *C.P.R., 1324–27*, pp. 247, 250, 252, 258, 261, 274, 275.

[4] *Cal. Letter-Books, City of London*, Book E, pp. 224-225.

ruler of the realm. This revolutionary step had, however, no prospective significance. Indeed the fact that the regent ruled under his privy seal, "because he had no other seal at that time," [1] perhaps gives Wyvill, here described as the clerk of the duke of Aquitaine, a place among keepers of the great seal rather than the privy seal. But even here the interchangeability of the two offices further illustrates the results of Baldock's policy.

Baldock's chancellorship had indirectly other important results on the development of the privy seal office. Speaking generally, there were under Edward II. few chancery reforms which, like the reforms of wardrobe and exchequer, were the conscious results of new legislation. Indeed some tendencies were apparently reactionary, even as compared with the latter years of Edward I. Thus the "chancellor's fee" was from time to time abolished and the "profits of the seal" handed over to be exploited by the chancellor after the thirteenth century fashion. It would be unwise to see in these experiments in reaction anything more than a temporary expedient to meet a practical need. First suggested by the debts owed by the crown to Reynolds, then more fully carried out in the days of aristocratic control under Sandal and Hotham, this device, so favourable to the magnate chancellor, obtained the formal approval of the York parliament of 1318.[2] It is significant, however, that Baldock received on his appointment the "customary fee." If in 1326 he was granted for short periods the issues of the seal, it was simply because the £500 fee was inadequate to support the chancellor and his household, when the chancellor held no higher church preferment than the archdeaconry of Middlesex. We can chiefly see in this last occasion of the revival of the ancient system the inability of Edward II. to procure a bishopric for his favourite chancellor, and the consequent need of special assistance to a minister who had no great ecclesiastical endowment to supplement the scanty resources of his political office. Yet

[1] *C.C.R., 1323–27*, p. 655. Wyvill was called the queen's secretary in July 1327 and the duke's in October. From 1329–1375 he was bishop of Salisbury, and famous for procuring the restoration of the manor of Sherborne to the possessions of that see.

[2] See for more details of the chancery reforms of this time, *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 180-186.

even here the revival, from time to time, of the exploitation of the chancery by the chancellor pointed towards the emancipation of the chancery from accountability to the wardrobe, the last real link that bound it to the court, which was soon to be broken by the exchequer reformers.

The ordainers' insistence on the use of the great seal as against the privy seal was another example of the way in which the times favoured the chancery. In return for its losses by reason of the growth of household administration, the chancery had one compensation in a perceptible growth of its judicial competence. So early as 1315 there was a distinct instance of the exercise of an equitable jurisdiction by the chancery, when a hard case in a suit for dower, which the technicalities of common law put outside the cognisance of either bench, was referred by parliament to chancery, on the express reason that the complainant could get no help from the common law.[1] Yet, despite the ordainers, the privy seal did not lose all judicial authority, so that in a later generation we shall witness a concurrent equitable jurisdiction emanating from chancery and privy seal, just as we have already a concurrent secretarial and administrative competence, allowed to great and small seal alike.

The greatest chancery reform of the reign was an indirect result of the exchequer ordinance of 1324. The separation of the hanaper department from the wardrobe was involved in the direction to the clerk of the hanaper of the chancery to account for the "profits of the great seal" in the exchequer, and not in the wardrobe, as had been customary.[2] As a corollary of this, the chancellor's fee, which had normally been paid out of the wardrobe, became henceforth a charge on the exchequer. And even the reaction, in 1317–20, to the old fashion of the chancellor making his profit out of the fees of the seal had been a preliminary step towards the separation of chancery and household, more drastically effected by Stapeldon's ordinance. With this great change disappeared the last conspicuous survival of the original household chancery. The inevitable result was the formal consolidation of the chancery as a great office of state, perman-

[1] *Rot. Parl.* i. 340, "sequatur in cancellaria. Et fiat sibi [i.e. to the plaintiff] ibidem justicia quia non potest juuari per communem legem."

[2] *R.B.E.* p. 921.

ently out of court, and maintained from national resources. In this attainment of departmental independence, the chancery had its compensation for the failure of Baldock's plan of bringing the privy seal under its control, and setting up a single great secretarial office, responsible for the clerical work of all departments

The administrative reformers under Edward II. were officials mainly interested in their own offices and anxious to promote their efficiency by practical reforms, though jealous of rival departments and careless of broad political considerations. It was natural, then, that Baldock's plan of constituting a single great secretarial establishment by subordinating the privy seal to the chancery should fail, as it was that the departmental growth of the privy seal as a self-sufficing secretarial office should succeed. Though it is generally futile to speculate upon the "might have beens" of history, it is significant that Baldock's reforms involved the following of French analogies and methods, where they were most contrary to the fashions favoured by English administrative tradition. Both in taking from the privy seal its leading clerk for the service of the chancery, and in sending three chancery clerks in succession to keep the privy seal, Baldock was following the custom of France, where Philip the Fair had set up a single centralised clerical department, subject to the chancellor, or keeper of the seal, as its head, and soon developing a strong departmental tradition of its own. This was the great corporation of royal notaries and secretaries, the famous *grande chancellerie royale*, which left so deep a mark on French administrative history. From this single secretarial corporation the French system was to assign individual clerks to write in the various offices of state. But they remained members of the chancery, bound by its traditions, and conducting their business in similar fashion. Thus centralisation and unity became the ideals of the French bureaucrat.

In England, also, bureaucracy triumphed; but it triumphed, so to say, by departments. The independence of the privy seal of the chancery, already stressed by Fleta under Edward I., became the more complete when the privy seal itself began to go "out of court" and became a small self-sufficing office of state. Yet even when this process was completed, there still remained

a household secretariat, whose later fortunes we shall have to trace, when we come to deal with the secret seal and the signet. And already since the twelfth century the exchequer had its own independent seal and secretarial corps. Thus in England we have four separate "chanceries," while in France there was only one "great royal chancery." The whole of the difference between French and English administrative history is contained in this distinction.[1]

[1] I have worked out these points at greater length in the *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 164-168.

SECTION V

The Revival of the Chamber [1]

Early in the reign of Edward II. a new chapter began in the history of the king's chamber. By a process whose beginnings we can only faintly discern, and from motives of which we are almost entirely ignorant, the chamber crept gradually back into its early position of an important administrative body. New functions were assigned to it, and a definite clerical staff was at work in it. At first the evidence for this new development is scanty and scattered, and we are left to give our own interpretation to the scraps of evidence which we can piece together. Gradually, however, our material becomes comparatively abundant, and, before the end of the reign, actual records of the chamber survive in sufficient detail to enable us to form a fairly clear conception of this process. It is the more important since there seems to be reason for connecting this renascence of the chamber with some of the most characteristic movements of the reign, the disgrace of Walter Langton, the fall of the Templars, the domination of favourites, the reaction against them in the ordinances, and the remarkable series of practical administrative reforms which culminated after the triumphs of the Despensers over the ordainers. So different does this chamber seem to be from the ancient domestic establishment of the king's bedroom, that at first sight we are tempted to believe that it is an entirely different body from it. It is, however, abundantly clear that the contrary is the case. Not only did the old officers remain, but the chamber continued to discharge its original domestic work. It is, indeed, perhaps the root of the matter that the same chamber which had ministered to his father's domestic wants gave Edward II. the machinery for carrying out his personal policy. It was the answer of the court to the efforts made by the ordainers to bring the wardrobe and the privy seal within the sphere of baronial influence. The ancient

[1] This section is an expansion of my *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 168-175.

court organisation was adapted to secure under these conditions the permanence of personal government and courtier rule. That result was attained by a drastic reconstitution of the ancient *camera regis*.

There is evidence of increasing chamber activity from the very beginning of Edward II.'s reign. Foreign bankers, such as Amerigo dei Frescobaldi and Antonio di Passano,[1] paid into the chamber considerable sums "for certain secret expenses," [2] and in some instances deliberately withheld information as to these transactions from the wardrobe officials, and refused to allow them to appear in their accounts.[3] Thus a more intimate "privy purse" than that of the wardrobe treasury was secured. This was probably a simple continuation, but might possibly be a revival, conscious or unconscious, of the *camera curie* of the twelfth century.[4] Now the king's interests required that there should be some means of replenishing this privy purse in more business-like fashion than by borrowing from foreign usurers. Such a source of revenue was soon found in the great forfeitures which marked the early months of the reign. The chief of these were those of the lands of Walter Langton and of the Templars.

[1] The true name of this Genoese merchant, whose family was closely allied to both the Fieschi and the Dorias, seems to have been *Passano*, a place on the Riviera, midway between Genoa and Porto Venere, which was subject to Genoa. But there is quite a literature on the subject, both in Italian and Portuguese, the latter by reason of Antony's kinsfolk's settlement in Portugal. I am indebted for this information to an unpublished thesis of my pupil Mr. Harland Watts, B.A., second lieutenant in the South Lancashire regiment, whose death in France at the enemy's hands ended prematurely a strenuous and promising career. I therefore abandon the form "Pessagno" used in *Pl. Edw. II.* Another possible name for Antonio's place of origin is Paesano, but this is highly unlikely, as Paesano is in Montferrat and quite outside the Genoese sphere of influence.

[2] *Exch. Accts.* 373/15 (1 Edw. II.) records liveries to the king by Emericus de Friscobaldis of £53 : 16 : 10, "pro quibusdam secretis suis inde faciendis" (Oct. 1307), and "in camera sua pro consimilibus secretis" (Jan. 1308). See also next note below. By the end of 1312 Antonio di Passano had advanced Edward II. £5000 in his chamber for his "secret expenses"; *ib.* 375/8, f. 7.

[3] *Ib.* 373/15, "Eidem domino regi quas recepit similiter ad opus proprium et ad armaturas secrete emendas Parisiis, *de quibus noluit garderobam suam certiorari*, nec allocari eidem Emerico in compoto suo" (Feb. 1308, Paris).

[4] For the *camera curie* see above, Vol. I. Ch. III. pp. 67-119. For the *camera* under Henry III. see Vol. I. Ch. V. Sect. II. and Sect. IV., especially pp. 216-217, and 228-232. "The chamber was where the king lived; the *aula* where his household lived"; Conway Davies, p. 67.

On September 20, 1307, the lands of the disgraced treasurer,[1] and on January 10, 1308, those of the threatened order of the Temple[2] were taken into the king's hands. At first both the custody of all these lands, and the guard of the persons of the knights of the Temple were assigned to the local sheriffs, who were directed to account for them as usual at the exchequer.[3] However, on September 14, 1309, the sheriffs were ordered to hand over the imprisoned Templars to certain central officers, and finally all the Templars were collected in the Tower of London and in York castle to abide their trial.[4] A similar centralising policy was also adopted as regards the lands of the doomed order, and for motives of convenience extended to the lands of bishop Langton. Special keepers were gradually appointed for the lands of the Templars and Langton in various localities. Many of the new keepers were officials of the king's household, and a large proportion of them officers of the king's chamber.[5] Conspicuous among them were the wardrobe clerks Ingelard Warley and Roger Wingfield, who, jointly with Sir William Inge, received the custody of Walter Langton's treasures.[6] The vital point for us is, however, the fact that several of these officers were withdrawn from the ordinary jurisdiction of the exchequer by an order to account in the king's chamber for the issues of the lands entrusted to them.[7] Thus on July 8,

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 7. [2] *Ib.* ii. 18-19, 23.

[3] That this order was strictly carried out is clear from the special accounts of sheriffs as respects these lands, e.g. *L.T.R. Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* Nos. 18, 19 and 20. These sheriffs' accounts generally began on Jan. 8, for instance, No. 19, mm. 1 and 45. The various stages in the administration and disposition of the Templars' lands have been carefully worked out by my pupil, Miss Agnes M. Sandys, M.A., in a thesis on "The Templars in England," which, I hope, will be eventually published.

[4] *Foedera*, ii. 90-91.

[5] For instance, the wardrobe clerks William Melton and Ingelard Warley, the latter of whom became clerk of Edward II.'s chamber. The "yeomen" (valletti) of the chamber concerned are quoted in the text (Hay, Compton, etc.). See numerous instances in *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* Nos. 19 and 20. The process of appointment was gradual, the first special keepers being chosen as early as Oct. 1308; *ib.* No. 20, m. 12 d. But in some cases sheriffs continued to account. As these appointments were by privy seal, they were not enrolled in any of the chancery enrolments.

[6] *Exch. Accts.* 373/19. For Warley, see also above, pp. 226, 231-234, 237 and 239.

[7] Mr. Clement Perkins, in his article on "The Wealth of the Knights Templars in England" in the *A.H.R.* xv. 253-63, pointed out clearly the institution of special keepers, but did not notice the bringing of many Templar estates under

1309, Alexander of Compton, king's yeoman, received from the local sheriffs the custody of the lands and goods of the Templars and Langton in Warwickshire and Leicestershire, with directions to answer for the issues therefrom in the king's chamber.[1] Similarly another king's yeoman, John de la Hay, was, on July 14, appointed steward and keeper of Crome Hill and of other Templar and Langton lands in Worcestershire and Herefordshire, for which he was to "answer for the issues therefrom in the chamber by faithful account."[2] Both Compton and Hay may well have been chamber officers, for a large proportion of king's yeomen were yeomen of the chamber. And though these seem the first specifically called upon to answer to the chamber, it is very likely that earlier keepers were, in fact, responsible to it without any specific statement to that effect in the privy seals of appointment. Before long even some of the sheriffs, who were still to some extent kept on as keepers of Templars' lands, were ordered to account in the chamber.[3]

One of the keepers was now given paramounce over his colleagues. This was Roger of Wingfield, a wardrobe clerk of Edward I., who had been made clerk of the kitchen in 1306, and who, in the first year of Edward II., continued to account in the wardrobe as clerk of the united "offices" of kitchen, pantry, and buttery.[4] Between June and August 1309 Wingfield received charge of important Templar manors in Cambridgeshire and Oxfordshire for which the sheriffs had previously

the jurisdiction of the chamber. We must not, however, exaggerate the proportion of these. There were in 1313 over 60 keepers of groups of Templars' lands; but only 13 of these estates were transferred to the exchequer and 17 to the wardrobe in 1311. Probably many remained accountable to the exchequer all through.

[1] *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* No. 19, m. 42. "Ita quod de exitibus inde prouenientibus in camera regis esset respondens." He is called king's yeoman in *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 523. He was still keeping these lands on Nov. 10, 1313; *ib., 1313–17*, p. 37, and had other lands also in his charge in 1311; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 381.

[2] *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* No. 19, m. 50. The "Hollecrombe" of the rolls is Crome Hill, near Upton-on-Severn, Worc. Garway was within his charge; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 390.

[3] This was the case with Thomas Burnham, sheriff of Lincolnshire, who accounted for certain Templars' lands in his shire from July 1309; *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* No. 18, m. 15.

[4] He is repeatedly so described in *Exch. Accts.* 367/17, m. 25, and 373/15, ff. 42-85.

been responsible.[1] At the same time he appears in the accounts as *clericus camere regis*, and we may assume from this that he accounted for these lands in the chamber, though we are not definitely told that this was the case. But the new "clerk of the king's chamber" was more than one of many keepers of chamber lands. So early as July 1309 other keepers were ordered to account to him.[2] Before long accounting to Wingfield and to the chamber meant exactly the same thing. Early in 1310 we find Wingfield acting as general keeper of all the Templars' lands, with under-keepers under his direction responsible to him for their issues. His charge also included the maintenance of the imprisoned Templars.[3]

It is not quite certain how long Wingfield continued to be clerk of the chamber, but it is pretty evident that he acted up to midsummer 1314. We know that between 1310 and 1313 he was constantly receiving moneys into the king's chamber.[4] We are forced to the conclusion that his custody of the Templars' lands was but an incident of his position as a chamber officer, and that his position over the chamber and its lands corresponded to that of the keeper of the wardrobe over his department. He was, in fact, the clerical head, the chief accounting officer of the chamber, and he, therefore, personally rendered his accounts to the exchequer, quite independently of the wardrobe.[5] In the next generation such a position was held by the clerk called

[1] *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* 18, mm. 10 and 23 d., No. 20, mm. 20, 21. Denney, Cambs, and Bisham, Berks, were within his charge. The latter entry shows the sheriff handing lands to the custody of Ingelard of Warley, sometime "clericus camere," some months before he became keeper of the wardrobe.

[2] For instance, Thomas Burnham, sheriff of Lincs, as above, in July 1309; *ib.* No. 18, m. 15. John de la Hay also paid to Wingfield £302 : 11 : 5 from the profits of his charge between 3 and 5 Edw. II. (*ib.* No. 19, m. 51), even though accounting for part of this time in the exchequer.

[3] *Foedera*, ii. 118; *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 290. This entry shows Wingfield acting on Oct. 23, 1310. It is clear, however, that he was already acting on Feb. 11, 1310; *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 210.

[4] The latest date at which he is recorded as receiving money in the chamber is Nov. 28, 1313; *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 29.

[5] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 224, well illustrates this. It records acquittances to the Frescobaldi for sums paid by them to the chamber and wardrobe respectively. As regards the amounts paid into the chamber, Wingfield is to be charged "in his account at the exchequer," just as Warley, already keeper of the wardrobe, is to be charged with sums paid into the wardrobe to the exchequer. Incidentally the passage suggests that the chamber was at this stage already regarded as accounting directly to the exchequer.

receiver of the chamber. Though contemporaries do not give Wingfield this name, he is described by this title in a record of 1334.[1] Anyhow it is clear that with Ingelard of Warley, Wingfield made his position as the reformer of the chamber. When Warley became keeper of the wardrobe, the chamber remained the exclusive sphere of Wingfield's activity. After Ingelard, he is the first of an unbroken line of clerks of the chamber, whose origin may be seen in the chamber clerks of Henry II.

The strengthening of the clerical staff of the chamber is the more significant, as the lay officers, notably the king's chamberlain and the subordinate knights of the chamber, came into great prominence in these years. *Camerarius*, which under Edward I. was still commonly used to designate any member of the chamber staff,[2] was now normally reserved for the chief chamberlain put at the head of it. This chamberlain now becomes an important functionary.

Gaveston was denounced by the chroniclers for his constant presence in the chamber, and for debarring the nobles from access to the king there, save in his presence.[3] Yet there is no evidence that he was ever the king's chamberlain.[4] Moreover, John Charlton, lord of Powys, soon held that office. Charlton, successively "yeoman," "esquire," and "knight" of the prince's chamber, and afterwards transferred to the household of the king,[5] probably already held the chamberlainship when, in April 1310, he acted jointly with Wingfield and Robert Clifford, then marshal of England, in receiving into the chamber moneys that came from the Italian farmers of the customs. In this patent Wingfield is mentioned first, and is "solely charged therewith in his account at the exchequer."[6] On other occasions

[1] *Rot. Parl.* ii. 79, where he is described both as "receivoure de la chambre nostre dit seignour le roi le piere des profitz des terres des Templiers" and as "receivour des deners pur la chaumbre le roi." We must not forget, however, that the enrolled accounts of the Templar and Langton lands only took their present shape in the early years of Edward III. This makes the refusal of contemporaries to give Wingfield the name of receiver the more significant.

[2] For instance, *Chanc. Misc.* 4/2, f. 6 d., records the wages of Albinus, "scutifer et camerarius regis."

[3] Malmesbury, p. 168; compare *ib.* p. 162.

[4] See *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 12.

[5] He was still "scutifer de camera principis" when the last year of the prince's wardrobe accounts began on Nov. 30, but was "miles de camera" before they ended on July 7, 1307; *MS. Ad.* 22,923, ff. 10 d., 11 d.

[6] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 224. See also above, pp. 198, 225 and 318, note 5.

he is associated with John Peacock, yeoman of the chamber.[1] On other occasions, again, we find James Audley, yeoman of the chamber, receiving into the chamber payments from local keepers of the Templars' lands, who were probably Wingfield's subordinates.[2] Most of these "yeomen" were men of gentle birth and high prospects, and there is not here the slightest suggestion of humble social status in either *valettus* or its usual translation "yeoman." The dignity of the staff manning the chamber would indeed have been an indication of its increasing importance, save for the fact that already in Fleta's day a special pre-eminence in this respect was claimed for it.[3]

The beginnings of the administrative chamber were in the days of Gaveston's influence and before the formulation of the baronial programme in the ordinances. It would have been natural then for the ordainers to aim at restricting this authority, just as they strove to limit the jurisdiction of the wardrobe and the privy seal. It is surprising, therefore, to find in the ordinances nothing at all that deals directly with the chamber and its officers. The chamberlain, for instance, is not among the long list of household officers whose appointment is henceforth to be made subject to the approval of the baronage in parliament. So far as the ordainers were concerned, the king was as free to govern his chamber at his discretion as he was before the triumph of the opposition. One provision only of the ordinances directly affected it. This was the provision that all issues of the realm should be delivered into the exchequer and received by the treasurer and chamberlains of that office, so that the king might live of his own.[4] Though on the face of it directed against the wardrobe, this ordinance was incompatible with the system of lands reserved to the chamber and accounted for there. Accordingly, immediate steps were taken to check the practice. Between November 4 and 10, 1311, a fresh set of commissions were issued to keepers of Templar and Langton lands. Some of the keepers, for instance, Compton and Hay, were those previously in charge, but they were now associated with baronial leaders, such as

[1] *C.C.R., 1307–13*, p. 426; *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 128.
[2] *Ib., 1307–13*, pp. 511-590.
[3] Fleta, p. 79, quoted on p. 335, later. See also above, pp. 43-44.
[4] Ordinance No. 8 in *Rot. Parl.* i. 281-282. For an interpretation put on this a few weeks later see later, pp. 321-323, and *Ann. Lond.* p. 201.

John Botetourt and Henry Percy. Moreover, the new appointment was by writ of chancery, while the old had been by writ of privy seal.[1]. But the most significant change was that the new keepers were to answer for their issues in the exchequer in accordance with the form of the ordinances.[2] How little in earnest the king was soon became clear, for on November 25 fresh writs were issued, appointing another set of keepers, who were seldom the same as those of the earlier list and among whom magnates of the opposition no longer figured. The earlier keepers were to transfer to these new men the lands they had in charge, and the new officers were to answer for their issues to the king's wardrobe.[3]

This was a glaring defiance of the ordinances, and yet was only one of a series of acts that compelled the ordainers to further action. Their result was the *ordinationes comitum secundae*, a vigorous attempt of the leading ordainers to give precision to the generalities of the earlier ordinances. For us the most significant clause was one directly answering the writs of November 25. "In as much," it ran, "that it had been ordained that the profits of the Templar lands should come entirely to the exchequer, and that in respect to this certain commissions had been granted to certain men to answer in the exchequer, according to the ordinances, thereupon some of the said lands have been regranted to those who held them previously against the ordinances, and that these things should be remedied."[4] We must connect

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 148, prints the writs, which were enrolled on the fine rolls; *C.F.R.* ii. 110-111. The subtle distinction between these writs under the great seal, authorised, however, by writs of privy seal, and the custom of 1309–10 of regarding the writs of privy seal as sufficient in themselves, is some suggestion of a desire to carry out literally the ordinances.
[2] *Foedera*, ii. 148. "Ita quod de exitibus inde prouenientibus nobis respondeat ad scaccarium nostrum.
[3] *Ib.* ii. 150. "Ita quod de exitibus inde prouenientibus responderet nobis in garderoba nostra." The appointments do not apparently deal with all the custodies, but within the limits of the list the only four keepers who remain are A. Compton, W. Spannby and J. de la Hay, king's clerks, and Edward Burnham. The letters close of appointment were enrolled on the fine rolls (*C.F.R.* ii. 115-116), but unluckily the calendarer omits the crucial words.
[4] *Ann. Lond.* p. 201. "Pur ceo qe ordine fust qe les profitz des terres des Templiers duissent vener al escheqer, entierement, et sur ceo commissions baillez a certain gentz a respoundre al escheqer solom lordeinement, ore sunt ascuns des ditz terres rebaillez a ceux qe les eurent devant contre lordeinement, et qe cestes choses soient redrescez." This clause is important as showing

with this the specific demand of the earls that John Charlton should be expelled the court. We know positively that Charlton was already chamberlain, and that in repairing the omission of the ordinances of October by bringing the chamber within their purview, the earls were perhaps punishing the ingenious author of this particular attempt to evade their provisions. Coupled with Charlton, as marked out for removal from court, was a yeoman of the chamber, Oliver of Bordeaux, who, like Charlton, had been an ancient functionary of the chamber of Edward as prince of Wales. It was perhaps in compliance with the spirit of the second ordinances that on December 29, 1311, a royal mandate directed many keepers of Templar manors to pay in all they had received from the issues of their lands to the exchequer before January 14, 1312.[1] Among these was Compton, who thus received four sets of directions, three of them contradictory ones, within two months.[2]

By this time Gaveston had returned to court, and the king for the moment defied the ordainers. There was no longer a question of the forfeited estates of Langton when the ex-treasurer was released from prison to resume his former office.[3] But after Gaveston's murder a period of half-measures and compromises ensued, in which neither of the above provisions of the second ordinances were executed. Charlton remained chamberlain, and the compromise of "wardrobe manors" was allowed to continue as a substitute for the tabooed chamber manors. A curiously perverse interpretation of another clause of the ordinances made it easy for the barons to accept this position without acknowledgement of defeat. The ordinances had enjoined that the king should "live of his own," and an easy way of securing this end was found by setting apart certain royal estates for the support of

that the ordainers had specially in mind the assigning the Templars' lands to the chamber when they insisted on all "issues" going to the exchequer, and by its explanation of the meaning both of the writs of 4-10 and of Nov. 25. It also shows that the "second ordinances" are not earlier than the end of November. See for this question above, pp. 197-198 and 231-232, and *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 96.

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 153.

[2] Up to Nov. 10 he was to account in the chamber, on Nov. 10 he was transferred to the exchequer, on Nov. 25 to the wardrobe, and again on Dec. 29 back to the exchequer again.

[3] His lands were restored on Jan. 23, 1312; *Foedera*, ii. 154.

the household out of their issues.[1] As, despite the ordinances, the wardrobe and chamber staff still largely controlled the administration, it was soon found both to save trouble and please the court if the issues of such estates were paid directly into the wardrobe instead of reaching it circuitously through the exchequer. The exchequer itself accepted the system. Thus, when Alexander Compton, in accordance with the terms of his penultimate instructions, paid the issues of his lands directly to the keeper of the wardrobe, we find that the exchequer acquitted him of those sums, and so shared responsibility with him.[2] What Compton did, all his colleagues placed in the same position did also. Moreover, other estates that happened in these years to fall to the crown were now treated after the same fashion.[3] Thus in 1312, when Margaret of Clare, the widow of Edmund of Almaine, earl of Cornwall, died, the whole of her lands went to the crown, and the issues of some of her richest manors, including Isleworth, Middlesex, and Glatton, Huntingdonshire, were paid directly into the wardrobe by their keeper Roger Morewode.[4]

Before the end of 1312 direct payment of the issues of Templars' lands to the chamber was resumed. Thus on November 23, 1312, forty marks were paid into the chamber by the keeper of Templars' manors in Leicestershire and Warwickshire.[5] It was natural under these circumstances that Compton should again make payment into the chamber an habitual practice, and be

[1] For instance, a grant from the exchequer, on consideration of the surrender of the manors of Langley Marsh and Wraysbury, Bucks, is subject to the provision that the sums of money *which ought to be provided for the households of the king and queen, according to the ordinance*, be first of all provided and paid; *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 564. The date of the writ is Nov. 16, 1316, and the relations of Robert of Appleby, clerk, to the business shows that the chamber had a lien upon both manors. See later, p. 329, note 2.

[2] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 441 (Mar. 14, 1312). Compare *ib.* p. 501. This laxity of the exchequer is the more curious, since later it raised technical difficulties as to the engrossing of Compton's accounts on the exchequer rolls on the ground of his earlier commission, ordering him to account to the chamber; *Misc. Enr. Exch. Accts.* No. 18, m. 42. A royal mandate under privy seal, dated Jan. 12, 1316, was necessary to secure their admission to the roll, "de ceo qe vous trouez qil ad paye par nos commandmentz." The pedantry of the exchequer was often prodigious.

[3] In *C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 440-442, there are ten exchequer acquittances similar to that of Compton.

[4] *Ib., 1313–17*, p. 3. This was in July 1313.

[5] *E.H.R.* xxx. 665, from *Ancient Correspondence*, xlv. No. 171.

acquitted by writ of chancery for so doing.[1] At last, on April 30, 1314, the king categorically informed the barons of the exchequer that he did not wish Compton to render accounts to that body for his issues, but to account directly with the chamber, and nowhere else.[2] By this time other lands were converted into chamber manors, for instance Glatton, which in 1313 was a wardrobe manor, but was accounted for after July 1314 in the chamber.[3] Thus the wardrobe manors of 1312 became the chamber manors of 1314, and so the system of chamber manors was not only restored but enlarged. Another indication of the spread of chamber influence was that Charlton remained chamberlain, despite the earls, and that his activity became more official and less anonymous. Moreover, we first discern in 1313 the existence of a chamber seal,[4] the secret seal.

Even Bannockburn did not stop the development of the chamber, despite the fact that its clerk Wingfield's personal activity in it was brought to a dramatic close by his capture by the Scots on the field. In the only chronicle which tells us of his imprisonment, Wingfield is described as one of two clerks of Roger of Northburgh, keeper of the privy seal, who were captured in the battle along with their master and the privy seal with him. Now this means either that the two minor prisoners were personal clerks of Northburgh or official clerks of the privy seal. It is very unlikely, however, that the clerk of the chamber should also have been subordinated to the keeper of the privy seal, and we know the names of most of the privy seal clerks of the time, and find that Wingfield and his colleague are not among them. Indeed the whole of the chronicler's statement is confused, and in the form in which it is put is demonstrably false.[5] He

[1] *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 511 (Nov. 24, 1312. This is the order for acquittance of the 40 marks paid the previous day); *ib.* p. 523 (Jan. 21, 1313), and *ib.* p. 565 (Apr. 7, 1313).

[2] *E.H.R.* xxx. 665, from *M.R.*, *K.R.* No. 87, m. 27, *ib.*, *L.T.R.* No. 84, m. 4 d.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 376/15. This account says that the issues of Glatton for July–October 1314 were delivered to Wingfield, though Wingfield was, as we shall see, at this time a prisoner of the Scots, and thought to be dead. The account is many years later, and such a mistake could easily have crept in, as, up to his departure on the Bannockburn campaign, Wingfield would naturally have been receiving these issues.

[4] See later, pp. 325-326, and in a later volume the chapter on the secret seal.

[5] *Cont. Trivet*, in Trivet's *Annales* (ed. Oxford, 1723), p. 16. "De quibus et dominus Rogerus de Northburge, custos domini regis targiae ab eo ibidem

tells us that Northburgh was keeper of the king's "targe," which he imagines to be different from the privy seal. He adds that, after the loss of the targe, the king caused another seal to be made, which he called the privy seal, and which was different from the targe which had thus been lost. We know already that the targe was but a synonym for the privy seal, and it is ridiculous to say that the privy seal was first devised in 1314. Very often, however, there is a basis of truth even in the most muddled statements of chroniclers. It is perhaps permissible to suggest that the clue to the chronicler's confusion lies in the fact that, though he is misinformed as to the names, this is precisely the period at which it is demonstrably true that the king possessed a second personal seal, different from the privy seal. Elsewhere we shall have to show that in 1313 a secret seal which is plainly different from the privy seal first appears. We shall also seek to prove that the secret seal was the seal of the chamber, just as the secret seal of the French king was a chamber seal, and kept by the chamberlain as early as 1312.[1] It is probable, though not certain, that this was the case from the first with the English secret seal. The chamber business was certainly sufficient to warrant its having a seal of its own, and the privy seal, "kept" by a baronial nominee, was no longer so entirely under the control of the court as to make it an adequate warrant for personal royal acts emanating from the king's personal chamber. I venture, therefore, to conjecture that the chronicler's story is a blurred reflection of the true fact that a second small seal now came into existence, and I even suspect that Wingfield, like the later receivers of the chamber, kept the secret seal. This would give the chronicler some reason for connecting him with sealing, despite the fact that he was certainly not a clerk of the privy seal. The immediate result, then, of the rehabilitation of the chamber as an administrative and financing body was the constitution of a chamber seal.

ablatae, una cum dominis Rogero de Wikenfelde et Thoma de Switone, dicti domini Rogeri clericis, pariter detinebatur ibidem: ob quod dominus rex cito postea fieri fecit sigillum, volens illud privatum sigillum appellari, ad differentiam targiae sic, ut premittitur, ablatae." Compare above, pp. 294-295.

[1] See the text quoted in Morel, p. 244. M. Morel adds, "Sous Philippe le Bel et ses trois fils, les lettres patentes scellées du sceau du secret sont presque uniquement les lettres concernant l'Hôtel."

The chamber system, which had weathered the storm of the ordinances, escaped unscathed from the vigorous efforts to enforce these regulations which followed the battle of Bannockburn. We have wondered why the incuriousness of the barons left the chamber out of the first ordinances, and we may wonder still more why, when, after the king's defeat in 1314, the partial purging of the wardrobe and household involved practically no attempt at restricting the activities of the chamber. One cannot but think that a possible solution of the problem is a conscious effort on the part of the only half-defeated crown to compensate itself for the control which the barons were now exercising over the old machinery of domestic administration by setting up, or rather reviving, the chamber machinery in its place. What doubtless began by accident and from convenience was now developed with deliberate intention, and the result was that, when a few years later the next great assault was made on the king's power, it was to be withstood by an organised and effective chamber. There was not only the "privy purse" developed into a third "treasury," fed by the chamber manors and withdrawn from the control of the semi-baronial officers of the exchequer. In these years, too, the chamber became another court chancery, the source of letters and writs, authenticated by a special seal, so that the chamber substantially reproduced the characteristic dual aspects of the king's wardrobe. Now that the privy seal was getting under the control of baronial nominees, and so in the way of becoming another seal of state, the secret seal of the chamber was made the nucleus of a still more private royal chancery, which was still removed from all baronial control.

The reasons for the neglect of the chamber by the ordainers are not, then, far to seek. The administrative chamber was still only in the making, and the unintelligent barons were not likely to understand the danger arising from tendencies as yet only imperfectly developed. They naturally limited their concern to concrete and standing abuses notorious to every one. Moreover, they had no wish to hurt unnecessarily the king's feelings. The special sanctity of the chamber and its peculiarly close relationship to the king's privacy, emphasised a generation earlier by Fleta, made it certain that Edward would bitterly

resent interference with things that concerned him only as a man. However this may be, the negligence of the barons gave Edward a weapon of which he was shrewd enough to avail himself to the uttermost.

We must now trace the detailed growth of the chamber between 1314 and 1318, the years during which the court seemed free to fashion it as it would. In this task it had no further help from the former clerk of the chamber, Roger Wingfield. He was, in fact, thought to have been slain in the battle. His benefices were conferred on others, and others took up his work in the chamber. When he came back safe from Scotland, his reappearance seems to have been resented rather than welcomed. We cannot find that he resumed his work in connection with the chamber.

One feature of the progress between 1314 and 1318 is the increasing importance that seems to be given to the lay element among the chamber officers. I have already spoken of the commanding position of Charlton. It is, however, by no means easy to disentangle the work of the chamber in these years. There only survive very fragmentary accounts[1] of the period, but these show, working side by side with the king's clerks, laymen such as John of Bures, knight; Simon de Swanland, citizen of London; John Cole, and, in particular, the yeomen of the king's chamber, Richard Squire and John Peacock, the elder. Both these latter personages had previously acted with Wingfield, and we now find them discharging the same functions, with small assistance from any clerk. Squire acted between 1314 and 1317 as keeper of certain forfeited lands at a salary of 1*s.* a day.[2] More important still is Peacock, who received in the chamber large sums from the Bardi in 1317 and 1318.[3] Indeed Peacock may be almost regarded as Wingfield's colleague and successor, for in 1315 he was formally acquitted for the moneys

[1] See in particular *Exch. Accts.* 376/15, a very valuable, though fragmentary account of moneys paid into the chamber between 8 and 16 Edward II., which gives us the best picture of the early personnel and functions of the chamber of this period.

[2] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 183. Compare *C.C.R., 1313–18*, pp. 123, 497.

[3] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, pp. 672-3; *ib., 1317–21*, p. 159. Compare *I.R., 11 Edw. II.*, Easter term, m. 6. "Johanni Pecok, seniori, de prestito, nomine illorum denariorum quos recepit in camera domini regis ad opus ipsius domini regis de Doffo de Bardis et sociis suis, etc."—£539. The date is July 1, 1317.

and other things received by him in the chamber up to June 20, 1314.[1] After Wingfield's disappearance, Peacock's acquittances recur with such regularity that they suggest that he held a definite office, the accounts of which he was responsible for at periodic intervals. Thus on April 8, 1318, he was "acquitted for all moneys, jewels, and other things received by him, or committed to his custody in the chamber, as he has answered up to March 12 last."[2] Again he satisfied the king in similar phrase for all money, jewels and goods received by him from March 12, 1318, to January 24, 1319.[3] In none of these cases was the accounting specified as having taken place in the exchequer. It was enough for a chamber officer if he satisfied the king personally. Besides this, we find Peacock constantly receiving moneys in the chamber between July 1314 and January 1319.[4] The particulars of one of his accounts survives, recording the details of a loan of £32 : 14 : 9 advanced by him to the wardrobe on February 11, 1316.[5] It is improbable that Peacock remained in office after January 1319, for on February 12 he received protection on going beyond seas on the king's service.[6] We hear nothing more of him in connection with the chamber.

During the period of Peacock's activity the most prominent chamber clerks were Robert of Appleby and Richard of Lusteshull. Appleby was Wingfield's successor, and was in high favour from the summer of 1314 to the end of 1315, being made subdean of York in February 1314.[7] He constantly received moneys paid to the chamber; he was keeper of Templars' lands and of certain other chamber manors;[8] he was also the clerk assigned to hear diverse accounts touching the king's chamber,

[1] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 257.
[2] *Ib., 1317–21*, p. 128.
[3] *Ib.* p. 310.
[4] *Exch. Accts.* 376/15. Compare *Exch. of Rec. Warrants for Issue*, bundle 1, where a warrant under privy seal of Jan. 16, 1317, shows the king receiving "en nostre chambre par les mains nostre cher vallet, J. Pecok leynez" from the steward of the honour of Eye, 200 marks of the issues of that honour.
[5] *Ib.* 376/24. "Particule de xxxij li. xiiij sol. et ix den. solutis per Johannem Pecok, anno ix°, in garderoba liberatis apud Lincolniam xi° die Feb., anno eodem." The account is in French, and begins "Ceux sont deners prestes sor la garderobe en temps sire Wil. de Melton hors de les coffres de la chambre par comand le roy en deniers contes."
[6] *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 311, cf. *ib.* p. 452. He was not apparently the same as his contemporary, "John son of Robert Peacock of Redburn, the elder."
[7] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, pp. 196 and 222.
[8] *Ib.* p. 214.

in other words, auditor of chamber accounts.[1] His high-handed acts involved him in disgrace, forfeiture, and imprisonment in November 1315.[2]

After this Richard of Lusteshull, another of the martial clerks who fought and suffered at Bannockburn,[3] and already busily engaged in wardrobe and chamber work,[4] definitely stepped into Appleby's place, being employed in seizing his predecessor's forfeited property,[5] and being sent in January 1316 to superintend the chamber manors previously in the fallen clerk's custody.[6] Four years later, he was still employed in similar work, as supervisor of manors and auditor of their accounts to the chamber.[7] One of Lusteshull's own accounts still survives, though, like all the formal chamber

[1] "Clericus assignatus ad diuersos compotos cameram regis tangentes audiendos"; *Exch. Accts.* 376/15, f. 115 (8 Edw. II.); *Pipe, 14 Edw. II.* m. 29. Compare *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 163, in which the keepers of Tickhill are acquitted at the exchequer, "as they have rendered their account in the chamber before R. of Appleby," March 12, 1315.
[2] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 564. Compare *Exch. Accts.* 376/7, f. 14 d, which records the expenses of two sergeants-at-arms taking the body of Robert Appleby from Clipstone, Notts., to the Tower and delivering it to the constable, and f. 17 d, where certain valets of the chamber, one named Walter of Appleby, are sent to London "pro bonis et catallis Roberti de Appleby, clerici, per preceptum eiusdem regis in carcere detenti, ibidem inuentis arrestandis."
[3] *Wardrobe debentures*, bundle 2. "Debentur in garderoba regis Ricardo de Lusteshull pro restauro equorum suorum predictorum amissorum in seruicio ipsius regis apud Striuelyn, xxiv° die Junii, anno vii°, per compotum factum apud Westmonasterium, tercio die Oct. anno ix°, xiij s. iiij d." Lusteshull then lost several horses at Bannockburn, and got compensation after over two years' delay.
[4] Before July 12, 1315, he was "clericus assignatus per dominum regem ad faciendum expensas domini regis"; *Exch. Accts.* 376/7, f. 16.
[5] *Ib.* f. 15 d, expenses to Lusteshull and another clerk for 18 days, beginning Nov. 18, 1315, when sent by king from Clipstone to York "pro bonis et catallis domini Roberti de Appleby ibidem inuentis arrestandis et ad regem ducendis." Compare *ib.* f. 18 d for a similar mission jointly with Robert Wodehouse.
[6] *Ib.* f. 16. "Expense Ricardi extra curiam. . . . Eidem domino Ricardo misso . . . ad instaurum maneriorum ad cameram domini regis spectancium, nuper in custodia domini Roberti de Appleby existencium, superuidendum." He left court on Jan. 5, 1316, with a clerk and two esquires, and was engaged on his mission 27 days.
[7] "Clericus assignatus per dominum regem ad superuidenda maneria ipsius regis ad cameram suam spectancia et ad compota balliuorum dictorum maneriorum audienda"; *MS. Ad.* 17,362, m. 10 d. He was "extra curiam" 157 days, receiving 4*s.* a day expenses. Madox, i. 265, quotes a roll, 9 Edw. II., showing that Lusteshull was "clericus camere regis" and successor to Wingfield.

accounts of this period, it was only drawn up after 1330.[1] We learn from it that on December 10, 1315, the king constituted him by writ of privy seal supervisor and keeper of lands reserved to the chamber, and that he held that office up to May 6, 1321, when he was succeeded by Humphrey of Walden. Yet the sum of Lusteshull's receipts for these five and a half years only amounts to £345 : 6 : 8. Very numerous chamber manors contributed towards them, but the sums paid in were so small, and at such long intervals, that it is difficult to believe that Lusteshull's office was as general in scope as his title seems to suggest.[2]

The study of this account strengthens, however, the impression, strongly conveyed by the most coherent account surviving of the period,[3] that there was no single important officer of the *camera*, but that various clerks and laymen worked together in discharging very similar functions, both as keepers of lands and receivers. We must be content, therefore, with noting the men employed during these years, and recognise that we have failed to establish a succession of receivers, and that we cannot define the precise relations of these various officers to each other. We cannot even say for certain whether Squire and Peacock or Appleby and Lusteshull were Wingfield's true successors. On the whole, however, it seems more likely that Peacock was the "receiver" in the later sense, and that Appleby and Lusteshull held posts that anticipate the later stewards of the chamber. Anyhow Walden, Lusteshull's successor, is definitely described as chief steward, though unluckily he is so called a little before he was put into Lusteshull's place.[4] It is clear, however, that the accounting officers in succession to Wingfield were Appleby and Lusteshull in turn. Probably our difficulties are much increased by the fact that the chamber accounts, drawn up after 1330, are, despite their apparent precision, by no means to be implicitly

[1] *Chancellor's Roll, 4 Edw. III.* m. 38 d.

[2] The account of Lusteshull professes to be of both receipts and payments, but as a matter of fact no expenses are given in the enrolment on the chancellor's roll.*

[3] I refer to the above-mentioned *Exch. Accts.* 376/15.

[4] *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 534. The appointment of Jan. 1, 1321, of a surveyor of royal manors enjoined on him "to render obedience to Humphrey de Waleden, the chief steward." Walden, a layman and knight, became baron of the exchequer on June 18, 1324; *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 429. He was not the same as his namesake, made baron in 1306. See *E.H.R.* xxxi. 463.

trusted.[1] We must not forget that one of them makes Wingfield receive money in the chamber when we know that he was in a Scotch prison.

The steady development of the cameral system between 1312 and 1318 is one of the most remarkable features of the administrative history of this reign. While other household departments were strongly influenced by the political currents of the time, the chamber, after the collapse of the slight effort to restrict its activity in 1311, goes on much the same, whether barons or king had the upper hand. Particularly remarkable is the fact that Bannockburn, which made an epoch in the history of the wardrobe, had no discernible effect on the growth of the chamber. It is more difficult to account for the lack of opposition to this further growth than it is for the indifference to the chamber shown earlier by the ordainers. But it is not impossible that hopes were entertained that the chamber might afford the king a more efficient and acceptable household following than his hopeless old *familia*. Thus a vague passage in the so-called "monk of Malmesbury," the most intelligent and open-minded of contemporary chroniclers, may suggest that he regarded a reformed *camera* as the best remedy for a bad *curia*.[2] However that may be, there is no doubt that the more capable courtiers and officials saw it to their interest to join hands with Pembroke and his followers after the last and worst of Lancaster's failures as king's chief councillor. This brought about the changes of 1318, which once more made it possible to aim at respectable administration along with due regard to the royal dignity.

The result was that the chamber comes more to the fore in the proceedings of the York parliament of 1318 than ever it had

[1] This is also the case with the elaborate special accounts of forfeited lands, Langton's, the Templars', and the Contrariants' in *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* Nos. 16-20.

[2] Malmesbury, p. 223. "Et si quaeratur cujus auctoritate fiant talia, dici potest quod tota iniquitas originaliter exiit a curia. . . . Iccirco nil magis utile, magis necessarium foret in curia quam ut *rex tales collaterales habeat in camera*, qui pro loco et tempore regem excessibus suppliciter corriperent, et impiorum satellitarum cum viderint facta suggererent." This was written in reference to the events immediately succeeding the Lincoln parliament of 1316. Compare Lancaster's reason for refusing to attend the York parliament of Jan. 1320. "Non enim decebat parliamentum habere *in cameris*, ut dixit"; *ib.* p. 250.

done since the twelfth century. For the first time the barons definitely included the king's chamberlain among the officers whose appointment and removal fell within the cognisance of the barons in parliament. Even earlier John Charlton, long regarded as responsible for many of the worst misdeeds of the court, had been superseded as chamberlain by the younger Hugh Despenser, then working heart and soul for the union of the Pembrokians and the moderate courtiers. The date of the change cannot be precisely determined, but it was previous to the York parliament.[1] When that assembly passed in review the ministers of the crown, rejecting some as insufficient and retaining others as adequate, on October 20, 1318, it advised and requested the king that Sir Hugh Despenser, the younger, should remain his chamberlain.[2] The establishment in this office of a vigorous personality, as full of ideas as of ambition, and rapidly winning a place in the royal favour, second only to that once enjoyed by Gaveston, gave a still further impetus to the development of the chamber, which lasted as long as the lives of the new chamberlain and his master.

The firstfruits of the new official's influence were seen in the York household ordinance of December 6, 1318. In drafting it the king's chamberlain was associated with the steward of the household and the treasurer and controller of the wardrobe, and it can hardly be an accident that the first household ordinance, which treats the chamber and chamberlain as integral parts of the household, was this one for which a chamberlain was largely responsible. Much of the development of the chamber between 1279 and 1318 is explained by the silence of the ordinance of Westminster on the points dealt with fully in the ordinance of York. The chamber was no longer an excrescence, an eccentric offshoot of the household; it was intimately bound up with it in all sorts of ways.

A large number of the chamber officers, from the chamberlain down to the yeomen, received their wages in the wardrobe. In 1279 all the officers of the chamber are described as *camerarii*,

[1] Charlton, chamberlain at the time of the ordinances, drew wages for that office for the year July 1312–July 1313; *MS. Cotton, Nero*, C. VIII. ff. 91 d, 93. He was acting so late as April 19, 1318; *C.P.R., 1318–1324*, p. 133.

[2] Cole, p. 4; see *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 126.

despite the fact that there was already a special *camerarius regis* who ruled over the others.[1] In 1318 the title of chamberlain is, so far as concerns the household, appropriated to the acting head of the chamber, the king's chamberlain. This personage now took his place among the greater household officials. He was mentioned immediately after the steward and the treasurer, its recognised official chiefs.[2] If slightly lower in precedence, he was in emolument and allowances substantially on the same level as the steward. If he were a banneret—and, like Despenser, he generally had attained that rank—the king's chamberlain had, like the steward, in attendance on him a knight and three esquires, "eating in the hall"; he only differed from the steward in having no "clerk for pleas" under him, but this was because he had no judicial functions, as the steward had. But the allowances "for his chamber" were similar to those of his colleague, save that he had only half the amount of wine. Moreover, he received his wine and bread, candles and torches, litter and firewood from the "usher of the chamber," and not from the "usher of the hall," who supplied the steward and the wardrobe officers. This points to the great dividing line between the officers belonging to the hall and those belonging to the chamber which runs all through the ordinance.[3] But the hall had a less intimate relation with the king than the chamber, as is seen by the steward having "dinners and suppers when he wishes for them," while the chamberlain seems to have had, as a matter of course, "dinners and suppers from your lordship the king," that is a normal position at the royal table in the chamber. Whether banneret or simple knight, chamberlain and steward had a similar "fee" of twenty marks, and the banneret chamberlain's allowance for robes was sixteen marks, which was on the same scale as that of the treasurer. He was always a member of the king's council.[4]

The chamber staff was now clearly defined and graded. There was, indeed, no exhaustive enumeration of these, for the

[1] Compare the ordinance of 1279 with Fleta, p. 71. But already in 1135 the "magister camerarius" was contrasted with the ordinary "camerarii"; *R.B.E.* pp. 811-12.

[2] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 271.

[3] For this see above, Vols. I. p. 139, and II. pp. 247-248 and 315, note 4. The distinction of "aula" and "camera" was already clear under Henry II.

[4] *Ib.* p. 275, "les euesqes, seneschal, tresorer, chambirleyne et autrez du counseil."

ordinance was not written for the information of historians, but to put on record what was novel or doubtful. On the whole, we may well be thankful to the ordinance for telling us so much as it does, rather than complain of the incompleteness of its picture. It is curious that the chamber should now in a sense have been brought under the wardrobe by its chief, and a certain number of his subordinates, receiving their wages and allowances from that body.

Officers of the chamber, whose status was assured and clear, were often not mentioned in the ordinance of York. Thus it is that it took no cognisance of knights of the chamber, though knights of the chamber we know there were. But they had the same status as any other knight of the household, and their position and emoluments were, we imagine, perfectly well known. Perhaps, too, if an esquire became a knight, his wages were not increased. We hear, however, of the esquires and valets of the chamber, and we know from the instance of the recent chamberlain, John Charlton, that a man might go through all these stages of valet, esquire, and knight, and finally become chamberlain himself.[1] Some of the esquires had definite duties and offices, such as the esquire surveyor and keeper of the viands for the royal mouth, the esquire who carved before the king, and the esquire who served him with his cup.[2] Such, too, were also the two squire ushers, one of these latter, with a valet under him, being sergeant purveyor for food and litter for the office of the chamber. These esquires had $7\frac{1}{2}d.$ a day as wages, food, and quarters in the household, and two robes a year, or a robes' allowance of 40s. Besides the esquires, there were eight valets, or yeomen, of the chamber to make the beds, hold the torches, tend the fires, and do other things by the chamberlain's command.[3] The valets had no wages, but victuals and lodging,

[1] For instance, besides Charlton, we have in Nov. 1322 Sir Giles Beauchamp, "chiualier de la chambre le roy"; *E.H.R.* xxx. 677. See also note 6, p. 336, below. Edmund Darel, "quidam miles de camera regis," was suspected of complicity in the plot of the Scots to capture queen Isabella at York after the rout of Myton, and was arrested and sent to London; *Ann. Paul.* p. 288. But Edward II.'s *familiares* were as a rule much more trustworthy than Lancaster's.

[2] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 280.

[3] *Ib.* p. 281. Compare *Fleta*, p. 70, "Debet enim camerarius decenter disponere pro lecto regis, et ut camere tapetis et banqueriis ornentur, et quod ignes sufficienter fiant in caminis."

one robe a year, or alternatively 13*s.* 4*d.* in cash, and a yearly allowance of 6*s.* 8*d.* for shoes.

There does not seem to have been any social difference between the esquires and valets. The "king's valet" was a person of importance, and men of good family often held the office. We have seen in Charlton's case how valets were often promoted. Even when they were not of good family, the instance of Geoffrey Chaucer, who was successively valet and esquire of Edward III.'s chamber, shows that a generation later a career in the chamber was not denied to the successful men of the middle class. For these valets, with their menial duties, were those whom an earlier generation had expressly called chamberlains. They were in constant contact with the king's majesty. They "ate in the chamber in the king's presence," save when they were sent "out of court by the king's command on the king's business." They shared, then, in the special sanctity of the chamber above the other offices of the household. They claimed to be of higher estate than the other ministers of the crown, because they were in closer personal relations with the king. Directly subject to the chamberlain in person, they were for most purposes exempt from the ordinary jurisdiction of steward and treasurer. They were only under the wardrobe to the extent that servants of the chamber, like servants of the hall, were compelled to appear each night at the wardrobe to render their account for the day.[1] They boasted that no officer of the hall or other "foreign" officer of the household dared interfere in matters relating to the king's chamber.[2] The chamber was to the hall as was the household to the inferior world dwelling outside the "verge" of the court. No wonder, then, that the service of the chamber was much coveted, and that many functionaries of the chamber were enabled to raise their family to exalted rank in its service. Such confidential servants were sure to be employed in every possible way. They looked after the king's estates; they were the keepers of the lands

[1] *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 306.

[2] *Fleta*, p. 79, "Et quia in hospicio pro regula habetur quod quanto propinquior fit quis regi, tanto dignior, ideo habent se camerarii tanquam ceteris ministris excelsiores, et ideo nullus minister aule vel alius forinsecus in camera regis quicquam se intromittat." This sacrosanctity could hardly survive the ordinance of 1318.

of royal wards; they were sent out on confidential missions; they owed to royal favour marriages with rich heiresses.

The equipment of the chamber was completed by a crowd of lesser functionaries, whose functions and emoluments seem to be described with a precision increasing with the insignificance of their office. As the fundamental line of division all through the household was that of the hall and the chamber; there are "ewerers" of the chamber and "ewerers" of the hall; and cooks for the "king's mouth," that is for the chamber; and cooks for the "mesnee," that is for the ordinary following of the household that ate in the hall.[1] Sometimes the same menials served both in the hall and chamber, as when a "sergeant naper" and a laundryman worked alike for chamber and hall.[2] The two trumpeters and two minstrels "who made their minstrelsey before the king whenever it was his pleasure," ate in chamber or hall as they were commanded.[3] A similar separation was kept up on the march, when different "herbergers" provided lodgings for the esquires, ushers and valets of the chamber, and when sixteen sumpter-horses, each with his sumpter-man, provided for the needs of the chamber as against the eighteen that conveyed from place to place the divers offices of the household.[4] In other cases groups of officers were divided between the two services. Thus four of the thirty sergeants-at-arms, the "household cavalry" of those days, were specially set apart to act under the orders of the usher of the chamber, and to sleep as near the hutch as possible[5] to afford protection to the chamber at nights.

The list is not exhaustive. We know how by 1318 the chamber had its staff of clerks, auditors, receivers, surveyors and so on, as much as the wardrobe. It is remarkable that the ordinance has no word to say of any of these, since they were the soul of the new chamber developments which had already made considerable progress. Doubtless lay stewards or auditors could also be esquires, knights, or valets of the chamber.[6] But

[1] The statute of St. Albans (see above, pp. 50-51) had deprived large sections of the household of the right of eating in hall. The unknown ordinance of Woodstock (*Pl. of Edw. II.* p. 307) seems to have made this provision less severe.
[2] *Ib.* p. 287 [3] *Ib.* pp. 303-4. [4] *Ib.* p. 301. [5] *Ib* p. 282.
[6] For instance, in 1322–3 Sir John Lesturmy or Sturmy was "seneschal de la chambre le roi," being himself a knight of the chamber; *E.H.R.* xxx. 670-676. In 1309 he was valet of the king's household; Conway Davies, p 146 He was in 1322 a member of the king's council; *ib* p 585.

the ordinance is even more restrained in speaking of the work of the chamber than it is as regards the clerical staff. Here the explanation is similar to that already suggested to account for the omission of the broader and more political functions of the wardrobe in all these household ordinances. Just as the supervision of the daily work of the household and the meticulous rendering of accounts was still the primary work of the wardrobe, so the ministration to the king's comfort, the care of his bedchambers, his meals, his furniture, and his fuel was still looked upon as the most obvious work of his chamber. The broader functions were, so to say, accidental and adventitious. Hence this curious silence as to all that gives their historical value to chamber and wardrobe alike.

Luckily we are now on the verge of other and more general sources of information. The development of the chamber, which took such strides in 1318, went on even more rapidly in the following years. We have partial but detailed chamber accounts from 1320; we have from 1322 much more complete and minute chamber accounts. Accordingly, from the time of the final repeal of the ordinances in 1322 up to the fall of Edward II., the whole history of the chamber is illuminated by these accounts in a way that enables us to study its operations better than at any period earlier or later. They show us that chamber administration and finance, already highly developed to equip the court party for its struggle with the baronage, was a chief instrument by which the restored chamberlain, the younger Despenser, governed England from 1322 to 1326 on behalf of Edward II.

These documents show a great development of the chamber activities and of the chamber staff. However, detailed records only begin in October 1322, and three months before that date a considerable limit had been imposed on the expansion of a chamber. In the first flush of the royalist victory of 1322 even greater destinies seem to have been reserved for it than those which it secured. We may best trace these curious vacillations of its range of activity by turning once more to the history of the chamber manors.

We have seen how by 1314 a large, though limited, chamber estate had been withdrawn from exchequer control and put under

the special direction of the "king in his chamber." Between 1314 and 1321 the chamber manors went on as before, without much perceptible increase or decrease in their numbers. Theoretically, the Templars' lands had ceased to be under cameral control, for on November 28, 1313, royal mandates were issued to sixty-one keepers of Templars' manors, directing them to hand over their charges to the knights of the hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in accordance with the provisions of the grant of Clement V.[1] As a matter of fact, few of these manors were at once surrendered to the Hospital, and it required a long and strenuous struggle before the knights of St. John secured any appreciable portion of them.[2] They soon found that the most practical way to obtain some share of them was to bribe the king, and the lords to whom he had granted many manors, by making "free-will" surrenders of large proportions of the spoil. It resulted that some considerable sections of Templars' lands became permanently part of the royal domain. Thus the theoretical restitution of the Templars' lands had little immediate effect in restricting the system of cameral manors. If some were lost, other lands escheated to the crown, and were annexed to the chamber by way of compensation. It was about 1320 that Burstwick in Holderness, which was soon to become the typical chamber manor, was subjected to chamber rule.[3]

The troubles of 1321–2 gave in the forfeited lands of the vanquished "contrariants" a new and abundant source for increasing the number of chamber manors. From 1321 onwards it was the systematic policy of the crown to assign rebels' estates to chamber administration. Thus, after the fall of Leeds Castle in 1321, the lands and goods of Badlesmere and its defenders were seized by the crown and handed over to keepers, who were instructed to pay their issues into the chamber.[4] Again, in

[1] *Foedera*, ii. 236-7.

[2] This is worked out by Miss Sandys in her *Templars in England*. The fullest published accounts are those of Mr. C. Perkins in *A.H.R.* xv. 252-63 (1910). Reference can also be made with profit to the same writer's "Trial of Knights Templars in England," in *E.H.R.* xxiv. 432-7, and "The Knights Templars in the British Islands," in *ib.* xxv. 209-230.

[3] See later, p. 350.

[4] *C.F.R.* iii. p. 77. This was on Nov. 4, 1321. Palgrave's *Calendars and Inventories of the Exchequer*, iii. 136-145, show how the Badlesmere chattels and valuables were administered by the chamber clerks, Langley and Fleet. See also *C.C.R., 1318–23*, p. 659.

January 1322, the issues of the Isle of Axholme, forfeited by John Mowbray's presumptuous acceptance of Gower, despite the desires of Despenser, were assigned to the chamber, as a firstfruits of the ruin of the marcher coalition and the return of the Despensers.[1] A month later, more general directions were issued to the keepers of the castles, lands and movables of ninety-three specified contrariants to pay the issues from these into the chamber.[2] All the sheriffs were instructed to raise all the money they could from the lands, goods and chattels of the contrariants, and to pay the same into the chamber.[3] After the crowning victory of Boroughbridge, the same policy was still further extended. Accordingly, mandates were issued for the seizure of "all castles, lands, tenements, goods, and chattels of all the contrariants who had taken up arms against the crown." Following closely on the precedent of seizure of the Templars' lands, some of these mandates were issued to the sheriffs, but from the beginning special receivers were appointed to administer parts of the confiscated property, and, as time went on, the special receiver became usual and the sheriff exceptional. Again, imitating the earlier precedent, it was also the general, but not the universal, rule that the administrators of the contrariants' lands and chattels should account for their issues to the king's chamber and not to the exchequer. Such orders became most numerous towards the latter part of March 1322. After this, fresh creations of chamber lands became exceptional. After September they seldom took place, save in the case of what we shall soon find to be quasi-permanent chamber manors, definitely absorbed into the royal domain.[4]

[1] *C.P.R., 1321–24*, p. 47 (Jan. 10, 1322). The Templar manor of Faxfleet, "granted" by the king to Mowbray, thus reverted to the crown, and became a chamber manor.

[2] *C.C.R., 1318–23*, pp. 517-518 (Feb. 12, 1322).

[3] *Ib.* p. 423 (Feb. 22, 1322).

[4] A study of the exchequer enrolments of the accounts of contrariants' lands, all drawn up, be it remembered, in their present form in the reign of Edward III., shows that the more numerous writs range from Jan. 4 to March 24. After that there are further writs, dated May 21, July 3, Sept. 13, 1322, and March 4, 1326. Most later mandates for the administration of contrariants' lands, ranging from Nov. 8, 1322, to April 16, 1324, order accountability to the exchequer; *Misc. Enr. Accts. Exch.* No. 16, *passim*. The surviving enrolments were based, I imagine, on the work of the special clerk, appointed by the Cowick ordinance of June 1323 to "keep the remembrances" concerning

Despite some limitations, it is clear that a very large proportion of the forfeitures had been put into the hands of officers accountable to the chamber by the early summer of 1322. Besides these, the chamber also controlled the former chamber manors and the Templars' lands which the crown had not yet disgorged to the Hospital. The addition to these of the enormous forfeitures, by which nearly all the greater baronial houses paid the penalty of unsuccessful rebellion, gave the chamber jurisdiction over a vast estate. Included in it were the five earldoms of Thomas of Lancaster. After these came the lands of magnates such as the two Mortimers,* Mowbray, Badlesmere, Gifford, Berkeley, Amory, Clifford, Audley, and many others. Scores of lesser contrariants swelled the roll of forfeitures. It looked as if the king had at last a real chance of living, royally and amply, "of his own." The bringing the forfeitures under chamber jurisdiction suggests that the crown meant to keep those estates tightly under its control. Not only vast territories, but numerous franchises and castles, fell to the king, and increased his political and military resources as well as his wealth. Had the plan been thoroughly and permanently executed, future English kings might well have been rich and unrestrained autocrats, able to call upon the loyalty of their own demesne tenants to help them in putting down both baronial privilege and popular control.

Mediaeval history is strewn with the wrecks of great plans imperfectly realised, and the glorified chamber system was shattered by the first storms of the summer of 1322. Early in July, a few writs of privy seal directed receivers of certain contrariant estates to transfer their accounts from the chamber to the exchequer. This prepared the way for the wholesale orders, issued under the great seal from Thirsk on July 21, and under the exchequer seal from York on July 25, which practically undid the work of the earlier part of the year. The writs recite that various ministers and receivers of lands had formerly accounted in the chamber, but that the king's wish was that

contrariants' lands and castles, after that the policy of exchequer control had been permanently accepted; *R.B.E.* iii. 904. In their existing form the rolls are magnificent specimens of methodical book-keeping. See also *C.F.R.* iii. 137, 139, 140, 142-3. For the special clerk, *see* William Coshall in *I.R.* 201 (March 20).

henceforward they should render accounts to the exchequer.[1] The reason given was in all cases substantially the same.* It was necessary that the king should have immediately at his disposal a large sum of money to defray the expenses of his household, and to pay the stipends, wages and equipment of the knights, men-at-arms, and foot-soldiers for the Scottish campaign which, it was proposed, should be undertaken after the dissolution of parliament.[2] For that reason all sums of money in the hands of receivers and ministers were to be sent to the exchequer at York by the morrow of Michaelmas, whither the officers were to fare to submit their accounts to the auditors appointed for the purpose. These auditors seem to have been the special auditors of the chamber, for it was clearly something other than the ordinary exchequer audit, and I can find no record of auditors chosen *ad hoc* at this period.[3] This may suggest a possibility that the

[1] The exchequer writs are conveniently collected in *M.R., L.T.R. 15 Edw. II.* "breuia retornabilia," mm. 90-92. They were directed to the various special receivers, to all sheriffs, and to former sheriffs whose accounts were not completed. There are 24 such writs to sheriffs and ex-sheriffs, and more than 100 to receivers, bailiffs and other accountants. The chancery writs are in *C.F.R.* iii. 147-152.

[2] The words of the writ to William of Otterhampton, receiver of Lancaster's castles of Tutbury, Donington, and Melbourne, Derbyshire, may be quoted, *M.R. u.s.* f. 90 d, "quia necessitas sit ad presens quod pecuniam habeamus in promptu non modicam ad expensa hospicii nostri et ad stipendia et vadia quibusdam militibus et aliis hominibus ad arma, nec non aliis tam equitibus quam peditibus in progressu nostro contra inimicos nostros de Scocia."

[3] The auditors of chamber accounts delivered some of their accounts into the exchequer at the time of the final making up of the rolls under Edward III.; for instance, *Misc. Enr. Exch. Accts.* No. 16, m. 43 d. Compare the following mandate on *M.R., L.T.R. 15 Edw. II.*, "baronibus per regem," m. 63: "Rex thesaurario et baronibus suis de scaccario salutem. Cum mandauimus custodibus terrarum, etc. . . . inimicorum nostrorum et aliorum . . . in manu nostra existencium, quod ipsi de exitibus aliquarum terrarum . . . de quibus hactenus nobis responsum fuit in cameram nostram quod ex nunc nobis responderi faciant ad scaccarium nostrum, et receptoribus exituum terrarum . . . illarum . . . et auditoribus compotorum baliuorum . . . et aliorum receptorum exituum eorundem, nec non et dictis compotis audiendis, aliqua faciant que pro nostro commodo videntur facienda, et quod vobis distincte et aperte certificent, prout in transcriptis breuium nostrorum, dictis custodibus, receptoribus, et auditoribus inde directorum, que quidem transcripta vobis mittimus presentibus inclusa, potestis videre plenius contineri. Vobis mandamus quod, inspectis transcriptis predictis, certificaciones quas predicti custodes, receptores et auditores vobis fecerunt de premissis, recipiatis, et excusationes inde vlterius faciatis prout pro commodo nostro fore videritis faciendum. Teste me ipso, apud Eboracum, xxiiij° die Julii, anno nostro xvj°. Memorandum quod transcripta, et alia de quibus fit mentio in isto breui, consuuntur eidem breui et remanent in custodia alterius rememoratoris."

payments to the exchequer were meant to be for this occasion only, on account of the Scottish war. But with the failure of the Scots expedition, and doubtless for many other reasons, the allocation became permanent.

An interesting writ of privy seal, directed to treasurer Stapeldon from Thirsk, on that same July 25, shows that the deviation of the chamber lands to the exchequer was an act of deliberate policy on the king's part, and was ultimately meant to extend to all the contrariants' lands.[1] It may be significant that the authorisation of the general policy was only sealed at Thirsk the same day that the exchequer writs, ordering the change, were issued from York, twenty-three miles away. That the chancery shared, or anticipated, the exchequer policy is shown from the chancery writs to the same effect on July 21, to which the exchequer writs were subsequent. Apparently the treasurer and chancellor were more eager for the change than the king, for when the exchequer writs were prepared and directed, so far as I can see, to all the keepers of contrariant manors, the king had only authorised the partial adoption of the policy mentioned in his writ of July 25.[2] This is natural enough, but it is not the only instance of grave difference of opinion between Edward and Stapeldon.[3] But the voluntary renunciation of a thoroughgoing policy of chamber extension, following so soon after Stapeldon had entered upon his memorable second treasurership, seems more than a coincidence. It might almost be suggested that the autocratic chamber, contemplated at the moment of the first flush of victory, could not continue in the atmosphere of

[1] *M.R., L.T.R. 15 Edw. II.*, "Thesaurario per regem. Edward par la grace de Dieu, etc., al honurable piere en Dieu W., per la meisme grace esveque Dexcestre, nostre tresorer, salutz. Nous vous feissoms sauer qe nostre entencion est qe les issues de totes les terres et tenemens des forfaitz, auxi bien de ceux qe sount lesses come dautres, *veignent entierement a nostre escheqier desore.* Donee souz nostre priue seal a Thresk, le xxv^me^ jour de Juyl, lan de nostre regne xvj^me^. Et memorandum quod breue predictum liberatur in cancellaria, xxvij^o^ die Julii, eodem anno, et remanet ibidem."

[2] See above, pp. 340-341, note 3. There are earlier instances of exchequer orders to account there, for instance, July 21 (*Misc. Enr. Accts.* No. 16, m. 29) and July 24 (*ib.* mm. 17, 43). There were some cases in which the order was not carried out till much later, for instance, Nov. 8, 1322 (m. 24), July 4, 1323 (mm. 16, 19 d), Oct. 10, 1323 (m. 19 d), and April 16, 1324 (m. 28).

[3] See for a glaring case my note on "The Westminster Chronicle attributed to Robert of Reading," in *E.H.R.* xxxi. 462, where in 1324 Edward speaks of the disobedience and "lacheste" of Stapeldon.

conservative reformation that now prevailed at court. A reformed and effective exchequer, sufficiently in touch with national needs, yet obedient to a king that governed as well as reigned, might well have been Stapeldon's alternative to the expansion of the chamber. And the court could acquiesce in this, because the removal of the exchequer from direct parliamentary control lessened the need for an independent chamber. The large addition to exchequer business caused at first grave inconvenience to its officers in the administration of the contrariants' lands, but in the Cowick exchequer ordinance of June 1323 a "sufficient clerk," sworn to keep all "remembrances" touching these lands and castles,[1] was added to the exchequer staff to supplement the remembrancers. Thus the first exchequer reforms contributed to make the limitation of the chamber permanent.

Despite the renunciation of July 1322, the chamber remained a formidable instrument of prerogative. It was immediately after this that the survival of continuous chamber accounts allows us to study in detail its administrative activity during the last years of Edward II.'s reign. These documents show a great increase in the chamber staff, beyond that revealed in the ordinance of 1318. There was a subordinate throng of porters, mariners, and servants of chamber manors. There was also a largely increased and nicely graded clerical staff, where a single chamber clerk had been a comparative novelty. Turning to the chief officers of the chamber, we may now distinguish three chief types among them. Let us now deal with these in succession.

The clerical heads of the chamber were still the receiver or the receivers. Disregarding the lay receiver, Peacock, the first person definitely called receiver, after the retirement of Wingfield, is master James of Spain. He was a veteran clerk of the king, a nephew of queen Eleanor of Castile, and had held during most of his time of office in the chamber one of the chamberlainships of the exchequer.[2] In the valuable fragment of chamber

[1] *R.B.E.* iii. 904.

[2] *C. Pap. R. Let.* i. 612, "nephew of the late queen Eleanor." He was farming royal manors as early as 1291; *C.C.R., 1313-18*, p. 412. He was made chamberlain of the exchequer of receipt on Jan. 30, 1317; *C.P.R., 1313-17*, p. 614. John of Langton, his successor, was appointed on April 6, 1323 (*ib.*,

accounts, 8 to 16 Edward II., to which we have so often referred, James of Spain is on two occasions styled *receptor denariorum prouenientium de exitibus terrarum respondentium ad cameram regis*.[1] Both these entries refer to the sixteenth year of Edward II., and under entries for earlier periods the same accounts simply describe him as king's clerk. There is extant in the pipe roll an account tendered by this same master James, ranging from November 8, 1320, to May 24, 1323.[2] Unluckily, however, these accounts never call James receiver, and it is very clear from their contents that, if he were receiver at all, he was only a partial receiver, accounting only for issues of lands reserved to the chamber and probably not for all of these.[3] His account, too, is for receipts only, and gives no information as to disbursements. Moreover, the period of his account overlaps with that of William of Langley, clerk, with whom the definite and continued series of receivers begins. Langley's account, which is on a much larger scale than that of James of Spain, also survives; but even in it he is not specifically called receiver, though his account is an account not only of receipts but also of expenses.[4] In strictly contemporary documents, Langley, when called by any title at all, is generally described as clerk of the king's chamber.[5] In 1328, however, he is spoken of as receiver of issues in the

1321–4, p. 269). Dr. Newton points out a later instance of a similar combination in the case of John Heron, knight, treasurer of the chamber, 1492–1509, and also chamberlain of the exchequer; "The King's Chamber under the Early Tudors," in *E.H.R.* xxxii. 355-6 (1917).

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 376/15.

[2] *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* No. 171, m. 42 d, "Compotus magistri Jacobi de Ispannia . . . tam de exitibus terrarum et maneriorum ad cameram ipsius regis spectantium quam de denariis aliunde receptis."

[3] The particulars of James's account are for 14 Edw. II. £602; for 15 Edw. II., £459 : 9 : 6; for 16 Edw. II., fresh receipts, £168 : 13 : 4. This sum, along with £159 : 9 : 6, the balance for 15 Edw. II., James delivered almost entirely to William of Langley. Piers de Pulford, clerk of the chamber about this time, also accounted in presence of the controller Holden; *Exch. Accts.* 379/17. It would be rash to call him a receiver. He was perhaps a keeper of the king's ships; *ib.* 380/4, p. 38.

[4] *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* m. 41. It is endorsed "compotus Willelmi de Langeleye, clerici, de receptis et expensis suis in camera regis," and we are informed that for the time of the account "idem Willelmus fuit deputatus per regem Edwardum, patrem regis nunc, ad diuersas summas denariorum et jocalia recipienda in camera ipsius regis, et diuersas expensas et liberaciones faciendas per preceptum ipsius regis oretenus, ut dicit, et per testimonium diuersorum contrarotulatorum subscriptorum." The "rex nunc" is of course Edward III.

[5] For example, *C.P.R., 1324–7*, p. 4; *Exch. Accts.* 379/14; and *ib.* 381/1.

chamber.[1] Langley's account extends from October 4, 1322, to October 31, 1326. His activity, therefore, covers the whole period from the triumph of the Despensers over the Ordainers to the fall of Edward II.

Langley's accounts show that the chamber had by his time become an orderly and organised institution. One proof of this is the circumstance that his accounts were from time to time controlled by a controller of the chamber, just as the wardrobe accounts were similarly checked by the controller of the wardrobe. Like their namesakes in the wardrobe, the controllers of the chamber drew up a duplicate account as the best way of fulfilling this object. We are fortunate in still possessing controllers' accounts for nearly the whole of Langley's receivership. They are written in French, and form a useful supplement to Langley's accounts, as enrolled in Latin.[2] From them we learn that the following controllers of the chamber held office in Langley's time. Thomas of Ousefleet acted from October 4, 1322, to March 5, 1323. William of Colby came after him, and served from March 6, 1323, to April 15, 1324. He was succeeded first by John of Thingden, from April 15, 1324, to May 23, 1325, and then by Robert of Holden, from May 24, 1325, to October 31, 1326. Of these four controllers we may remark that all of them were king's clerks. Ousefleet was actively engaged in chamber business before his controllership, his name occurring in chamber accounts as far back as the year 1319–20.[3] Five months after

[1] *C.P.R., 1327–30*, p. 241.

[2] Ousefleet's controller's book is in *Exch. Accts.* 379/7. Colby's book of issues in *ib.* 379/17, and of receipts in *ib.* 379/11, but both only for the period July 8, 1323–April 15, 1324. Thingden's book is in *ib.* 380/4. Mr. J. Conway Davies has printed large portions of Ousefleet's controller's book in *E.H.R.* xxx. 662-680 as "The First Journal of Edward II.'s Chamber." The earlier part is given in full; selections only are printed from the latter portion. Mr. Davies has prefixed to his document some useful observations of the chamber under Edward II., including a careful analysis of Ousefleet's accounts. The title "journal" given by Mr. Davies to Ousefleet's book is perhaps not technically accurate, but it indicates with sufficient precision the method by which it was put together. Mr. Davies overstresses the point that chamber accounts were invariably in French, and wardrobe accounts in Latin. The pipe roll enrolments of James of Spain and Langley are both in Latin; and French was largely used in wardrobe documents, especially in and after Edward II.'s reign. On the whole, however, the more personal the household document, the more likely was it that in the fourteenth century it should be written in the vernacular. That French was the vernacular of the court is absolutely certain.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 376/15. Compare *I.R., 15 Edw. II. Easter Term*, "de pecunia

he ceased to control the chamber, he became, as we shall see, keeper of the great wardrobe.[1] Of Robert of Holden we should note that he was controller of the wardrobe for nearly the whole time of Langley's receivership. It is curious, therefore, that he should duplicate the controllership of the chamber with the controllership of the wardrobe for the last part of his tenure of power, but not for the earlier period of it. It is perhaps another of the attempts to correlate the various offices of state and household which were so decided a feature of the latter years of Edward II.'s reign. When the accounts of Langley were finally brought before the exchequer in 1330, the counter-rolls of his controllers were also delivered there. Langley's accounts were rendered by their "view and testimony," so that the pattern of wardrobe accounts was exactly followed. The exchequer, however, raised difficulties as to auditing Langley's accounts, on the ground that the four "controllers" "had not commissions from the late king for being controllers of the said William of Langley." Their objections were met by peremptory orders, dated April 1330, to audit and close Langley's account, notwithstanding that the controllers had not such commissions.[2]

In the fully developed chamber of Edward III.'s reign there were a steward and various auditors among the officers of the chamber. These functionaries also first appear in the latter years of Edward II. We have seen already that, on April 26, 1320, Humphrey of Walden was appointed steward of a specified list of "castles, towns, manors, lands, and rents, for the issues whereof the king wished to be answered in his chamber." Walden was also then appointed "auditor of the accounts" of those who hold these manors, "and of all others who owe account to the king's chamber, without rendering any further account to the king."[3] Yet he was not the sole steward, for in 1322–3 Sir John Sturmy, a knight of the chamber, was also steward of the king's chamber.[4]

recepta de Thoma de Ousefiete de thesauro camere regis," £376 : 4 : 8, and *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* m. 42. [1] See later, in the chapter on the great wardrobe.

[2] *C.C.R., 1330-3*, pp. 27-28. Compare *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* m. 41, where the exchequer objects that the controllers had no written commission. It had accepted, however, Langley's commission "oretenus, ut dicit."

[3] *C.F.R.* iii. 20. On Jan. 1, 1321, he is called "chief steward"; *C.P.R., 1317–21*, p. 534. [4] Ousefleet's controller's book in *E.H.R.* xxx. 676.

Again, on March 5, 1324, the king appointed Richard of Iken, king's clerk, and the same Humphrey of Walden "stewards of certain castles, towns, manors, and lands in the king's hands, and auditors of the accounts of those who ought to render account of their issues."[1] The chamber is not specifically mentioned, but it is quite clear that the "certain lands" were the lands reserved to the chamber, and on March 8 the appointment, enrolled in the fine rolls, definitely affirmed their authority to be over chamber lands in terms borrowed from the letters of appointment of 1320.[2] Humphrey, a knight of Essex, who had already served on many judicial commissions, only held office till June 18, when he became a baron of the exchequer.[3] Iken was thus left sole steward and auditor. He had a salary of forty marks a year, and keep for his horses, when he stayed on the lands committed to his charge. This provision seems to suggest that his primary function was to visit and control the bailiffs and stewards administering the various cameral manors. His sole power was of brief duration, for on August 20, 1324, he was associated with Richard of Winfarthing as steward and auditor.[4] Before long, however, the sphere of the office seems to have been extended to the examination of the accounts of the clerks of the chamber also, so that we hear no more of controllers of the chamber after the fall of Edward II.

A further step towards the amalgamation of the controllership and the auditorship of the chamber took place, when in the summer of 1325 Iken was associated with his brother auditor the king's clerk, Richard of Winfarthing, and Robert of Holden in the commission as auditors of the accounts of the chamber. On July 15, 1325, James of Spain finally completed his accounts by paying over his balance to Langley in the presence of these three auditors.[5] For the rest of the reign Holden must there-

[1] *C.P.R., 1323–7*, p. 230. [2] *C.F.R.* iii. 259.

[3] *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 429. He was already a knight in 1313; *C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 554-5.

[4] *C.F.R.* iii. pp. 295-6. The actual farmers or keepers of the chamber manors were different people from these supervising officers. On the same Aug. 20 the sheriffs of Yorkshire, Kent and Cambridgeshire were appointed keepers of Temple Newsam, Strood and Denney (*ib.* p. 296). It is striking to find sheriffs accounting for royal lands elsewhere than at the exchequer.

[5] *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* m. 42, "et debet xj li. ij sol. et x den. Quos idem Jacobus computatos liberauit, xv° die Julii anno xix°, super hunc compotum, prefato

fore have acted in the triple capacity of controller of the wardrobe, controller of the chamber, and auditor of the chamber. Henceforth the controllership of the chamber seems to have been merged in the auditorship. It is probable, however, that Holden was only associated with his colleagues in the review of the clerk of the chamber's accounts. In local business, and in relations with cameral lands, we find Iken and Winfarthing acting by themselves as stewards and auditors, as, for instance, in relation to certain manors once belonging to the Templars, and still in 1326 under chamber control.[1]

The accounts and other more scattered material enable us to form a fairly clear conception of the chamber and its work in the closing years of the reign of Edward II. There could be no doubt that the chamber attained a new importance as the result of the administrative reforms brought about by the Despensers after their triumph in 1322, and we are pretty safe in believing that the strengthening of the chamber as a financial and administrative office, directly expressive of the personal will of the king, formed a part of the Despensers' general policy. The constant references to him in the accounts, and the large sum paid over to him in them, show that the younger Despenser took an active part as chamberlain in controlling the chamber of which he was the official head.

If we could be sure that any receiver's accounts represented complete revenue and expenses, we should say that the financial resources of the chamber at this period were not very great. The receipts for the four years for which Langley accounted amount to £7820, an average of over £1954 per annum.[2] The

Willelmo de Langele apud Burgoyne in presencia Roberti de Holden, Ricardi de Wynneferthing, et Ricardi de Iken, auditorum compoti dicte camere per regem assignatorum."

[1] *C.C.R., 1323–7*, p. 608.

[2] Langley's receipts may be tabulated as follows:

Oct. 4, 1322–Mar. 5, 1323	£377 14 5	Controller,	Ousefleet.
Mar. 6, 1323–Sept. 29, 1323	1681 10 0	,,	Colby.
Sept. 29, 1323–April 15, 1324	1311 4 4½	,,	,,
April 15, 1324–Sept. 29, 1324	350 5 6	,,	Thingden.
Sept. 29, 1324–May 23, 1325	1532 16 5	,,	,,
May 24, 1325–Sept. 29, 1325	469 15 10	,,	Holden.
Sept. 29, 1325–Sept. 29, 1326	2097 4 6¾	,,	,,
Total	£7820 11 1¼		

great mass of this came from the issues of the manors permanently reserved to the chamber. All other receipts than these were "foreign receipts," and insignificant in amount. The most important of them were from fines and forfeitures of "contrariants," but there were also sums derived from loans, from direct payments from the wardrobe and exchequer, from the profits of the clerk of the market, and from the keeper of the king's boats on the Thames.[1] Large sums were paid from the wardrobe to the chamber which do not figure in these accounts. Those paid to the king "for his secrets" were outside the receiver's province.[2] The details of the expenses illustrate all the fields of chamber activity. What these fields were we must now endeavour to ascertain.

The most characteristic and permanent work of the chamber was still the control and administration of the royal manors, specially reserved to the service of the chamber. We have spoken already of the origin of this practice of reservation, and have traced its history up to July 1322. Even after that limitation, the chamber estate remained considerable. The renunciation of all contrariants' lands was not absolutely carried out, and some new forfeitures, along with more old ones, remained under chamber control. Moreover, the old chamber manors still largely preserved that status. Many Templars' lands were still in the royal possession, some because the crown, ignoring the papal grant to the Hospital, claimed them as escheats; others

For the period Sept. 29–Oct. 31, 1326, no receipts but only expenses are given. See *Pipe*, No. 171, mm. 41-2, and *Exch. Accts.* 379/7, 11, and 17, and 380/4. Compare *E.H.R.* xxx. 667-8. The controllers' books were delivered to the exchequer, and the consequent enrolments made under Edward III. Thus Ousefleet's book has an entry on the disk of the cover, "Hunc libellum liberauit hic [*i.e.* in scaccario] Thomas de Usseflete, contrarotulator Willelmi de Langeleie, nuper clerici camere regis Edwardi, filii regis Edwardi, et receptoris denariorum ipsius regis in eadem camera, vj° die Junii, anno regni regis Edwardi tercii post conquestum iiij°," that is, on June 6, 1330. Thingden's book was delivered to the exchequer on June 30, 1330. The exchequer adds, "Et prestitit juramentum eodem die quod omnia et singula in hoc libro contenta vere et fideliter facta sunt," etc.; *ib.* 380/4.

[1] "De custode shutarum et batellorum regis in Tamisia." Some of the entries are curiously minute. For example, "De carne unius vacce mortue de morina et de lactagio ouium . . . apud Cowyk, 3*s.* 4*d.*"

[2] For example, from Waltham's wardrobe account, May 1, 1322–Oct. 19, 1323, "domino regi liberata ad cameram suam pro secretis suis . . . et eidem domino regi in denariis sibi liberatis ad consimilia secreta sua, etc., £2000."

more specifically because the knights of the Hospital had given them by deed to the crown, in the hope that their surrender of a part would make it easier for them to get possession of the rest. A considerable number of these manors still remained under chamber jurisdiction, as, for example, Cowick, West Riding of Yorkshire, Faxfleet,[1] East Riding, and Temple Guyting, Gloucestershire. A more important group of reserved lands was now to be found in some considerable estates which had recently escheated to the crown. Early among these was the castle and honour of Tickhill, the keepers of which had already rendered their account for it in the king's chamber in March 1315.[2] A few years later the chamber laid hands on the great manor of Burstwick, the centre and nucleus of the Fors lordship of Holderness, with its many members, including the port of Ravenspur, the whole being valued a little later at the huge sum of a thousand marks a year. Burstwick and Holderness had escheated to the crown with the rest of the Fors inheritance on the death, in 1274, of Avelina of Fors, the first wife of Edmund of Lancaster. After very many changes of possession, it went back to the crown at the end of 1316, and between that date and 1320 was assigned to the chamber, henceforth becoming the greatest and most typical of chamber manors.[3]

[1] Faxfleet was "deeded" by the Hospital to the king, Aug. 19, 1324. It had been in John Mowbray's possession, and had been forfeited to the crown; *Misc. Enr. Accts.* No. 16, m. 24; *Foedera*, ii. 567. See Perkins in *A.H.R.* xv. 252-263. The royal doctrine was that the Templars' lands had escheated to the king and the other lords, by whose ancestors they had been given to the order. Finally, the grant to the Hospital was made in 1324, "by the king with the assent of parliament, and not otherwise," the papal grant at Vienne being ignored; *C.C.R., 1323–27*, pp. 91, 111. It was at this time that the formal surrenders of Faxfleet and other lands to the crown were made.

[2] *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 163.

[3] Burstwick was in the king's hands by 1275, and was kept by various royal bailiffs up to 1307, when it was granted by Edward II. to Gaveston, but resumed on Aug. 5, 1309, and again kept by various bailiffs, the last of whom was Edmund of Mauley, steward of the household, who accounted up to 1312. On Sept. 12, 1312, it was regranted to Margaret of Gloucester, Gaveston's widow; *C.P.R., 1307–13*, p. 497. Margaret surrendered it to the crown on Dec. 20, 1316; *ib., 1313–17*, p. 576. Its custody for the next few years is uncertain, but on Nov. 22, 1320, John of Thwaite was appointed steward, and directed to answer for its issues to the chamber; *Pipe, 1 Edw. III.* m. 44. Of course his predecessor may also have accounted there, but the earlier bailiffs up to Mauley accounted at the exchequer; *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi.; *Enrolled Foreign Accounts*, p. 194. Compare *C.P.R., 1307–13*, pp. 384-5, 461. It was worth one thousand marks a year in 1316.

Next in importance came certain estates of the earldom of Cornwall, which escheated in 1300 on the death of Edmund of Almaine, and included the castle and town of Rockingham, which was certainly under chamber administration in 1320–21.[1] To these may be added other estates of the Cornish earldom, which fell to the crown only after the death in 1312 of earl Edmund's repudiated wife, Margaret of Clare.[2] Such were the rents of the honour of Eye in the eastern counties, the manor of Haughley, Suffolk, administered by the chamber as early as 1313,[3] and also Glatton and Holme, Hunts, and Isleworth, Middlesex. To these and similar acquisitions must be added various individual crown manors scattered over the country, and some additional escheats and forfeitures. Thus when Andrew Hartley, or Harclay, earl of Carlisle, paid in 1323 the penalty of his treason, his lands fell to the chamber. Less well-endowed rebels suffered the same fate, for we find the sheriff of Lincolnshire paying into the chamber £21 of the issue of the lands and chattels of the disgraced chancery clerk, William of Airmyn, and the escheator of Norfolk and Suffolk accounting before the same body for £25 in respect of the profits of the lands which had belonged to John de Ros.[4] These trifling items, and the inevitable shifting of chamber manors, as forfeitures were restored or regranted, make it difficult to get a clear conspectus of the chamber estates at any one moment.[5] We also must not suppose that because some

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 376/15.

[2] *C.C.R., 1313–18*, p. 15, gives the manors, but suppresses the critical words "ita quod de exitibus nobis respondeat in camera nostra" in the original, dated Oct. 3, 1313; *C.R. 7 Edw. II.* m. 23.

[3] Glatton (see above) had become reserved to the chamber by 1314, and Isleworth, perhaps by then, and certainly by 1319–20; *Exch. Accts.* 376/15.

[4] These illustrations are mainly taken from Langley's accounts in *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* mm. 41-42 d. Instances of lands appropriated to the chamber after July 1322 are to be found in *C.F.R.* iii. 177 (Skipton), 189 (Kilvey), 195 (part of N. de la Beche's lands), 343 (Swanscombe), 383 (John de Ros' lands). But the transfer of chamber lands still continued; for instance, Builth, granted to Gruffydd ap Rhys on Jan. 23, 1322, to answer at the chamber, but transferred to the exchequer of Carmarthen on Dec. 8, 1325; *ib.* iii. 91, 368.

[5] The following is a rough attempt to make a list of lands, known to have been more or less permanently administered by the chamber between 1322 and 1326. Places known to have been forfeitures from contrariants (*e.g.* Pickering and Pontefract) or temporary surrenders (*e.g.* Bramber and Sandal) are omitted. The list is based on the indications in *Exch. Accts.* 376/11, 15, 17; *ib.* 380/4; *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* mm. 41-42 d, and the scattered references in the calendars of

of a contrariant's estate fell under chamber jurisdiction that the whole was so administered.

It should be noticed that some at least of the chamber manors were favourite places of royal residence. Edward II.'s special devotion to King's Langley is well known, and Burstwick and Cowick often entertained the monarch when the court was in Yorkshire. Had we accessible such indispensable tools for historical work as adequate itineraries of Edward II. and Edward III., the large proportion of time spent by both those monarchs on manors assigned to the chamber would probably suggest one good reason why these particular manors were reserved. They were, one guesses, chamber manors because they were among the particularly favourite abodes of the sovereign. There was an obvious utility from the king's point of view in excluding unsympathetic public functionaries from the control of his most usual residences, and leaving their management in the hands of his own personal servants. In modern times a king would attain the same end by reason of the distinction between the

patent, close and fine rolls, notably *C.F.R.* iii. pp. 20, 259, 295-6. The last reference gives a complete list of the chamber manors, entrusted to Winfarthing and Iken as stewards, on Aug. 21, 1324:

Berks	Crokeham, Easthampstead, Windsor Park.
Bucks	Langley Marsh, Cippenham, Fulmer, Bulstrode, Wraysbury, Swanbourne (dependency of Chiltern Langley).
Cambs.	Denney.
Essex	Hadleigh (castle) and Thunderley, Newport and Northweald.
Glouc.	Temple Guyting.
Herts	Chiltern (=King's) Langley, Iselhampstead (=Chenies, now in Bucks).
Hunts	Glatton with Holme.
Kent	Gravesend, Strood.
Leics	Bagworth and Landridge.
Middlesex	Isleworth, "la Neyte."
Notts	Gringley on the Hill (a member of Tickhill), Wheatley, Clipstone (peel).
Northants	Rockingham (castle and town).
Salop	Adderley.
Suffolk	Haughley (castle), Eye (castle).
Surrey	Byfleet, Henley (in Ash parish, near Guildford), Sheen.
Warwick	Kenilworth (castle).
Yorks	Burley, Burstwick (castle) with Holderness, Cowick, Carleton, Faxfleet, Haddesley, Howerah (park), Pollington, Sandall (castle), Scarborough (castle and town), Snaith, Templehurst, Temple Newsam, Tickhill (castle, town and honour).

private and the official estate of the crown, which was unfamiliar to the middle ages. Burstwick and Langley stood to Edward II. as Osborne and Balmoral to queen Victoria, or Sandringham to Edward VII.

Not only the traitors' lands, but their chattels, armour, plate and jewels were received, kept, and sold by chamber officers. The chamber also collected and negotiated the compositions of the heavy fines by which the less guilty contrariants were allowed to redeem their lands, or to buy back the royal favour.[1] Nor was the system of chamber lands limited to England. The queen had her chamber as well as the king, and as early as May 14, 1308, Ponthieu and Montreuil, Edward's own maternal inheritance, were assigned to queen Isabella for her chamber, to provide her with jewels, gifts and other things necessary for her chamber.[2] Moreover, on May 18, 1316, Bordeaux was declared to be perpetually annexed to the "crown of England and to our chamber and that of our heirs and successors for ever."[3] In the case of Bordeaux we are told that this involved a special measure of royal protection and favour, the results of which were so favourable that other Gascon towns petitioned the crown to have extended to them the privilege allowed to Bordeaux.[4] But there is no reason for believing that any of these grants presupposed ordinary cameral administration; and there is no trace of this in the extant chamber accounts. However, it shows at any rate how largely the idea of the chamber loomed in the royal mind, and how subjection to the chamber suggested possession tempered by protection and privilege.

Enough has been said to furnish sufficient indication that the administration of this large estate was enough in itself to account for the development of the chamber system. This was the more

[1] *C.P.R., 1321–4*, p. 257. An acknowledgment of the receipt in the chamber of £500 from John Botetourt, knight, in full payment of £1000 owed in the chamber for his adherence to Thomas of Lancaster, Oct. 8, 1322. Compare *ib.* p. 79, where a burgess of Gloucester pays on Mar. 4, 1322, £100 into the chamber "for communicating with contrariants."

[2] *Foedera*, ii. 44.

[3] *Ib.* ii. 290. Other Aquitanian towns, however, were declared annexed to the crown only, and not to the crown and chamber; *ib.* ii. 353, 361.

[4] Conway Davies (pp. 203-204) quotes from *C.W.* 99/4117 a royal writ saying that the men of Bordeaux were "souz nostre protection et deffense especial, comme ceux de nostre chambre."

necessary, since the receipt of the issues of chamber manors by no means exhausted the work of the chamber in administering its lands. The chamber manors, like the forests in earlier times, were in the process of being withdrawn from the ordinary system of administration and subjected to a special *régime* of their own. They ceased to pay their taxes after the ordinary fashion. Collectors of tenths and eighths were ordered not to levy these taxes upon the tenants of royal manors because the king wished that they should be answered for in his chamber.[1] Like the collectors of parliamentary taxation, the sheriffs were excluded from levying such portions of the traditional revenues as naturally passed through their hands.

The escheators in the same way had no concern with chamber lands. Under Edward II. some special commissioner, some chamber officer on his promotion, took possession of escheats within chamber manors, as was the case when Richard Squire, valet of the chamber, took possession of the lands which lapsed to the lord on the death of Sir Robert of Winnington in Medham, Pollington and Bellasis.[2] The steward of the chamber took inquests into the extents of chamber manors, and the tenants did homage and fealty before the local keeper of chamber lands.[3] The king's tight grip on his chamber lands extended to the patronage of the local churches. The chancellor, who normally gave away at his discretion the minor crown livings, was warned not to present any nominee of his to the church of Beeford in Holderness, since the advowson belonged to the king in his chamber, and presentation, therefore, was a matter for the king personally.[4] Thus, while the exchequer was totally excluded from all control of chamber lands, even the chancery was made to feel that it had little to say in regions under the king's individual control. In all matters appertaining to chamber business, writs under secret seal, the seal of the chamber, tended to supersede the normal writs of chancery and wardrobe, the writs of great and privy seal.

[1] *M.R., K.R.* No. 93, m. 43 d; *ib. L.T.R.* No. 90, "breuia directa baronibus," m. 9 d.

[2] *C.W.* 90/3215. I owe this and the following two references to Mr. J. Conway Davies.

[3] *Chanc. Misc.* 49/2, 27, now printed in Conway Davies, p. 570.

[4] *C.W.* 132/7441 (June 15, 1326), now printed in Conway Davies, p. 579.

Thus in an age which still regarded obedience to a direct territorial lord as a stronger claim on loyalty than allegiance to crown or nation, the monarchy strove to make difficult the revival of the baronial opposition by bringing under the immediate control of the king and his domestic servants a great landed estate, scattered throughout England and constantly tending to increase. Here the great renunciation of July 1322 prevented the chamber system becoming of real constitutional importance. But had circumstances permitted the permanent annexation to the chamber of great fiefs, including all the earldoms of earl Thomas, such an attempt might well have succeeded. The king's chamber might, like the church, have been a state within the state, practically exempt from the ordinary national administrative and judicial system. A more complete answer to the policy of the ordainers cannot be conceived. The king had been instructed to "live of his own." The chamber system enabled him to live of his own with a vengeance. An Angevin or Capetian autocracy was assured; and the infant parliamentary and constitutional system, with its control over the national administrative offices, could hardly have attained maturity. Luckily the forces which made for tradition were far and away stronger than those which sought, consciously or unconsciously, to bring about radical innovations. The new experiment was never tried in its fulness. Such attempts as were made resulted rather in an additional complication to the already over-complicated machine of state. And all that was novel in these plans was afterwards swept away at the bidding of a baronage that hated novelties.

Even if the barons had been less rigidly conservative, the want of honesty and thoroughness of the Edwardian innovators prevented the new system from getting a chance of success. The small amount of the gross issues of chamber manors, some £2000 a year, was perhaps the best indication of the peculation and malversation that characterised the latter years of Edward II.'s reign. This poor result was not because the chamber lands were exceptionally well treated. On the contrary, the inhabitants of the reserved manors took the first opportunity, after Edward II.'s deposition, of petitioning parliament that they might be allowed in the future to account at the exchequer.[1]

[1] *Rot. Parl.* ii. 432.

The income from chamber lands was looked upon as the normal revenue of the chamber. All the rest, including forfeitures and fines, was the chamber's "foreign receipt." To these we must add such miscellaneous items as sale of stores, freight charges for the king's ships, and many particulars so exactly similar to the miscellanea of the wardrobe receipt that it is hard to guess what things went to the chamber and what to the wardrobe. Certain it is that the two offices were in the closest relations. The chamber often received and paid moneys into the wardrobe for the expenses of the household.[1] Sometimes also payments were divided between the chamber and the exchequer. But in either case money that went to the chamber went to the king *pro secretis suis*, and no particulars of it were furnished to any external authority.

We must next deal with the way in which the chamber income was expended, for this affords our best insight into the scope of chamber work. As we turn over the elaborate details of chamber expenses, afforded by the two versions of Langley's account, we are so bewildered by the variety and heterogeneity of the items that we find it difficult to draw the line between the functions of the chamber and the exchequer, and almost impossible to determine where the chamber sphere began and where that of the wardrobe ceased. Because certain things were sometimes paid for by the chamber, it by no means follows that this was always the case. The new machinery only made the old overlapping worse than ever. Chamber, wardrobe, and exchequer were all liable to be called upon to pay for almost anything. Some approach, however, to generalisation may be made, allowance always being given for the fluidity of administrative conditions during the middle ages.

Subject to these limitations, we may safely say that while the chamber paid for the king's requirements in his personal and individual capacity, the wardrobe kept up the state and dignity of the crown, and the exchequer was the source of all properly national expenditure. Thus the first charges upon the chamber seem to have been those which we should say were chargeable to the king's privy purse, just as the

[1] Thus in the year July 1323–April 1324 more than a quarter of the chamber receipt was paid to the treasurer of the wardrobe; *Exch. Accts.* 379/17.

primary reason of payments to the wardrobe was to "maintain the king's household." Customary and traditional household expenses were paid for by the wardrobe, while the charges involved in the execution of the personal wish of the king went out of the chamber. Accordingly, moneys paid by the exchequer or the wardrobe into the chamber were generally earmarked, so to say, for the king's "secret" expenses, a phrase in no wise suggestive of modern "secret service money," but rather of the private and individual needs of the king. Thus the formal and traditional alms figured as a regular head of wardrobe expenses, while alms, given as the result of the king's personal impulse, made a modest demand on the resources of the chamber. Personal gifts of the king, again, were often paid for by the chamber, as were jewels on some occasions, though it is more clear that the chamber had to receive and keep jewels bought by other departments, than that it constantly purchased these expensive luxuries itself. Typical items of chamber expenses are the "minute" personal expenses of the king, his gambling debts, his present to an ale wife who gave him some beer, his gratification to the clerks of one chamber manor who played interludes at another such manor to divert Edward and his chamberlain. Another chamber charge included the wages of the humbler categories of chamber servants and the special gratifications to the higher sort of chamber officers from the chamberlain himself to the valets and porters of the chamber.[1]

The large number of payments made on behalf of the younger Hugh Despenser, the chamberlain, is particularly remarkable. There are such items, for example, as wax bought for his chamber, armour purchased for him, bows for munitioning one of Hugh's castles, payments to couriers bearing letters of secret seal addressed to him, and grants for his personal expenses. Moreover, there is evidence not only of Hugh's close comradeship with the king, but of his personal share in the government of the chamber. A new chamber

[1] The wages of the porters of the chamber, their journeys by water and land are regularly reserved; but the higher officers, knights, esquires, valets have their wages in the wardrobe, and only gifts and occasional extra-payments from the chamber. Unusual work like that of the four "king's yeomen" who in 1322-3 took the chamber from York to Newark by water is also recognised by the chamber; *E.H.R.* xxx. 679.

of Sir Hugh within the castle of Winchester was paid for by the chamber. When a clerk of the privy seal came back from a commission, he accounted "in the presence of the king to Sir Hugh" for the money which had been expended.[1] When a new "great ship" was built, it was called *La Despenser*.[2] It is clear that the personal control of the chamber in these years was very largely in the chamberlain's hands. He was the first great chamberlain of English history, as apt to magnify his office of chamberlain as Simon of Montfort and Thomas of Lancaster had been glad to glorify the hereditary stewardship, and lucky in having in the shadowy hereditary chamberlain no real limitation to this effective power. In so doing he was but following French models. He aspired to do in England what Peter de la Broce and Enguerrand de Marigny had done not so long before in France.

Besides the personal expenses of the king and the rewards of chamber officers, an important element in chamber expenses was the upkeep of chamber manors. No doubt the local bailiffs deducted ordinary expenses of management before they sent the net issues of the manors into the chamber; but anything like extraordinary expenses seem to have been charged to the chamber accounts. Thus the chamber expenses included the cost of building material and the wages of workmen employed in erecting or repairing buildings on these manors. Sometimes the most trivial and necessary administrative necessities were paid by the chamber, as when, for example, it paid fifteen men 4*d.* a day and ten women 1½*d.* a day each to mow grass and make hay in the park at Barnard Castle,[3] and when it hired "twelve men of the country" to act as keepers of the king's vacheries in Ribblesdale.[4] Similarly we have payments for wood-cutters and wagon-makers, smiths, and other workmen.

More interesting than these were the sums spent by the chamber in such administrative work as the carrying of letters

[1] *Exch. Accts.* 379/7, m. 4 d, "et le dit Johan accompta en la presence le roi a monsieur Hughe." Conway Davies (pp 96-97) collects some interesting examples of Hugh's close participation in chamber business.

[2] *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* m. 41 d.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 379/17, m. 1.

[4] *Exch. Accts.* 379/17, m. 2, "Paye a xii hommes du pais, gardeins des vacheries le roi es parties de Ightenhull." Ightenhill park is a township in the parish of Whalley, Lancs, and now a suburb of Burnley.

of secret seal.[1] Most interesting of all was the considerable proportion of chamber expenses devoted to what we should regard as distinctly national objects. Prominent among these was the repair and construction of the king's ships. There are constant payments for masts, pitch, resin, ropes, sails, and other necessities for the boats and great ships of the king. There are other payments of the wages of mariners, and we find special clerks of the chamber set apart to supervise and pay for the making and equipment of new ships for the king.[2] The king's ships traded as well as fought. Occasionally we also have payments for wages, transport, and expenses of men-at-arms engaged on some special service near the king's heart.[3]

However heterogeneous these chamber payments seem to modern eyes, they had this common idea running through them that they were in even a more special sense than wardrobe expenses the personal expenses of the king. It was the same thing for the king to speak of money "paid into our chamber" as it was for him to describe it as "received by our hand."[4] The king describes the chamber account as "his private account," in contrast with the general national accounts of the exchequer,[5] or the general household accounts of the wardrobe. While the

[1] There are in *ib.* 381/1 numerous particulars of (chamber) payments made by Roger de Clisseby in June 1320, and even better illustrations in *Exchequer of Receipt, Warrants*, bundle 1.

[2] Thus James of Spain paid £27 to Stephen Alard of Winchelsea "super reparacione cuiusdam navis vocate la Nicholas"; *Pipe, 19 Edw. II.* m. 42 d. See *ib.* 41 d for the great ship called *La Despenser*. *Exch. Accts.* 379/7, m. 4, 379/17, m. 5, and 380/4, pp. 38-42, show that "sire Piers de Pulford, clerc de la chambre le roi," was constantly employed in the construction and repair of ships.

[3] *Exch. Accts.* 379/7, m. 4 d records an interesting payment to John de Carleton, clerk of the privy seal, sent from Tutbury to Wales with men-at-arms and infantry to repress the rebellion of Robert Lewer. It was for this sum that John accounted to the king in Despenser's presence. The whole expedition to pursue Robert seems to have been at the chamber charge, no doubt because the culprit had been a household official; *E.H.R.* xxx. 680.

[4] *C.P.R., 1313–17*, p. 37, where the chancery clerk translates the "recu par nostre meyn" of the writ of privy seal into "received in the king's chamber" of the Latin letter patent.

[5] This is well illustrated in *Exch. of Rec. Warrants*, bundle 1. Among these is a privy seal of July 1, 1323, enclosing particulars of payments made by the Bardi "a nous et as autres en nostre chaumbre," and ordering allowance to be made to them of those sums at the exchequer. In the schedule annexed, giving particulars of the debt, emphasis is laid on "plusurs parcelles les queux notre seigneur le roi fist oster de son accounte propre et vouleit qil soient accountez al escheker."

latter accounted to the exchequer, the chamber accounted only to the king.[1]

Parallel with this development of chamber activities, we find a corresponding growth of the use of the secret seal. This instrument had become by the death of Edward II. not only the usual means of authenticating the king's personal correspondence, but the normal authority for the transaction of chamber business. In a later chapter this will be illustrated more in detail.[2]

Such was the chamber system in the days when Hugh Despenser, the chamberlain, was the chief confidant and adviser of Edward II. How much it was personal to the policy of these two friends is brought out clearly by the collapse of the power of the chamber, as exercised by them, as an immediate result of the fall of Edward II.

[1] As a matter of fact, the chamber accounts of James of Spain and Langley were, as we have seen, tendered to the exchequer. But this was done after the fall of Edward II. and the collapse of the chamber system as understood in this reign. But they only seem to be partial accounts, and perhaps were only tendered for such chamber revenue and expenses as the chamber was responsible for to the exchequer. In no case are there any detailed accounts of the sums paid to the king in the chamber *pro secretis suis*. The disposition of this was known only to the king. Under Edward III. we shall see that for a time the chamber refused to account to the exchequer.

[2] See the chapter on the secret seal in a later volume.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII

PARTICULARS OF WARDROBE RECEIPTS FROM OTHER SOURCES THAN THE TREASURY IN CERTAIN YEARS OF EDWARD II.

(1)

1 EDWARD II. (FROM PIPE, No. 168, 16 EDWARD II. M. 50), COMPOTUS JOHANNIS DE BENSTEDE . . . 8 JULY 1 E. II. TO 8 JULY 2 EDWARD II.

De exitibus magni sigilli regis	744	18	4
De exitibus placitorum aule regis	55	5	2
De amerciamentis mercati pro transgressione ponderum et mensurarum in diuersis locis	213	13	8
De Henrico le Say, nuper pincerna regis et receptore nove custume vinorum in Anglia	1,379	19	2
De episcopo Lincolnensi et decano et capitulo ecclesie beati Petri Eboracensis, de dono regi per ipsos facto	133	6	8
De pannis aureis, vessellamentis, petrariis, coclearis, ciphis, florenis et aliis jocalibus venditis	1,250	12	11
Pro uno equo carvanni vendito	1	0	0
De Jacobo Dalilegh tam . . . de vendicione victualium . . . quam in precio victualium aliorum computatorum, per eundem liberatorum diuersis	709	3	1½
De Milone de Stapletone, balliuo de Holdernesse, et aliis, de frumento, braseo, auena, vino, et aliis victualibus venditis diuersis	2,919	16	3½
De Johanne de Drokenesford, custode garderobe regis in anno secundo	1,053	12	6
De Ingelard de Warle, custode garderobe regis	205	1	8½
De Jacobo de Dalilegh, eschaetore regis citra mare Scocie, de exitibus eiusdem eschaetoris	296	6	4
[Carry forward	8962	15	10½

[Brought forward . .	8962	15	10½]
De denariis domini Walteri Couentrensis et Lichfeldensis episcopi, inuentis in locis diuersis .	2,466	14	4
De Johanne de Drokenesford, nuper custode garderobe domini Edwardi, patris regis nunc . .	17,111	8	9½
De Ingelardo de Warle, nuper clerico camere regis.	85	16	11
De Radulpho de Stokes, emptore magne garderobe, de precio panni, pellure, cindonis, speciarie, et aliarum rerum diuersarum de stauro eiusdem garderobe	301	12	6½
De thesaurario et camerariis de scaccario Dublinensi	11	11	8
De mercatoribus de societate Friscobaldorum .	37	4	7
De domino Waltero Reginaldi, pro illis c s. prius liberatis Simoni de Kele per ipsum Walterum, pro quodam sigillo faciendo pro rege de quibus garderoba non erat prius onerata . . .	5	0	0
	28,982	4	8½

(2)

11 EDWARD II. (FROM W. AND H. ENR. ACC. 2, M. 1)

De exitibus placitorum aule regis	10	13	8
De exitibus mercati	90	10	0
De exitibus magni sigilli regis	909	5	2
De diuersis jocalibus venditis	17	17	1
De tribus annulis auri venditis	9	0	0
De precio diuersarum rerum de stauro magne garderobe liberatarum diuersis	189	8	1
De precio rerum consimilium liberatarum . .	3	10	0
De bonis diuersorum burgensium ville Berewyci arestatis in diuersis portubus Anglie . . .	11	15	0
De feno cuiusdam prati regis apud Cornebury vendito	3	0	0
De mutuo de denariis camere regis . . .	1	10	0
De precio cuiusdam ciphi argenti deaurati, mutuati de garderoba domini regis	4	14	7
De precio 24 quarteriorum, 1 buss. 1 pec. auene de auantagio auene expendite pro equis regis .	4	16	7½
De precio 298 quart. 2 bus. auene de auantagio auene expendite . . . pro equis regis . .	60	4	5
De precio 6 quart. frumenti de bonis burgensium de Berewyco predictorum arestatis . . .	2	0	0
[Carry forward . .	1318	4	7½]

[Brought forward . .	1318	4	7½]
De precio 7 quart. auene de auantagio auene expendite pro equicio regis	1	8	0
De precio 52 quart. 2½ buss. frumenti et 14 quart. 3½ buss. brasii de auantagio frumenti et brasii expenditorum in hospicio regis hoc anno. .	34	4	2
De precio diversorum victualium de stauro regis apud Karliolum	914	12	7½
De precio 21 quart. auene de auantagio auene expendite pro equis regis	5	3	3
De precio diuersorum victualium de stauro regis apud Novum Castrum super Tynam venditorum .	1,698	19	10
De precio 11 quart. frumenti venditorum . .	7	6	8
De precio diversorum bladorum venditorum . .	274	6	6
De precio 483 quart. frumenti	326	6	0
De precio duarum ollarum enearum . . .	0	6	8
De precio diuersorum victualium	1	16	8
De precio trium caprarum	0	9	9
De Aycardo Barde, constabulario Burdegalensi etc.	70	6	8
De Petro Bonegente, burgense de Hull, de mutuo facto regi	10	0	0
De Johanne de Wisham, milite, de consimili mutuo	2	13	0
De Ricardo de la Riuere, vicecomite Gloucestrie .	13	6	8
De Priore Beate Marie Karleoli, collectore decime annualis	10	0	0
De [abbate] Beate Marie Eboracensis, collectore subsidii xii d. de marca.	54	0	0
De Roberto de Wytring, uno agistatore foreste de Inglewood, de eodem agistamento . . .	13	15	11
De Roberto Timparone, altero agistatore foreste predicte	4	10	9¾
De Willelmo de Burstowe, camerario Cestrensi, de exitibus eiusdem camerarie	20	3	0
De Ricardo de Ripariis, vicecomite Gloucestrensi, super expensis equorum regis. . . .	24	3	0
De Rogero de Pilkington' et sociis suis, collectoribus vicesime et quindecime in comitatu Lancastrie	13	6	8
De archiepiscopo Eboracensi, collectore decime sexannualis . . . de mutuo facto regi de decima primi anni decime predicte	560	0	0
De Rogero de Tyryngham, vicecomite Bedefordie et Bukinghamie, de exitibus balliue sue . .	2	0	0
De Hugone de Despenser seniore, de mutuo facto regi	100	0	0
	5,482	8	1¼[1]

[1] I make the total £5481 : 10 : 5¾.

(3)

14 EDWARD II. (W. AND H. ENR. ACC. 2)

De denariis regi remissis per diuersos creditores .	1,292	16	4
De exitibus placitorum aule regis	29	10	9
De exitibus mercati	168	10	7
De exitibus hanaperii magni sigilli . . .	780	9	0
De precio 39 quart. 6 buss. 3 pec. frumenti de auantagio frumenti expenditi in hospicio regis.	12	1	6
De alecia et moruca remanentibus in lardaria regis in fine quadragesime venditis. . . .	16	0	5½
De precio 4½ quart. fabarum et 9 quart. 7 buss. 1 pec. auene	64	0	1
De precio diuersorum bladorum	81	14	3½
De precio diuersorum victualium de stauro regis apud Karliolum	149	1	8
De precio dimidii dolii aceti.	0	10	0
De precio unius summarii redditi ad caruannum .	0	16	0
De precio unius unchie auri	0	13	4
De Willelmo de Cauersham, receptore terrarum de Gower	5	10	0
De Willelmo la Zouche de Assheby, milite, de parte cuiusdem finis	133	6	8
	2,674	9	3[1]

[1] I make the addition £2735 : 0 : 8. The sums "carried forward" are my own calculations, and are printed within brackets. Any totals not so printed are taken from the roll in the case of the first two accounts.

END OF VOL. II

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA

PAGE

2, n. 6, line 1, *See* Baldwin, *King's Council*, p. 72, where is quoted *Exch. Plea Roll*, 1 Ed. I, *m.* 6, giving one of witnesses to an exchequer process as "R. B. cancellario domini Edwardi predicti domini regis primogeniti." Professor Baldwin dates this process 1 Ed. I, but that is clearly wrong. Mrs. Sharp has kindly drawn my attention to this point.

4, n. 1, Mr. C. G. Crump has pointed out to me that Burnell's account, and that of his subordinate John of London, are in *Pipe Roll* 9, Ed. I, *m.* 4.

5, n. 3, lines 3-4, the liveries were "by Burnell," Mr. C. G. Crump reminds me.

n. 4, line 9, Mr. C. G. Crump is of the opinion that *E.A.* 350/8 is a membrane of states and views of accounts, presumably from a memoranda roll.

11, n., Cf. with *C.P.R. 1266–72*, p. 475, which records as keeper of the rolls of chancery, on 22 Dec., 1269, John Kirkeby; *and modify* first recorded holder *to* one of the first recorded holders

16, line 22, "Droxford": the earliest instance of this spelling belongs to 1390, and occurs in the will of a rector of 'Droxford'; *Reg., Wykeham* II, 424

17, line 25, *delete* whom he succeeded as treasurer

18, n. 3, *C.C.R. 1339–41*, p. 631, shows Benstead held the manor of Bensted, Hants, therefore the modern form of his name is Binstead

21, line 25, I have omitted from this list Langton's predecessor as cofferer, Henry of Wheatley (1284–87), who followed Edward I to Gascony and died there on 20 Nov., 1287; *see below*, vi. Appendix 1, p. 30. Langton was certainly cofferer by 1 July, 1288, and it looks as though he immediately succeeded Wheatley; *E.A.* 352/18: *see also* A. G. Little in *Revue de l'histoire française*, ii. 252 *and below*, vi. p. 30.

22, line 1, for further evidence of Manton's work in the north, *see S.H.R.* xxiv, 246 (1927); P.W.I, 369; *C.P.R. 1301–7*, p. 109; *MSS. Ad.* 7966, f. 46. On 11 March, 1303, his Irish goods were sequestrated (*C.F.R.* I, 471; *Cal. Doc. Ire. 1302–7*, p. 69), and even at this date a cofferer was still often called simply clerk of the wardrobe.

39, n. 3, *see corrigendum to* page 21, line 25 above; *and see also Liber Memor. Ecclesie de Bernewelle* (ed. J. W. Clark), p. 227, for the visit to Barnwell of Philip the cofferer of the king's wardrobe, with the king's offerings, on 2 April, 1293

42, n. 2, *add* On 3 July, 1277, Ralph de Dunion was queen's treasurer (*C.Ch.R.* II, 204), and Sir Guy Ferre was queen's steward. Alexander Bradenham was queen's chaplain and Richard Morel usher of her chamber. But it seems practically certain that Guy Ferre and other officers here named were in the service of Queen Eleanor of Provence (*C.Ch.R.* II, 409, *C.P.R. 1281–92*, pp. 405, 465 and *cf. ibid.*, p. 329) and the charter here referred to (*C.Ch.R.* II, 204) is almost certainly from Eleanor of Provence, though ascribed by the indexer to Eleanor of Castile.

PAGE

43, lines 9-10, Professor Hilda Johnstone differs from me on this point. She says that Henry's wardrobe was broken up on his death and that the wardrobes of Alfonso and Henry ran concurrently. Miss Johnstone also informs me that Papworth was *clericus uxoratus*

43, line 16, The wardrobe for the king's sons, Thomas and Edmund, was continued to the next reign. The cost in 2 Ed. II was £1763 6s. 3d.; *Pipe* 16, Ed. II, m. 50

44, lines 4-6, As shedding some light on the condition of the chamber, Miss M. H. Mills has supplied me with the fact that in the middle of m. 7 of *E.A.* 505/4 (? 1239-40) occurs this phrase: "Transcriptum rotul' de camera regis recept' per manus magistri B . . . [MS. torn away]. *See also corrigendum to* i. 244, n. 1.

58, line 9, *MSS. Ad.* 35,114/11 shows that there was still a wardrobe storehouse in the Tower in 1324.

65, line 7, For another Edwardian bastide in England see *C.P.R. 1281–92*, p. 217; *C.Ch.R. II*, 337; J. Tait, *The Medieval English Borough*, p. 344 (1936)

n. 1, line 3, *See also Misc. Books of Exch. T. of R.* vol. 201/7, 11, 16d.

74, line 21, *see Cal. Inq. Misc.* I, 1219-1307, p. 455 for chancery accommodation in Canterbury in 1293

80, n. 2, line 25, *see* v. 311, n. 2

99, 35, *after* also *insert* in process of time

103, *see corrigendum to page* 105, n. 3, *below*

105, n. 3, *add* See H. Jenkinson, *Archaeologia*, lxxiv. (1925), 289-351, "Mediæval Tallies, Public and Private." Cf. page 99 *above*

126, lines 16-19, Mr. Charles Johnson is of the opinion that this *quintus compotus* is Droxford's fifth *personal* account for 27 Ed. I, of receipts and expenses administered directly by himself and his personal clerks. He tells me that *E.A.* 356/3 for the same year is marked *primus compotus*, and points out that *E.A.* 355/27 is a cash account only. It looks as though Droxford sent in his accounts for 27 Ed. I in driblets. Did he ever send in one complete account or does the sum of the five or more accounts make the complete one?

158, *see addendum* to i, 36, line 22 on i, p. 318.

165, last line *after* 1290, *add* at which date he was removed and Adam de Blida appointed (*Exch. Accts.* 352/8, m. 2)

168, n. 1, Sir Geoffrey Pitchford in 1273-74 acted in some capacity to Edward of Carnarvon's brother Henry. He was controller to Papworth keeper of the wardrobe of the king's children and also "custos puerorum regis in eodem castro existencium." The controllers of the time of Henry III were higher in rank than the keepers. But Pitchford was a knight also, and Papworth was his clerical assistant. *See B.J.R.L.* vii. 387, 388.

n. 2, Peter of Abyton was already a clerk in the household of Edward, the king's son, on 8 October, 1294, when he was authorised to stay in England on Edward the king's son's service (*C.P.R., 1292-1307*, p. 96), and the protection was renewed on 16 May, 1297 (*ib.* p. 414)

171, n. 1, line 3, Melton is described as "nuper confrarius regine" in 1306-7; *E.A.* 365/10, p. 61: *MSS. Ad.* 35292/63d.

PAGE

176, line 15. *For* was sent *read* was to be sent. He never reached France, though from 25-29 October he was at Dover prepared to cross the Channel. (*E. H. R.* xxiii, 728-9)

198, n. 1, line 4, *for* (*Ms.* K. 11, dorso) *read* (*Ms.* K. 11, on the dorse of a transcript of the earlier ordinances)

238, n. 1, Miss M. H. Mills refers me to *M.R.*, *L.T.R.* 97/4, for a schedule concerning the account of William Melton, late keeper of the wardrobe, showing that the end of the account is entered on *Pipe* 18, Ed. II, under Gloucester. Cf. other cases of ends of accounts and sometimes whole accounts being hidden away under a county.

265, line 15, *before* Likewise etc. *insert* Accordingly such keepers of great horses were still to receive their funds from, and render their accounts to, the king's wardrobe

271, line 26, *after* controller *insert* and keeper of the privy seal

27, *see below*, iii, 2; iv. 91-92 and n. 1

273, lines 5-8, 13, *see below* iv. 91, n. 3.

278, n. 3, *see also M.R.*, *K.R.* 103/9d., where a memorandum records that, on 4 Aug. 1326, John Ockham, lately cofferer of the king's wardrobe, delivered to the exchequer a certain book touching the account of John Benstead, entitled *Liber de unde respondebit anno secundo* (139 fol.), and a bag containing particulars of the accounts of divers offices of the "hospicium" of 1 Ed. II

279, line 2, Melton's accounts were completed and presented for audit by his two deputies, Robert Wodehouse and Richard Ferriby; *M.R.*, *K.R.* 89, *M.R.*, *L.T.R.* 86, (9 Ed. II), *Communia-Recorda*—Easter term, under marginal heading *Anglia*.

6, For examples relating to Droxford's accounts, *see M.R.*, *K.R.* 103/149 and *Mem. Rolls*, 1-5 Ed. III *passim*

14, In 1331, the books of Warley's account were in the exchequer; *C.C.R. 1330–33*, p. 250.

22, For an example of the delays in presenting Wodehouse's account, *see M.R.*, *K.R.* 103/150

n. 6, Waltham was still molested by the exchequer in 1331, *C.C.R. 1330–33*, p. 213. Cf. below iv. 91, n. 3

301, n. 4, *see below* iii. 2; iv. 91-92 and n. 1

302, n. 2. To examples of description of Baldock as secretary *add Reg. Tho. de Cobham* (Worc. H. Soc.), p. 130 and n.

304, lines 23-25, *see above* page 301, n. 4

note, line 1, cf. *below* v. 110

330, n. 2, Was this Richard of Lusteshull the Richard of Lusteshull warden of St. Cross, Winchester, who died in or before 1349? *Reg. Wykeham*, II, 29

340, line 11, Miss M. H. Mills tells me that a whole set of sheriffs' accounts for forfeited lands (1322) exists, and that *Sheriffs Accounts* 15/6 contain, among various accounts, that for the lands of Mortimer of Wigmore.

341, line 2, This passage must be modified in the light of *E.H.R.* xxxviii, 63-71; xxxix, 482. Cf. below iii. 19, n. 2.