Serving the man that ruled: aspects of the domestic arrangements of the household of King John, 1199-1216

Henrietta Kaye

A thesis submitted in September 2013 to the School of History at the University of East Anglia in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Abstract

King John played a direct role in the domestic arrangements of his household. He shifted the function of officials, moulded the structure of household offices and took personal control over the purveyance of food, wine and luxuries. During his reign, John adapted his household to suit his circumstances and personal method of ruling. These findings reveal that a medieval king could be directly involved in the minutiae of his domestic establishment; this is an aspect of kingship not previously noticed by historians. It is upon these findings that this thesis makes its greatest original contribution to our understanding of the period.

To reach these conclusions, this thesis examines the officials at court and in the localities who enabled the domestic side of the household to function effectively. Hitherto, the medieval royal household of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries has been studied as part of the wider system of Angevin government. The political, administrative and financial elements of court are, however, entirely outside my remit. This thesis interrogates the evidence of the household ordinances from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, by using a corpus of record sources extant from 1199 onwards, which break through the façade of departmentalism to reveal the complexity of the royal household.

The king's chamber and his stewards are the focus of the first two chapters. These chapters show the changing nature of the household; they reveal the expansion of the chamber's sphere of function and the decline of the stewards' domestic role. The purveyance of household victuals is the focus of the final three chapters. These chapters demonstrate how the peripatetic nature of John's household was enabled through a network of local and court officials. By serving King John in his domestic needs, these officials were a vital tool in the facilitation of his rule.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

There are many people to whom I am indebted to and without whom this thesis would not have been possible. I would especially like to thank my supervisor, Stephen Church. His support and enthusiasm for this project has been a constant source of reassurance and inspiration. Without our regular meetings and lively discussions it would have been a great deal harder to bring the ideas in this thesis to fruition. Thank you to the many other staff at the University of East Anglia, in particular Julie Barrau, who has read drafts of a number of chapters and given me a useful, different perspective on my work. And to Nick Vincent, who has allowed me access to his extensive charter collection.

Great thanks go to my Mum, Dad and Dave. To my Mum for always providing me with someone to talk to when I needed a break from the long silence of the library days. To Dave for making home such a lovely place to be during the times when I needed to relax. And to both my Dad and Grandma for all their support and interest; and, especially, for making the last year of study financially possible.

Thank you also to all my friends who also have an interest in medieval history, sharing the PhD experience with you has made it all the more enjoyable. For my friends who don’t wholly share that interest, thank you for listening to me! Also, thank you for providing the necessary distractions and holidays from my work that have kept me happy and sane.

Finally, great thanks go to the Arts and Humanities Research Council for funding this PhD.

Abbreviations

BIHR	*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*
Book of Fees	*Liber Feodorum. The Book of Fees Commonly Called Testa de Neville*, 3 vols (London, 1920-31)
CFR	*Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1216-1234* (available both on the Henry III Fine Rolls Project's website (http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk) and within *Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1216–1234*, ed. by P. Dryburgh and B. Hartland, technical ed. by A. Ciula and J. M. Vieira, 2 vols (Woodbridge, 2007)
Church, *Household Knights*	S. D. Church, *The Household Knights of King John* (Cambridge, 1999)
Chron. Maj.	*Mattaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*, ed. by H. R. Luard, Rolls Series, 7 vols (London, 1872-83)
Dialogus and Constitutio	*Dialogus de Scaccario, and Constitutio Domus Regis: The Dialogue of the Exchequer, and The Establishment of the Royal Household*, ed. by E. Amt and S. D. Church (Oxford, 2007)
Docs. of English History	*Documents Illustrative of English History in the Thirteenth and*

	Fourteenth Centuries, ed. by H. Cole, Record Commission (London, 1844)
EHR	*English Historical Review*
Fleta, ii	*Fleta, Vol II,* ed. by H. Richardson and G. O. Sayles (London, 1955)
Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity*	C. Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England 1360-1413* (London, 1986)
Green, *Government*	J. A. Green, *The Government of England under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986)
Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*	J. E. A. Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* 2nd edn (London, 1963)
Kanter, 'Itineraries'	J. E. Kanter, 'Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of the Thirteenth-Century English Kings' (unpublished doctoral thesis, King's College London, 2011)
Map, *De Nugis*	*Walter Map: De Nugis Curialium,* ed. by M. R. James, rev. by C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983)
Memoranda Roll 1 John	*The Memoranda Roll for the Michaelmas Term of the First Year of the Reign of King John, 1199-1200,* ed. by H. G. Richardson, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 21 (London, 1943)

Memoranda Roll 10 John	*The Memoranda Roll for the Tenth Year of King John (1207-8),* ed. by R. Allen Brown, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 31 (London, 1955)
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, online edition 2004
Pipe Rolls	*Pipe Rolls:* citations to Pipe Rolls are to the regnal years of the reigning kings and published by the Pipe Roll Society, London
Round, *King's Serjeants*	J. H. Round, *The King's Serjeants and the Great Officers of State: With their Coronation Services,* (London, 1911)
Red Book	*Red Book of the Exchequer,* ed. H. Hall, Record Commission, 3 vols (London, 1986)
Rot. Chart.	*Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati,* ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1837)
Rot. Fin.	*Rotuli de Oblatis et Finibus in Turri Londinensi Asservati,* ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1835)
Rot. Lib. John.	*Rotuli de Liberate ac de Misis et Praestitis Regnante Johanne,* ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1844)
Rot. Litt. Claus.	*Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati,* ed. by T. Duffus

	Hardy, Record Commission, 2 vols (London, 1835, 1844)
Rot. Litt. Pat.	*Roturi Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londinensi Asservati,* ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1835)
Rot. Norm.	*Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi Asservati,* ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1835)
TCE	*Thirteenth Century England Conference*
TNA	The National Archives
Tout, *Chapters*	T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England: the Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals,* 6 vols (Manchester, 1920-33)
Tout, *Edward II*	T. F. Tout, *The Place of Edward II in English History* (Manchester, 1914)
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
Vale, *Princely Court*	M. Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380* (Oxford, 2001)
VCH	*Victoria History of the Counties of England,* ed. by H. A. Doubleday, W. Page, L. Salzman, R. B. Pugh and C. R. Elrington (Oxford, 1900-)
Warren, *King John*	W. L. Warren, *King John* (London, 1961)

Chapter 1: Introduction

'The value of this historical document is inestimable'.[1] So wrote Hubert Hall, the nineteenth-century archivist and editor of the earliest extant depiction of the English medieval royal household, the *Constitutio Domus Regis*. Scarcely has a decade passed in the century since Hall wrote these words in which there has been no significant contribution to our interpretation of this document. The study of the *Constitutio* has defined much of our understanding of the medieval royal household from the end of the eleventh century until the reign of Edward I, which produced its own household ordinance in 1279.[2] Having survived in three thirteenth-century copies, the *Constitutio* has consistently inspired rigorous debate.[3] The dating of the original has, in particular, given rise to varying suggestions. Initially, Hall put forward a date in the reign of Henry II. Six years later, however, in his *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, Hall adjusted his assessment to agree with the dating given by the scribe of the *Red Book* to the reign of Henry I.[4] Yet, within the document lies indications of that king's death - Henry I died on 1 December 1135 - which shifted the dating of the *Constitutio* to *c.*1136, prompting the suggestion by G.H. White that it was drawn up for the benefit of the new king, Stephen.[5]

This interpretation remained common orthodoxy until 1986, when Judith Green, drawing on the commentaries of Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, suggested that the *Constitutio* was probably based upon earlier household reforms introduced by Henry I in 1108, which might not have been put in writing until 1136.[6] The most recent editor of the *Constitutio,* Stephen Church, has also seen echoes of an even earlier date embedded within the document. The format of the *Constitutio* gives rise to the impression that the chancellor continuously travelled with the ambulatory royal court; Henry I's chancellor, Geoffrey Rufus, however, remained in England

[1] H. Hall, *Court Life under the Plantagenets: Reign of Henry II* (London, 1890), p. 244.
[2] Tout, *Chapters*, ii, pp. 158-63.
[3] The three copies are in the 'Red Book of the Exchequer', TNA E164/2 the 'Little Black Book of the Exchequer', TNA E164/12; a third copy is preserved in British Library, Hargrave MS 313.
[4] Hall, *Court Life,* p. 242; *Red Book,* pp. cclxxxviii, 759. For the same view, see G. H. White, 'The Royal Household of Henry I', *Notes and Queries,* 151 (1926), 381-4.
[5] G. H. White, 'The Household of the Norman Kings', *TRHS,* 30 (1948), 127-55 (p. 130); F. Barlow, *William Rufus* (London, 1983), p. 122; Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 2; R. L. Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1912), p. 95.
[6] Green, *Government,* p. 27. Green's view is partly challenged in F. Lachaud, 'Order and Disorder at Court: The Ordinances of the Royal Household in England in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', in *Hofe und Hofordnungen, 1200-1600,* ed. by H. Kruse and W. Paracini (Sigmaringen, 1999), pp. 103-16 (p. 108).

whilst the king was in Normandy. As such, Church has argued that the *Constitutio* has in it an echo of a date when the chancellor had a permanent attachment to the royal household.[7] Amongst the current commentary on the topic there now exists a more sensitive reading of the many dates embedded in the three surviving copies of the *Constitutio.* Nonetheless, it continues to be viewed mainly as a portal into the world of the royal household in the early twelfth century, albeit with evidence of accretions from different eras etched within it.

Household ordinances have consistently framed our discussions on the medieval royal household. A common feature of the extant household ordinances is their focus on the regulation of the material conditions of court life. As a result, historians have often used them to reveal the domestic sphere of the household. Frank Barlow used the *Constitutio* as the basis of his study of the household of William Rufus. He then employed other material, such as Domesday Book and eleventh-century writs and charters, to add context to the structure of the *Constitutio,* thereby showing the changes which had taken place between the reigns of Rufus and Henry I.[8] Michael Prestwich used the structure of the household ordinance of 1279 as the foundation for his discussion of the lay and ecclesiastical officials who facilitated the domestic arrangements of Edward I's household.[9] J.H. Johnson used the ordinance of 1318 as evidence of the intricacies of the royal household in the mid-fourteenth century.[10]

Historians of medieval England have not been alone in seeing ordinances as key texts for our understanding of the royal household. The palatine ordinances of the kings of Aragon and Majorca have been thoroughly analysed by Marta Vanlandingham. She saw the circumstances in which these documents were created as having great importance to our interpretation of the household's function in practice.[11] Malcolm Vale drew on a range of ordinances, such as those of the Low Countries in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and those which were subsidiary

[7] For this and other dates, see *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. xxxviii-xli.
[8] Barlow, *William Rufus,* pp. 99-155.
[9] M. C. Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1988), pp. 134-69.
[10] J. H. Johnson, 'The King's Wardrobe and Household', in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336 Vol. I: Central and Prerogative Administration,* ed. by J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris (Cambridge Mass, 1940), pp. 206-49. For the printed edition of the 1318 household ordinance, see Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 270-314. This ordinance is also extensively used in Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity*.
[11] M. Vanlandingham, *Transforming the State: King, Court and Political Culture in the Realm of Aragon, 1213-1387* (Leiden: Boston: Cologne, 2002), esp. p. 15.

to the English royal household in the late thirteenth century in his examination of princely courts. Using the household ordinances of John of Brabant, who was a member of the court of Edward I, and John de Warenne, a ward of Edward I, Vale claimed that these ordinances show princely establishments in miniature, thereby demonstrating the degree of uniformity found in the structure of noble households.[12] In a similar vein to Vanlandingham, Vale has also stressed the need for caution when using household ordinances, as they often describe things as rulers wished them to be, rather than as they truly were. Ordinances are not without their hazards and understanding their context and purpose is vital. Nonetheless, they are useful tools as they provide a point of reference from which we can ask questions of the other surviving financial and administrative material in our determination to understand the medieval royal household.

Given the usefulness of these documents it is unfortunate that there is no existing household ordinance for King John's household. It is curious that a century like the thirteenth, which produced an abundance of administrative treatises, lacks a household ordinance until the reign of Edward I.[13] The provisions of Oxford (1258) claim 'that it should be remembered to reform the household of the king and queen'.[14] Despite this provision, there is no surviving evidence of a household ordinance during the reign of Henry III. Without any surviving depiction of the royal household until 1279, historians have often used the *Constitutio* as a base from which to work forward in time, looking for similarities across the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and beyond.[15]

As the *Constitutio* provides us with the earliest depiction of the English medieval royal household, J.H. Round used it as a starting point in his *The King's Serjeants and Officers of State* (1911). In this study, Round sought to find the origins of the great officers of state of the twentieth century among the senior men of the king's household in the medieval period.[16] Round was inspired to assess the validity of

[12] Vale, *Princely Court,* pp. 42-56.
[13] For a general discussion of ordinances in England and for a suggestion why none are extant from the years between *c.*1136 and 1279, see Lachaud, 'Order and Disorder at Court', pp. 103-16. For further explanations for the scarcity of household ordinances, see Tout, *Chapters,* i, p. 35.
[14] *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion 1258-1267,* selected by R. E. Treharne, ed. by I. J. Sanders (Oxford, 1973), p. 111.
[15] Jolliffe, being the exception, warned that we should not see the *Constitutio* as depicting more than the household at the end of the reign of Henry I, see *Angevin Kingship,* p. 190.
[16] Round, *King's Serjeants,* pp. 52-264.

modern claims for the right to perform coronation services, by tracing claimants' connections to ancient predecessors. To this end, Round analysed tenants who held land from the king by serjeanty, for which they rendered a specific service to the crown, excluding knight service.[17] Round traced the development of the great officers of state from the men of the household in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, by following the lines of inheritance of serjeanties. Round was not alone in this quest to link the medieval household to the modern state. White also averred that these 'great offices of state have their origin in the office of the royal household of the Norman kings', as shown in the *Constitutio*.[18] In these suggestions, White and Round were adhering to a general desire shared by early twentieth-century historians to place the royal household within the context of the development of the English bureaucratic state.[19]

Working in this vein, White sought to departmentalise the household and create a structure from which it was possible to see the origins of the major state offices. White used the *Constitutio's* list of household officials to outline a clearly defined hierarchal ranking system, based on the value of the monetary and alimentary allowances given to each individual. White saw three classes of officials within the household, who could be further delineated into subsequent ranks. On occasion, officials did not comply with the arrangement that White had imposed on the *Constitutio*'s image of the household. William fitz Odo, an assistant constable, for example, received no monetary payments, unlike his counterparts Henry de la Pomeroy and Roger d'Oilly.[20] White explained such anomalies by suggesting that the two thirteenth-century copies of the *Constitutio,* from which he was working, were both based upon an earlier copy of the original. White claimed that it was the fault of an earlier copyist that these errors occurred. On this basis, White suggested revisions to the existing order of the list of officials in the *Constitutio.* Namely, White sought to move the stewards above the dispensers of bread, because he saw them as being the more senior officers.[21] So compelling was White's structured, hierarchal image of the king's household that Charles Johnson, in his edition of the *Constitutio* in 1950, chose to follow this new order and altered the stewards' position

[17] For Round's discussion of the definition of serjeanties, see *King's Serjeants,* pp. 21-34.
[18] White, 'Household of the Norman Kings', p. 127.
[19] Tout pioneered this method of thinking in his *Chapters.*
[20] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 208-11.
[21] White, 'Household of Norman Kings', p. 155.

within his edition of the document.[22] In recent times, Church has been critical of this misrepresentation of the documentary evidence and, in his edition, returned the order of the *Constitutio* to that shown in each of the three surviving exemplars.[23]

Church's edition of the *Constitutio* is a reflection of the trend, since the 1950s, to see a significant degree of flexibility within the household. J.E.A. Jolliffe's *Angevin Kingship* (1955) provided the decisive step towards re-shaping our perception of the royal household. In stark contrast to Hubert Hall - who declared that the king's household witnessed minimal changes over the six hundred years from the *Constitutio* to 1782 - Jolliffe saw the household as a fluid, protean establishment which changed dramatically from reign to reign during the Middle Ages.[24] Jolliffe's findings were the result of an entirely different methodology from that used by previous scholars. Eschewing the trend towards tracing the origins of the great officers of state, Jolliffe claimed historians had been too concerned with magnate pretenders, who had little but a title to connect them to the household.[25] Jolliffe also lamented the disproportionate interest in serjeanties, which had dominated scholarship on the royal household. Jolliffe sought to reveal the household in practice. By an analysis of the exchequer and chancery records from the Angevin period, Jolliffe showed that it is possible to witness the activities of the men who actually worked within the household. These men, it transpired, had little in common either with the great magnates holding household titles, or those men holding serjeanties attached to a service within the household.[26] Jolliffe revealed the means by which we can access information concerning the household beyond the hereditary magnates and the structural impression given by household ordinances, by examining in detail the careers of the household officials.[27] This methodology has formed a basis upon which it has been possible for others to build. Notably, Church

---

[22] *De Necessariis Observantiis Scaccarii Dialogus: Qui Vulgo Dicitur Dialogus de Scaccario,* ed. and trans. by C. Johnson (London, 1950), p. 130.
[23] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 198-9; S. D. Church, 'Returning to the Text: Reflections on the *Constitutio Domus Regis*', *Archives,* 33 (2008), 1-13 (pp. 5-6). Church points out that Douglas and Greenway, in their edition of *Constitutio* for *English Historical Documents,* also follow White's new structure.
[24] *Red Book,* pp. ccxciv-ccxcv; Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* esp. ch. ix.
[25] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 191-2.
[26] By the mid-thirteenth century, the same situation emerged in the French royal household and the household of the counts of Artois, whereby domestic incumbents were not held by hereditary entitlement, see Vale, *Princely Court,* pp. 42-3.
[27] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 218-9.

has shown the great rewards available from an extensive study of one section of the royal household – the knights.[28]

The study of the military arm of the royal household has been instrumental in moulding our interpretation of the *Constitutio*. White thought the *Constitutio* represented the whole of the king's household and this belief prevailed throughout much of the twentieth century.[29] In 1980, however, J.O. Prestwich showed that there was further element to the king's household under Henry I which did not appear in the *Constitutio.* Prestwich showed the royal household also contained a permanent military element that provided the core of the king's army and was crucial to the imposition of his rule in Normandy.[30] A few years later, Frank Barlow published his work on the royal household during the reign of William Rufus. Barlow added to Prestwich's findings and also saw the *Constitutio* as an incomplete representation of the king's household. The *Constitutio,* Barlow showed, contained no evidence of officials employed to keep the king's hawks. Moreover, the *Constitutio* lacked evidence concerning the officials of the hall, of which Geoffrey Gaimar had claimed that there were three hundred who stood at the doors of the hall and led nobles to feasts.[31] Although, such numbers were possibly exaggerated, they nonetheless reveal an element of the household which is absent from the *Constitutio*. Barlow also argued that there would have been a number of clerks and scribes working within the chapel; but Barlow acknowledged that they might have been hidden from the *Constitutio*'s list as they were paid by the master of the scriptorium or the chancellor.[32] Finally, Barlow pointed out that the royal household also employed a marshal for the prostitutes following the king's court, yet no such official appears in the *Constitutio*.[33]

The studies of Prestwich and Barlow encouraged a desire to define these newly understood elements of the royal household. Prestwich saw that there was a wider

[28] Church, *Household Knights*.
[29] White, 'Household of Norman kings', p. 130.
[30] J. O. Prestwich, 'The Military Household under the Norman Kings', *EHR*, 96 (1981), 1-35. See also, M. Chibnall, 'Mercenaries and the *Familia Regis* under Henry I', *History*, 62 (1977), 15-23.
[31] Barlow, *William Rufus*, pp. 122, 140; *L'Estoire des Engleis,* ed. by A. Bell, Anglo-Norman Text Society (Oxford, 1960), ll. 5976-5996.
[32] Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 146.
[33] Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 154. During the reign of King John and Henry III, Henry de Mara held the serjeanty for keeping the prostitutes following the king's court, see *Book of Fees*, pp. 103, 253, 344.

household which incorporated the king's knights, known as the *familia regis*, in addition to a more narrow, domestic sphere, known as the *domus regis*. Henceforth, the nomenclature of the household was the subject of much discussion.[34] In 1986, two historians put forward similar, yet discernibly different definitions of the household. Judith Green in her *The Government of England under Henry I* sought to define the *domus,* the *familia,* and the *curia*. Green based her interpretation of these different sections of the household on the function they performed. The *curia* provided the setting for the most formal and ceremonial of functions, by creating a forum for dispensing justice and receiving counsel. The *familia* was largely military in function, but also, according to Green, incorporated other important intimates of the king. Finally, the *domus* provided the domestic necessities for the king, including his means to written communication through his clerks and his entertainment through the office of the hunt.[35]

In 1986, Chris Given-Wilson also sought to define the difference between the *familia* and the *domus.* In addition to function, he saw attachment to the household as a defining characteristic. The *domus,* Given-Wilson suggested, contained men with a permanent attachment to the household including domestic and secretarial servants and the king's body-guard. The *familia* was an extended network of officials not permanently attached to the household, whose connection to the household was so flexible that those within it might not have considered themselves to be royal servants. Within this definition Given-Wilson included those men who came to the household to give counsel or make an army.[36]

It seems that the differences between these definitions of the household stem from the main source used by historians – the *Constitutio*. There are inherent obstacles within the *Constitutio* which ensure that any attempt to define the *domus* with this document as its foundation will meet with defeat. The key reason for this problem is the incomplete nature of the *Constitutio*. Prestwich and Barlow made it clear the *Constitutio* does not depict the whole household. However, nor does the *Constitutio*

---

[34] B. L. Wild has also recently noted the problem facing historians concerning the nomenclature of the household, see, 'A Truly Royal Retinue: Using Wardrobe Rolls to Determine the Size and Composition of the Royal Household of Henry III of England', *The Court Historian,* 16 (2011), 127-43, (p. 128).
[35] Green, *Government,* pp. 19-37.
[36] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 2. For further discussions of the definition of the court and household, see Vale, *Princely Court,* pp. 15-33.

reveal the whole *domus*, as it does not list all the domestic officials of the household. For example, there would have been many more members of the hall, hunt and bodyguard than appear in that document. The *Constitutio* does not only include officials with a permanent attachment to the household; this is made clear by the alternative allowances for those officials who dined out of the *domus*.[37] Without a full contemporary depiction of the *domus,* attempts to delineate this term have naturally led to results of variable quality.

Despite these difficulties, historians have been keen to define the household so that we may speak of the establishment in the same terms as contemporaries. The words of Walter Map have been frequently used to demonstrate that, in the twelfth century, there existed an appreciable difference between the *familia* and the *domus*. Map described how Henry I had put in writing the customs of his ‘domus et familia’. Map then clarified the reforms which affected both sections of the household. Firstly, the *domus* was reformed to ensure that the household was adequately supplied with provisions, the royal itinerary was pre-planned and publicly declared, and, finally, all barons who attended the king received a fixed allowance from the household. Secondly, the *familia* was reformed so that no one in the household should be left wanting, by establishing fixed grants.[38] Here, it is the reforms outlined in relation to the *familia,* not the *domus,* which, rather confusingly, best describe the contents of the document we have come to know as the *Constitutio Domus Regis.*[39] Such contradictory evidence may stem from the innate confusion even amongst contemporaries regarding the enigmatic nature of the king’s court and household. Map also famously declared ‘what is the court, God knows, I know not’.[40] The difficulty contemporary commentators had in defining the king’s court and household has permeated modern historical interpretation.

To add further complications to the matter of the nomenclature of the household, the term *domus* is rarely applied to the royal household of King John in contemporary record sources. *Domus* also translates as a building and it is in this context which we find this word employed throughout John’s reign. This use can be seen in the many

[37] For an example of the stewards, see *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 198-9.
[38] Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 438-9.
[39] For an alternative interpretation that sees Map as confused in the belief that the *Constitutio* was actually a list for barons, see Lachaud, ‘Order and Disorder at Court’, p. 109.
[40] Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 1-2.

orders sent to ensure repairs were made to royal residences. In 1205, for example, Peter of Stokes ordered that repairs be made to the king's *domus* at Powerstock.[41] In 1207, William de Cantilupe instructed the sheriff of Oxfordshire to make repairs to the king's 'domus et officium' at Oxford.[42] On only one occasion was *domus* used in a context which suggests that it was the domestic part of the household. In 1199, William de Quevilly, fined in forty marks to hold the ushership of the buttery within the royal *domus*.[43] The term 'familia regis' also has few domestic connotations in the early thirteenth century; this term being consistently employed to denote the military sphere of the household.[44] During John's reign, *hospicium regis* is a term employed to describe the domestic officials and arrangements of the household. When the household incurred expenses, they were described as victuals for the *hospicium regis*; when additional equipment was required, such as pitchers and cups, it was sent to the *hospicium regis*; cartermen were said to have transported all the offices of the *hospicium regis.*[45] Very few examples exist in which 'domus regis' can be read in a similar context.[46]

Hospicium regis, although more commonly used than *domus regis* to describe John's household, is still an infrequent feature of the contemporary records. It is, in fact, surprisingly difficult to find direct references to the king's household during John's reign. The reason for this is that, in much of our evidence, no word is used to describe the household, as all things pertaining to the household are described as directly belonging to King John. Chancery letters were written in the majestic plural. These describe officials connected to the household with the possessive 'our'. William the royal baker, for example, is described as 'our baker' rather than as the baker of the king's household.[47] The household offices, such as the kitchen, also have the description 'our'.[48] In the exchequer pipe rolls, most things related to the household are referred to as 'of the king'. In the pipe roll for Michaelmas 1215, for

---

[41] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 57b.
[42] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 97. For other examples of *domus* used in this context, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 28b, 186b.
[43] *Pipe Roll 1 John*, p. 102.
[44] For further examples, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 125, 145, 212; *Rot. Norm.,* p. 54; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 263.
[45] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 17b; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 236, 255; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 78, 128b, 143b, 151, 155b, 159b, 160b, 174, 185, 196, 259; *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 172.
[46] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 98b, 109.
[47] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 58.
[48] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 190.

example, a list of officials, such as the chaplains, huntsmen, bakers and washerwomen, who appear in receipt of robes, are all described as 'of the king'. This direct ownership extends to all victuals purchased for the household; wine, wax, spices, for example, were all bought 'for the king's use', rather than for the use of the court or household.[49] The king was synonymous with his household. This evidence inspires a different perspective on the study of the royal household, which is less focused on fixing the definition of the *domus* and the offices within it, and more concerned with the place and role of the king within his household. In previous scholarship concerned with the medieval royal household, although it has been recognised that the king stood at the top of any hierarchal structure of the household, little focus has been given to the function that the king played in organising daily life at court. Historians have hinted at the importance of this aspect of kingship, without ever exploring the full extent of the king's involvement.[50] Contemporaries, such as Walter Map, although claiming it was an impossible task, were aware of the fact that the king regulated and controlled the entirety of his household.[51] This thesis aims to reveal the place of King John within the mechanics of his domestic household and the impact that his involvement had on daily court life.

At the heart of the domestic arrangements for the king was his chamber. Here he enjoyed privacy, here he slept and here he entertained his closest associates. Previous scholarship has made the financial functions of the royal chamber its focus; this thesis will take a different approach. Chapter one will investigate the identity of the chamber and wardrobe officials and consider the function they fulfilled in supporting the king in his domestic living. Central to this investigation will be the king. John's wishes and needs emerge from the study of those officials who worked closest to him in his chamber. The activities of other household officials also reveal the king's impact on the domestic sphere of his household. This can be seen especially in the example of the stewards; it is an analysis of the men who served in this role which make up the focus of chapter two. Through an examination of the careers of the stewards we witness the adaptability of household servants and their ability to bend

[49] *Pipe Roll 17 John*, pp. 20-1.
[50] Barlow claimed 'the king should not be pushed too far out of sight', see *William Rufus*, p. 139; Frédérique Lachaud claimed that the king 'was probably much more involved in the life of his household than one usually assumes', see 'Order and Disorder at Court', p. 115.
[51] Map, *De Nugis*, pp. 24-5.

to the needs of the king. These findings have the capacity to challenge the existing paradigms in which historians have viewed the structure of the royal household.

The semantics used by contemporaries to describe the household as synonymous with the king, also encourage us to see all servants, either directly connected to the household or working in the localities, as sharing one central focus – to serve the needs of the king. King John used his servants irrespective of their apparent affiliation to a particular institution or positions - all officials were, without exception, the king's servants. This point is important as it allows us to envisage a system without the constraints of departmentalism, which is a vital consideration in the final three chapters of this thesis. Chapters three to five examine the processes by which the household was supplied with victuals, focusing on food, wine and other luxuries. In order fully to appreciate and comprehend the scope of this enterprise, officials working both internally and externally to the household are examined, as they worked together to ensure that the king was fully provided for in all his daily needs. As Jolliffe demonstrated in the 1950s, there was a large network of provincial offices at work ready to supply the vast quantities of comestibles and luxuries required to maintain the majestic splendour of the royal establishment.[52] This thesis will investigate the domestic arrangements which surrounded and supported the king, and which incorporated a network of officials, who functioned in both the ambulatory court and in the localities. Jolliffe started us on this path by briefly outlining the mechanics by which the royal buttery used provincial offices across the country; this outline, Jolliffe claimed, 'may stand for all' the provisioning offices.[53] This generalisation, however, does little justice to the magnitude and complexity of the system of purveyance undertaken for the royal household. This thesis will look at the purveyance system, both internal and external to the household, for a wide range of victuals.

The study of household purveyance also makes a contribution to the debate surrounding the nature of the court's itinerary. Amongst the existing scholarship lies disparity between those who have seen the ambulatory Angevin household as following a highly organised itinerary that was planned a number of weeks in advance, and those that have seen an itinerary with a chaotic route, reactive to events

[52] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 189, 195.
[53] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 195-202.

of the realm.[54] A key consideration for those who have seen the household as following a 'steady, pre-planned progress', has been the implausibility that there were arrangements in place which could adequately supply the royal household with all the necessary victuals at short notice. There has existed, however, until now, no in-depth study of the organisation of purveyance.[55] This thesis makes a major contribution to our understanding of how the household was sufficiently supplied during its itineration.

The royal household provided the material infrastructure of the court, which enabled the practice of itinerant kingship. The household, like other institutions such as the treasury and exchequer, was a tool of kingship.[56] This thesis seeks to show how King John utilised this tool. Great feasts, large councils, courts of justice were all part of court life and part of the way the king displayed his wealth and power to his subjects. The propaganda value of court life, especially of ceremonial occasions, in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, has been noted by Green, who sees it as 'emphatic reminder of the sacral power of kings, the splendour of their court and generosity of their hospitality'.[57] Vale has also given attention to the importance of courtly display and culture, recognising the 'symbiotic relationship' between the culture of court and material aspects of the household, seeing them as constantly overlapping and impinging on each other.[58] The domestic arrangements of the king's household were a vital element in facilitating the powers of court and royal propaganda. There exists no study which focuses on these domestic arrangements for the English medieval royal household. It is the purpose of this thesis to fill this void. With the chancery and household records, which are extant from John's reign onwards, we have sufficient tools at our disposal with which we can, for the first time, explore the domestic arrangements of a medieval king's household.

---

[54] For the opposing views, see Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 32 and S. D. Church, 'Some Aspects of the Royal Itinerary in the Twelfth Century', in *TCE XI,* ed. by J. Burton and B. K. Weiler (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 31-45 (p. 32). For a full discussion of the existing scholarship, see Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 22-6.

[55] For the later medieval period, see C. Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance for the Royal Household, 1362-1413', *BIHR,* 56 (1983), 145-63. The shift towards sedentary kingship throughout the thirteenth century renders the findings of Given-Wilson's study valuable yet insufficient for understanding purveyance during the reign of King John.

[56] The first historian to demonstrate the importance of the household in government was Tout, who saw 'The whole state and realm as appurtenances of the king's household', see *Chapters,* ii, p. 59.

[57] Green, *Government,* pp. 20-22.

[58] Vale, *Princely Court,* p. 166.

Chapter 2: Sources and methodologies

As noted in the introduction, household ordinances have formed the basis of much of the existing scholarship on the medieval royal household. As King John's domestic establishment is not the subject of any surviving household ordinance, this thesis has made use of three ordinances from the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The earliest of these ordinances, the *Constitutio,* has been discussed in the introduction. Of the two later ordinances, the first depicts the household of Edward I. It survives in its original manuscript from 1279 and was printed by Tout in 1920.[1] The second has survived in two fifteenth-century copies and a further English translation of 1601. This ordinance contains details of Edward II's household in 1318.[2] Tout also produced a printed version of this document based upon the two fifteenth-century copies.[3]

Each of these ordinances is generally concerned with the domestic sphere of the royal household, but in specifics they vary. The *Constitutio* reveals the wages, food, drink and candle allowances assigned to domestic household officials. It also describes the duties of some of these officials.[4] This evidence casts light on the structure, hierarchy and size of the royal household. Similarly, the 1279 household ordinance lists the monetary allowances due to a limited number of household officials. The 1279 ordinance concludes with a description of the nightly account and audit procedure for the household offices, which, we are told, was conducted by the stewards, treasurer and controller of the household. Finally, the 1318 household ordinance is a far longer, detailed account of the royal household. This ordinance shows the allowances of a much greater number of domestic officials. A comparison between the 1279 and 1318 household ordinances leaves one in little doubt of the

---

[1] TNA C47/3/15. Tout, *Chapters,* ii, pp. 158-63. It is also printed with an English translation in *English Historical Documents Vol. III,* ed. by H. Rothwell (London, 1975), pp. 581-587.
[2] The earliest manuscript is British Library Add. MS. 32097, dated by Tout as no earlier than the reign of Henry IV (1399-1413), see *Edward II,* p. 268. The second copy is in British Library Cotton MS. Tiberius E VIII, Tout dated the section of this manuscript containing the ordinance to the latter half of the fifteenth century. Finally, the manuscript containing an English translation is Bodleian, MS. Ashmole 1147, dated to 1601 and written by Francis Tate. For Tate, see L. A. Knafla, 'Tate, Francis (1560–1616)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26981, accessed 21 April 2010].
[3] Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 270-318. Another printed version can be found in F. J. Furnivall, *Life Records of Chaucer: Chaucer as Valet and Squire to Edward III,* Chaucer Society (London, 1876), pp. 5-57. There is another household ordinance of 1323, but this adds little more to our knowledge of the *domus,* so it has been unnecessary to include it in this study. This ordinance of 1323 is contained in the same manuscripts as its predecessor and was also printed by Tout in his *Edward II*.
[4] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 194-215.

limited nature of the earlier document. It seems very unlikely that the household quadrupled in size from the reign of Edward I to Edward II. Rather the later ordinance was a more complete account of the king's domestic establishment.

It is a comparative approach between these ordinances that has been of most benefit to the study of King John's household. The dates of John's reign (1199 to 1216) fall between the surviving household ordinances. As such, identifying the continuity and changes that exist between these documents has been of central importance to this thesis. The findings from this examination have prompted a range of questions that can be asked of the contemporary sources from John's reign. To take some examples, there were three constables in the *Constitutio,* but none in the later ordinances, which encourages us to question whether such an officer was still part of the king's domestic establishment during the reign of King John. Upon examination of the evidence, it is clear that no man holding the title of constable had any discernible role within John's household. In another example, there is an apparently clear continuity in the status of stewards across the ordinances, which suggests that, throughout the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, the steward was the senior member of the household. These findings invoke the question: did the stewards have a similar senior position during John's reign? Chapter two is dedicated to answering this important question. A comparison between the surviving household ordinances of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries was the cornerstone of my methodology in the early stages of this thesis, as the questions this study inspired formed the structure for subsequent study.

Household ordinances have been used throughout this thesis as a frame of reference from which questions can be asked, but, wherever possible, I have sought to interrogate the testimony of an ordinance with sources contemporary with John's reign. This approach was essential because even a cursory look at the household ordinances shows that they represent an idealised version of the royal household at the times that they were compiled. The 1279 and the 1318 household ordinances are concerned with the financial costs of the household. The 1279 ordinance is focused on curbing the venality of household officials and reducing costs. The description of duties at the end of the 1279 document is concerned with auditing spending, punishing waste and removing from the hall those people not entitled to eat at the king's expense.[5] This ordinance reflects an attempt to change the household by reducing the scope for abuse of its systems. The household ordinance of 1318 was part of a reforming movement imposed on Edward II for a decade after 1311. This household ordinance was a product of these reforms; it reveals the household as it was intended to be under the new regime, not necessarily as it truly was.[6] The view of the household provided by the surviving ordinances has a relationship to the reality of the household organisation which is far from straightforward. They only reveal the image of the household in accordance with the agendas of those who compiled them.

Another way in which the ordinances distort our view of the royal household is by concealing the impact of the king upon his own household. No ordinance set out to explain, curb or expand the king's place within his own household. This was not part of their agenda. As such, the king appears detached from his household; his influence is manifestly absent. Yet the household was an institution defined by the personal needs of its master; its purpose was to enable the king to live his daily life in the manner he desired. Every aspect of medieval government was designed to serve the monarch, but the household was especially concerned with meeting the needs of the king as a man rather than as a ruler, which naturally differed depending on the man who was king at the time. The ordinances, however, suggest that the royal household was marked by consistency, structure and departmentalism. An interrogation of the evidence at our disposal for the reign of King John reveals a household which was marked by the conditions of fluidity and able to change rapidly in response to the immediate needs of the king. Evidence from the household ordinances conceals the centrality of the king to the household.

'As long as household business is done within the household its records remain there and are lost.' Jolliffe's words, here, sum up the difficulties which face those who would study the English medieval royal household. A shadow of obscurity is cast over the king's household; created, at least in part, by the household's near permanent attachment to the king. The proximity between the king and his household officials ensured that the vast majority of the information which passed

[5] Tout, *Chapters*, ii, pp. 160-3. The same procedures were to be implemented in the queen's household.
[6] The ordinance partly reveals the real household customs, but it also represents many of the changes intended to be made to the household, see Tout, *Chapters*, ii, pp. 245-8.

between them was transmitted verbally. For the most part, there would have been no need to send written instructions within the household, as they could have been given in person. If, on rare occasions, written correspondence was produced within the household, it was of only immediate use and not kept past the point of its utility. For example, if the king wanted a specific dish to be served at his next meal, he could summon the cook to him and directly give his instructions or send a servant with the order. Only if a chronicler notes such a moment in passing can we witness these interactions within the household. On the whole, we cannot learn about domestic arrangements from records of instructions sent from the king to members of his household.

When aspects of government cease to be in the constant presence of the king their activities gain a place on the surviving documentation; as Jolliffe said, they ‘step into the clear light of history’.[7] This evidence materialises as a result of the king’s need to communicate with the parts of his administration which were not attached to the itinerant court. The writing office of the household (the chancery) enabled the king, or his ministers, to communicate with the realm beyond the court through the written word.[8] From 1199 onwards, there has survived a body of records from the chancery which richly portray the reign of King John. These include copies of charters,[9] fines,[10] writs of *liberate*,[11] letters close,[12] and letters patent,[13] all of which were

---

[7] J. E. A. Jolliffe, ‘The Camera Regis under Henry II: Part I’, *EHR*, 68 (1953), 1-21 (p. 3).

[8] In the early thirteenth century, the chancery was still part of the ambulatory royal court. Historians have looked to prove the chancery’s attachment to the court by comparing the locations recorded on the letters patent and letters close, which were affixed with the great seal and produced by chancery clerks, and those locations recorded on the household accounts, the misae and praestita rolls. The findings were that, for the most part, the chancery travelled with the king; the king’s privy seal being used for letters and writs between the king and chancery on the occasions when they were separated. For an overview of these comparisons, see Kanter, ‘Itineraries’, pp. 47-9. For the chancery in the thirteenth century, see D. A. Carpenter, ‘The English Royal Chancery in the Thirteenth Century’, in *English Government in the Thirteenth Century*, ed. by A. Jobson (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 49–70.

[9] TNA C53/1-17. The charter rolls of John’s reign recorded grants of land, privileges and liberties. They are extant from 1199 and have been printed in *Rot. Chart.*

[10] TNA C60/1A-7B. The fine rolls for John’s reign record proffers of money or animals made to the king for royal patronage. They are extant from 1199 and have been printed in *Rot. Fin.*

[11] TNA C62/1-3. The *liberate* rolls for John’s reign, which are extant for second, third and fifth of John’s regnal years. They are printed in *Rot. Lib. John.*

[12] TNA C54/1-15. The close rolls for John’s reign are extant from 1204. They are printed in *Rot. Litt. Claus.* D. A. Carpenter has argued that the *liberate* rolls should be seen as the start of the series of close rolls, see ‘‘In Testimonium Factorum Brevium’: The Beginnings of the English Chancery Rolls’, in *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm,* ed. by N. Vincent (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 1-28 (p. 50). Also, see N. Vincent, ‘Introduction: The Record of 1204’, in *ibid.,* pp. xiii-xx.

[13] TNA C66/1-16. The patent rolls for John’s reign, which are extant from 1202, are printed in *Rot. Litt. Pat.*

enrolled and preserved by the royal chancery.[14] It is the rolls containing the letters close and, to a lesser extent, letters patent, from which we can garner most information regarding the domestic sphere of the royal household.

Letters patent are open documents with the great seal affixed; they often have a general address and cover a diverse range of subjects, such as grants of office, safe conduct and protection. Letters close and writs of *liberate* have a specific address; they were folded over and sealed to conceal their contents. They contain instructions on a multitude of topics, such as orders to sheriffs, bailiffs and exchequer officials, many of which are of an ephemeral, domestic nature. That King John's chancery documented and preserved a record of these communications, even those of a transient nature, is, as Michael Clanchy explained, part of a general shift from memory to written record affecting wider European society during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[15] Much scholarly debate surrounds the question of why the chancery rolls have survived from 1199: did this genuinely marked the start of the creation of these enrolled copies of letters and grants? Or, were such enrolments made before this date, not enduring the vicissitudes of time?[16] Whatever the answer to these questions, the result is that from the start of John's reign, for the first time we can make a detailed study of the domestic side of an English monarch's household.

As already noted, the chancery rolls do not reveal communications between the king and those officials permanently attached to his entourage. What they record are precepts emanating from the central power of household; from the king or his ministers, to local officials, members of the exchequer, or household officials separated from court. There is, therefore, a great deal of dark matter that we know must be there, yet we cannot see. To overcome the difficulties imposed by the nature of the surviving record sources, so that we can learn about the domestic arrangements of King John's household, we must wait for moments of household business to be conducted out of court. Only then is household business evidenced in the records of the chancery. To take an example, on 28 February 1205, a letter close

[14] There is a lacuna in the surviving records in the years 1208 to 1212.

[15] M. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England From 1066 to 1307,* 3rd edn (Chichester, 2013), pp. 58-70.

[16] Carpenter, 'Beginnings of the English Chancery Rolls', pp. 1-28; N. Vincent, 'Why 1199? Bureaucracy and Enrolment under John and his Contemporaries', in *English Government in the Thirteenth Century,* ed. by A. Jobson (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 17-48.

was sent to the sheriff of Lincoln with instructions to find a cart load of fish and send it on to York, ready for the household's visit to that city the following week. This letter was warranted by the steward, Peter of Stokes, and attested by the king.[17] From letters such as this one, we can begin to discern information regarding the domestic arrangements of the household. This letter reveals that local officials undertook procurement of household victuals. This evidence, of a local official's role in supplying victuals to the household, provides only part of the picture of the whole purveyance operation. Throughout this thesis, it has been essential to see the evidence provided by the chancery records as part of a much larger system of household business – a system which is largely hidden from the record sources.

The methodology employed to unveil the workings of the household is best illustrated through an example. Let us consider the means by which the household was supplied with ale. As a staple drink of much of society, ale was clearly served in large quantities within the royal household.[18] Ale is mentioned in the *Constitutio*, when it is noted that the watchmen were entitled to a gallon of ale in the morning after their watch.[19] The ordinance of 1318 shows that ale was a staple drink supplied to much of the household. It records that two hundred gallons of ale were dispensed daily to household officials. This quantity may be a conservative estimate of the total, as there were more men entitled to dine in the king's hall than those whose daily provisions are detailed in the ordinance.[20] The impression given by the 1318 ordinance is that ale was served to the majority at court and wine was reserved for officials of a higher status.[21] The Black Book of Edward IV suggests that half a gallon of ale could be sufficient for a servant at one meal time.[22] Beyond the royal household, Barbara Harvey has calculated that valets in monastic houses could expect to receive one gallon of best ale a day, whereas a groom could receive a-

[17] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 20b.
[18] For a general overview of ale consumption in the medieval period, see J. M. Bennett, *Ale, Beer and Brewsters in England: Women's Work in a Changing World, 1300-1600* (Oxford, 1996). For ale drunk in monastic houses, see B. Harvey, *Living and Dying in Medieval England, 1100-1540* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 44, 56-8. For the consumption of ale in aristocratic households, see C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Medieval in Medieval England* (London, 1999), pp. 126-8; C. Dyer, *Standards of Living in the later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 55-8.
[19] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 210-11.
[20] Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 270-314.
[21] For two valets serving wine and ale in the hall, see Tout, *Edward II,* p. 289.
[22] For example, see A. R. Myers, *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478* (Manchester, 1959), p. 117. Yet, this amount should be seen in the context of the Black Book's provenance, which was that costs in the royal household had to be drastically reduced. For the financial difficulties of royal household in the fifteenth century, see *ibid.*, pp. 5-7, 9-15, 21-6, 35-44.

gallon-and-a-half of the second best ale.[23] Given the size of the royal household during the reign of King John, we may estimate that at least five hundred gallons of ale were required for each and every day of the year.[24]

We might expect that the purveyance or production of such a large quantity of ale to have made an impact on the surviving record sources. The pipe rolls have been used throughout this thesis to bolster the greater body of evidence found in the chancery rolls, as they reveal much concerning the function of local officials in supporting the royal household. In many instances, the pipe rolls record payments made by local officials for the purchase and transportation of victuals for stocking royal residences. In the case of ale, however, there is no evidence whatsoever of such payments. There is also almost no mention of ale in the records produced by the royal chancery.[25] What this lack of evidence suggests, then, is that ale, unlike many other household victuals, was not purchased by local officials for the household. Had sheriffs or other officials bought ale for the household we would expect to see a record of instructions sent to them on the letters close, and a note against their account on the pipe roll. This, then, is part of the dark matter of the household: how was the household supplied with ale?

Royal officials might have produced ale specifically for consumption in the household. This production might have occurred on the king's estates or within the itinerant household. There is, however, no evidence of such production. Had the household adopted its own production of ale we could expect to detect some evidence of this process through the purchasing of malted grains. Local officials were regularly commissioned to purchase grains used for making flour for bread; they were not, however, instructed to purchase malted grains so that ale could be made.[26] Moreover, there is no evidence concerning the maintenance or purchase of equipment for a brewery. Nor do any of the surviving household ordinances of the

[23] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 171.
[24] For the size of the household, see *infra*, pp. 115-7.
[25] For a rare exception when John fitz Hugh was instructed to supply necessities including ale, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 61b.
[26] The exception to this rule was during war-time when there is some limited evidence of malted grains being purchased, see *Pipe Roll 12 John*, p. 149; *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 169.

twelfth to fourteenth centuries describe an official whose responsibility it was to brew ale.[27]

The surviving records for John's reign are limited; they tell us by no means the whole story. But, in light of the evidence, in so far as it is revealed to us, ale was seemingly neither bought by local officials nor produced in the household. Through an understanding of the nature of the surviving record sources, it is possible to use this lack of evidence to draw some conclusions. Tentatively, we may conclude that ale was bought in its fully made form from brewsters in the local area surrounding the household. This method of purveyance, like those already discussed, leaves no trace of evidence during John's reign. The key difference, however, is that we would not expect it to. Such a method would have left no impression on the sorts of records which have survived to the modern day. Purchases made by household purveyors in the vicinity of the household must have been made with coin from the royal chamber. The only records to survive that provide evidence of chamber expenditure are the misae and praestita rolls, which are not concerned with the purchase of victuals for the wider household.[28] As such, ale could have been bought from local brewsters by household purveyors with money from the chamber without any trace of these activities making an impact on the records of the exchequer or the chancery. In this example, I hope to have demonstrated the difficulties of the sources in the early thirteenth century for studying the king's household; as well as the ways in which we can tentatively overcome the gaps in our evidence to make plausible arguments for how the domestic arrangements of King John's household were conducted.

The attestations and warrants attached to the letters produced in the royal chancery have also been of great importance throughout this thesis. The *per* and *teste* clauses of the chancery letters have been taken as a literal representation of the authority and directive behind the command within the letter. Pierre Chaplais questioned who was entitled to attest letters close and patent; he saw a link between subject matter of the document and the role of the person who made the attestation. Chaplais saw this link

[27] It is unlikely that ale was brewed by buttery officials as their titles indicate a responsibility for wine alone.
[28] For a discussion of the misae and praestita rolls, see *infra*, pp. 30-5.

as occasional and not illustrative of a general rule.[29] This link between subject matter and warrantor is, however, present for the vast majority of letters concerning household business. Chaplais pointed to the presence of the chamber clerks' attestation attached to many writs of interest to the chamber.[30] For example, Richard Marsh, the chamber clerk, and Ralph Parmenter, a chamber serjeant, warranted a letter close with instructions to the barons of the exchequer to account to Fulk, bailiff of Glamorgan, for one hundred marks that he had paid into the chamber at Woodstock.[31] Likewise, when a letter contained instructions regarding the king's wine it would often be warranted by a royal butler. In January 1208, for example, Daniel the butler warranted a letter, which the king attested, to the barons of the exchequer with instructions to account to the reeve of Southampton for the money paid in the carriage of the king's wine.[32] In another link between content and warrantor, Walter de St. Ouen, who had charge of the king's stable, attached his warrant to many letters concerning horses. In December 1207, for example, Walter's warrant was attached to a writ of *computate*, witnessed by the king, for cash spent by Robert of Ropsley on expenses for the king's horses.[33] Household officials warranted letters and writs with subject matters that were directly their concern.

The *per* clause is evidence of an official's role in giving the verbal instructions to the scribes of the chancery to have a letter written and their authority behind the action it commands. For this reason, when, for example, a steward's warrant was attached to a letter concerning the purchase of victuals or instructions concerning the payment of household officials' liveries, this is indicative of the steward's particular responsibilities and function within the household. Likewise, the *teste* clause reveals another person who was concerned with business within the letter or writ. The attachment of the king's attestation to many writs and letters of household business should not be viewed as a mere formality of the diplomatic of these documents. V. H. Galbraith argued that chancery letters, charters and writs from the early thirteenth century that were 'given by the king' were a honest representation of his personal involvement in the compiling of the document.[34] Moreover, Galbraith claimed the

[29] P. Chaplais, *English Royal Documents: King John to Henry VI, 1199-1461* (Oxford, 1971), p. 16.
[30] Chaplais, *English Royal Documents*, p. 16.
[31] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 89b.
[32] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 100b.
[33] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 99.
[34] V. H. Galbraith, *Studies in the Public Records* (London, 1948), pp. 126-30.

teste clause implied a similar involvement. Galbraith claimed that the *teste* clause, as found during John's reign, had not become 'universal, therefore meaningless'.[35] The attestation of King John on chancery letter concerning the domestic arrangements can be interpreted as honest representation of his direct involvement in this sphere of his household.

Comparisons made by a number of historians between the locations in the dating clauses of the chancery and household records during John's reign have demonstrated that the king was with the great seal, and that his attestation should be interpreted as a genuine representation of the king's presence during the production of chancery letters.[36] Chaplais explained that, until the 1240s, the clause *teste me ipso* implied that a draft of the letter had been read in the king's presence, suggesting that the king was personally concerned with its contents. During John's reign, his attestation is attached to a great many letters concerning household business; moreover, it regularly appears without an accompanying warranty clause. In June 1207, for example, the sole attestation of the king was attached to a writ of *computate* for money spent on wax, pepper and spices for the household, bought by Reginald of Cornhill.[37] The implication of this sole attestation is that the king was personally involved in the process of purveyance for commodities from Reginald of Cornhill, and that he gave the verbal command to the chancery scribes to produce this writ of *computate*. The king's attestation and warrant of letters and writs produced in the royal chancery has a considerable impact on our understanding of his role within the household. Throughout this thesis the diplomatic of the chancery records is used as a means of understanding the structures and arrangements of the household.

In addition to the series of chancery rolls, the first examples of household accounts of an English monarch also survive from this period. These are the misae and praestita rolls. These records are enrolled copies of expenditure out of the king's chamber.[38] The first surviving misae roll covers John's eleventh regnal year (7 May

[35] Galbraith, *Studies*, pp. 125-6.
[36] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. xlii-xliii; Chaplais, *English Royal Documents*, pp. 17-8.
[37] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 86b.
[38] For the purposes of this discussion I have said the expenditure came from the king's chamber, which for most of the reign it would have done. In the later years of the reign as the wardrobe expanded and it, too, had cash to dispense, which equally might have appeared on the misae and praestita rolls.

1209 to 27 May 1210), and was printed by Thomas Duffus Hardy in *Rotuli de Liberate ac Misis et Praestitis, regnante Johnanne* (1844).[39] The second misae roll that has survived comes from John's fourteenth regnal year (3 May 1212 to 23 May 1213); this was printed by Henry Cole in *Documents illustrative of English history in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries* (1835).[40] The praestita rolls have survived in two forms. Firstly, as a record of issues from the king's chamber and, secondly, as a summarised list of this expenditure drawn up for the purpose of informing the exchequer.[41] Of the first type, a complete roll survives from John's seventh regnal year (19 May 1205 to 11 May 1206), printed by Cole,[42] and from John's twelfth regnal year (27 May 1210 to 12 May 1211), printed by Hardy.[43] A fragment of the chamber copies of the praestita rolls from John's fourteenth regnal year, covering the period 8 November 1212 to 4 December 1212 and 15 December 1212 to 9 January 1213, also exist.[44] J.C. Holt printed this, alongside the praestita rolls drawn up for the exchequer, which survive incompletely from John's fourteenth to eighteenth regnal years.[45] From internal evidence within the rolls we know that these were not the only rolls of their kind to have been made during John's reign. The praestita roll for John's twelfth regnal year, for example, makes numerous mentions of a corresponding misae roll of the same year that no longer survives.[46]

The purposes of the misae and praestita rolls are difficult to determine. It is possible to give an impression of their general purpose and the mentality behind their production, but there will be many exceptions to these generalities. This difficulty derives, in part, from the appreciable differences between the various exemplars; these were not documents with a static form or purpose. In the context of their length and detail, there are changes between the existing exemplars. For example, the misae roll for 1212 to 1213 is over twice as long as its earlier counterpart.[47] These rolls

---

[39] TNA E101/349/1B. *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 109-71.
[40] TNA E101/349/2. *Docs. of English History*, pp. 231-69. A duplicate of membranes 2 to 12 is also on TNA E101/349/3.
[41] *Pipe Roll 17 John*, p. 74.
[42] TNA E101/325/1. *Docs. of English History*, pp. 270-6.
[43] TNA E101/325/21. *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 172-253.
[44] Bibliothèque royale de Belqique, Brussels, MS 3897-3919, ff. 173*r* – 174*v*; *Pipe Roll 17 John*, pp. 85-8.
[45] TNA E101/325/2. *Pipe Roll 17 John*, pp. 89-100.
[46] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 175, 234, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 245. There is, however, no mention of a corresponding misae roll in the praestita roll for 1205 to 1206.
[47] The misae roll for 1209 to 1210 covers fives membranes, the total parchment used was 1176 inches. The later roll was twelve membranes long using 2728 inches of parchment.

changed because the way they were used adapted to meet the needs of the king as he dealt with the challenges facing his court and wider realm. As a result, the expenditure recorded on these rolls reflects the issues facing the household and the kingdom. They reveal political and military events, changes to financial processes and household structures, as well as the king's personal domestic requirements. The praestita roll for 1210 to 1211, for example, is testimony to the king and his household's focus on the campaign in Ireland in the summer of 1210. This focus is evidenced by the fact that the sixty-three day campaign dominates three quarters of the praestita roll of that year.[48] Likewise, the misae roll for 1209 to 1210 reflects the establishment of castle treasuries. From 1207, John established various provincial treasuries to allow greater accessibility to coin as he toured the country.[49] In total, this misae roll records £2837 2*d* of expenditure which passed through the chamber and was deposited at a castle treasury. For example, the misae roll records three hundred marks paid into Northampton castle in February 1210.[50] Much of this cash that the misae roll records came from the profits of ecclesiastical lands. These profits reflect another major event within the realm – the interdict, which had been imposed on England by Pope Innocent III in November 1209. These examples serve to demonstrate that these household rolls reflect the concerns of the king and the realm. They were documents that were very malleable in their uses and, yet, they share one key consistency: they existed to serve the needs of king.

It is through the differences between the rolls which much of our knowledge about the royal household emerges. They reveal the changes to the household's structures, officials and accounting procedures. For example, a comparison of the two misae rolls reveals a shift in the terminology used to describe the officials of the chamber and wardrobe. Much can be discerned from this shift in terminology with regards to the changing function, status, and personnel of these two household offices. Moreover, changes to the structure of the later misae roll to include interpolations of accounts for multiple days, in what is an otherwise chronological sequence, provide an insight into the account and audit procedure of the household. This comparative

[48] S. D. Church, 'The 1210 Campaign in Ireland: Evidence for a Military Revolution?', A*nglo-Norman Studies,* 20 (1998), 45-57 (p. 48).
[49] J. E. A. Jolliffe, 'The Chamber and the Castle Treasuries under King John', in *Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke,* ed. by R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 117-142.
[50] *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 148.

approach is a key way in which these household accounts have been used in this thesis.

The content of the misae rolls mainly consist of payments for tangible items or services which the king had received. Messenger service, for example, is a prominent feature of both misae rolls. The rolls record the amount given to the messenger, where they were travelling to and, on some occasions, the nature of their business.[51] The services of huntsmen, carters, knights, tutors, almoners and spies also appear on the misae rolls. There is one, rather grisly, example of a service provided by a man named William who, on 8 May 1212, received a payment of six shillings for bringing to the king at Rochester six severed heads of Welshmen who had been serving Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, the Welsh prince, who was on the brink of war with King John.[52] The items purchased and recorded on the misae rolls are of a miscellaneous nature. To take just a few examples, they record purchases of leather sacks, shoes, hauberks and other paraphernalia, as well as purchases of fine textiles for making the robes of the king and his closest associates.[53] The diversity of the contents of the misae rolls highlights the flexibility of their use. These rolls also demonstrate the lack of any perceptible division between the king's public and private spending. A purchase for the king's new chamber pot, for example, is adjacent to a payment to Flemish knights.[54] The expenditure recorded on the misae rolls provides a perspective on royal spending which usefully balances the disproportionate focus of the surviving sources on the function of local officials in supplying the royal household. The misae rolls cannot, however, reveal a full and complete account of expenditure on any given item or service. They provide just a small window into a much greater operation of royal purchasing. The king might have used the cash within his chamber to pay for the expenses of his household, but he was just as likely to ask a local official to cover the costs of the same type of expenses. We cannot, therefore, use the misae rolls to calculate any totals of expenditure; the evidence they provide must be used in the context of the great Angevin system of finance.

[51] For some examples, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 112, 118.
[52] *Docs. of English History,* p. 231; A. D. Carr, 'Llywelyn ab Iorwerth (*c.*1173–1240)', *ODNB,* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16874, accessed 18 June 2013]
[53] For leather sacks for the king's baggage, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 116, 132, 144, 150; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 244, 247, 257. For cloths and robes, see *infra,* ch. v.
[54] *Docs. of English History,* p. 239.

The praestita rolls differ from the misae rolls due to the conditions attached to payments they record. The name *praestita* suggests that these rolls record loans; advances from royal funds for which the recipient would later be held to account either within the chamber or at the exchequer (the debt collecting agency of the crown). The surviving copies of the summarised praestita rolls, from the final years of the reign, which were sent to the exchequer, suggest that these loans were to be re-called at the exchequer.[55] At cursory glance, this appears to be a simple process; except, however, that these 'praestita' were not summoned at the exchequer.[56] Not until the reign of Henry III, in 1229, were the loans, which are recorded on the praestita rolls of John's reign, transferred onto the exchequer pipe rolls.[57] Church has provided an explanation for why the serjeants, crossbowmen and knights, who were given prests in preparation for the campaign in Ireland in 1210, were not summoned to account for these debts.[58] He argued that King John employed a system of paying wages to these men serving on overseas campaigns. For those men of knightly status, these wages were paid under the guise of a loan, which was more morally pleasing to knights due to the stigma attached to receiving 'dirty lucre' in return for military service. Church suggested that *praestita* had a far more flexible meaning than prest, advance or loan. To take an example, the prests given to Geoffrey Luttrell and Henry Fitz Count for the hire of ships were never intended to be recalled. Rather, there was an expectation that Geoffrey and Henry would later account for their spending. So, there were conditions attached to the expenditure in the praestita rolls, such as the promise of future service, the requirement to account, or the repayment of the debt at the chamber or the exchequer.

The *praestita* discussed by Church were of a military nature. But, what of the expenditure of a domestic nature which appears on the praestita rolls? The praestita rolls include payments made to household officials as advances on their wages, such as for Charles the fisherman, Ouen the serjeant and Violet the fiddler.[59] Expenditure

---

[55] *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 73.
[56] With the exception of the prests given to men who accompanied the king on the expedition to Poitou in 1214, see *Pipe Roll 16 John,* pp. 9, 18, 25, 33, 37, 42-3, 45, 52, 54, 59, 62, 65, 74, 81, 95, 103, 114, 118, 121, 134, 136, 140, 143, 152, 160, 166, 176.
[57] These prests appear on pipe roll for Henry III's thirteenth regnal year, see TNA E372/73. The following year's pipe roll has been printed and many of the prests can be found under the heading *De Pluribus Prestitis Factis Tempore Regis Johannis*, see *Pipe Roll 14 Henry III,* pp. 29, 46, 63, 70, 105, 127, 158, 175, 194, 212, 220, 239, 250, 263, 289, 304, 323, 348.
[58] For the following discussion, see Church, '1210 Campaign', pp. 55-6.
[59] *Docs. of English History,* p. 275; *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 230, 242.

on the hire of carts to transport the household offices, in particular the wardrobe, is also recorded on the praestita rolls.[60] The praestita roll for John's seventh regnal year records many loans to Peter of Stokes, the king's steward, and the chamber clerk, Philip de Lucy.[61] What seems very unlikely is that these loans of a domestic nature were ever passed to the exchequer for collection. Of the loans recorded on the chamber copy of the praestita roll for John's fourteenth regnal year, few relate to household expenditure; those that do, however, cannot be found on the praestita roll drawn up for use in the exchequer in the same year.[62] To take an example, William fitz Richard, the master of the hunt, received two marks for the expenses of the king's hounds. This payment to William fitz Richard cannot be found on the corresponding exchequer copy of the praestita roll.[63] Throughout the exchequer copies of the praestita rolls for John's fourteenth to eighteenth regnal years there is little to suggest the debts notified to the exchequer for collection were ever concerned with the domestic sphere of the royal household.[64] Similarly, the debts listed under the headings *De Prestitis Factis Tempore Regis Johannis* found in the pipe rolls of Henry III rarely include payments to members of the royal household.[65] Insofar as the evidence is revealed to us, prests recalled at the exchequer were not of a domestic nature. When this evidence is seen in the context of the many payments made to household officials for advances on liveries, payments for equipment, and expenses for hiring carts or keeping the king's hounds which appear on the praestita rolls, it seems unlikely that the *praestita* made for domestic household business were loans. Instead, these payments must have been accounted for at the chamber. When William fitz Richard received other *praestita* in John's fourteenth regnal year, for example, all of his debts were cancelled as, it is stated, he had already accounted for them. In all likelihood this accounting process happened at the chamber.[66] These monies paid to domestic officials were part of the internal accounting procedure of the household; they were not intended to be passed to the exchequer for collection. Household business largely remained within the household, but the praestita rolls

---

[60] *Docs. of English History,* p. 273.
[61] *Docs. of English History,* pp. 272, 273.
[62] One exception to this rule may be the prest given to William de Ireby, a valet of the king, but the amount given does not correspond with the chamber copy, see *Pipe Roll 17 John,* pp. 87, 89.
[63] *Pipe Roll 17 John*, p. 85.
[64] *Pipe Roll 17 John,* pp. 89-100.
[65] With the exception of the debts of John's household knights.
[66] *Pipe Roll 17 John*, pp. 86-7.

can provide a glimpse of the internal financing of the domestic sphere of the royal household.

It is through a combination of the surviving household ordinances, the letters and writs produced by the royal chancery, the pipe rolls of the exchequer and the misae and praestita rolls, that a study of King John's household has been possible. Other sources, in particular the accounts of contemporary chroniclers, have provided a narrative of the medieval household during the reigns of John's predecessors and successors which has enhanced the information provided by the record sources. For the most part, however, it is upon the strengths and the weaknesses of the record sources which this thesis is based.

Chapter 3: The Chamber

The defining feature of the existing historiography on the royal chamber of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries has been the desire to place the chamber within the context of the greater mechanics of Angevin government. In the 1920s, T.F Tout took the first decisive step in this direction. In his great work, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England,* the chamber and wardrobe's financial and administrative processes and their subsequent developments were discussed at length, allowing Tout to demonstrate the importance of these offices outside the bounds of the royal household.[1] Tout introduced historians to the idea of the chamber both as a vital accounting office for the kingdom, and as a secretariat. Where Tout led, others followed. A generation later, Jolliffe began his studies on the Angevin chamber. Jolliffe described the chamber as the treasury of the king and the exchequer of the household. He showed that, from the reign of Henry II onwards, the chamber received and distributed large sums of money that had been collected from royal revenues, such as fines made with the king, arrears of debts, and county farms. Jolliffe argued that Henry II was motivated to increase the financial functions of his chamber by an inherent weakness in the mechanism of the exchequer inherited from the tumultuous reign of his predecessor, King Stephen, which had allowed the crown's debtors to accumulate arrears for many years.[2] Although Jolliffe's explanation of these motivations has been strongly criticised, especially by H.G. Richardson, his conclusions remain valid. Over the Angevin period the wealth, and consequently the power, of the chamber dramatically increased.[3]

During the reign of Henry III, however, although we can witness the existence of the chamber in the records of royal government, it largely ceases to have an administrative or financial capacity.[4] The historiography reflects this change, as no study has given significant attention to the Henrician or early Edwardian chambers.

[1]Tout, *Chapters,* i-vi.
[2] For Jolliffe's work on the chamber, see Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part I', pp. 1-21; Jolliffe, 'The *Camera Regis* under Henry II: Part II', *EHR* 68 (1953), 337-62; Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* ch. xi; Jolliffe, 'Castle Treasuries', pp. 117-42.
[3] H. G. Richardson, 'The Chamber under Henry II', *EHR,* 69 (1954), 605-11.
[4] *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III,* ed. by B. L. Wild, p. xiii; W. L. Warren, *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England, 1086-1272* (London, 1987), p. 189. For the administrative role of the royal chamber during the reign of King John, see J. B. Edwards, 'The English Royal Chamber and Chancery the Reign of King John' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Cambridge University, 1974).

It is the revival of the chamber's wealth in the early fourteenth century which has brought a resumed interest from historians.[5]

Scholars have been rightly concerned with the uses of the royal chamber as a major accounting office of the kingdom, yet in the process their focus has been steered away from its traditional domestic functions. The chamber had three functions. Firstly, it was the king's personal treasury.[6] Secondly, attached to the chamber, until the reign of Henry III, was the wardrobe which stored the king's clothes and regalia.[7] And, finally, the chamber was the personal sanctum of the king where his bodily and domestic needs were met. It was here that the king slept, ate, washed and entertained his friends. These domestic functions of the chamber are excluded from the scope of the current historiography. Tout acknowledged that the chamber's role in 'the daily life of the king and his court is entirely without my sphere'.[8] Jolliffe's investigation into the domestic operations of the chamber was limited to its role in financing domestic expenditure and its changing relationship with the wardrobe office. That no study of the royal chamber during the Angevin period has considered the chamber in terms of these traditional occupations might at first seem an idiosyncrasy of the historiography. The reason for this omission, however, lies partly in the nature of the surviving evidence for the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, which does not easily reveal the intricacies of this private aspect of the king's chamber. Jolliffe stated that body-service to the king 'by its very nature, eludes the records'.[9] Yet, it is possible to be a little more optimistic about understanding the domestic functions of the royal chamber during the reign of King John. And, it is these domestic functions that will be the primary concern of this chapter.

Much of the existing scholarship on the royal chamber has focused on the activities of those men we can readily associate with the office through title. From the reign of Henry II onwards, a new clerkship emerged which played a significant role in the

---

[5] J. Conway Davies, 'The First Journal of Edward II's chamber', *EHR,* 30 (1915), 662-80. Tout, *Chapters,* ii, pp. 314-60; P. Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adoptive Brother* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 104-6. For Henry III's chamber, see Tout*, Chapters,* i, pp. 228-32.

[6] White, 'Household of the Norman Kings', p. 144; Poole, *Exchequer in the Twelfth Century,* pp. 22-4.

[7] For the chamber's function in purchasing and storing items of the king's wardrobe, see *infra,* ch. v.

[8] Tout, *Chapters,* i, p. 18.

[9] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', p. 350. Jolliffe saw Round's study on the bodily services performed by the chamber as sufficient, see Round, *King's Serjeants,* pp. 112-32.

chamber.[10] Through an analysis of his activities, Jolliffe identified Osbert as an early holder of this clerkship. Jolliffe saw Osbert's main function as a receiver of cash into the royal chamber, especially during times of war. Over the following thirty years, the chamber clerkship became a regular feature of the household. The chamber clerk's importance and responsibility increased as the scope of the chamber's financial capacity expanded.[11] At the start of John's reign, the chamber clerkship was held by a triumvirate of men: Thomas, William and Bartholomew.[12] This triumvirate subsequently shifted to a senior clerkship in sole charge under Peter des Roches, until his elevation to the bishopric of Winchester. After Peter's consecration at Winchester on 25 September 1205, he was replaced by Philip de Lucy; who later suffered a sudden fall from favour in 1207, after which Richard Marsh obtained the position of senior chamber clerk.[13] Richard had been employed in the chamber since at least 1205, and his position as the senior clerk later led to his promotion as chancellor, an office he held by October 1214.[14] For the remainder of the reign, after Richard's elevation to the chancellorship, there was no identifiable senior chamber clerk. It is possible that Master Arnulf of Auckland occupied the position, although he was never given the title.[15]

During John's reign, the warrant of these clerks appears against the hundreds of writs concerning the receipt, issue and account of money which passed through the chamber.[16] Much of the financing of the realm was conducted through the actions of the royal chamber clerks. The clerks were, for example, central to the chamber's role

---

[10] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 226.
[11] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part I', pp. 342-3.
[12] For the working triumvirate, see *Rot. Norm.,* p. 31.
[13] N. C. Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An Alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 47-52. Peter des Roches continued to exert considerable control over the chamber's financial actions for the remainder of the reign, see *ibid.,* pp. 58-61. For Philip de Lucy's fall from grace, see Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 248; Edwards, 'Chamber and Chancery', p. 195; *Rot. Fin.,* p. 386; *English Episcopal Acta IX: Winchester 1205-1238,* ed. by N. Vincent (New York, 1994), pp. 198-9.
[14] *Docs. of English History,* p. 272; *Rot. Chart.,* p. 202. It is possible Richard was chancellor earlier, as Walter de Gray resigned in July 1213, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 102.
[15] Arnulf first appeared in the sources in September 1210, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 229. His first recorded dealings in finance were in October 1212, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 125b. Arnulf did not receive money into the chamber like the other senior clerks. Jolliffe described Arnulf as the deputy clerk of Richard Marsh with a special responsibility for the wardrobe, see *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 271-2. The lack of an obvious chamber clerk in the later years of John's reign may be as a direct result of the increased financial functions of the wardrobe. For the clerk of the wardrobe, see *infra,* pp. 61-2.
[16] For examples of clerks receiving money and issuing writs, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 53; *Rot. Norm.,* pp. 102, 116; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 21b, 22, 26, 28, 29b, 31b, 34b, 35, 36, 36b, 38, 44, 46b, 48, 51, 55b, 56b, 84b.

in financing the military campaigns of the reign.[17] Thomas the chamber clerk supplied money to William Brewer to pay knights' liveries and hire ships in preparation for the planned expedition in Poitou in 1205.[18] Later in the reign, Richard Marsh was the clerk given charge of making payments of prests to knights going on campaign to Ireland in 1210.[19] Chamber clerks were also concerned with finances within the household, specifically with the receipt of cash and documents.[20] Chamber clerks kept account of the value of the chamber and wardrobe's contents and issued cash from the chamber treasure.[21] Their focus was on finance and administration both internal and external to the household. Therefore, despite the plentiful evidence for these clerks, a study of their activities does little to enhance our understanding of how the chamber fulfilled its domestic role in meeting the king's daily needs. As a result, the clerks' presence in this chapter will be limited to those occasions on which they authorised writs concerning domestic expenditure on items for the royal chamber.

The other officers of the chamber who are identifiable by title are the chamberlains. In the *Constitutio* the king's chamber, like other household offices, had a head minister – the master chamberlain, who was supported by chamberlains serving in turn.[22] The office of the chamberlain was subject to fluctuations in power and diversions in responsibility across the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Jolliffe gave these vicissitudes central focus in his study of the *camera regis;* he explained that, in 1158, a distinction emerged between the chamberlains of the exchequer and those of the household. This separation was followed by a period of absence of any man titled chamberlain who held a discernible role in the household.[23] Jolliffe identified a number of men who, during this time, received money into the chamber, but he stopped short of identifying these men as chamberlains.[24] Jolliffe dated the

[17] For chamber clerks' role in financing military campaigns, see Church, *Household Knights*, pp. 41-2.
[18] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 28b.
[19] For examples, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 98b; *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 214, 218, 224.
[20] For examples of clerks receiving documents, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 42, 83. Clerks accepted money into the chamber and then issued a writ of *computate* to the exchequer, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 21b, 29b, 92.
[21] For Philip de Lucy, the chamber clerk, issuing money out of the chamber, see *Docs. of English History*, pp. 270-5 *passim.*
[22] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 206-7.
[23] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', pp. 338, 350.
[24] These include Ralf Fitz Stephen, Geoffrey Monachus, Ralf Waspail and William de Ostilli, who all received money into the chamber. Nick Vincent identified Ralf Fitz Stephen as a chamberlain from

emergence of a new household chamberlainship to *c*.1166. This position was occupied by Richard Ruffus and Turpin under Henry II, Brice under Richard, Hubert de Burgh, Willian de Cantilupe and Geoffrey de Neville under John, and by Stephen of Seagrave under Henry III.[25] Jolliffe conceded that there was no contemporary warrant for the title 'household chamberlain', but considered that it best explained the domestic nature of the role of these men.[26] Yet, Jolliffe did not illustrate this domestic nature through their activities. Instead he claimed that a land grant given to Richard Ruffus in 1166 was of such low value that the recipient must have had purely domestic responsibilities.[27] Jolliffe's evidence for Ruffus' domestic activities included two warrants for expenses on works for the king's houses, and one example of his involvement in purchasing robes for the royal family.[28] This evidence is very limited. In using it to declare the existence of a new 'innovative' domestic office, Jolliffe, it seems, stretched the evidence to its limits.

When we turn to those men who are named as the immediate successors of Ruffus, we find that there is little to recommend the notion that these chamberlains had an incumbent domestic function within the household. Brice was a mainly financial officer during Richard's reign.[29] In John's reign, Brice the chamberlain held no discernible place in the king's domestic arrangements and was deployed in offices on the continent which would have kept him almost permanently away from court. In 1200, Brice was made constable of Pontorson; two years later, he was promoted to the seneschalscy of Anjou.[30] Hubert de Burgh, the next of Jolliffe's 'household chamberlains', enjoyed a stronger connection to the office from which he took his title. In 1199, Hubert - alongside John de Gray and Elias Bernard - paid money into the chamber from the master of the Knight's Temple.[31] In May 1200, he ordered money to be paid to Bartholomew, the chamber clerk, who had fallen ill at Rouen. In

charter witness lists from the reign of Henry II, see 'The Court of Henry II', in *Henry II: New Interpretations,* ed. by C. Harper-Bill and N. Vincent (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 278-333 (p. 297).

[25] William de Cantilupe was John's steward, not his chamberlain.

[26] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', p. 339.

[27] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', p. 340. As our knowledge of land grants under Henry II is incomplete, it is entirely possible this was just part of a larger corpus of lands given to Ruffus, This is not necessarily the case, but it is worth making the point as it demonstrates the futility of categorising Ruffus as a domestic servant on this basis.

[28] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', p. 340.

[29] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', p. 339.

[30] *Rot. Chart.,* p. 59; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 17b. There is evidence of Brice being in receipt of coin. But this coin was never explicitly received into the chamber, see *Rot. Fin.,* p. 73; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 8b; *Rot. Norm.,* p. 49.

[31] *Rot. Fin.,* p. 73.

April 1201, Hubert ensured payment was made for shoes received into the chamber. Geoffrey fitz Peter was instructed to account to Hubert at the chamber for money which had been spent on robes. Finally, in the following month, Hubert caused a chamber clerk to be paid for robes that had been brought into the chamber.[32] These examples are the only indications that Hubert de Burgh acted in a capacity which directly related to the chamber. After the spring of 1201, there is no evidence of Hubert having any financial or domestic responsibilities in the chamber (despite holding the chamberlainship until 1206), as he was deployed on missions for the king on the continent.[33]

The next chamberlain in Jolliffe's list was Geoffrey de Neville. Geoffrey held this position from October 1207 until his death in 1225, yet he only performed service in the royal chamber for the first four months of his chamberlainship. In those few months, Geoffrey - alongside the chamber clerk, Richard Marsh - received coin into the chamber.[34] Geoffrey also witnessed a writ of *computate* for money Reginald of Cornhill had spent on fur hoods and cloth, which had been received into the household by Ralph Parmenter, the chamber serjeant.[35] Geoffrey authorised two other commissions for materials for tablecloths and robes for the king's chaplains.[36] By 1208, Geoffrey had ceased to serve in the office from which he took his title. In 1210, he was sent to Poitou to help secure support for John from the Poitevin barons.[37] This marked the start of a number of years that Geoffrey spent away from England. In 1214, Geoffrey was made seneschal of Gascony and, in the following year, seneschal of Poitou.[38] Geoffrey returned to England in 1215, as tensions mounted between the king and barons. Yet, despite retaining the chamberlainship, he never returned to active service within the chamber or the wider household.

---

32 *Rot. Norm.*, p. 23; *Memoranda Roll 1 John*, p. 92; *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 14.
33 M. Weiss, 'The Castellan: The Early Career of Hubert de Burgh', *Viator*, 5 (1974), 235-52. For the later career of Hubert de Burgh, see D. A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990); D. A. Carpenter, 'The Fall of Hubert de Burgh', in his *The Reign of Henry III* (London, 1996), pp. 45-60; S. H. F. Johnston, 'The Lands of Hubert de Burgh', *EHR*, 50 (1935), 418-4352; F. A. Cazel, 'Intertwined Careers: Peter des Roches and Hubert de Burgh', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 1 (1989), 173-81.
34 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 93, 94b, 100b, 101b.
35 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 101b.
36 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 98, 104b.
37 *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 154.
38 A. F. Pollard, 'Neville, Geoffrey de (*d.* 1225)', rev. by S. D. Church, *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19932, accessed 19 Feb 2013].

For all three of these men who held the title of chamberlain during John's reign, evidence of their domestic, or even financial, duties within the chamber is sparse. Their deployment to the continent is a key indicator that chamberlains were not required to be in active service within the household. Richardson, in his response to Jolliffe's work, appropriately warned of the hazards of assigning specific duties to a chamberlain.[39] The history of the chamberlain is obscured by the quantity of men given the title, which included noble hereditary claimants, men holding chamber serjeanties and chamberlains of the Exchequer. Moreover, messengers, tutors, ushers, and those men who cared for the king's bodily needs could all also be titled 'chamberlains'.[40] The men Jolliffe described as holding the working-court chamberlainship during John's reign, were holders of an honorific title, which did not imbue its recipient with any specific responsibilities in the king's chamber. The title was a mark of status and indicative of a man's importance to the king, rather than to the household. This represents another example of the variety of ways in which this title was used in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

During John's reign, there are a number of other men described as *de camera* but, generally, we can only catch glimpses of them in the record sources.[41] The activities of Gerard of the chamber, however, are slightly better represented in the sources. He was active within John's chamber from 1200 to 1207. Described as 'our serjeant', it seems probable that Gerard was a literate layman.[42] Like the chamber clerks, he received money into the chamber, which often came directly from the treasury.[43] Gerard dispensed cash, paid royal expenses and issued writs of *computate* to the barons of the exchequer for money paid into the chamber.[44] Gerard appears to have had some connection to the Exchequer and the treasury in his capacity as a receiver of coin from the treasury to the chamber. A reward given to Gerard for his services supports the view that he was an official with ties to both the chamber and Exchequer. On 23 January 1203, Gerard received a charter from King John granting

[39] Richardson, 'Chamber under Henry II', pp. 597-8.
[40] For a chamberlain acting in the capacity of an usher, see *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle,* ed. and trans. by R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981), nos. 207-209. For a chamberlain serving the king's bodily needs, see Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 440-1.
[41] For Simon of the chamber, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 108. For Laurence of the chamber, see *ibid.,* p. 142.
[42] *Rot. Chart.,* p. 119; Edwards, 'Chamber and Chancery', p. 191.
[43] *Memoranda Roll 1 John* p. 92; *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 73b, 81.
[44] *Rot. Norm.,* pp. 53, 59; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 15, 26. 65.

exemption from justice outside the king's court, and exemption from paying summonses for military service, scutages and tallages.[45] The *Dialogus de Scaccario* informs us that everyone who sat at the Exchequer by the king's orders was exempted from common assarts, assizes, murder fines, danegeld and scutage.[46] There are no other known charters for members of the king's household conferring such exemptions during John's reign. It seems possible, therefore, that Gerard received these exemptions in his capacity as a link between the chamber and the Exchequer.

Norman of the chamber also appears occasionally in the record sources. We know of Norman's existence as he was named as the second husband of Grace, the daughter and heiress of Thomas of Saleby, for whom Brian de Lisle (the household knight and later household steward) had fined in three hundred marks in 1205.[47] We can see also that King John sent Norman on missions. In 1203, Norman went to Germany and took a palfrey to the king's nephew, Otto.[48] In January 1204, Norman travelled with Ralph of Cirencester and Richard of Dovedale on 'a secret ship' in the king's service.[49] It is probable that Norman was a messenger of the king with specific attachment to the chamber. It was not uncommon for chamber officials to be employed as messengers. Another can be identified on the misae roll, for 1209 to 1210, as Ralph the chamberlain.[50] Ralph's position was evidently as a trusted envoy; he was sent to important figures in the localities such as to sheriffs and Reginald of Cornhill. In January 1210, Ralph was charged with taking the fine rolls to the exchequer.[51] Ralph was also sent, on occasion, *in nuntium* (on a mission), rather than as a *nuntius* (messenger), suggesting a degree of importance to his role.[52] On one such occasion, Ralph was sent on a mission to the Roman Curia, for which he was paid one mark for his expenses.[53] One important function the chamber fulfilled for the king was to provide a class of trusted messengers who the king could use to

[45] *Rot. Chart.*, p. 119.
[46] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. 72.
[47] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 240; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 212. For a discussion of this marriage, see *infra,* pp. 103-4.
[48] *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 9.
[49] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 77.
[50] D. Crouch, *The Image of the Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300* (London, 1992), p. 298. For Odo the chamber clerk's role in diplomacy, see Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', pp. 342-3.
[51] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 112, 113, 123, 129, 133, 134, 144, 146.
[52] For household knights sent *in nuntium,* see Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 63-7. For diplomacy during John's reign, see P. Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in Middle Ages* (London, 2003), pp. 72-4; J. Benham, *Peacemaking in the Middle Ages: Principles and Practice* (Manchester, 2011), pp. 117-137 (esp. pp. 134-6).
[53] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 165. Also, see *ibid*., p. 151.

communicate with local powerful men, foreign dignitaries and with his own administrative officers.

The men who have been discussed so far are those who can be readily identified as officials of the king's chamber. Yet, few of these men tell us anything of how the chamber supported the king in his daily life. Most were not domestic officials, they were men of national importance honoured with a title: administrators and financiers. In order to investigate the chamber as a space which surrounded the king's person and provided for his daily needs we must look for evidence of the chamber's function as part of the wider household. Identifiable by their title, the chamber officials whose careers have been so central to previous explorations of Angevin government spent only a small proportion of their time fulfilling household duties.

The primary domestic function of the chamber was as the king's sleeping quarters.[54] The king's bed would have been part of the impedimenta of the itinerant household; in the *Constitutio* responsibility for the bed was given to a porter.[55] The transportation of the king's bed can also be traced in John's reign. On 3 November 1212, for example, a packhorse carrying the king's bed was taken from Southwark to the New Temple over the Thames.[56] The king's bed was not just a place for sleeping, it was also a place for sitting and talking whilst in the chamber.[57] Whilst the household was on the road, rather than being established in a royal residence, the king's bed might have been set up in a pavilion.[58] By the reign of Henry II, *thalami* were being constructed in royal residences, such as at Geddington.[59] These rooms might have been intended as specific sleeping chambers for the king; an inner private space within the chamber. The notion that a part of the chamber could be cordoned off for the king's sleeping was current in the minds of contemporaries. Jordan Fantsome describes the private quarters of the chamber ('sa chambre demeine') where King Henry II slept, as a place of silence without the sounds of court or music,

[54] Tout, *Chapters*, i, pp. 67-71.
[55] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 206-7.
[56] *Docs. of English History*, p. 246. Also, see *ibid*., p. 237.
[57] 'cum rex et regina, in camera quadam convenientes, super lectum quemdam sedendo confabularentur', see *Chronica monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. by H. T. Riley (London, 1865), p. 114.
[58] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 181.
[59] *The History of the King's Works: The Middle Ages,* ed. by R. A. Brown, H. M. Colvin and A. J. Taylor, 2 vols (London, 1963), ii, p. 943.

with chamberlains who guarded his privacy.[60] During John's reign, works continued to be done on *thalami* rooms. At Woodstock in 1207, John fitz Hugh spent over thirty pounds on a *thalamus* and, in 1204, a fireplace was made for the king's *thalamus* at Portsmouth.[61] This evidence suggests that a number of King John's chambers contained a secluded space in which he slept. The king's sleeping arrangements involved some considerable comfort; John had a stuffed mattress with feather-filled, silk lined pillows, all covered with a silk quilt and extra blankets, which were stored in the wardrobe.[62] The king's sleeping chamber and his other chamber rooms were kept warm by a large fire. The rare recorded purchases of firewood demonstrate that almost equal amounts were bought for use in the chamber as in the great hall, which indicates the shift in the focus of the court away from communal living in the main hall.[63]

It was also within the chamber that the king bathed. The misae rolls provide the first real indication of the number of baths a monarch might have taken in one year.[64] From 29 January 1209 to 26 May 1210 John paid for baths in various places, including Northampton, Gloucester, Marlborough, Bramber, Bristol and Havering. The misae roll records a total of twenty-two baths in these sixteen months, each bath costing between 4*d* and 6*d*.[65] A few years later, from 16 April 1212 to 23 May 1213, John paid for eight baths, costing between 3*d* and 6*d*.[66] It seems likely, however, that John bathed more than eight times in a year. As the misae rolls are not a full representation of John's expenditure and give us only part of a much larger picture it seems plausible that baths were also paid for through other means. The *Constitutio* informs us that the king paid his water-carrier 4*d* for each bath, except those he took on the three annual feasts - presumably Easter, Pentecost and Christmas - when the money went to the church where the festivities took place.[67] In 1209, John took a bath at Easter (29 March) during his stay at Northampton from 27 to 31 March. John

---

[60] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle,* nos. 207-209. Vincent has noted the same practice in the reign of Henry II, see 'Court of Henry II', p. 311.
[61] *Pipe Roll 9 John,* p. 188; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 123. In 1204, a private chamber was also constructed at Hereford, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 4.
[62] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 109, 175; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 47; *Docs. of English History,* p. 244.
[63] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 101b-102; D. A. Carpenter, 'The Household Rolls of King Henry III (1216-1272)', *Historical Research,* 80 (2006), 22-46 (p. 37). For the importance of keeping the warm with 'adequate fires', see *Fleta,* ii, p. 116.
[64] For a comment on the cleanliness of William Rufus, see Barlow, *William Rufus,* pp. 150-1.
[65] *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 115, 137, 170.
[66] *Docs. of English History,* pp. 237, 249, 262.
[67] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 208-9; Barlow, *William Rufus,* p. 150.

also bathed during his visit to Marlborough over Pentecost, which fell on 17 May 1209.[68] For Pentecost on 13 May 1212, John bathed at Odiham on either 11 or 12 May.[69] On Christmas Eve in 1212, John bathed at Westminster, and a week later John bathed at Havering on 31 December. John also bathed on the day before Easter at Rochester on 13 April 1213.[70] For each of these great feast days, the money was paid to his water-carrier for the bath. There is no indication that the money was going to the church, suggesting that the practice as described in the *Constitutio* had lapsed by John's reign.

The water-carrier, who made the king's baths, was listed as a member of the chamber in the *Constitutio*; his livery was double rations and a further penny when the household was travelling.[71] By John's reign, this allowance had been standardised to a halfpenny per day. In 1209, the water-carrier, William, received a halfpenny for everyday of the year from 29 January 1209 to 26 May 1210.[72] The same halfpenny wage was given to Roger the water-carrier, from April 1212 to 23 May 1213. This wage was paid in addition to one-off payments for each bath the king took, presumably to cover the costs of heating the water to a suitably king-pleasing temperature.[73] These payments to the king's water-carriers give us some indication of the king's bodily needs which were attended to by the officials of the chamber. Under Henry II other chamber officials had been employed to keep wine ready for the king during the night, should he require refreshment, or to rub his feet as he dozed off to sleep.[74] The primary concern of many of the men of the chamber was keeping the king comfortable. The chamber was the inner sanctum of the household where the king slept, washed and kept warm. The officials performing these duties were not men who served the king as king, so much as they served the man who ruled.

King John's chamber also provided an alternative space for eating in the household. It seems natural that the king would have occasionally chosen to eat in his chamber

[68] Here, I have matched the places in which John bathed with his known itinerary, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 115. For John's location on these dates, see Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 597, 598.
[69] *Docs. of English History,* p. 237; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 661.
[70] *Docs. of English History,* p. 262.
[71] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 208-9.
[72] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 115, 137, 170.
[73] There was a gap in Roger's wages in December 1212. John, however, took two baths in this month, see *Docs. of English History,* pp. 237, 249, 262.
[74] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle,* nos. 207-209; Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 440-1.

away from the communal hall, as there must have been times when discussions needed to be carried out in private, most conveniently over meals. The food served on these occasions was produced by a kitchen with a special attachment to the chamber. A distinction between the hall and chamber kitchens can be traced through the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. In the *Constitutio* and the household ordinances of 1279 and 1318, the great kitchen or its cooks are variously described as 'de magna coquina', 'cuisiners de la quisine de la mesnee*'* and, in 1318, the cooks were 'deux sergeantz keus pour la mesne'. This great kitchen of the household must have produced the food for all those present in the household who were permitted to eat at the king's expense; whereas, separate provisions were made for the king. In *c*.1136, the head of this separate kitchen was described as 'cocus dominice coquina*'*; in 1279, there were 'cuisiners de la quisine le rei*'* and, in 1318, there were 'deux sargeantz keus pur la bouche le roi*'*.[75] In 1318, the role of king's cooks was clarified, stating that it was their responsibility 'to make the roasts and other courses for the chamber'.[76] Given the consistency of the evidence in the ordinances, it seems plausible that the same organisation existed in the early thirteenth century. Meats, fish and grains would likely have been purchased for the household as a whole, being appropriately divided between the great and chamber kitchens.[77]

Although, it seems likely that chamber kitchen was generally stocked through the household's main purveyance arrangements, some additional luxuries, such as spices, sweeteners, fruits and nuts were bought and stored specifically in the chamber. These luxuries must have enabled the cooks of the chamber kitchen to supplement the king's table with victuals that often surpassed the quality of what was served in the wider household. Luxuries for the household at large were bought by Reginald of Cornhill, the king's purveyor in London, who was commissioned in this task by the steward or the king. These luxuries were released to household serjeants, such as Geoffrey the king's saucer, who received the spices for the

[75] Tout, *Edward II*, p. 292; Tout, *Chapters,* ii, p. 159; *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 202-3.
[76] Tout, *Edward II*, p. 262.
[77] In the fourteenth century the chamber kept just a small stock of victuals for those eating privately with the king, see Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 153, note 54. This view is supported by the fact in the household rolls of Henry III no separate account is made for a chamber kitchen, suggesting that most food was purveyed for the household as a whole, see Carpenter, 'Household Rolls', p. 25. I am grateful to David Carpenter for bringing this to my attention at the Revealing Records Conference, King's College London, 2012.

household.[78] On some occasions, the chamber was stocked with luxuries purchased by Reginald. However, officials of the chamber could also make purchases from merchants in the immediate vicinity of the household, bypassing the usual purveyance routes. On 28 October 1212, for example, King John paid two marks for two pounds of gillyflowers (a type of clove used to spice wine) from a merchant of Provence.[79] Later that same year, on 24 December, likely in preparation for Christmas, the king brought three barrels of honey.[80] Baskets of fruit containing figs and nuts, such as chestnuts and almonds, were also brought directly from merchants and received into the chamber to be stored in the wardrobe.[81] The purchases of these luxury items were paid with coin from the chamber treasure. This method of payment suggests that they were intended for consumption by the king and his closest associates within the chamber. The chamber's dual capacity as both the financial and domestic centre of the king's household gave it the flexibility to operate outside the usual routes of supply used for the main household. By operating in this way the chamber was able to function as a small spicery, independent from the great kitchen of the household, which had the cash and the necessary servants to provide the king with luxury food products without requiring the involvement of other household officials.

The peripatetic nature of King John's household was made possible by the hundreds of horses, stabled and groomed within the household. Transport was an essential daily need of a medieval king, and John's chamber played a vital role in ensuring this need was fulfilled. The existence of an independent chamber stables comes to light when, on 27 June 1209, separate equipment was purchased for both the large stables and the stables of the chamber.[82] The royal household evidently contained two stables; one larger, presumably responsible for the majority of the horses, and another, which was subsumed within the office of the chamber, suggesting it would have provided exclusively for king and his companions.

A clear distinction can be made between the king's horses and those of the rest of the household. In November 1209, for example, at King's Cliffe, many payments were

[78] For spices in John's household, see *infra*, pp. 209-12.
[79] *Docs. of English History*, p. 245.
[80] *Docs. of English History*, p. 249.
[81] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 131, 134,135; *Docs. of English History*, pp. 245, 246, 247.
[82] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 117. There another description of a chamber attached to a stables at Woodstock in July 1205, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 41b.

made for the expenses of horses and grooms. Forty-one of these horses were described as 'of the king' and a further forty horses were without this description.[83] The care of the king's horses was the responsibility of Walter de St. Ouen, whose activities are well documented in the surviving household accounts. Commonly, sections of the stables were hived off from the household and boarded away from the court for short periods of time. This practice was presumably to give the well-worked horses an opportunity for rest.[84] On these occasions, Walter de St. Ouen either personally stayed with the grooms and horses or allocated one or more of his squires to attend.[85] In October 1212, for example, two squires, Thomas de la Lande and Nicholas, were charged with keeping thirty-three horses and grooms for a night at Newport, Staines, Reading, Newbury, and two nights at Marlborough and Wilton.[86] The money for the expenses incurred during such operations was usually paid to Walter de St. Ouen or Walter, a clerk of the stables.[87] On 8 March 1213, for example, Walter de St. Ouen was accounted the expenses numerous grooms, cartermen and horses, including the costs of ninety-nine horses and seventy-two grooms for three days near Rockingham and Newport.[88] This is the largest number of horses recorded as being under Walter's control at any given time. Their time away from court incurred substantial costs, totalling £11 10*s* 11½*d*.[89] With this money Walter would have bought hay, oats, straw, iron and paid for the liveries of the squires and grooms. Horses were also sent from court to stay with local officials. Letters close directing local officials to receive and care for horses were warranted by Walter de St. Ouen. For example, palfreys and grooms were sent to William of Cornhill in April 1205 and to the sheriff of Gloucester in 1207.[90] Walter's warrant also appears on writs of *computate* sent to the barons of the Exchequer for the costs incurred by officials when keeping the king's horses.[91]

---

[83] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 140.
[84] As the misae rolls are a list of expenditure out of the chamber, I have taken the payments made concerning horses, squires and grooms to be part of the chamber stables, although this is not always stated in the rolls.
[85] For an example when Walter de St. Ouen stayed with a section of the stables, see *Docs. of English History*, p. 241.
[86] *Docs. of English History*, p. 244.
[87] *Docs. of English History*, pp. 237, 244, 247.
[88] *Docs. of English History*, p. 255.
[89] *Docs. of English History*, p. 268.
[90] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 27b, 97.
[91] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 99.

Walter de St. Ouen had at least five squires working beneath him: Hugh de St. Ouen; Thomas de la Lande; Nicholas; Geoffrey; and Garcia.[92] Each of these men could expect to receive money when away from court; the money being paid to Walter's namesake, the squire, Hugh de St. Ouen.[93] Grooms of the chamber stables also received robes. Unwine, Matthew and Hudde each received a robe worth four shillings after travelling to the king in Nottingham.[94] This evidence from the misae rolls provides an intimate glimpse at the king's chamber and demonstrates that there was a hierarchy of officials whose purpose it was to care for the king's chamber horses. That the king had his own horses is perhaps not that surprising - the very best would have undoubtedly been reserved for him. However, that these horses were attended to by different squires and grooms and were kept in different stables, ultimately under the control of the chamber, suggests a degree of separation between the king and his wider household not previously noticed by historians. Through his horses, John was able to maintain one of the fundamental aspects of his kingship as they allowed him to tour his realm with astonishing speed. The office of the chamber had the means to maintain the king in this peripatetic lifestyle, without requiring the network of support from the wider household.

From the payments recorded on the misae rolls, it also transpires that Walter de St. Ouen had control of an armoury and a forge. On 2 May 1213, Walter accounted the expenses of carters and grooms of an armoury.[95] On 18 March, earlier that same year, Hugh de St. Ouen, received the money to pay for the expenses of the sumptermen of an armoury and a forge.[96] The misae rolls also reveal that there was a smith, Richard, working this forge.[97] Walter de St. Ouen was responsible for making purchases for equipment for the king's armoury, including new wheels, nails and binders to fix carts.[98] Walter also bought a saddle and six surcingles for the armoury, and three wheels for burnishing the armour of the king.[99] The armoury employed a hauberk-maker, Emeric, who purchased leather for making the king's hauberks and

[92] Thomas de la Lande and Geoffrey can be seen in both the misae rolls, see *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 163-4; *Docs. of English History*, pp. 233, 237, 238, 243, 244, 256, 257, 262.
[93] *Docs. of English History*, p. 257.
[94] *Docs. of English History*, p. 254.
[95] *Docs. of English History*, p. 261.
[96] *Docs. of English History*, p. 256. Also, see *ibid*., p. 236.
[97] *Docs. of English History*, p. 238.
[98] *Docs. of English History*, p. 262.
[99] *Docs. of English History*, p.237. 'per iii rotuli ad rotulandum arma domini regis'

bought sacks for transporting them.[100] Emeric also worked on other armour; he placed a metal tip on the king's helmet, bought felt for the king's armoured shoes and made a horse's armoured head-piece and fur-lined bridle rein.[101] Emeric sometimes personally transported these items. On such occasions, he received wages (*vadia*) or expenses. For example, Emeric delivered hauberks from Bristol to Northampton over the course of four days in October 1209, for which he received 2*s* 6*d*.[102] The evidence concerning the chamber armoury indicates that it was concerned exclusively with the king's armour, rather than for the wider household.

The armoury and forge were all directly under the control of Walter de St. Ouen. Their expenses and costs are found almost exclusively on the misae rolls. Moreover, that equipment made in this armoury and forge was specifically for the king, suggests that these offices were another part of the chamber's responsibility. These functions of the John's chamber are echoed in the *leges palatine* of 1337, which depict the royal household of Jaume III of Majorca. In this ordinance, the chamber is described as having its own armourer and squires who were responsible for carrying the king's arms and armour.[103] Vale, when discussing this ordinance, notes that it bore close resemblances to the chamber of the king of England in the early fourteenth century.[104] In light of the evidence provided by the household accounts from John's reign, similar developments can be traced a hundred years earlier to the early thirteenth century.

The domestic functions of King John's chamber were impressive. It had the means to provide the king's food, his transportation, his armour, his clothes, a private space to sleep and to keep warm. Combined, these functions demonstrate that John had the means to live separately from his wider household. The chamber had the capacity to fulfil all his daily needs without requiring the immediate support of the other household offices. This separation is different from that identified by those historians concerned with the royal itinerary. Julie Kanter in her thesis on the itineraries of thirteenth-century kings, pointed to a number of occasions when John left the body

[100] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 116; *Docs. of English History,* p. 257.
[101] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 119. Decoration of horse equipment was important in the display of royal riches. See F. Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries: A Study of the Material Culture of the Court of Edward I, (1272-1307)' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1992), pp. 169-70.
[102] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 134-5.
[103] For a discussion of this ordinance, see VanLandingham, *Transforming the State,* pp. 15-7.
[104] Vale, *Princely Courts,* pp. 61-2.

of the household to go hunting, for example, in Sherwood forest.[105] What John's itinerary highlights is that, when the household had to make a long journey, which would perhaps take five or six days travelling with the various carts of royal baggage, then the king would often leave the household to its own devices and make additional trips to places just off the main route, along the way staying at the houses of local nobles or abbots. Warren described the royal household's itinerary as a 'steadily moving focus of a more widely roving king'.[106] John could cover far greater distance in this way. As a man on horseback, he could travel up to thirty miles a day, whereas the household was restricted by the speed of the slowest baggage carts and could cover, perhaps, just twelve miles in a day.[107]

Such separation was motivated, for the most part, by convenience. So, on these occasions, John would travel with no more than a few men and the bare essentials. In August 1212, for example, the misae roll shows that John travelled to Nottingham with just the essential squires and grooms for his horses, while the rest of the court was ten miles away at Gunthorpe.[108] What is very clear is that on these occasions John was not accompanied by his chamber, because it, like the other household offices, had to be transported on carts.[109] The author of the history of William Marshal gives us an example of John leaving his household, when, in 1203, having become enraged by an argument with the Marshal, John left his household, and it was said that they could not 'find him in the hall, or in his bed in his chamber'.[110] John did not travel separately with his chamber, but what the evidence concerning the many functions of the royal chamber informs us is that, when the king was present in his household, which would have been the majority of the time, he had the means to live apart from the hustle and bustle of court. The structure of John's chamber suggests the existence of a significant division within the royal household.

Why, then, did such a division exist? The answer lies in the nature of the medieval royal household. It was an immense entourage, so daunting in its approach that contemporary commentators described the unbridled fear with which communities

[105] Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 97-8
[106] Warren, *King John*, p. 137.
[107] Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 29, 98
[108] *Docs. of English History*, p. 239.
[109] *Pipe Roll 11 John*, p. 10.
[110] *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. by A. J. Holden, trans. by S. Gregory, 3 vols (London, 2002–2006), ii (2004), ll. 12743-67.

anticipated its arrival.[111] It was a busy, frenetic, noisy establishment of unrivalled complexity and diversity. The king's court jostled with huntsmen and falconers, merchants selling their wares, prostitutes and paupers, great barons of the realm, visiting foreign dignitaries, the household knights, clerks and, of course, all the king's domestic officers who handled the logistics of providing food, drink, lodgings, transportation and care for this vast array of people.[112] It was the chamber's role within this great institution, at least in part, to provide peace, solitude and privacy for the king from the babble of his court.

Privacy was a developing royal aspiration in the twelfth century. Barlow saw the chamber of William Rufus, at the end of the eleventh century, as an overcrowded space which did not constitute a separate suite of rooms.[113] Walter Map, in seeking to critique the closed nature of Henry II's chamber, praised the openness of the chamber of Henry I, by claiming that it was accessible to nobles and the young of court alike.[114] From the reign of Henry I, however, Crouch has argued that, in both royal and aristocratic households, rulers and magnates were reducing their presence in the household and creating a private world within their chambers.[115] For the reign of Henry II, Vincent has shown that royal privacy was a real feature of court life. Through the rich descriptions of court life from Walter Map and Peter of Blois, Vincent has brought to our attention the king's retreat to his chamber, in order to avoid the enforced sociability of court, the constant petitioners and the petty squabbles of courtiers who looked to the king for settlements.[116] The author of the history of William Marshal reveals the privacy which surrounded King John's chamber, when he stated that 'I do not have a lot of information as to what he did in that room [the chamber]'.[117] For the Angevin period, Jolliffe stated that any apartment that might be a private space for the king could effectively become the chamber; in doing so, Jolliffe made privacy the defining feature of the royal chamber.[118] Likewise, Vale, looking to the fourteenth century, has asserted that there

---

[111] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. by M. Rule (Kraus, 1965), pp. 192–3; Green, *Government*, p. 27.
[112] Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 31-45.
[113] Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 148.
[114] Map, *De Nugis*, p. 472.
[115] Crouch, *Image of the Aristocracy*, p. 301.
[116] Vincent, 'Court of Henry II', pp. 310-8.
[117] *Guillaume le Maréchal*, ii, ed. Holden, ll. 12748-12751.
[118] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part I', p. 4.

was need for privacy, diversion and entertainment for rulers in the pre-renaissance period, and that the chamber was the natural setting of these activities.[119]

Each of these historians has contributed to our understanding of the recognised trend towards an increased desire for privacy across the princely courts of North-Western Europe in the Middle Ages. This desire was satisfied by a gradual detachment of the lord's chamber from the communal living of the household's main hall.[120] This process culminated in a self-conscious separation of the upstairs and downstairs elements of royal and aristocratic households in the fifteenth century. Yet, already by the mid-thirteenth century, it is clear that commentators were aware of this separation emerging from within the household. Robert Grosseteste, for example, writing in the 1240s, saw the great days of the hall as being in the past.[121] Michael Prestwich also noted that, in the accounts of Edward I, it is clear the king rarely ate in the hall, only venturing there on special occasions. For the most part, Prestwich states, Edward ate in his chamber.[122] The rise of the status and political importance of the office of the chamber in the fourteenth century highlighted this division between the chamber and hall.[123] Tout showed that, during the reign of Edward II, the chamber had a resurgence of power; this emphasised the great importance and influence of the king's chamberlain as the man who controlled access between the chamber and the hall.[124] The detailed description of the functions of the chamber in the 1318 household ordinance also demonstrates an awareness of the growing importance of the office. Yet, a comparison with the earlier household ordinances from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries can also reveal a very real separation of the chamber and the hall, long before the revival of the chamber's financial and political importance in the fourteenth century. The fluctuating importance of the chamber office serves as a reminder that we should not look for simplistic lines of development in the royal household. The household has been viewed by constitutional historians as a simple tale of progression to the modern state; the

---

[119] Vale, *Princely Courts,* pp. 58-9.
[120] Vale, *Princely Courts,* p. 57; Tout, *Chapters,* ii, p. 248; Johnson, 'King's Wardrobe and Household', p. 207.
[121] *Walter of Henley and other Treatises on Estate Management and Accounting,* ed. by D. Oschinsky, (Oxford, 1971), p. 407.
[122] Prestwich, *Edward I,* p. 158.
[123] There is a clear dividing line shown in household ordinance of 1318. Officials are referred to as 'of the chamber' or 'of the hall'.
[124] Tout, *Chapters,* ii, pp. 332-6.

reality, however, is far more complex due to the household's susceptibility to the decisions, personality and will of the king.[125]

The *Constitutio*, which depicts the household in the early twelfth century, provides a picture of a full chamber office. Chamberlains serving in turn, a candle chamberlain, a water-carrier, a tailor, a laundress and a porter for the king's bed all supported the master chamberlain.[126] In the *Constitutio*, the king's chamber is described amongst the other household offices: there is no indication that when the *Constitutio* was written the chamber was in any way separated from the main body of the household. Conversely, by 1279, when the second of the surviving household ordinances was compiled, the chamber is most notable by its absence. The reason for this exclusion arguably lies in the purpose of the ordinance. The 1279 household ordinance survives in its original form as a small, slightly muddled, document of which there are no later copies.[127] This is in stark contrast to the *Constitutio* or the 1318 household ordinance, which both survive as richly decorated later copies, presented in such a way as to suggest that the scribes intended them to be used as a frame of reference for future generations.[128] The 1279 ordinance is written in French (the vernacular of the court) whereas the *Constitutio* and the 1318 ordinance are in Latin, the language of administration. Finally, the 1279 ordinance provides the names of individuals who were owed allowances; whereas the other ordinances are overwhelmingly focused on principle, with most, if not all, personal names excised from them. Each of these aspects of the 1279 manuscript suggests that it was intended for contemporary use in the household, rather than to be preserved for posterity as a model of the king's household. The 1279 ordinance was intended to establish the nightly accounting procedure for each household office, with the exception of the chamber.[129] In 1279, the steward, treasurer and controller were to examine the servings given in the hall, specifically the issues of the pantry, buttery

---

[125] Especially, see Round, *King's Serjeants,* pp. 52-264; *Red Book,* pp. ccxciii-ccxcvii.
[126] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 206-9. There is also a tally-cutter listed amongst the chamber officials, which may show the financial role of the chamber at this early stage. The ushers of the chamber appear later under the marshalsea, the office of the household concerned with security, see *ibid.*, p. 212.
[127] TNA C47/3/15
[128] Manuscripts of the *Constitutio Domus Regis* are TNA E164/2, TNA 164/12, BL. Hargrave MS 313. Manuscripts of the 1318 Household ordinance manuscripts are BL. Add. MS. 32097, BL. Cotton, Tiberius E VIII, Bodleian, Ashmole, 1147.
[129] The ordinance was also intended to reduce the scale of the royal establishment by naming those who were permitted to sleep within the household and instructing the marshal to clear away ribald, wantons and horses.

and kitchen.[130] The servings in the chamber were not subject to the same accounting procedure. The close and intimate relationship that chamber staff shared with their ruler meant that they were considered answerable only to him.[131] The inclusion of the chamber in the *Constitutio,* compared to its exclusion in 1279, strongly suggests that between the 1130s and 1270s, an appreciable separation emerged between the chamber and the rest of the household; a separation which is reflected in its private accounting procedure.

The headings that appear in the thirteenth-century copies of the *Constitutio* imply that the scribes of the mid-thirteenth century appreciated this separation between the chamber and the wider household. In the introduction to the latest edition of the *Constitutio,* Church devotes great attention to the headings given to many of the household offices, such as 'de buteleria' and 'de escantionibus'. Church concludes his introduction with the possibility that there were no headings in the original document (*c*.1136) except, perhaps, 'de quatuor pistoribus simul sua vice servientinbus'. In this conclusion, Church was following the evidence in Hargrave MS 313 which offers no headings, and using the fact that the headings in the two thirteenth-century copies of the *Constitutio* differ greatly.[132] If his hypothesis is sound, then it suggests that the headings are the result of the thirteenth-century copyists imposing their own contemporary understandings of the structure of the royal household upon a twelfth-century document.[133] It is interesting, therefore, that these thirteenth-century copyists chose to provide headings for almost every household office, including the larder, the buttery, the stewards, the kitchens, the napery, the cupbearers and the chapel, all in fact, except the chamber and the king's hunt.[134] This evidence adds further weight to the view that, in the thirteenth century, the chamber was considered separate to the other domestic royal offices. The copyists, by not giving the chamber staff the heading 'de camera', as one would have

[130] Tout, *Chapters,* ii, p. 160-1. The chamber and the wardrobe were also not subject to the jurisdiction of the steward, see *Fleta,* ii, p. 116.
[131] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 85; Vale, *Princely Courts,* p. 59; Tout, *Chapters,* i, p. 229. 'with the exception of the chamber all the other departments accounted to the wardrobe', see Johnson, 'King's Wardrobe and Household' p. 206.
[132] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. lxiv-lxv.
[133] Church, 'Reflections', p. 8.
[134] Charles Johnson interpolated headings for the chamber and the hunt into his English translation of the *Constitutio,* see *Dialogus,* ed. Johnson, pp. 133, 135. For evidence that the hunt also separated from the main body of the household, see *Docs. of English History,* pp. 231-69; Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 37-8.

expected, were trying to mould the twelfth-century household, as depicted in this document to fit with their early thirteenth-century understanding of the disposition of the royal household. Overall, the evidence of the household ordinances strongly suggests that, over the course of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, a change occurred that witnessed the separation of the chamber from the main body of the household.

Architectural evidence of royal residences seems to give structural substance to this documentary testimony. In an eleventh-century castle it was common to find the chamber on the second floor above the hall. By the thirteenth century, chambers were being built in separate buildings and connected to the hall through a series of passageways.[135] Vincent, in his study of the court of Henry II, has pointed to the evidence of significant building works being done on royal chambers in the mid to late twelfth century.[136] Henry's son, King John, continued these works with perhaps even more enthusiasm than his father had shown. He built new chambers or improved existing structures in the royal hunting lodges at Silverstone, Brill, Bere-Regis and Woodstock; in castles at Marlborough, Ludgershall, Portchester, Rockingham, Kenilworth, Winchester and Corfe; and in the royal manor house at Gillingham.[137] These chambers might have been the tip of the iceberg. There were so many more generic 'works' done on royal residences during John's reign that there could have been considerably more new buildings or improvements made to royal chambers than the records reveal. The time, money and energy John devoted to his chambers are clearly indicative of the growing importance of the chamber as a distinct space.

The evidence of the structure and functions of King John's chamber demonstrates how this general trend towards separate living, which is recognised by historians, actually impacted on the daily life of the monarch. By the early thirteenth century, the chamber was not simply a private space to which the king could sporadically retire when the milieu of court grew tiresome; it was a capable of functioning as an inner household surrounding and separating the king. The chamber had absorbed

[135] Vale, *Princely Court,* p. 63; Crouch, *Image of the Aristocracy,* p. 299.
[136] Vincent, 'Court of Henry II', p. 313.
[137] *King's Works,* i, p. 83; *ibid*., ii, p. 617. For Bere-Regis, see *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 151. For Kenilworth, see *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 191. For Brill, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 60. For Gillingham, Silverstone, Rockingham, Ludgershall, Marlborough, Portchester, see *Pipe Roll 13 John,* pp. 83-4; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 100b.

elements of the wider household so that it had the capacity to provide the daily needs of the king. This evidence gives substance to the very gradual trend of the chamber's detachment from the hall.

This extraordinary glimpse of the intricacies of the domestic functions of the king's most intimate royal office is made possible due to the proliferation of chancery and household records at the start of John's reign. During the reigns of previous Angevin kings, the chamber is more enigmatic, as we are more reliant on contemporary commentators for the bulk of our knowledge. Due to this disparity in the surviving sources, it is unlikely that we can ascertain whether these various domestic functions of the chamber were an innovation of John's reign or whether they had been inherited from his predecessors. What we know, however, is that the royal chamber was not a static office consistently maintaining the same features from reign to reign or even year to year.[138] In J. Lally's study of the household of Henry II, he also viewed the chamber as a protean office. Lally saw that Henry II moulded and altered the staff of his chamber across the reign; in particular, the office of the chamberlain witnessed many changes.[139] The changes that Lally glimpsed for the reign of Henry II become increasingly visible during John's reign. John's desire to shape and change his most personal household office can be seen most clearly in the appreciable shift in the relationship between the chamber and the wardrobe. This evidence suggests that what we can demonstrate for John was also true for Henry II, and therefore, probably for Richard.

A comparison between the two surviving misae rolls suggests that there was a shift towards the wardrobe being an autonomous office separate from the chamber. From May 1210 to May 1212 (the time between the two misae rolls), there was, at the very least, a change in the terminology employed by scribes producing these rolls.[140] In the misae roll for John's eleventh regnal year, the descriptions 'de camera' or 'de garderobe' were used synonymously for cartermen and sumptermen.[141] By 1212, the

---

[138] Jolliffe, too, saw the chamber as a rapidly changing office, see '*Camera Regis*: Part II', p. 347.
[139] J. Lally, 'The Court and Household of Henry II, 1154-189' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Liverpool, 1969), pp. 46-8.
[140] For the view that this was fundamentally a change in terminology, see Edwards, 'Chamber and Chancery', p. 201.
[141] For examples of 'de camera', see *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 118, 128, 137, 143. For examples of 'de garderobe', see *ibid*., pp. 110, 122, 159, 162, 164.

cartermen and sumptermen were only described as 'de garderobe'.[142] What seems likely is that this change was concerned with far more than simple semantics. In these few short years a distinction had arisen between the chamber and wardrobe staff which had not fully existed before 1210.[143]

In the second half of the reign, officials appear in the record sources who had a specific attachment to the wardrobe. The wardrobe had ceased to share all its personnel with the chamber, suggesting that it enjoyed an increasing degree of autonomy. One notable example is Charles of the wardrobe, who is first recorded in the sources from 1209. Charles' function is unclear, but we can glean some impression of his status.[144] In 1209, Charles was wealthy enough that he was able to proffer five hundred marks for the right to marry the daughter of John of Rye. In right of his wife, Charles gained lands in Brignall, Cliffe, Cowton and East Layton; these lands were all held of the honour of Richmond.[145] Such a large fine is testimony to Charles' wealth, but it is the men who pledged their support for this fine who provide the greater evidence of Charles' status. Amongst his pledges were prominent members of the nobility, courtiers and long-standing royal servants, including the earl of Warenne, Fulk de Cantilupe and William de Neville. It is clear that Charles had wealth and a significant place at court. Charles was a trusted servant of the king, evidenced by the fact that during the civil war he was granted permission to take seisin of the lands of rebel barons in Leicestershire and Norfolk.[146] These facts strongly suggest that Charles was no menial domestic servant, and that his affiliation to the wardrobe consequently suggests the growing importance of that office, even from its infancy in John's reign.

Ivo the usher was another official specifically attached the wardrobe in the later years of John's reign. Ivo's role included making repairs to the wardrobe's coffers and keys, and purchasing baskets and blankets; but, he was mainly concerned with

[142] *Docs. of English History,* pp. 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 240, 242, 244.
[143] Tout, *Chapters,* i, pp. 67-119, 158-69; Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 256-76; *Wardrobe Accounts,* ed. Wild, pp. xi-xiii.
[144] Given Charles' association with the wardrobe, it is possible he was a court merchant.
[145] *Pipe Roll 11 John* p. 36; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 220b; *Rot. Fin.*, pp. 558, 562; *Early Yorkshire Charters Volume V: The Honour of Richmond, Part II,* ed. by C. T. Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (Wakefield, 1936), pp. 333-4.
[146] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 232, 232b, 238b, 243, 290b. In these letters he is named 'Charles Fitz William'.

the safe transportation of the king's possessions.[147] The wardrobe's baggage included an archive of the king's documents. In August 1212, cases were bought for the purpose of keeping charters and letters in the wardrobe, and later that same month two purses were bought in which to keep the rolls of the wardrobe.[148] The wardrobe also stored items for the king's armoury and forge, such as axes, hammers, nails and plate armour.[149] Other baggage included the king's money, bed, fruit, cloths and silks.[150] It was these items for which Ivo, as the usher of the wardrobe, had overall responsibility. Before 1212, no such official can be found in the sources fulfilling these responsibilities for the wardrobe, suggesting that the importance of the wardrobe had grown to the extent that it needed its own usher to care for its valuable contents.

In the later years of John's reign, the wardrobe also employed its own clerk, which added to its growing repertoire of staff. Odo the clerk appears to have been the same official who was also called a carter. Ben Wild has discussed the likelihood that the entries on the misae roll for 1212 to 1213, which covered the expenses of the household carters, were the result of internal household expense keeping by the carters of the wardrobe.[151] Such record-keeping would have required a clerk; Odo appears to have fulfilled a dual role as a clerk and a carter. Odo's responsibilities included hiring carts for the wardrobe, receiving the *denarii de garderobe,* giving instructions for the repair of the king's silver plate, and giving allowances for keys and storage boxes to be bought.[152] Odo's financial functions might also have come to absorb some of the responsibilities of the chief chamber clerk. After Richard Marsh's elevation to the chancellorship in 1214, there is no clear replacement identified as chief chamber clerk. It seems reasonable to suppose that this void could, at least in part, have been filled by Odo. Overall, by 1212, the wardrobe had a clerk, cartermen, sumptermen, a serjeant and an usher - all the necessary personnel of an independent household office.

[147] *Docs. of English History,* pp. 240, 244, 247, 249.
[148] *Docs. of English History,* p. 238, 239; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 183b.
[149] *Docs. of English History,* p. 238.
[150] *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 107; *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 131, 134; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 233, 237, 243, 245, 246.
[151] *Wardrobe Accounts*, ed. Wild, p. xxviii. Also, see *infra,* pp. 124-8.
[152] *Docs. of English History,* pp. 240, 247, 254; Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 268-73.

The growing scope of the wardrobe's responsibility is also evidenced by the frequent need to hire more carts to transport its baggage. From 7 to 9 May 1212, carts were hired to take the wardrobe from Lambeth to Odiham, then to Freemantle and Winchester. Later that month, on 21 May, more carts were required to transport the wardrobe's baggage from Windsor to the Tower of London, and then to Havering. Finally, on 23 May, a boat was hired to take the wardrobe across the Thames as London Bridge was broken.[153] This practice was sustained throughout May 1212 to May 1213, and is demonstrated by payments on the misae roll for the liveries of the sumptermen and cartermen of the wardrobe as it travelled alongside the household.[154] There were also occasions when the wardrobe's carts did not follow the household's main itinerary. In November 1209, for example, Thomas the marshal (with two cartermen, two sumptermen, five horses, two packhorses and a rouncey) stayed at Northampton and Rockingham with the wardrobe, whilst the king went riding and hawking in the nearby forest.[155] In another example, on 4 June 1212, the wardrobe baggage was kept in Chertsey, in Surrey, for one night whilst the king was a few miles away in Thames Ditton.[156] This evidence clearly demonstrates that there was a shift in the relationship between the chamber and wardrobe. The wardrobe gained more independence and had its own officials. Consequently it developed a greater presence in the record sources. The wardrobe, rather than working in the shadow of the chamber, was now working on its own account. That such a change occurred gives credence to the idea that John was actively moulding and developing his chamber to suit his personal needs. Such an important change to the most intimate of royal offices must have been personally sanctioned by the king. This change encourages the view that John was not a passive participant in the gradual detachment of the chamber from the communal living of the hall, but rather that his personal needs and demands contributed significantly to the structure of his chamber.

By retreating into the seclusion provided by his chamber, King John was able to limit access to his person. These restrictions were enforced by ushers. In the *Constitutio*, the ushers were in charge of the king's bed when the household was on the road, but it is possible they would have also granted or refused access to the

[153] *Docs. of English History*, pp. 231-2.
[154] *Docs. of English History*, pp. 231-269 *passim.*
[155] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 137-8.
[156] *Docs. of English History*, p. 233.

chamber rooms when the household was sedentary.[157] Jolliffe saw the ushers' importance as aligned with the chamber's growing financial responsibilities, as the usher would have had special charge of the part of the chamber where the money was kept.[158] The ushers, however, were concerned with more than guarding the king's money; they also protected the king's privacy, by blocking entry to the king's chamber rooms and fending off uninvited guests.[159] Stephen of Thurnham, a long-standing royal servant, was connected to the ushership of the chamber by a serjeanty attached to the lands he held by right of his wife Edelina. These estates included Frobury in Hampshire, Cattishall in Surrey and Walton-on-Thames (*Waletona*) in Berkshire.[160] Each of these lands is described as having been held by the service of keeping the king's door or keeping the door of the chamber. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Stephen of Thurnham ever discharged the services attached to this serjeanty. Another official described as an usher was Brian de Therefeld.[161] We may know of a number of the duties which Brian performed outside the household, but on the whole activities of household ushers are not revealed in the sources.[162] Despite the lack of specific evidence regarding the role of ushers, it is clear that access to the king within his chamber must have been strictly limited. The king, for example, had guards, such as Robin, John's guard, who received from the chamber fifteen shillings for a new robe in November 1212.[163] The chamberlain also had the power to limit access to the king's person. Jordan Fantosme describes a chamberlain blocking a messenger's route to King Henry II, whilst the king slept in his chamber.[164] In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it was common for a chamberlain to block access to the king or act as an intermediary and speak on the king's behalf. Criticisms levied at Hugh the Despenser the younger denounced him for his constant presence in the chamber and debarring nobles' access, highlights the power he held in controlling access to the king.[165] In the *Vita Edwardi Secundi,* Piers Gaveston, Edward II's chamberlain, is described as being the only person the king

---

[157] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 212-3.
[158] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis:* Part II', p. 346.
[159] Vincent, 'Court of Henry II', p. 310.
[160] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 4b; *Book of Fees,* pp. 67, 74, 108.
[161] *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 12, 85.
[162] For the career of Brian de Therefeld, see Benham, *Peacemaking,* pp. 134-5.
[163] *Docs. of English History,* p. 247. For serjeants used as guards outside the king's chamber door, see Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 281-2.
[164] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle,* nos. 207-211.
[165] Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston,* p. 102.

would speak to within his chamber.[166] Through the many officials of the king's chamber - the chamberlains, guards and ushers - the king's privacy was protected and access to his person strictly limited.

This separation allowed the king to manipulate power at court by handpicking those he would honour with his company. We have few descriptions of life within John's chamber, but the misae rolls do provide some insight into the sorts of men that had the honour of being granted access to his chamber; this is shown through the records of the debts incurred through gambling games.[167] From 1209 to 1211, John played such games with Henry Fitz Count, Roger de Lacy, Ingelram des Préaux (a household knight), Pain of Chaworth, Brian de Lisle (a household knight), Hugh de Neville and, on many occasions, with William Longespée (John's half-brother).[168] Many of John's friends were his servants, knights he had raised in power and he trusted them; they were not the great barons of the realm.[169] These men had access to the chamber, and shared an intimacy with the king that must have inspired jealously in those courtiers and petitioners who were excluded.

The tensions, which were created by the growing use of the chamber as a space for royal privacy, were noted by contemporary commentators, who viewed the practice with a critical eye. Walter Map and Robert Grosseteste both imply that they thought the king should not spend any significant period of time away from the public milieu of the court. Walter Map claimed that Henry II was taught by his mother to spend more time in his chamber than in public. Walter was so displeased with this practice that he confidently implied that many of the vexations of Henry II's reign stemmed from these teachings.[170] Robert Grosseteste wrote in his rules, dating to the 1240s, that dinners taken in hiding places and chambers brought no honour to the lord or lady of the household. Grosseteste attached great importance to the public theatre of the hall in the exercise of lordship. By eating in the hall the king or other lord would

---

[166] *Vita Edwardi Secundi: The Life of Edward the Second,* ed. by W. R. Childs (Oxford, 2005), p. 28. For the power Gaveston wielded as chamberlain, see Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston,* pp. 101-8.

[167] For the game played was *tabula,* which was similar to modern backgammon, see H. J. R. Murray, 'The Medieval Game of Tables', *Medium Aevum,* 10 (1941), 57-69.

[168] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 131, 147, 158, 159, 238, 243, 244. Brian was still John's gaming partner in 1212, see *Docs. of English History,* pp. 239, 249-50, 253, 254.

[169] Warren, *King John,* pp. 105-11. For friendship between a lord and his men, see G. Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social bonds in Medieval Europe,* trans. by C. Carroll (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 102-35.

[170] Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 478-9. This was also noted in Vincent, 'Court of Henry II', p. 310.

develop a reputation for splendour and generosity, a practice which was being eroded with the private use of the king's chamber.[171] Contemporary perception indicates that retreating to the chamber from the main hall would have a detrimental effect on a king's honour and reputation.[172] This attitude must, in part, have been a consequence of the impact of restricting access to the king's person. These restrictions placed limitations on courtiers' opportunity to seek patronage, such as making petitions for lands, marriages and wardships, which were amongst the most sought-after benefits of royal favour. In a household structure which enabled the king to spend vast amounts of time within the bounds of his private chamber rooms, these benefits would have been dramatically biased towards the select group of courtiers granted access to him. Similar actions of fourteenth-century kings resulted in the criticisms of chamber politics, which marked the reigns of Edward II and, especially, Edward III. These criticisms accumulated in the Good Parliament of 1376, which was an attack on a clique at court that travelled within Edward III's *privata familia*.[173] In this later example, we can see how the structures of the royal household had a potential to impact on the politics of the wider realm.[174]

The manifold domestic functions of the royal chamber created a space in which the king could live apart from his wider household. This divided household structure enabled the king to create boundaries around his person and place restrictions and limitations upon courtiers. This control was a powerful tool in the dynamics of court-life; it allowed the king to manipulate the balance of favour and create an inner circle of trusted friends. The chamber had the capacity to cook the meals shared by these men, marshal the horses they rode and purchase the luxuries they enjoyed. King John's chamber had the ability to provide for all the essential daily needs of the king and his immediate companions. The impact of this increasingly private aspect of kingship might have had far-reaching consequences for the household, court and kingdom.

[171] *Walter of Henley,* ed. Oschinsky, pp. 407; Crouch, *Image of the Aristocracy,* p. 299.
[172] Vale, *Princely Courts,* p. 58.
[173] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 147.
[174] For the difficulties King John had in effectively distributing patronage and bestowing royal favour, see J. C. Holt, *The Northerners: A Study in the Reign of King John* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 217-250, (esp. p. 224).

Chapter 4: The Stewards

Appendices to the history of the royal stewards of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries may be divided between those historians who have been concerned with the noble, hereditary stewards and those concerned with the stewards who actively worked in the king's household. W.L. Vernon-Harcourt's work, *His Grace the Steward* (1907), is still by far the most extensive study on the hereditary claimants. Vernon-Harcourt studied the stewardship which evolved across the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries into the Lord High Stewardship of England. Here his concern was with the status of these men rather than the duties they performed. Vernon-Harcourt attributed the steward's rise beyond the status of 'a mere household officer with no pre-eminence' to the example set by continental seneschals. By the beginning of the twelfth century, these continental officials had acquired control over the army, justice and local government of the various Frankish rulers of Western Europe. English nobles aspired to the office of steward in order to emulate the power wielded by their French counterparts.[1] The English royal stewards were not, of course, equivalent to the French seneschals. In England seneschalscy power lay with the justiciar. Nonetheless, in the mid-twelfth to thirteenth centuries, prominent noble families vied for the title of steward, suggesting that the title must still have invested the holder with qualities worth pursuing, even if not with real power. On John's accession, two claimants to the hereditary stewardship came forward, Roger Bigod, earl of Norfolk, and Robert de Breteuil, earl of Leicester. Each claimed the honour of providing service to the new king at his coronation. The status of this honour is shown through Breteuil's promise to give Bigod ten knights' fees to relinquish his claim. This deal resolved the dispute and Breteuil was awarded the title of steward by King John.[2] This transaction emphasises the importance of service. Serving the king on the most important of days, his coronation, bestowed the highest of honours to which the greatest nobles in the realm aspired.

In his study of coronation services, J.H. Round made a significant contribution to our understanding of the men who petitioned for the right to perform the duties and honours at the coronation services of English medieval kings. In his discussion on the stewards, Round followed the path laid by Vernon-Harcourt and focused on

[1] W. L. Vernon-Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward and Trial of Peers* (London, 1907), pp. 18-22.
[2] Vernon-Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward,* pp. 73-5.

those men who held their title through hereditary claim. Round advanced on previous scholarship by providing a closer examination to the specifics of the coronation services. Following the evidence from the continent, he concluded that it was the right of the steward to serve a dish at the king's table.[3] These studies by Vernon-Harcourt and Round highlight the steward's role at high festivals, but have little relevance to the study of the king's household in daily practice. In the 1920s, Tout tentatively suggested that the hereditary royal stewards had only a minor role to play in the household. Tout refrained from placing the hereditary stewards completely outside the sphere of the royal household during the reign of King John. Rather, Tout suggested, during the reign of Henry III (*c.*1239), hereditary stewards came to be largely replaced by household stewards.[4] Tout pointed to a letter close from 1221, which described the hereditary steward as of 'hospicii nostri'.[5] This letter, however, is the only piece of evidence to support the view that the hereditary stewards still played a role in the household in the thirteenth century. Tout, aware of this lack of evidence, noted that it was hard to know which of the men with the title of steward were actually performing household duties, or in fact how many household stewards were functioning at any one time.[6]

Subsequently, scholars have challenged Vernon-Harcourt's portrayal of the royal steward. J. O. Prestwich, for example, in his article on the military household of Norman kings, questioned Vernon-Harcourt's assertion that stewards had merely domestic origins. Prestwich pointed to the military careers of William fitz Osbern, steward to the Conqueror, and Eudo Dapifer to illustrate that the stewards had been men of importance from at least the time of the Conquest.[7] Prestwich focussed on the military responsibilities of the stewards and was not concerned with the stewards' role in the domestic sphere of the king's household. Only Jolliffe, in his *Angevin Kingship*, delved into the history of the stewards' domestic role without being distracted by 'noble phantoms', the description with which he aptly dismissed the hereditary stewards, who Vernon-Harcourt had made the central focus of his study.[8] Jolliffe recognised the existence of the non-hereditary stewards, who he saw as a

[3] Round, *King's Serjeants,* p. 72.
[4] Tout, *Chapters*, i, pp. 202-3.
[5] Tout, *Chapters*, i, p. 202; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 455. Here, Tout was following the work of Vernon-Harcourt, see *His Grace the Steward*, p. 77.
[6] Tout, *Chapters*, i, pp. 202-4.
[7] Prestwich, 'Military Household', pp. 21-2.
[8] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 212.

product of Angevin kingship. These stewards, Jolliffe thought, were an example of the Angevin kings' tendency to pluck men of obscure origins and place them in powerful positions on the basis of their skill and ability, rather than a perceived right or hereditary claim.[9] Jolliffe described these stewards as the 'workaday, dismissible, household stewards'.[10] This chapter will share a similar focus and look at many of the men Jolliffe identified. The hereditary stewards, however, who attracted so much attention in the early twentieth century, had no role in the daily domestic functioning of King John's household and, as such, have no place in this study.

Although my study focuses on many of the same men Jolliffe discussed, my approach is different. Jolliffe's study was, in part, guided by his interpretation of the stewards' fixed connection to the household. Jolliffe described these men as 'household stewards'. Yet no contemporary record described stewards as 'of the household'. They were always 'seneschallus noster' – our stewards – meaning the king's stewards. This difference is fundamental to our understanding of the role of the steward during John's reign. Jolliffe's description of the steward has created a construct from which other historians have worked, seeing the place of the steward in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as lying firmly within the household.[11] Chris Given-Wilson, for example, saw the steward of the twelfth century as the officer who supervised the domestic organisation of the household.[12] Church described the steward as 'the head of the military household, just as he was head of the whole household.[13] The following chapter will reveal a different interpretation of the stewards' role during the reign of King John. Jolliffe saw the stewardship as a distinct office within the royal household which could be studied as a whole. This approach enabled him to make generalisations from the examples of individuals, about the role of the steward across the Angevin period. But, by studying each man, rather than viewing them as a collective entity, a new perspective emerges, which highlights the complexity and diversity embodied in the title of steward.

---

[9] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 215.
[10] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 213.
[11] White also contributed to this construction, as he saw the stewards in charge of the pantry, larder, kitchen and great kitchen. White restructured the *Constitutio Domus Regis* to better suit his interpretation of the stewards' position, see 'Household of the Norman Kings', pp. 137-8, 155.
[12] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 4.
[13] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 12. Also, see S. Painter's opinion 'unfortunately we have little precise information on the seneschal's duties, but it is probable that he was the executive head of the royal household', see *The Reign of King John* (Baltimore, 1949), p. 89.

During King John's reign, there were seven men who can be identified as the king's stewards: William de Cantilupe, Robert of Thurnham, Peter of Stokes, Geoffrey de Neville, William de Harcourt, Brian de Lisle and Falkes de Bréauté. These men did not all tread the same path to this exulted position. Church has already laid the foundations for our understanding of how men were recruited into the military element of John's household and we can see that king's stewards entered royal service in a like manner.[14] The reason for this similarity is that the stewards were sometimes recruited from the body of household knights. Brian de Lisle, who served as steward from October 1213, and Falkes de Bréauté, who served as steward from February 1215, were both promoted from the ranks of household knights.[15] Falkes de Bréauté came to England in 1204. He was of modest Norman origins but rose in status largely on the basis of his martial abilities.[16] Falkes is first recorded as a royal serjeant in 1207 and was, perhaps, also knighted about this time. Falkes' elevation to the stewardship occurred in the midst of mounting tensions between the king and his barons in early 1215.[17] Brian de Lisle had entered royal service by April 1200 and was first recorded as a household knight in November 1204.[18] His background was typical of the majority of John's household knights. He was from an English knightly family, from Mottistone in the Isle of Wight, whose wealth would have put them amongst the upper echelons of knightly society.[19] Brian's father was the seneschal of the bishop of Ely, William de Longchamp, and this tradition of administrative service probably gave Brian access to a career in royal service, as he was not only a military man but also a useful administrator.[20]

William de Harcourt was made steward by August 1210. The first recorded mention of him in this role is amongst the payments of prests to knights going on the Irish

---

[14] Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 16-38.

[15] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 190. Falkes was certainly steward from March 1215, see *ibid.,* p. 190. However, a possible earlier misspelling of his name in February 1215, suggests he might have been steward at least a month earlier, see *ibid.,* p. 188.

[16] For Falkes' origins, see *Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria: The Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry,* ed. by W. Stubbs, 2 vols (London, 1872-3), ii (1873), p. 253; *Histoire des Ducs de Normandie et des Rois d'Angleterre,* ed. by F. Michel, Société de l'histoire de France (Paris, 1840), pp. 172-3.

[17] D. J. Power, 'Bréauté, Sir Falkes de (*d.* 1226)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3305, accessed 5 June 2013]; *Rot. Fin.,* p. 373.

[18] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 13b.

[19] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 36; S. D. Church, 'Lisle, Sir Brian de (*d.* 1234)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47250, accessed 23 May 2013].

[20] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 10.

campaign in that year.[21] It is seems reasonable to assume that William was recruited for the purpose of assisting with the administration and logistics of this campaign. William de Harcourt's role in the royal household before 1210 cannot be extrapolated from the evidence. Nonetheless, it is clear his family was closely associated with royal service.[22] At the end of the reign of Richard I, Robert de Harcourt, William's father, was sheriff of Warwickshire and Leicestershire. Robert then resumed this position from 1200 to 1201 under King John.[23] Robert de Harcourt witnessed at least nineteen charters for King John, between January 1200 and July 1203.[24] From 1202 to 1203, Robert appears to have travelled with the household from Harcourt to Moulineaux and Rouen.[25] During this time, Robert was the recipient of one hundred livres Angevin, lands in Vatteville and Brocton and a cape from the king.[26] The lands at Vatteville and Brocton might have been given in return for a specified service, as they were given in place of 'his wages'.[27] What this service exactly was is uncertain, but Robert warranted writs to the barons of the exchequer at Caen and writs ordering the transfer of seisin.[28]

A family tradition of service probably facilitated William's entry into the royal household. In May 1208, William was active in Leicestershire making repairs to the royal house and castle at Mountsorrel.[29] In addition to familiar connections to royal service, William might also have proved his administrative and organisational abilities within the household of William Marshal. A letter patent of 1202 records the name of William Marshal's steward as William de Harcourt.[30] It was not uncommon for the king to take into royal service men who had proved their worth in the service

[21] *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 212.
[22] William de Harcourt witnessed a charter for John whilst count of Mortain, suggesting he had a relatively long period of service before he was made steward, see *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters,* no. 2691. For the history of the Harcourt family, see D. Crouch, *The Beaumont Twins: The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 120-6.
[23] *Pipe Roll 10 Richard I,* p. 152; *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 175; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 231. For each year Robert was sheriff he accumulated debt. In 1205, the debt was £127 3*s* blanch; his son, William de Harcourt, accounted for him. In 1209, the king pardoned William de Harcourt £27 8*s* 3*d* blanch of this debt, see *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 18.
[24] *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 33b, 35, 65b, 69b, 79, 104, 104b, 105, 105b, 109, 109b, 112, 112b. Robert de Harcourt also witnessed a charter for Count John, see *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters,* no. 436.
[25] *Rot. Norm.,* pp. 48, 76, 79.
[26] *Rot. Norm.,* pp. 91, 93, 99.
[27] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 29.
[28] *Rot. Norm.,* pp. 48, 76, 79.
[29] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 114.
[30] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 13.

of noblemen. This situation was beneficial for both parties: the king gained a capable servant and the nobleman gained a sympathetic ear to one close to the king through whom he could petition for his wants.[31] William de Harcourt's apparently sudden appointment to the stewardship may be explained by the fact he came recommended by both his family and William Marshal.

Family service was also the determining factor in William de Cantilupe's entrance into the king's household. William was steward of John's household whilst John was count of Mortain; the first mention of him in this position comes on 12 July 1198.[32] He appears to have retained this position after John's accession and held it throughout the reign and into the minority of Henry III.[33] William's uncle, Fulk, and his father, Walter, were also members of Count John's household and both witnessed a number of Count John's charters. Walter witnessed at least seven charters during John's comital rule.[34] Fulk must have been a very regular visitor at Count John's court as he witnessed twenty-one of the surviving charters from this period.[35] Fulk's attestations also show that he did not abandon John when King Richard returned from captivity in 1194. This loyalty was rewarded as Fulk and his nephew William were retained in their positions at court and, therefore, were able to make the transition from comital to royal household.[36]

Two of William's kinsmen can be identified: Roger Orgete and Robert Barat.[37] These men became household knights for King John, further demonstrating the Cantilupe's strong familiar connection to royal service.[38] The importance of recommendation in securing entry into the royal household is clearly evidenced in the example of the Cantilupe family. Once entrance had been gained, however, it was individual aptitude and loyalty which facilitated career progression. William de

[31] Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 28-33.
[32] *Angevin Acta Project: King John's Charters*, no. 372.
[33] For William still being described as 'our steward' during the minority, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 454.
[34] *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters,* nos. 298, 210, 558, 557, 556, 184, 2691.
[35] *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters,* nos. 5529, 184, 235, 2128, 556, 234, 4836, 996, 558, 557, 735, 210, 5284, 607,9, 236, 298, 376, 2162, 372, 3815, 2169.
[36] Church, *Household knights,* pp. 20-1.
[37] Robert Barat was William de Cantilupe's brother, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 94, 531b; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 201; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 5. Roger Orgete was also referred to as Robert Barat's brother, see *Rot. Lib. John,* p. 189. The connection between Roger Orgete and William de Cantilupe is also highlighted when Roger received a gift of one hundred marks on behalf of William in January 1213, see *Docs. of English History,* p. 250.
[38] Church, *Household knights,* pp. 26-7.

Cantilupe must have demonstrated such qualities in the years prior to John's accession, as throughout the reign it is clear he was considered a safe pair of hands to whom the king could turn for assistance in time of need.[39] William was the only one of John's stewards who was recruited from his comital household. Other men, who held the title of steward in the years before 1199 do not seem to have made the step from one household to the other.[40]

Another of John's stewards who might have owed his entry into royal service to a tradition of family service was Geoffrey de Neville. Geoffrey briefly served as steward from December 1206 until August 1207. He was likely the grandson of Alan de Neville, the administrator and chief forester under Henry II, whose son, also named Alan, continued this family tradition in forest administration. Geoffrey was the younger son of Alan (II) and was, perhaps, also the cousin of Hugh de Neville, the chief forester under Richard and John.[41] Such connections were likely the basis upon which Geoffrey made his entrance to royal service.

Roger of Wendover described how, on Richard's death, John travelled to Chinon to seize the treasure and there he 'retained with honour all his brother's servants'.[42] Wendover, here, was sketchy in his description of the new king's household, but two of John's stewards were chosen from Richard's household.[43] Robert of Thurnham, the treasurer of Chinon, was steward from early 1200 to the summer of 1201, after which he returned to the continent to be seneschal of Gascony and Anjou.[44] Robert, and his elder brother Stephen, had long and distinguished careers in royal service, both serving King Richard on crusade; they were the sons of a Kentish landowner

[39] For the later success and service of the Cantilupe family, see D. A. Carpenter, 'St Thomas de Cantilupe: His Political Career', in his *Reign of Henry III*, pp. 293-306.
[40] John's comital stewards include William de Wenneval, see *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters*, nos. 609, 612, 690, 2119, 476, 528, 529, 520, 567, 583, 2116, 465, 920, 881, 2123, 2124, 4827, 611, 9, 697, 624, 526, 565, 566, 2162, 5284, 2143, 2132, 4836, 4955, 5023, 738, 2136, 3043, 1841, 4574, 351, 356, 298, 2168, 236, 2359, 2609, 5006. For Roger of Newborough, see M. Preen, 'The *Acta* of John, Lord of Ireland and Count of Mortain: With a study of his Household' (MA thesis, University of Manchester, 1949), no. 77. John Marshal, see *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters*, nos. 530, 2126, 2183, 2125, 2128, 624, 5006. For Roger de Amundeville, see *ibid*, nos. 2110, 4640, 2110, 5023, 584, 2184, 4082, 606, 5664, 2179, 2168, 3888, 920, 262, 3403, 2164, 4088. For Walter de Mautravers, see *ibid*, nos. 733, 697, 3090, 236, 3192, 737, 298, 4939.
[41] Pollard, 'Neville, Geoffrey de', rev. Church, *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19932, accessed 12 March 2013]
[42] *Chron. Maj.*, ii, p. 452.
[43] Richard's stewards, Robert de Wancy, Robert de Préaux and Stephen de Longchamps, did not continue their careers in the new royal household.
[44] H. Summerson, 'Thornham , Robert of (*d.* 1211)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27884, accessed 14 Feb 2013].

and were, again, typical of the knightly stock from which the Angevin kings frequently drew their servants.[45] Another of John's stewards who had a role in Richard's household was Peter of Stokes. Peter's connection to Richard's court can first be seen in April 1197 when he attested a royal charter. Peter must have had a regular presence at court in the last few of years of this reign, as he witnessed at least nine charters in 1198 and five in 1199, including Richard's final charter during his fateful mission to Châlus.[46] Little can be known of Peter's role in Richard's household, except that he attested royal writs concerning the payment of money and he accompanied the king's treasure when in transit.[47] John retained Peter in his new royal household until his promotion as steward in December 1201. During this time, he attested at least seven charters, demonstrating that he must have travelled with King John to England in 1200 and back to the continent in 1201.[48]

Each of John's stewards served for different lengths of time. Often more than one steward served at any given time. In order to establish the number of stewards who served in the royal household historians have looked to the evidence of the *Constitutio.* The use of the plural *dapiferi* in the *Constitutio* reveals that, at the end of the reign of Henry I, there was more than one steward working in the royal household.[49] The first modern editor of the text of the *Constitutio*, Charles Johnson argued that there must have been four holders of this office, who served by turn in the household. His suggestion was based on the statement in the *Constitutio* that royal dispensers served by turn. Johnson's tentative proposal was that, since the dispensers were on a par with the stewards, that the stewards, too, enjoyed the same conditions of service.[50] Conversely, for the thirteenth century, Jolliffe saw that it was possible for just one steward to serve in the household, as he saw Peter of Stokes as briefly holding a 'sole seneschalship'. By contrast, Church suggested that, during

---

[45] For Robert's role in Richard's *familia*, see L. Landon, *Itinerary of King Richard I,* Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 13 (London, 1935), pp. 117, 134, 135, 142, 143, 144. Summerson, 'Thornham , Robert of', [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27884, accessed 14 Feb 2013].
[46] Landon, *Itinerary of King Richard I,* pp. 117, 125, 126, 132, 133, 134, 145.
[47] *Pipe Roll 10 Richard I,* pp. 182, 224.
[48] *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 35b, 42b, 54; *Rot. Norm.*, p. 19; TNA E 368/368 m.39d; TNA E 159/110 m.156; Rouen Archives Department Seine-Maritime 18HP28 (Le Valasse cartulary) fos. 22v-23r, s.xv. My thanks go to N. C. Vincent for these manuscript references from his charter collection.
[49] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, p. 198.
[50] *Regesta Regum Anglo Normannorum, 1066-1154: Vol. 2, Regesta Henrici Primi, 1100-1135*, ed. by C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne (London, 1956), pp. xi-xiii. Unfortunately others have not been as cautious as Johnson, see Green, *Government*, p. 35; Barlow, *William Rufus,* p. 140. Also, see Given-Wilson *King's Affinity*, p. 4.

John's reign, there were 'always at least two, and sometimes as many as four, stewards holding office'.[51] Tout suggested the evidence was 'too sporadic' to conclude how many stewards were serving in the household, but was perplexed by the number of men given the title in Henry III's charters. Tout noted that in one charter, in 1227, there were five named stewards. His confusion stemmed from the general understanding that there were normally two household stewards in the thirteenth century.[52]

As can be seen from this review of the secondary literature, there has been a lack of clarity about the number of men who served at any one time as stewards in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. What I propose to do is to review the evidence for the careers of each man given the title of steward during John's reign. What the evidence will show is that the picture is much more complex than any previous commentators have allowed. To establish who the stewards were and for how long they served, I have, firstly, only used men given the title *seneschallus noster*.[53] Secondly, I have used the first mention of their title as an approximate indication of the start of their service. Thirdly, I have used the charter witness lists as evidence of their presence at court.[54] Finally, the end of each steward's tenure has been fairly easy to ascertain. Robert of Thurnham and Geoffrey de Neville were both moved from their position as stewards into different official capacities. Peter of Stokes' stewardship ended with his death in 1206. William de Harcourt, Brian de Lisle and

[51] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 217; Church, *Household Knights,* p. 9.
[52] Tout, *Chapters,* i, pp. 202-3.
[53] On only two occasions were any of King John's stewards referred to as *dapifer,* see *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 170b, 195. Throughout the rest of the reign all stewards were referred to as *seneschallus*. This terminology is different to that seen in the surviving charters of John as count of Mortain. Count John's stewards were usually described as *dapifer,* only William de Wenneval was described as *dapifer* and *seneschallus*. For references to the comital stewards, see *supra,* p. 73, note 39.
[54] For a discussion of a similar methodology used for the reign of Henry II, see Vincent, 'Court of Henry II', pp. 284-91. Vincent sees that the charter witness lists demonstrate, albeit imperfectly, those people who were truly 'of the court' not just occasional visitors. Henry II's steward, Manasser Biset, was the third most frequent attester of royal charters. As a result of this evidence, Vincent suggests he must have been with the court much of the time. Jolliffe, also, observes that very regular attestations were a mark of a steward's service. Jolliffe noted that no other courtier was as consistent in their attestations as Manasser Biset, see *Angevin Kingship,* p. 215. For the view that, in the late eleventh century, charter witness lists do not equate to being in the presence of the king at the moment the confirmation was made, see D. Bates, 'The Prosopographical Study of Anglo-Norman Charters', in *Family Trees and Roots of Politics: The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century,* ed. by K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 89-102. Julie Kanter, whilst addressing the issue of using charters as means to establishing the king's itinerary showed that despite the fact that charters were often not given by the hand of the king, in the 'overwhelming majority of cases' it can still be proven that the king was with the great seal through the evidence of letters close and patent. See Kanter 'Itineraries', p. 47. What Kanter's findings allow us to think is that a witness to a charter was in same location as the king and his court.

Falkes de Bréauté all ended their tenure as steward on the death of King John. The only steward to retain his position in the royal household beyond John's life was William de Cantilupe, which makes him a remarkably resilient royal servant in the mould of other extraordinary individuals such as William Marshal and Peter des Roches.

In the first instance, we can confidently state that, during John's reign, there was always one serving steward. This is a relief given the centrality historians have accorded to this official in the medieval royal household. William de Cantilupe is first recorded as steward in a charter of Count John in 1198.[55] There may have been a break between Richard's death and William's first attestation of a royal charter as John's steward, in October 1200, but it seems more probable that he was one of those men John took into his service as king on his accession.[56] William travelled with the king to the continent after his coronation, witnessing royal charters at Barfleur and Valognes, and returned to England with the royal entourage in February 1200.[57] Stewards were not always given their title in the record sources. Often they appeared simply by name. Yet, William de Cantilupe was given his title in almost every year of the reign, suggesting he was probably steward throughout.[58]

Robert of Thurnham was described as a royal steward in January 1201, eighteen months into the reign and, yet, we can see that he was in constant attendance at court from January 1200 until April 1201, which is evidenced by the eighty-eight surviving royal charters he witnessed.[59] During this period, no other courtier made such frequent attestations, and this proximity to the king and constant presence at court is strongly suggestive that Robert was steward as early as January 1200. Robert's tenure as steward ended in the summer of 1201, when he returned to the continent. Initially, Robert was seneschal of Gascony and Anjou; by May 1202,

---

[55] *Angevin Acta Project: Count John's charters,* no. 372.
[56] *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 1.
[57] *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 36.
[58] For 1200, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 1; for 1204, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 45; for 1207, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 85b; for 1208, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 103b; for 1209, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 126; for 1211, see *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 252; for 1212, see *Rot. Chart.,* p. 186; for 1213, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, 155b; for 1214, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 175; for 1215, see *Rot. Chart.,* p. 214; for 1216, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 246b.
[59] *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 33-101 *passim*. From April 1201, the charters rolls are missing for two years between May 1201 and May 1203. The only months Robert made no attestations are July and November 1200.

however, he was serving as seneschal of Poitou.[60] When Robert departed for the continent, Peter of Stokes filled the void in the household. Peter was first styled steward in December 1201.[61] Whether there was a gap of six months between the departure of Robert and the appointment of Peter, or when he was given the position immediately, cannot be definitively ascertained. Any conclusions about Peter's position at court during these months are made more difficult as there are very few charters extant from May to December 1201. There are, however, surviving charter rolls for thirty-four months of Peter's stewardship in which he attested one hundred and fifty-two charters.[62] This evidence shows that Peter continued Robert's tradition as a frequent witness to royal charters. Peter travelled with the king to the continent in the summer of 1201 and returned to England with him in December 1203. Thereafter, he continuously itinerated with the household. Although we do not have the charter roll for John's eighth regnal year, it is clear from the attestations on the close rolls that Peter was still constantly attending the king, until at least April 1206.[63] Peter died sometime from June 1206, when his last actions are recorded, to August 1206, when his widow and possessions were put in the custody of Walter fitz Godfrey.[64] Geoffrey de Neville had replaced Peter as steward by December 1206.[65] Geoffrey had the shortest period of service of any of John's stewards, serving from late 1206 to July or August 1207, when he was made royal chamberlain.[66] This chamberlainship was an honorary title, since there is little to suggest that Geoffrey played any active role in the chamber, as he spent his time on military expeditions to Poitou.[67]

Until 1207, there was always at least one steward, William de Cantilupe, but generally two. Firstly, William served with Robert of Thurnham, then Peter of Stokes, then Geoffrey de Neville. During these years William's attestations of

[60] *Rot. Norm.*, p. 46; Summerson, 'Thornham, Robert of' [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27884, accessed 12 Dec 2011].
[61] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 24.
[62] *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 104b-166b *passim*. The only months Peter made no attestations were January and April 1205.
[63] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, pp. 30-70 *passim*.
[64] For both dates, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 66b.
[65] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 75.
[66] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 90, 93. In August, Geoffrey was referred to as having been steward in the past, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 90. By October he was certainly chamberlain, see *ibid.*, p. 93. The charter witness lists, however, suggest that this change happened in July 1207, when William de Cantilupe's charter attestations suddenly increased.
[67] For Geoffrey de Neville's chamberlainship, see *supra*, p. 42.

charters suggest that, for the majority of the time, he was not at court. This evidence suggests that although there were two men holding the title of steward, only one man served in the household. There are some occasions when two stewards attested royal charters.[68] But, it was also common on occasions when William de Cantilupe briefly joined the household, such as in late April and May 1204, September 1204 and March 1205, that his attestation would replace that of Peter of Stokes.[69] It might have been that, on the occasions William came to the household, this gave Peter the opportunity to attend to business outside court.[70]

The practice of two stewards serving at the same time (one, who spent the vast majority of his time at court, and another, who was deployed elsewhere) continued until Geoffrey de Neville was transferred to the chamberlainship. Hereafter, for the next three years, William de Cantilupe was the sole steward. The witness lists reflect this change in practice. The frequency and quantity of William's attestations to royal charters grows from the summer of 1207, which suggests that his presence at court increased exponentially. From May 1207 to May 1209, when the charters rolls are extant, William de Cantilupe witnessed charters in every month except two, October 1207 and January 1209.[71] From this evidence, we might infer that his responsibilities in the household also increased and those duties he held in the localities were deputised or transferred to other officials.

Despite the lacuna in the chancery records from 1208 to 1212, we can be fairly certain, due to the survival of a misae roll for the year 1209 to 1210, that William de Cantilupe continued to serve as the sole steward until August 1210. At this time, William de Harcourt was first titled steward.[72] This misae roll is peppered with payments issued 'by the steward'. The scribes of the misae roll only clarified who this 'steward' was with William de Cantilupe's name on two occasions; this suggests that, on the whole, there was no need for such clarification: William was the only

---

[68] For examples of William de Cantilupe and Robert of Thurnham witnessing together, see *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 36. For William de Cantilupe and Peter of Stokes witnessing together, see *ibid.*, p. 122.
[69] For the end of April 1204 to early May 1204, see *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 126-8. For mid-September 1204, see *ibid.*, pp. 136-7. For mid-November 1204, see *ibid.*, pp. 139-40. For late March 1205, see *ibid.*, pp. 144-5.
[70] On 10 September 1204, for example, a letter close was sent to Peter of Stokes suggesting he was away from court, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 8. On that same day William de Cantilupe witnessed a charter, see *Rot. Chart.*, p. 137.
[71] *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 166b-185b *passim.*
[72] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 212.

steward to whom the scribe could have been referring from May 1209 to May 1210.[73] This practice can be set in comparison with the misae roll for 1212 to 1213, when we know there were two active stewards. Here, each time the scribe mentioned a steward, their name was included or, in the one instance when the plural 'stewards' was used, both William de Cantilupe and William de Harcourt were named.[74] We are, then, safe to assume that William de Cantilupe served independently until at least May 1210, when the misae roll finished, but probably to August 1210, when William de Harcourt was recorded as a steward paying prests to knights going on expedition to Ireland.[75] As we know that William de Cantilupe did not participate in the Irish campaign, Harcourt's appointment was likely to have been to fill this void when the household travelled to Ireland.

There are comparatively fewer charters recorded on the later charter rolls between 1212 and 1216. Even with this disparity in the evidence, the charter attestations of William de Cantilupe reduce dramatically after 1212, compared to the years 1207 to 1210 when he was the sole steward. William witnessed just five charters in 1212, four in 1213, and none in 1214. In 1215, the numbers increase to fourteen, but eight of these were issued in the same month, July 1215, when John called all his stewards to court in the build-up to and aftermath of Magna Carta. Finally, William attested at least six royal charters in 1216.[76] These attestations did not occur regularly and do not present a pattern of continuous attendance at court. On the contrary, they present a picture of a man whose business was very definitely away from court. Likewise the charter attestations of William de Harcourt strongly suggest he was seldom with the household. Harcourt attested only four charters in 1212, six in 1213 and none in 1214. In 1215, Harcourt witnessed nine charters, but all of them date to July that year.[77]

In October 1213, we have, for the first time, a third steward named as serving simultaneously with the other two when Brian de Lisle was appointed to the role.[78]

---

[73] *Rot. Lib. John,* pp. 113, 118, 126, 127, 130, 131. For the two occasions William de Cantilupe's name was used, see *ibid*., pp. 126, 129.
[74] *Docs. of English History,* p. 266.
[75] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 212.
[76] *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 188, 188b, 189, 189b, 190, 192, 192b, 193, 203, 204b, 205, 205b, 211b, 212, 213, 216b, 217b, 218, 219b, 220, 221b, 222b, 223.
[77] *Rot. Chart.*, pp. 186, 187, 187b, 189b, 190, 190b, 192, 192b, 211, 212, 212b, 213, 213b, 214b, 217b, 220, 223b, 224.
[78] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 154.

Brian accompanied the king to Poitou the following year and there he attested eighteen charters, revealing his proximity to the king throughout the campaign.[79] Yet, after the royal party's return to England in October 1214, this continuous attendance at court ceased. Brian witnessed just ten charters enrolled on the charter rolls for the remainder of the reign, six of which were issued in July 1215, as he joined the other stewards in what we might characterise as a summit of John's most trusted household officials.[80] In February 1215, Falkes de Bréauté was also given the title of steward.[81] Falkes appears to have been briefly active in the household during the first two months of his stewardships. By May 1215, however, Falkes was also working outside the household.

In the years 1210 to 1216, the number of men holding the title of steward ranged from two to four. Despite this apparent plethora of stewards, it is a surprising feature of the later years of the reign that no royal steward spent any significant length of time in the household. In what follows we see shall how the activities of these men support the evidence of the charter rolls and demonstrate that the household came to function without a workaday steward in the later years of John's reign.[82]

The function of the steward in the king's household is not fully described in the existing household ordinances of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. The *Constitutio* gives no details of the stewards' responsibilities. We only know that they were senior ministers of the household, as their allowances reflect this status, but their daily function is not explained by the text. The household ordinance of 1279 is slightly more revealing as it states that, along with the keeper and controller of the wardrobe, the steward oversaw the nightly checks of the provisioning offices of the household.[83] In the ordinance of 1318, however, we are given no description of the duties of a royal steward.[84] To determine the services performed by a royal steward during John's reign we must look to the existing chancery and household accounts.

Jolliffe asserted that the steward was the chief operating officer of the household, whose responsibilities included attesting or warranting all liveries and advances to

---

[79] *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 197, 197b, 199, 200, 200b, 201, 201b.
[80] *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 202, 202b, 211b, 212, 214, 214b, 216, 216b.
[81] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 190.
[82] For the how the household functioned without the steward, see *infra,* chapters three to five and the conclusion.
[83] Tout, *Chapters,* ii, pp. 160-1.
[84] Tout, *Edward II,* p. 270.

household officials serving out of court, commissioning repairs to the king's houses, ordering wine for the household, organising the replenishment of the king's larders and making preparations for great feasts. The evidence Jolliffe cited to support his description is, however, almost wholly from the years 1205 to 1206 and in reference to one steward, Peter of Stokes. We are, therefore, left with the impression that stewards were immersed in each aspect of the domestic operations of the household.[85] But do these generalisations for the reign stand up to detailed analysis?

Peter of Stokes' stewardship is the first to be richly illustrated in the surviving close rolls, which provide so much of our information for operations of the household.[86] As such, we can establish Peter's role within the household and then use it as the basis for a comparison with the other stewards. Peter of Stokes actively participated in the work of the provisioning offices of the household. For the buttery, Peter commissioned orders to local officials to purchase wine to be stocked in the king's cellars. Peter, for example, sent instructions to the constable of Bristol castle, who kept a large store of the king's wine purchased at that city's port, to distribute wine to nearby manors, such as Marlborough and Tewkesbury.[87] Likewise, Peter sent orders to William Anglicus and Robert Hardwin, keepers of the king's other main store of wine at Southampton, to send wine to royal residences at Portchester and Clarendon.[88] Upon completion of these commissions, Peter warranted writs of *computate* to the barons of the exchequer to ensure the money spent by the officials was allowed against their accounts. In July 1205, he issued a writ of *computate* concerning fifteen shillings that John fitz Hugh had spent on wine that was carried across the Thames to the king's house at Windsor.[89] Some glimpses of these activities are also visible in the sources for Normandy. In November 1203, when the household was at Montfarville (Manche, cant. Quetehou), Peter sent instructions to the barons of the Caen Exchequer to account for money which had been spent on carting the king's wine.[90]

---

[85] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* ch. x.
[86] Carpenter has shown that the *liberate rolls* from 1200 were part of the close rolls sequence, see 'Beginnings of the English Chancery Rolls', p. 50. These early 'close rolls' provide helpful information regarding stewards' activities, however, it is with the survival of the close rolls *proper* that there is sufficient evidence to determine their domestic functions.
[87] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 57b, 58, 61.
[88] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 69. For other examples, see *ibid*., pp. 41, 44, 57b.
[89] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 43.
[90] *Rot. Norm.,* p. 116.

Peter also assisted the other provisioning offices of the household (the kitchen, larder and dispensary) in their purveyance of victuals such as meat, fish and grains. The sheriff of Lincolnshire, for example, was commissioned by Peter to buy fish; the bailiffs of Taunton were told to have wheat threshed and ground for flour; the sheriff of Wiltshire was instructed to have driven to Guildford cows and sheep ready for the Easter celebrations.[91] Once these provisions had been received in the household, Peter issued writs of *computate* for those officials who paid for such victuals. Writs, for example, were sent on behalf of the sheriff of Southampton for money he spent on fish and pigs, and for John fitz Hugh, who had covered the costs of replenishing the larders at Windsor and Winchester.[92]

Peter was also concerned with maintaining the standard of the equipment used by the provisioning offices of the household. In January 1204, for example, Peter commissioned the sheriff of London to purchase equipment for the dispensary, the kitchen and the buttery. This equipment included a cauldron and a new cart for the hunt.[93] In April 1206, Peter commissioned the sheriff of Southampton to supply more new carts for the kitchen and the buttery.[94] The horses that pulled these carts also had to be equipped. Peter arranged for horse apparatus to be purchased, such as saddles from the sheriff of London, which were given over to Richard, a household marshal. Peter also witnessed a letter to William of Cornhill with instructions to provide 'good long carts' for the household with all the necessary equipment for the king's horses.[95] The entirety of the king's large marshalsea did not always itinerate with the household; sections were sent to other manors to be temporarily housed.[96] Peter of Stokes made arrangements for these sections of the marshalsea to have expenses and board whilst separated from court. Officials such as Reginald and William of Cornhill were instructed by Peter to cover these costs and account at the Exchequer.[97] For example, when William of Cornhill spent £14 2*s* 10*d* on 'boarding and marshalling' the king's horses, the horses of the king's men, the queen's horses

[91] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 20b, 31, 25b.
[92] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 50, 61b.
[93] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 80.
[94] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 86.
[95] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 54b, 57.
[96] *Supra*, pp. 50-1.
[97] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 18, 30b, 41, 64b, 65.

and the horses of her men, Peter sent a writ to the barons of the Exchequer to allow this amount against William's account.[98]

It was not just officials of the marshalsea who were at times separated from court. Men such as carters, fishermen and serjeants of the chamber, also had responsibilities which drew them away from the household. In these instances, Peter ensured that their 'necessities' were provided for by local officials.[99] Peter might also have been responsible for arranging for the wages of those officials within the household. In February 1203, at Moulineaux, Peter was responsible for paying wages to the royal clerk, William fitz Alan, who received a standard rate of five shillings Angevin per day.[100] Peter also, on very rare occasions, provided prests for officials against their wages, such as the twenty shillings he gave to Robert the naperer in December 1205, and the half a mark he gave to Charles the fisherman in January 1206.[101] In July 1202, Peter also ensured that Geoffrey Luttrell received wages of seven shillings Angevin a day 'just as all our household knights received'.[102] Peter certainly had some responsibility for ensuring that correct wages were received by members of the household.

Peter also ensured that permanent fixtures of the domestic offices in the king's residences were properly maintained. In April 1205, Peter sent instructions to Hugh de Neville to have the kitchen at Clarendon covered with shingles, to make new kitchens for making the king's meals at Marlborough and Ludgershall, and to put in these kitchens a furnace large enough for cooking two or three cows.[103] Peter was also concerned with keeping the king's manors and castles in good repair. It is possible to see Peter's activities in this regard in Normandy before 1204, when he sent writs of *computate* to the barons of the Exchequer at Caen to account for works done on the royal houses, such as at Valognes.[104] Peter continued in this role in England, as he sent orders to the sheriff of Worcester to repair the royal house at Feckenham and to the sheriff of Dorset and Somerset to repair the house at

98 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 26.
99 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 26, 39b. *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 88.
100 *Rot. Norm.*, p. 82.
101 *Docs. of English History*, pp. 274, 275.
102 *Rot. Norm.*, p. 54.
103 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 52.
104 *Rot. Norm.*, p. 119.

Powerstock.[105] After repairs had been completed, Peter also issued writs of *computate*, such as for the money spent by John fitz Hugh on building works at Woodstock, and by the sheriff Nottingham on works at Clipstone.[106] Overall Peter's activities indicate that, for the years he was steward, he took a directing role over many aspects of the king's houses as well as his household. During his stewardship, Peter's warrant appears authorising more than two hundred and fifty writs concerning the running of the king's household. If we were to take Peter as our paradigm for a steward of the reign of King John, then we would see a servant of the highest rank in the household with responsibilities for the maintenance of the harmony of the king's domestic space. Peter of Stokes was not, however, typical.

Geoffrey de Neville, who was appointed steward after Peter's death, assisted with the preparations for the Christmas court at Winchester in 1206. On 16 December 1206, Geoffrey commissioned the sheriff of Wiltshire to buy five hundred measures of linen cloth for the forthcoming Christmas.[107] Moreover, a late writ of *computate*, from July 1207, shows that Geoffrey instructed Reginald of Cornhill to buy wax and various spices, including pepper, cumin, saffron, nutmeg, two types of ginger, mace, cinnamon and cloves for the same Christmas.[108] For the remainder of Geoffrey's stewardship (until August 1207), he attested just four other writs concerning the domestic needs of the royal household. These writs included an order for fish to be sent from Ramsey to the household at Cambridge on Ash Wednesday, and three writs of *computate* for money officials had spent on wine and almonds.[109] From this evidence we can infer that, in his role as a steward, Geoffrey was far less concerned with the domestic arrangements of the household than his predecessor, Peter. In the summer of 1207, Geoffrey's position in the household changed from that of a steward to that of a chamberlain. This change was followed by a period of a sole stewardship by William de Cantilupe.

The survival of the close rolls from 1207 and 1208 allow us to see that, during this time, William de Cantilupe was concerned with aspects of the domestic running of the household. For example, William authorised a number of commissions to

[105] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 5, 57b.
[106] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 61b, 66.
[107] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 75.
[108] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88.
[109] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 79, 80b, 81, 86.

Reginald of Cornhill to buy wax, spices, almonds and horse equipment.[110] William then issued writs of *computate* for the money Reginald had spent on these household commodities.[111] William also played some role in the organisation of the king's buttery. On 21 March 1208, for example, in preparation for the household's visit to Portchester on 25 March, William ordered the custodians of the bishopric of Exeter to send wine to Portchester ready for the king's arrival.[112] William also attested a number of writs of *computate* for money spent on wine and buttery vessels, by the reeves of Winchester, William of Cornhill, the constable of Bristol and buttery officials.[113]

William was also concerned with the means by which the household maintained its ceaseless perambulations – its horses and carts. William, for example, called upon the sheriff of Southampton to give money to Robert the marshal of Winchester for a cart he had provided for the household.[114] He issued a writ for the bailiffs of the archbishopric of Canterbury to have the cost of thirteen *summae* of oats allowed against their account, which they had given to the king's marshal for his horses.[115] William, on one occasion, also ensured the liveries of the king's carters were paid out of the profits of the bishopric of Lincoln.[116] From 1208 to 1212, the chancery rolls are not extant, which makes it difficult to assess the activities of the stewards. It is during this period, however, that we get the survival of some remarkable household documents that give us another view of the domestic side of the king's household. These are the misae and praestita rolls and they show that William de Cantilupe continued in at least some of his domestic duties in these years. William, for example, maintained an involvement in the king's marshalsea, as he authorised the expenditure on equipment for the chamber stables. William also commissioned further repairs to royal residences, such as the king's house at Hanley.[117]

Between the years 1207 to 1210, it is clear that William de Cantilupe was fulfilling many duties in the household, which had not previously lain within his remit, despite

[110] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 86b, 87, 91b.
[111] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 101b-2, 103b.
[112] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 107.
[113] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 84, 91b, 97b, 99b, 100.
[114] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 89. For another example, see *ibid*., p. 112.
[115] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 103b.
[116] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 85b.
[117] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 129, 166.

holding the title of steward from the start of the reign. Yet, even during these years, William's involvement in the daily functioning household was noticeably less prominent than that of Peter of Stokes. The domestic role of the steward was gradually decreasing over these middle years of the reign. By the time the chancery rolls recommence in 1212, it is clear that the role of the steward had dramatically altered. From 1212 to the end of the reign, William de Cantilupe's involvement in the household was almost entirely limited to moments of extraordinary purveyance in preparation for great feasts. On 17 December 1213, for example, William de Cantilupe issued five letters close to prepare for the forthcoming Christmas at Windsor. The first letter was to Reginald of Cornhill with instructions to send pigs, hens, saffron, pepper, almonds, wine and wax. A second letter was sent to the sheriff of Buckinghamshire to request five hundred hens and twenty pigs; a third letter was sent to Matthew Mantel for a further two hundred pigs and a thousand hens; a fourth letter was sent to John fitz Hugh for another five hundred hens, pitchers, cups, cutlery, wood and charcoal. Finally, a fifth letter was sent to the sheriff of Kent to send 'before our feast' a thousand salted eels.[118] These letters are not representative of William's usual dealings with the household. They supply an example of the king using a trusted pair of hands to deal with the extra work required to make ready for Christmas. For the most part, in the later years of the reign, William was based out of court, and he held no responsibility or control over the domestic offices of the royal household.

The other stewards of the later years of the reign, William de Harcourt, Brian de Lisle and Falkes de Bréauté, rarely acted in a domestic capacity. William de Harcourt issued just one writ of *computate* concerning the domestic operations of the household, which was for money spent by the custodians of the bishopric of Durham on household expenses. This writ, however, was issued on a day when the household was at Pontefract, where William de Harcourt was the custodian, so it seems likely this was the reason for his attestation, rather than being evidence of his service in the household.[119] Only one other letter from the six years that William was steward suggests that he had any domestic role in household. This letter reveals that he had

---

[118] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 157-157b. For William's involvement in Christmas preparations in 1207, see *ibid.*, p. 97.
[119] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 151.

purchased wine, *bacons*[120] and other things whilst the household was at Rothwell.[121] These two letters are the entirety of the evidence which shows William de Harcourt active in the sort of domestic activity of which Peter of Stokes did so much. Likewise, neither Brian de Lisle nor Falkes de Bréauté played a significant role in the domestic sphere of the household. Only when Falkes was appointed steward, in March 1215, did he briefly work within the household.[122] In that month of March, Falkes sent an order to William Cook, the chamberlain, Henry of St. Albans and Ralph Asswy, to make 'ready for the festivities' (presumably Easter), by sending the kitchen vessels required by Robert the king's scullery servant.[123] In that same month, when Reginald the kitchen-boy was away from the household, Falkes arranged for him to have a wage of two-and-a-half pence a day.[124] Falkes also attested a letter that was sent to the sheriff of Nottingham with instructions to provide 'all necessary things' for the carters and horses of the king's wardrobe, hunt and armoury.[125] Finally, in March 1215, Falkes attested a letter to the bailiffs of Carlisle stating that the king's tranters should be permitted to buy salmon and other victuals for the king's use in Carlisle.[126] After this flurry of activity in the household, for the remainder of the reign Falkes was deployed in the localities and discharged no further domestic duties.

The evidence from the years 1212 to 1216 informs us that the function of the steward had shifted away from domestic duties in the household. The idea that a steward could be employed out of court was not new. The two varying allowances due to the stewards in the *Constitutio* depending on their location reveal that there was an expectation that the stewards could work out of court.[127] Barlow and Green followed the *Constitutio*'s tradition and saw that the stewards probably had a role outside the household, but they thought that this was conducted alongside their usual domestic duties.[128] From the evidence for the activities of the stewards in the later years of

[120] *Bacons* is used throughout this thesis to mean a type of preserved pork, ham or bacon, the sources do not reveal the exact nature of this meat, see Woolgar, *Great Household*, pp. 116-7.
[121] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 155b; *Rot. Fin.*, p. 473.
[122] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 135b.
[123] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 190.
[124] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 192.
[125] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 192b.
[126] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 191b. Brian de Lisle also attested this letter.
[127] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 198-9.
[128] Barlow, *William Rufus*, pp. 139-41; Green, *Government*, p. 35.

John's reign, it is clear that, by contrast, these men had almost no domestic responsibilities and worked on a permanent basis out of court.

With their domestic duties diminished, the stewards naturally fulfilled other tasks for the king. The military responsibilities of the king's stewards have been recognised throughout the period from the twelfth to the fourteenth century. For the reign of Edward I, Michael Prestwich described the stewards' role, as, above all, to take charge of the household military forces.[129] This military element to the steward's responsibilities, Jolliffe claimed, came about with the disappearance of the constable of the royal household in 1163. Yet, Jolliffe could do little to link the stewards to the activities of the household knights at times of war.[130] Church has enhanced our understanding of the stewards' military role during the reign of King John and showed that, in many respects, the careers of the stewards were not that different to those of the senior household knights.[131] Church demonstrated that the stewards were the head of the military arm of the king's household; as such, their role involved duties concerning the financing and logistics of military campaigns.[132] Like some knights, the stewards acted as paymasters and administrators during military campaigns. Peter of Stokes, despite his role being largely domestic, was involved in the financing of campaigns. In this role, he worked alongside the chamber, such as in preparation for the planned expedition to the continent in June 1205. When crossbowmen were sent to various commanders near Portchester, to make ready for their departure, it was Peter who sent instructions for their liveries to be paid. Peter instructed William Brewer, for example, to supplement the funds already supplied by the chamber clerk to pay knights going to Poitou.[133] Peter also instructed the constable of Chester, Roger de Lacy, to pay crossbowmen.[134] Peter, working with the chamber clerk, Bartholomew, attested a letter to William of Cornhill explaining that crossbowmen were being sent to him and that he should find liveries for them.[135] Peter also attested another letter to William de Cantilupe with the same

[129] Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 145.
[130] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, p. 211.
[131] For the functions of King John's household knights, see Church, *Household Knights*, pp. 39-73.
[132] Church, *Household Knights*, p. 12.
[133] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 28b.
[134] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 21b.
[135] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 26b.

instructions.[136] Peter, alongside Philip the chamber clerk, calculated the prests given to sailors in preparation for the Poitevin campaign, William of St. Maxient, another clerk, kept hold of the details.[137] Much of this work was undertaken alongside the chamber clerks, which reflects the fact that Peter was working from within the household sending instructions to men in the localities arranging for the financial aspects of the campaign.

William de Cantilupe was also a paymaster during military campaigns. On the expedition to Scotland, for example, William dispensed *dona* to the king's *familia*.[138] In 1213, during the Welsh campaign, William de Cantilupe, Robert de Vieuxpont, the earl of Chester and the squire of John Marshal together paid one thousand foot soldiers in the Welsh Marches.[139] Likewise, other stewards also participated in British and foreign campaigns paying sections of royal *familia* and the wider army. William de Harcourt, for example, worked alongside the chief clerk of the chamber, Richard Marsh, to dispense prests to knights at Carrickfergus, Kells and Fore during the Irish campaign in 1210.[140] During the civil war, Brian de Lisle and Falkes de Bréauté also acted as paymasters. Brian de Lisle paid those serjeants stationed near his centre of power in the north of the country.[141] And Falkes arranged, in April 1216, for the serjeants and crossbowmen of the king's *familia* to have the same money as regular serjeants.[142]

There is, evidently, a critical difference between the roles of Peter of Stokes and those of other stewards. Peter worked from within the household, from where he delegated the responsibility for paying serjeants and crossbowmen mustered for a pending campaign to officials placed in the localities. The evidence suggests that, in the early part of the reign, chamber clerks would dispense cash to military commanders or local officials at mustering points so that they could provide liveries to military men, with the steward on occasion providing assistance in the form of

---

[136] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 53. For other examples of Peter instructing others to pay liveries, see *ibid*., pp. 27b, 42, 44, 47, 55b, 61, 62b, 63b.
[137] *Docs. of English History,* p. 271. For examples, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 37, 39. For the career of William de St. Maxient, see *EEA IX*, pp. 200-1.
[138] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 125, 126, 145.
[139] *Docs. of English History*, p. 266.
[140] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 207, 212, 218.
[141] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 195b, 249b.
[142] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 263. Falkes also paid serjeants in July 1215, see *ibid*., p. 223.

writs issued from the household.[143] Later in John's reign, however, stewards were more immediately connected to the military arm of the king's *familia*, dispensing prests and *dona* directly to the knights, serjeants and crossbowmen on campaign. These stewards also played an active role leading knights and serjeants during a campaign. William de Harcourt led a small contingent of sixteen household knights in Ireland.[144] William de Cantilupe had with him twenty or thirty knights in the Welsh Marches.[145] Falkes de Bréauté was especially active during the civil war. For example, he was one of four commanders sent to London to engage the French and rebel forces whilst the king rode north.[146]

These stewards were also used in the logistics of arranging a campaign. In October 1213, for example, Brian de Lisle requested that Reginald of Cornhill send to Robin the saddler wheels, saddles, saddlebags, stirrups, halters, girdles, reins and cart covers for both the kitchen and the hunt. In January 1214, William de Harcourt issued a letter to Reginald of Cornhill with instructions to purchase various pieces of equipment for the carts of the king's hunt and kitchen, including wheels, axles, cart-covers, cart-shafts, saddles and girdles.[147] These commissions are not evidence of the stewards conducting routine domestic duties. Rather, they were orders made in the light of the pending campaign to the continent to improve the quality of the king's domestic offices so that they were sufficiently robust on campaign.[148] The martial role of the steward dramatically increased in the later years of John's reign. This may partly be in response to the increased military activity within England, but as John's reign was generally so bellicose, this explanation can only be stretched so far. What appears to have been the case was an actual shift in the way John decided to utilise his stewards, by diminishing their domestic responsibilities, in favour of military deployments.

This shift can also be seen in terms of the increased use of stewards as castellans of some of the king's most strategically placed castles. Brian de Lisle, for example, held the northern strongholds of Knaresborough and Boroughbridge, which were important due to their position along the great north road. Moreover, Brian had

[143] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 26.
[144] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 21.
[145] *Docs. of English History,* p. 250; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 228; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 109.
[146] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 10.
[147] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 153b-154.
[148] For these purchases, see, *infra*, pp. 216-7.

custody of Peak and Bolsover castles which controlled the main routes into the North.[149] Corfe castle, a centre of financial importance and one of King John's most favoured residences, was held by two stewards. Firstly, Geoffrey de Neville was custodian during his stewardship until July 1207, then he was instructed to relinquish it to John of Bassingbourne, a household knight.[150] In August 1212, John of Bassingbourne passed custody to the steward, William de Harcourt, who held it until August 1215, when he was made sheriff of York. The influx of cash given to William de Harcourt during his custody of Corfe castle is testimony of Corfe's importance to King John.[151] William de Harcourt was also made joint custodian with Elias de Beauchamp of the confiscated castle at Framlingham.[152] Falkes de Bréauté also held, at least nominally, the castles at Oxford, Bedford, Hanslope and Northampton during the civil war.[153] William de Cantilupe, when he was made sheriff of Warwickshire, took control of Kenilworth castle, which was an important centre for administration and controlled one of the main routes into Coventry.[154] Throughout the reign, William de Cantilupe also held the castles of Pulverbatch, Holdgate, Worcester, Richard's castle, Stapleton, Clifton-upon-Terne, Wilton, Mountsorrel and Hereford.[155] Peter of Stokes also held Northampton castle during his stewardship.[156] Yet, it is clear from the evidence that, in the latter years of the reign, stewards were far more active in their role as castellans. William de Cantilupe, for example, organised the garrisoning of Kenilworth castle.[157] Brian de Lisle sent crossbow bolts produced at Knaresborough castle to Portsmouth, for the king's campaign on the continent in 1214.[158] The stewards were also gaolers for the king's hostages and prisoners in the castles they held: William de Harcourt was responsible

---

[149] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 48.
[150] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 74.
[151] *King's Works,* i, pp. 65-9; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 226; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 257, 259, 264; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 158, 178b, 185.
[152] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 169b.
[153] Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 47-50; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 74.
[154] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 48.
[155] *Book of fees,* p. 144; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* pp. 46b, 50, 73b, 162; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 27b.
[156] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 30b. Also, in June 1202, the household knight Geoffrey Luttrell was instructed to release the castle at Moulineaux in Normandy to Peter of Stokes, see *Rot. Norm.,* pp. 53, 82.
[157] *VCH Warwick,* ii, p. 426.
[158] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 143, 148.

for prisoners at Corfe; William de Cantilupe for those at Kenilworth; Falkes de Bréauté for those at Bedford, and Brian de Lisle for those at Knaresborough.[159]

Stewards were placed in the localities to consolidate royal power, not only as castellans of castles, but also as sheriffs and custodians of escheated lay and ecclesiastical lands. Peter of Stokes served as sheriff of Northampton from 1203, but this was his only position in the localities, and given the amount of time he spent at court it was seems reasonable to suppose that, for the most part, this county was administered by his deputy, his namesake Robert of Stokes.[160] Robert of Thurnham was already sheriff of Surrey from 1194, a position he continued to hold until 1203, then again from 1204 to 1207, but no other shrievalties were added to his portfolio during his time as the king's steward.[161] Conversely, William de Cantilupe was granted the shrievalties of Worcestershire, Herefordshire, Warwickshire and Leicestershire at different times across the reign. He also received custody of the vacant bishoprics of Worcestershire and Lincolnshire.[162] William was given other responsibilities in the localities, such as collecting tallages for Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Shropshire, Staffordshire and Herefordshire.[163] Geoffrey de Neville briefly held the shrievalty of Wiltshire in 1207, but he was probably relieved of this office soon after he was made chamberlain.[164] William de Harcourt was sheriff of Somerset and Dorset from January 1214 to April 1215, when he was transferred to the shrievalty of Yorkshire.[165] William de Harcourt was also custodian of the honor of Pontefract, of the escheated lands of the constable of Chester and of ecclesiastical

---

[159] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 101b, 104b, 105, 106, 107b, 108, 108b, 121b, 123b, 126, 133, 133b, 134, 134b, 145b, 150b, 179, 188; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 164, 269b; *Rot. Fin.*, pp. 321, 495-6, 525.
[160] *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 176; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 133.
[161] *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 225; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* pp. 12-3; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 197; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 45; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 115; *Pipe Roll,* p. 63.
[162] For the sheriffdom of Worcestershire, see *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 114; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 16; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 28; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 88; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 265; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 210; *Pipe roll 9 John,* p. 197; *Pipe Roll 10 John,* p. 39; *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 62; *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 169; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 251; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 58; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 107; *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 27; *Rot. Fin.*, p. 400; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 153b, 193b. For the sheriffdom of Herefordshire, see *Pipe Roll 7 John,* pp. 271, 275. For the sheriffdom of Warwickshire and Leicestershire, see *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 231; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 31; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 28; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 220; *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 89; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 188; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 136; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 109; *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 28. For the bishopric of Worcester, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 103, 110; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 60; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* pp. 109b, 175. For the bishopric of Lincolnshire, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 85b.
[163] *Pipe Roll 3 John,* pp. 54, 56, 63, 69, 252.
[164] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 74b; *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales,* Public Record Office, Lists and Indexes 9 (New York, 1963), p. 152.
[165] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 108b, 152; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* pp. 96, 106. The appointment to the Yorkshire shrievalty was short-lived, Geoffrey de Neville was appointed in March 1216, see *List of Sheriffs,* p. 161.

lands, such as those of Keynsham Abbey.[166] Brian de Lisle did not hold any shrievalties, but he was custodian of Knaresborough and Boroughbridge.[167] Brian was also made forester of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire from 1207 to 1217.[168] Moreover, Brian administered the vacant archbishopric of York from 1209 until the end of the reign, as well as the bishopric of Lincolnshire.[169] Falkes de Bréauté was made sheriff of Oxfordshire in November 1215 and Northamptonshire in May 1216; he also held the vacant bishopric of Ely from March 1216.[170]

John's stewards were men of significant martial and administrative skills who he utilised extensively to provide support in the localities. In the later years of the reign, these local functions became the focus of the stewards' role, as their attention shifted away from the household. What this discussion of the duties of the king's stewards has demonstrated is the fluidity embodied in the title. These men were not holders of a fixed office with a defined set of duties; they were individuals whose role was dependent on changing factors, such as the king's needs and the immediate problems facing the realm. The paradigm set up by Jolliffe that the steward played a central, authoritative role in the domestic functioning of the royal household during the Angevin period does not hold up against an examination of the evidence concerning each individual titled steward during John's reign. John was much more willing to play with the notion of what a steward might be than we once thought. The stewards, like so many other Angevin servants, were malleable in their function; how they served the king was not determined by the title they held, but by the king's wishes. Jolliffe's general hypothesis on the flexibility of Angevin household servants is actually strengthened in light of this new evidence. It is only the uncharacteristic rigidity with which Jolliffe treated the function of the stewards which needs to be amended.

---

166 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 145, 151b, 212; *Rot. Fin.*, p. 473.

167 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 57b, 65b, 66, 66b, 83b, 105b, 144, 151; *Rot. Lib. John,* p. 127; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* pp. 38-40; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 217; *Pipe Roll 9 John,* p. 125; *Pipe Roll 10 John,* p. 50; *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 14; *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 135; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 88; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 168; *Pipe Roll 16 John*, p. 66; *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 13.

168 *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 72b, 73.

169 For the archbishopric of York, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 66, 248b; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 88b; *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 148; *Pipe Roll 17 John*, p. 12-3. For the bishopric of Lincoln, see *Book of fees,* p. 104; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 58.

170 *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 159b, 169b, 179b, 183.

We may now use this knowledge to pose questions of the reigns of other Angevin kings. J. Lally in his study of the court and household of Henry II noted that, in 1166, there was a change in the household stewardship. Henry II's steward, Manasser Biset had, like Peter of Stokes, been in almost constant attendance on the king. When Biset retired in *c.*1166, no steward replaced him within the court. The lack of chancery or household records during Henry II's reign greatly inhibited Lally's ability to explain this change in stewardship.[171] In light of the similarities which can be detected in the years 1166 and 1206, we may suppose that Henry II, like his son, moulded the position of steward to suit his own needs and those of his household. Jolliffe's powerful hypothesis on the adaptability of royal servants may be as well suited to the stewards of Henry II, as it is to those of King John.

The benefits and rewards that King John dispensed to his stewards can further inform us about their role within the household and their relationship with the king. The *Constitutio* informs us that domestic service in the royal household was remunerated by bread, wine, candles and daily wages. The quantities received by the stewards were five shillings a day, one loaf of the king's bread, two salted loaves, one measure of best wine, one measure of ordinary wine, one large wax candle and forty candle pieces if they dined out of court. If the stewards dined in the court their allowance was reduced to 3*s* 6*d* a day, two salted loaves, one measure of ordinary wine and a full candle allowance.[172] It is clear that, in the early twelfth century, the stewards, regardless of their proximity to the household, were entitled to a continuous salary in return for their service. Whether a salary and daily victuals were dispensed to domestic servants in the royal household of King John is not a question which can be easily answered from the surviving documentation. The misae rolls reveal the wages of the water-carrier. The rolls also contain suggestions of other wages paid to men employed in the household, such as to the tutor for Henry, the son of the Duke of Saxony, a young noble living in the royal household.[173] For the vast majority of John's household, however, we do not have sufficient evidence to be able to ascertain whether or not domestic servants were in receipt of daily sustenance and cash in return for their services. Mentions of *rotuli de liberacionibus* indicate there was a greater system of dispensing liveries in existence within John's

[171] Lally, 'Court and Household of Henry II', pp. 44-8.
[172] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 196-9.
[173] For a discussion of the wages paid in household, see *infra,* pp. 126-7.

household. Unfortunately without a surviving example of these rolls we are forced to wait for moments of activity outside the household to inform us about internal practice.[174]

On occasion, it is possible to see the provisions made for household servants when such men were separated from court. When Stephen, a carter for the household, was bringing fish to Marlborough for the king, for example, the constable of Taunton was instructed to find for him all his required necessities (*necessaria*).[175] Similarly, when Hugh of the wardrobe was delayed in crossing the sea to England in October 1203, the bailiffs of Barfleur were told to provide him with 'reasonable necessities'.[176] On a number of occasions, Reginald of Cornhill was instructed to provide 'necessities' for members of the household. Robert the king's marshal, for example, in April 1215, was accompanied by destriers, rouncies and grooms, all of which required necessities during their separation from the household.[177] The instructions sent to these officials do not usually quantify or explicate these necessities, but one piece of evidence shows that these 'necessities' consisted of wheat, oats, bread, ale and meat.[178] Local officials were also asked to provide money for household servants working away from court. In October 1205, for example, two royal servants were sent to William of Cornhill. The nature of their business is not known, but whilst they were away from court William was to find for them two-and-a-half pence a day or to allow them to eat with others in his household. The money William spent on sustaining these servants was allowed against his account at the Exchequer.[179] Such a small amount of money, when seen in comparison with the wages paid in the *Constitutio,* would suggest these were relatively menial domestic servants; men, for example, who assisted the hound handlers in the *Constitutio,* received two pence a day for their service.[180]

This evidence suggests that arrangements were made for household servants to have 'necessities' whilst they travelled away from court. This arrangement probably

[174] *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 231, 233, 235.
[175] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 26.
[176] *Rot. Norm.,* p. 108.
[177] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 198b. For other examples, see *ibid*., pp. 25, 54, 64b, 65, 66, 159, 160, 175, 176b, 183, 207b.
[178] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 61b.
[179] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 54. The same reference also shows a horse serjeant being sent to Reginald of Cornhill, who was to have 'necessities'.
[180] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. 212.

reflects the sustenance they received when in attendance at the court, for which the evidence is absent from the record sources during John's reign. The domestic servants, however, in receipt of these 'necessities' appear to have been attached to the lower strata of the royal household. For the senior officials of court, namely the stewards, while it seems plausible that they received hospitality whilst performing domestic duties at court; there is no evidence of a steward receiving 'necessities', or a continuous monetary salary, when separated from the household.[181]

When a steward received a monetary payment, it was in the form of gifts (*dona*) or loans (*praestita*), rather than liveries (*liberaciones*) or wages (*vadia*). These payments were for specific royal missions or to sustain their recipients during a military expedition. For example, in 1212, William de Harcourt was given three marks when he accompanied John on his rapid march into the north of England to put down the conspiracy stirred up by Robert fitz Walter and Eustace de Vescy.[182] In 1213, Brian de Lisle and Falkes de Bréauté were sent on a diplomatic mission to Flanders and both received forty marks.[183] William de Cantilupe seems to have received grants of money throughout the reign, but these too were almost entirely for missions and military campaigns. In 1213, for example, William received a hundred marks as a gift from the king while he was on campaign in the Welsh marches.[184] Earlier in the reign, William had been given a prest of a hundred marks when he went on a mission to Germany.[185] The pipe roll of 1215 records a debt of £66 16*d* from a time when William was in service in Poitou and a further ninety marks for minor expenses, which he presumably incurred whilst on campaign.[186] Church, when looking at similar payments made to household knights concluded that these payments did not constitute evidence of a system of regular wages. Men associated with the higher echelons of the royal household, such as knights and stewards, received cash in the form of a gift or loan to meet the needs of a specific task or

[181] Church concluded the same about the household knights of King John, see S. D. Church 'The Rewards of Royal Service in the Household of King John: A Dissenting Opinion', *EHR,* 110 (1995), 277-302 (p. 286).
[182] *Pipe Roll 17 John*, p. 91.
[183] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 139b.
[184] *Docs. of English History*, p. 250.
[185] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 417. This trip to Germany probably happened in 1205. For the prest of 100*m*, see *Pipe Roll 7 John*, p. 266. Also, see *Rot. Fin.,* p. 471.
[186] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 558.

mission the king had assigned to them. Daily wages were, it seems, limited to lower status officials in the household.[187]

Church demonstrated that household knights were not reliant on monetary wages because they were rewarded for their service with feudal privileges dispensed as patronage by the king to his loyal retainers. There was no defined set of benefits to which a household knight was entitled. It was a household knight's proximity to the king and his personal relationship with him that ensured his petitions for royal favours were regularly heard.[188] A similar rewards structure seems to have operated for John's stewards, informing us not only about the benefits of royal service but, importantly, about the relationship between the steward, the king and his household.

The evidence of the 1279 household ordinance and a study conducted by Michael Ray suggest that wardships were a vital form of reward for the royal steward in the thirteenth century. The household ordinance of 1279 describes two stewards: the senior man was to receive a wardship worth fifty pounds, and the junior received a wardship worth twenty-five pounds, in addition to a ten-pound money fief and eight marks for robes.[189] Michael Ray has shown that, during the reign of Henry III, wardships were also used to reward royal stewards. Both Imbert Pugeys and Peter de Champvent received two wardships during their tenure as stewards.[190] Ray's study shows that the rewards received by these men were similar, but were not limited, to those outlined in the household ordinance of 1279.

This practice of dispensing wardships as a means of rewarding the service of a steward was also in existence during the reign of King John. Wardships were valuable source of patronage at the king's disposal. The recipient of a wardship held in their control all the lands pertaining to the heir or heiress given over to their custody. Moreover, the king could grant the right of *maritagium* over the ward, which allowed the custodian to arrange the marriage of the heir or heiress in their

---

187 Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 81-4.
188 Church, *Household Knights,* p. 86; J. Lally, 'Secular Patronage at the court of Henry II', *BIHR,* 49 (1976), 159-84.
189 Tout, *Chapter,* ii, p. 158.
190 Champvent served as steward for two years under Edward I, but received no notable rewards in the form of wardships or land. Champvent and Pugeys both received other types of rewards such as marriages, land, money, timber, deer, horses, wine, see M. Ray, 'Three Alien Stewards in Thirteenth-Century England: The Careers and Legacy of Mathias Bezill, Imbert Pugeys and Peter de Champvent', in *TCE X,* ed. by M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 51-68 (p. 5).

care.[191] John dispensed these privileges to a number of his stewards upon their elevation to that office. The earliest writ which records Peter of Stokes' title as steward, also contains a grant to him of the wardship of the heir of William de Ros for 'sustentandum se in servicio nostro'.[192] Given that we know that wardships were certainly part of the steward's rewards later in the thirteenth century, this grant may well indicate the moment of Peter's appointment.

When Falkes de Bréauté was given the title of steward in early March 1215, it also coincided with a grant to him of a wardship. Falkes received the wardship and the marriage rights over the heir of Walter of Ely, with lands in Suffolk and in the liberty of the bishopric of Ely.[193] In 1210, the year William de Harcourt was made a steward, he too received a wardship, for which he fined in fifty marks and a palfrey (a debt which King John chose not to recall during the remainder of his reign). This fine gave William custody of the land and marriage rights over the heir of Alexander of Wilton in Peckleton, Leicestershire.[194] Each of these three stewards was granted a gift of wardship apparently upon their appointment. Although we cannot witness the same grant at the moment of appointment for the other of John's stewards, the sources are not sufficiently full for John's reign to say with any certainty that such grants were never made. The surviving record material for John's reign does not provide a complete picture of all gifts of patronage. That there is evidence for three of John's stewards receiving wardships at the moment of their appointment could perhaps be viewed as strong evidence to suggest that stewards could expect to get a wardship from John as part of their remuneration as stewards.

That King John favoured the practice of rewarding his stewards with wardships is supported by subsequent grants made throughout the stewardships of William de Cantilupe and Peter of Stokes, both of whom did remarkably well from this form of

---

[191] E. Mason, 'Maritagium and the Changing Law', *BIHR,* 49 (1976), 286-9.
[192] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 24
[193] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 189.
[194] *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 93. This fine appears in the pipe rolls for 1211, 1212, 1214 and 1218. William de Harcourt also appears to have custody of the heirs of William of Mutun. The fine is not repaid, which suggests as an additional dimension to this patronage as King John did not recall this debt, see *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p.191; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 138; in *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 111; *Pipe Roll 1 Henry III,* p. 51. After William de Harcourt's death, it was the responsibility of the sheriff of Leicestershire to control the activities of the executors of his will, see *CFR 1222-3,* no.137.

patronage.[195] The connections that can be discerned between William de Cantilupe and the wards granted into his custody suggest he was not a passive recipient of these grants. William must have actively sought this patronage, which he viewed as a profitable addition to his portfolio of lands and custodies. In 1211, for example, he offered five hundred marks and a palfrey for custody of the lands and heirs of Henry de Longchamps, including a knight's fee in Wilton.[196] Henry de Longchamps was a household knight who had married Matilda, William de Cantilupe's sister, so Henry's heir was William's nephew.[197] In the same grant, William was also given marriage rights over his sister, Matilda, which allowed William to decide who would have control over her dower and dowry lands, or even if she would remarry.[198] We might naturally expect family connections to hold sway in the king's decision where to place his patronage, but those men with access to the king's ear, such as the stewards, would have been especially well placed to make these petitions.[199]

William de Cantilupe's proximity to the king also enabled him to lobby for wardships to the detriment of other families. By 1212, for example, William held the wardship of the heir of Hugh de Scoteny, through which he held one carucate in South Willingham and two-and-a-half bovates of land in Kingthorpe for the service of three parts of a knight.[200] William was a tenant of the Scoteny family. He held Withcall from Thomas de Scoteny and two further knights' fees from Lambert de Scoteny.[201] This connection between the two families continued into the reign of Henry III, when, in 1242, William (II) de Cantilupe can be seen holding lands in Willingham, Kingthorpe and Withcall, by custody of the heirs of William de

[195] In 1200, Brian de Lisle received a wardship for custody of the land and heirs of *Breton de Sidelus*, for which he fined in 120*m* and one palfrey, see *Rot. Fin.*, p. 98. In 1211, Brian fined in 20*m* and one palfrey for custody of the lands and heirs of Geoffrey Columbers, see *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 34. Both of these wardships were granted before Brian's elevation to the stewardship. Moreover, in 1207, when Robert of Thurnham was seneschal of Poitou, he fined in one thousand marks for custody of the land and heirs (with *maritagium*) of Robert del Mesnill, see *Pipe Roll 9 John*, p. 69.
[196] *Book of Fees*, p. 100; *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 253; *Rot. Fin.*, p. 47. In 1212, William de Cantilupe paid £100 3*s* 1*d*, and had a further £58 15*s* 7½*d* taken off the debt due to a surplus on his account, see *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 61. No further payments were made during John's reign. In 1218, another surplus on William's account was used to pay part of this fine; the remainder was pardoned by Henry III, see *Pipe Roll 2 Henry III*, p. 29.
[197] Church, *Household Knights*, p. 88, note 83.
[198] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 253.
[199] S. L. Waugh, *The Lordship of England: Royal Wardships and Marriages in English Society and Politics, 1217-1327* (Princeton, 1988), pp. 146-7.
[200] *Book of Fees*, p. 170.
[201] *Book of Fees*, p. 177; *Red Book*, p. 518.

Scoteny.[202] The Scotenys were tenants in chief of the king, and out of their lands they let significant fees to the Cantilupes. By successfully petitioning for the wardship of the Scoteny heir, William consolidated his power in East Lincolnshire, perhaps to the annoyance of the Scoteny family.

In 1205, William successfully petitioned for custody of the lands of another ward, the heir of John of Kilpeck.[203] A few years later, the king also granted the land and heirs of Lady Egidia of Kilpeck, John's wife, who had been widowed for a second time in that year.[204] The lands of the Kilpeck heir were valued at a substantial one-and-a-half knights' fees, which included half of Broadfield which was held by William by foreign serjeanty.[205] John de Kilpeck had held jurisdiction of the forests in Herefordshire from 1200 and he also had Kilpeck castle in the same county. It seems likely that it was William de Cantilupe's position as sheriff of Herefordshire which motivated him to petition the king for this profitable wardship, and that it was his position as steward that allowed his petition to be heard successfully. In 1214, William continued his acquisition of wardships when he fined in two hundred marks for custody of the land and marriage rights of Katherine, the heiress of Hugh de Lisle.[206] William, it seems, initially planned to use his right of *maritagium* over Katherine for the benefit of his son.[207] In 1215, however, William fined in two hundred marks for the marriage rights of Millicent, the widow of Aimery, count of Evreux; this record also suggests William intended Millicent to marry his son.[208] In 1218, the situation was clarified, William had arranged a marriage between his son and the countess of Evreux, and Katherine de Lisle was to marry William's brother.[209] Evidently, William de Cantilupe altered his plans for his son's marriage when a more eligible bride, the countess of Evreux, became available. William was making his family fortune through the judicious acquisition of wardships.

[202] *Book of Fees*, p. 1055.
[203] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 28b. In this instance, the marriage rights were kept by the king.
[204] *Pipe Roll 11 John*, p. 62. Lady Egidia was probably the wife of John Kilpeck; after his death, in 1205, she married William fitz Warin. William fined in forty marks for her lands and heirs; in the following year, the surplus from William's account in Worcestershire paid off this debt, see *Pipe Roll 12 John*, p. 146.
[205] *Book of Fees*, pp. 100, 101.
[206] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 520; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 109; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 174; *Pipe Roll 16 John*, p. 109. This fine was paid off in 1218 using a surplus from William's account. For the lands, see *Book of Fees*, p. 604.
[207] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 520; *Pipe Roll 2 Henry*, p. 63.
[208] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 558.
[209] *Pipe Roll 2 Henry III*, p. 63.

Peter of Stokes also benefited greatly from wardships. Connections between the families of his wards and Peter are less apparent than those between William de Cantilupe and his wards. But, it is probable that such connections were present and have evaded the surviving record sources. In addition to the wardship granted to Peter upon his appointment to the stewardship, he also received three wardships of the heirs of Henry de Vere, John Le Sor and Jordan d'Anneville in 1203.[210] Henry de Vere had held substantial lands in Suffolk, Wiltshire and Essex, which produced profits of at least thirty pounds a year.[211] Peter fined in a hundred pounds and a palfrey for the right to hold custody of the land and heir of Jordan d'Anneville; the proviso was that this fine should not be summoned unless the king explicitly requested it. This grant to Peter also contained the marriage rights over Jordan's widow, whom Peter intended to marry his brother.[212] Peter, like William de Cantilupe, used the patronage bestowed upon him by the king to enhance his family's fortune. The final wardship granted to Peter in 1203 was of the heir of John Le Sor, which stipulated that the lands were to be held until the heir came of age. The marriage rights over the same heir were also granted, with the caveat that the heir should be married 'without disparagement'.[213] When these grants are seen in the context of Scott Waugh's estimation that, for the period from 1217 to 1327, English kings could typically expect to gain access to a dozen wardships per year, that three were granted to Peter of Stokes draws direct attention to his ability successfully to petition the king for patronage.[214]

This success continued in 1204, when Peter fined in fifty marks for the wardship and marriage rights of the heir of Ralph de Mara; this had the same caveat that the marriage should be made 'without disparagement'. This wardship gave Peter control of lands in Lincolnshire and Cumberland.[215] Peter was never summoned to repay this debt of fifty marks and the leniency displayed to him can, perhaps, be read as

---

[210] *Rot. Chart.*, p. 110b; *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 62; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 13, 35.
[211] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 74, 93. After Peter's death in 1206, these lands can be found in the custody of the household knight, Robert Peverel, which suggests that the king was keen to place these lands in the hands of men close to him within his household, see Church, *Household Knights,* p. 53.
[212] *Rot. Lib. John,* p. 42; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 184.
[213] *Rot. Chart.,* p. 110b.
[214] Waugh, *Lordship of England,* p. 146.
[215] *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 77. This wardship was later granted to John of Bassingbourne, the household knight, see Church, *Household Knights,* p. 90.

another element of the king's patronage.[216] Peter served as steward for only five years. In this time, he was the recipient of five lucrative wardships. This was an impressive haul of royal patronage. The charter witness lists for these years make it apparent that there was barely a day that went by when Peter was not at court. No other royal steward spent so much of their time by the king's side, and his example is an illustration of the profits that could be gained by close proximity to the king.

Wardships were not the only means by which the king rewarded his stewards. Marriage to a wealthy heiress or widow was another reward to which men of the king's household might aspire. Church has shown that there were twenty-six known marriages of household knights to notable women during John's reign, and Church suggests that this may be a conservative figure which underrepresents the true extent to which this form of reward was dispensed.[217] All but one of John's royal stewards, however, came to the position already married. In 1198, Peter of Stokes, for example, fined in one hundred marks to marry the daughter of Aimery the dispenser.[218] In 1204, King John pardoned the entire debt.[219] Peter's bride, Juliana, had family connections to royal service dating back to the eleventh century. Her father's family had held the position of household dispenser; Thurstan the dispenser appears in an anecdote told by Walter Map, who describes a squabble between him and Adam, the court sealer.[220] On her mother's side, Juliana descended from the de Broc family, holders of the Cattishall serjeanty, which was attached to ushership of the chamber, the marshalsea and keeping the court prostitutes.[221] When Peter married Juliana in 1198, she was described as the heiress of Aimery the dispenser.[222] Aimery died between April 1204 and February 1205. However, before his death he had married Alda Bloet and had a son, Thurstan.[223] It seems possible that Peter of Stokes received the wardship of Aimery's young son; as, in February 1205, the sheriffs of Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire and Hampshire were

---

[216] For this and other debts remaining on Peter's account after his death, see *Memoranda Roll 10 John*, p. 59.
[217] Church, *Household Knights,* p. 88.
[218] *Pipe Roll 10 Richard*, p. 107; *Pipe Roll 1 John*, p. 7.
[219] *Pipe Roll 1 John,* p. 12; *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 57; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 180; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 148; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 179; *Pipe Roll 6 John*, p. 135.
[220] Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 486-7; Round, *King's Serjeants,* pp. 186-97.
[221] Round, *King's Serjeants,* pp. 98-108.
[222] *Pipe Roll 10 Richard I,* p. 107.
[223] N. Vincent, *The Lucys of Charlecote: The Invention of a Warwickshire Family, 1170-1302,* Dugdale Society Occasional Papers, 42 (Warwickshire, 2002), pp. 6-7.

instructed to provide Peter with full seisin of Aimery's lands in those countries, save the dower lands of Aimery's widow.[224] By holding this wardship Peter would have, albeit temporarily, held the lands he had expected to receive through the right of his wife whilst she was still Aimery's heiress. In 1206, probably after Peter's death, Thomas Bloet fined in four hundred marks and two war-horses for the land, son and widow of Aimery the dispenser with the right of *maritagium*.[225] Subsequently, Geoffrey de Lucy fined in three thousand marks to marry Juliana, which demonstrates the wealth that was to come with Peter's widow.[226]

Of John's other stewards, Brian de Lisle received his marriage during his time as a household knight. Of all the marriages of household knights that Church has identified, Brian's marriage was particularly interesting. In 1205, Brian fined in three hundred marks to have the marriage of the widow of Norman, a servant of the king's chamber.[227] This widow was Grace, the daughter and heiress of Thomas of Saleby a Lincolnshire knight, whose life was marked by controversy and is the subject of a tale by Adam of Eynsham in his life of Hugh, bishop of Lincoln. Thomas of Saleby's wife, it is told, was barren. Out of hatred for her brother-in-law, William de Hartishall, into whose control she would have gone had she remained childless when her elderly husband died, she faked a pregnancy and took in a child from a nearby village to pass off as her own.[228] The evidence of the *curia regis rolls* supports this story, as it reveals the attempts that were made by William de Hartishall to seize back his lands after Thomas' death.[229] Hugh of Lincoln claimed that the case was one that belonged to ecclesiastical jurisdiction and so excommunicated Thomas of Saleby's wife, Agnes, for her deception. Yet, as Thomas had accepted Grace as legitimate during his lifetime she remained the heiress to his lands.[230] It is interesting that King John chose to marry a woman of such problematic background, firstly, to a man of his chamber, Norman, and then to a household knight, Brian. On both occasions, John accepted vast fines in return for this patronage – Norman fined in

[224] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 20b.
[225] *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 16.
[226] *Pipe Roll 9 John,* p. 148.
[227] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 240; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 212. For Norman of the chamber, see *supra,* pp. 44-5.
[228] *The Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln*, ed. by D. L. Douie and Hugh Farmer (London, 1961-2), pp. 20-7.
[229] J. C. Holt, 'Feudal Society and the Family in Early Medieval England: IV. The Heiress and the Alien', *TRHS,* 5th series, 35 (1985), 1-28 (p. 22).
[230] *St. Hugh of Lincoln*, ed. Douie and Farmer, p. 25.

two hundred marks and Brian three hundred.[231] Presumably, these men expected that as members of his household, King John would be able to protect them from the pleas which must have been made against them by William de Hartishall.[232] Nonetheless, all of Grace's marriages ended childless and the inheritance of Thomas of Saleby eventually passed to the rightful heir (if we believe Adam of Eynsham) the son of William de Hartishall.

The only royal steward to come to the position unmarried was Falkes de Bréauté.[233] In September 1216, King John sanctioned the marriage between Falkes and Margaret de Redvers. Margaret was a rich, double heiress in her own right, as the daughter of Warin Fitz Gerold, the hereditary chamberlain of the exchequer, and Alice de Courcy, the heiress of William (III) de Courcy.[234] Margaret was also the hugely wealthy widow of Baldwin de Redvers, son and heir of the earl of Devon. Margaret brought to her new marriage her dower lands in the Isle of Wight.[235] Furthermore, Falkes held custody of Margaret's son, Baldwin, whose wardship brought lands, including the borough of Honiton.[236] Falkes was the archetypal Angevin 'new man', raised through the ranks on the basis of merit and ability rather than birth or hereditary right.[237] The marriage of such a wealthy heiress to a man of Falkes' birth and reputation did not escape criticism. Matthew Paris claimed that the king could not see 'right from wrong' because of the power Falkes held over him and so gave

[231] *Rot. Fin.*, pp. 40, 240.
[232] For the judicial protection afforded to those with an affiliation to the royal household, see Church, *Household Knights*, pp. 57-8.
[233] Concerning the marriages of the other stewards, two were granted by King Richard. Robert of Thurnham had married the heiress of William Fossard by 1197, raising him to the ranks of the baronage, with thirty knight's fees in Doncaster in West Riding of Yorkshire and Mulgrave in Cleveland, see *Pipe Roll 9 Richard I*, p. 51; *Pipe Roll 13 John*, pp. 30-1. William de Cantilupe's first marriage was to Mascelin, the daughter of Arnulf de Brascy, see *A Calendar of the Feet of Fines for Bedfordshire*, ed. by G. H. Fowler (Aspley Guise, 1919), p. 39. William's second marriage was during the minority of Henry III to Millicent the daughter of Hugh de Gournay, see *Curia Regis Rolls*, viii, pp. 213-5; *Feet of Fines, Bedfordshire*, p. 70; *CFR 1221-2*, no. 183. William de Harcourt received his marriage in 1201; he fined in one hundred marks for Alice, the eldest daughter of Thomas Noel. William shared the Noel inheritance with his brother-in-law Thomas fitz Eustace, see *Rot. Fin.*, p. 125; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 501b. It has not been possible to discover who the wife of Geoffrey de Neville, if, indeed, he had one.
[234] By right of his wife, Falkes held Fritwell, see *VCH Oxfordshire*, vi, p. 136; Steeple Aston, see *VCH Oxfordshire*, xi, p. 26; Worde, see *Pipe Roll 2 Henry III*, p. 6. In 1218, Falkes owed a relief of one hundred pounds for the lands of Warin fitz Gerold by right of his wife, see *CFR 1218-9*, no. 98.
[235] *Book of Fees*, p. 263.
[236] *Book of Fees*, p. 263.
[237] R. V. Turner, *Men Raised From the Dust: Administrative Service and Upward Mobility in Angevin England* (Pennsylvania, 1988), pp. 1-19.

Falkes 'the noble lady Margaret with all her land'.[238] Later, Matthew Paris continued his attack, describing how at the point of death, Margaret had complained that she had been handed to this ignoble creature [Falkes]…by the tyrant John to whom no evil was abhorrent'.[239] Contemporary concern over such matches is highlighted in clause six of Magna Carta, which stated that heirs should be given in marriage 'without disparagement'.[240] Disparagement, however, was an undefined term. Only in the Statute of Merton (1236) was it defined as marriage to a villain or burgess, in neither which categories could Falkes be placed.[241] Holt argued, however, that the views of Paris were not necessarily representative of current opinion and should be seen in the light of Falkes' treatment of St. Albans during the civil war. Contemporary evidence actually suggests that the marriage was supported by Margaret's father, Warin fitz Gerold.[242]

Although, King John did not arrange any other marriages for his stewards, we may still suppose that Falkes was uncommonly fortunate in his new bride. Few widows would have brought with them such a vast amount of lands. Falkes' marriage should be seen in the context of the political climate of England at the time it was given. In September 1216, the country was split by civil war, Louis of France occupied London and even those who had served loyally in John's household had joined the rebellion against him.[243] Falkes' marriage should be seen as a reward for his unwavering loyalty and his ruthless attack on lands and castles which had fallen to the opposition. Falkes had taken castles, such as Bedford and Hanslope, out of rebel hands, sacked the town of Worcester when it succumbed to Louis and defended Oxford against baronial forces.[244] It seems certain that it was these actions, not his position as the king's steward, which the king rewarded with such an advantageous marriage.

Another form of reward, which was frequently used by John for his stewards and other members of his household, was grants of land, either from the royal demesne

[238] Matthew Paris included these words to Roger of Wendover's narrative concerning the ravages conducted by Falkes in late 1215 in the south of England, see *Chron. Maj.*, ii, p. 638.
[239] *Chron. Maj.,* v, p. 323.
[240] J. C. Holt, *Magna Carta* (London, 1965), p. 319.
[241] Waugh, *Lordship of England,* p. 81.
[242] Holt, 'Heiress and the Alien', p. 28; W. Farrer, *Honors and Knight's Fees* (London, 1923-5), p. 213.
[243] Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 110-16.
[244] Power, 'Bréauté', [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3305, accessed 1 Feb 2013]

or from escheats.[245] As with other methods of rewards, the extent to which the king dispensed land grants to his stewards varied enormously between individuals. There is no sense that the holder of a stewardship was entitled to a predetermined amount of land, as a result of an established prerogative. William de Cantilupe and Peter of Stokes were the only two royal stewards to be granted lands in perpetuity (to be held by them and their heirs), rather than 'whilst it pleased the king', which was the clause found within many of the land grants to John's stewards. In May 1205, Peter of Stokes received the manor of Ospringe by charter.[246] In April 1205, William de Cantilupe received the manor of Eaton Bray, for which he exchanged three hundred marks and the manor of Great Coxwell, in Berkshire.[247] In 1203, William de Cantilupe was also granted Great Bowden and Harborough, in Warwickshire, for which £17 10*s* was allowed out of the county farm.[248] This grant was not made 'pro se et heredibus suis' and, in 1228, William's claim was challenged by William de Stuteville. As a result, Henry III sent orders to return those manors to royal custody.[249] After 1209, William de Cantilupe also held other royal manors at farm including Hanley in Worcestershire.[250] William's position as sheriff of Warwickshire, from 1200 to 1204, and Worcestershire, from 1200 to 1216, might have been a determining factor in the king's decision to grant manors on the royal demesne to William in these counties.[251]

Despite other stewards also serving as sheriffs, they were not granted manors from the royal demesne in the counties over which they held the sheriffdom. Other stewards petitioned for, and were granted, lands that had escheated to the crown. Geoffrey de Neville, during his brief stewardship, was given the land of the wife of

---

[245] Church, *Household Knights*, pp. 90-4.
[246] *Rot. Lib. John*, p. 53; *Rot. Chart.*, p. 148b.
[247] *Pipe Roll 3 John*, p. 201; *Rot. Chart.*, p. 147. William may have petitioned for the manor of Eaton Bray as it held a connection to his wife's family. Her father, Arnulf de Brascy, held it from 1173 to 1179, see, *VCH Bedfordshire*, iii, p. 370.
[248] *Pipe Roll 5 John*, p. 28; *Pipe Roll 6 John*, p. 220; *Pipe Roll 7 John*, p. 28; *Pipe Roll 8 John*, p. 1; *Pipe Roll 9 John*, p. 190; *Pipe Roll 10 John*, p. 159; *Pipe Roll 11 John*, p. 17; *Pipe Roll 12 John*, p. 89; *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 188; *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 136; *Pipe Roll 16 John*, p. 109; *Pipe Roll 17 John*, p. 28; *Pipe Roll 2 Henry III*, p. 50; *Book of Fees*, p. 375.
[249] *CFR 1227-8*, nos. 135, 152.
[250] *Pipe Roll 11 John*, p. 64; *Book of fees*, p. 140. William may have also held the royal manors Calne and Calstone, in Wiltshire, see *CFR 1223-4*, no. 84.
[251] Before his stewardship, Brian de Lisle was granted *Lann',* Lincolnshire 'whilst it pleases the king', see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 90b. Likewise, in 1213, Falkes de Bréauté was granted Congresbury, in Somerset, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 139b.

Walter of Carrow in Lincolnshire.[252] Peter of Stokes had held the lands of William du Hommet and William de Lisours 'whilst it pleases the king'.[253] In 1214, John divided custody of the lands of Petronilla, countess of Leicester, between two of his stewards – William de Cantilupe and William de Harcourt.[254]

In 1204, John lost control of Normandy. Consequently men were forced to declare their allegiance to either the English or French king. By performing homage to Philip Augustus, tenants forfeited their English possessions to King John. The two serving royal stewards at the time, Peter of Stokes and William de Cantilupe, greatly benefited from this newly acquired source of escheated lands. Peter, for example, received the manor of Whaddon in Buckinghamshire, which had previously belonged to William du Hommet, the constable of Normandy.[255] William received the manor of Milston in Wiltshire, which had belonged to Gilbert de Villers.[256] William was also granted the manor of Aston Cantlow in Warwickshire, which had belonged to the Chamberlains of Tancarville. The connection between this manor and the Cantilupe family continued throughout the thirteenth century and beyond, resulting in the place-name echoing that of the family.

In August 1204, William de Cantilupe was also granted custody of lands in Herefordshire, Worcestershire and Shropshire, which Hugh de Ferrières had held as the dower of his wife, Margaret de Say. To this grant was added the dowry lands of Mabel de Say, Margaret's mother, which contained two manors in Worcestershire, Cotheridge (valued at £13 2*s* 6½*d*) and Wychbold (valued at £22). Moreover, the grant included all other lands pertaining to Mabel's first husband, Hugh de Say, including control of Worcester castle.[257] Two months later, William was also granted custody of Lucy de Say, with her manor of Yeovil in Somerset.[258] William's custody of the De Say lands might not have been intended to be of long duration as, in November the following year, Thomas of Galway was given Margaret de Say in

[252] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 85; *Rot. Fin.*, p. 373.
[253] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 67.
[254] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 109b. In July 1213, William de Harcourt also received Cliffe in Lancashire, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 146b.
[255] *Rot. Norm.*, p. 131.
[256] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 8; *Books of Fees*, p. 381.
[257] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 5b; *Rot. Norm.*, p. 122.; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 27b. Mabel's second husband, Roger d'Amundeville had presumably also died.
[258] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 12.

marriage.[259] William held onto the De Say lands a little longer, however, due to an apparent dispute between the king and Thomas. A fine of a thousand marks seems to have resolved the dispute and, in 1207, Thomas was granted seisin of all the lands pertaining to Margaret's father, Hugh.[260] William was compensated for his loss with three castles, which had been held by Thomas of Galway: Richard's Castle, Stapleton and Clifton-upon-Terne.[261] It may have been as a result of this dispute that the king wished to take these castles out of Thomas' control and placed them in the secure hands of his loyal servant, William de Cantilupe.

During the civil war, another large body of lands escheated to the crown, out of which John made a number of grants to his stewards. Most grants given during this turbulent period should be seen as permission to seize land if possible, rather than a promise of immediate seisin, as the rapidly changing political scene would have made such acquisitions difficult, if not impossible. It is hard to view these land grants in the context of rewards. Instead, they are a demonstration of the trust and reliance John placed in his stewards. The lands granted to William de Cantilupe, for example, were intended to create a block of power from the west in Shropshire and Herefordshire into the Midlands in Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire. [262] In the North, Brian de Lisle's already substantial power base, centred on his custodianship of Knaresborough and Boroughbridge, was enhanced by the lands of Robert de Percy and Peter of Plumpton in Yorkshire.[263] The vital role that Falkes de Bréauté played in the royalist cause is demonstrated by the great swathes of rebel lands granted to him.[264] Moreover, in September 1216, Falkes was given the lands of Baldwin de Béthune. Baldwin was a household knight of Flemish aristocratic origins who had married a rich Anglo-Norman heiress, Hawise, which

---

[259] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 56b-57.
[260] *Rot. Fin.*, p. 408. Except those lands which William de Cantilupe had previously given to his brother, Robert Barat. It was entrusted to William de Cantilupe to find surety for this large fine, which he probably did in his capacity as sheriff of Worcestershire, as much of the De Say lands were held in that county.
[261] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 73b.
[262] For Courtney's lands, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 246b. For Viel's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 247. For De Monte's lands, see *ibid.*, pp. 277, 278, 293b, 298b. For Verdun's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 287. For Du Hommet's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 289b. For Charneles' lands, see *ibid.*, p. 290; For Ropsley lands, which also included the lands of Ralph the butler and was extended to include the lands in the honor of Richmond under Henry III, see *ibid.*, pp. 280b, 313b.
[263] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 245b. William de Harcourt was also granted escheated lands. For Dunston's lands, see *ibid.*, pp. 266b, 284. For Jordan's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 288. For Marmium's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 289. For Vescy's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 288.
[264] For Malet's lands, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 251. For Bosco's lands, see *ibid.*, p. 279b. Falkes also briefly held the lands of William Mauduit, see *ibid.*, p. 250.

gave him title as count of Aumale. Baldwin died in 1212. His wife, Hawise, died two years later. King John did not redistribute her extensive lands immediately, as the profits were to be kept for the crown at the Temple, in London. These great lands, however, which spanned Lancashire, Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Northamptonshire and Worcestershire, were all granted to Falkes in the midst of civil war.[265] With his marriage to Margaret de Redvers and the grant of these lands of the count of Aumale, King John was bestowing the greatest favours in his kingdom upon Falkes. The lands granted in the years 1215 to 1216 were distributed according to the king's needs. They created areas of royal strength in a war-torn country.

From this review of the evidence concerning rewards, it is possible to conclude that King John's stewards were not entitled to an established set of rewards for their services; except, perhaps, that they received a wardship at the moment of their appointment. On the whole, however, each steward received different benefits, in the form of wardships, rights of *maritagium* and grants of land, but there was no uniformity in terms of quantity or value of the rewards. What this evidence enables us to see is that these men were not treated as holders of a simple, fixed office in the household. They were treated as individual servants to the king. Being given the title of steward did not assign to the holder a particular income; stewards were expected to petition and vie for the king's patronage through the same means as other knights, nobles and barons. Naturally, those who enjoyed physical proximity to their king could increase their success in this regard, which is evidenced by the disproportionately large number of land grants and wardships made to Peter of Stokes, who was in almost constant attendance at court during his stewardship. In essence, it was the steward's proximity to, and relationship with, the king and their usefulness to him which determined the patronage which would be bestowed upon them. This evidence tells us something important about the king's stewards. To have the title of steward was more indicative of one's relationship with the king than with the household. Crouch, when assessing the situation in France and Normandy before 1066, came to a similar conclusion; he recognised the confusion which stemmed from the titles 'Count of the Palace' and 'Seneschal'. Couch saw that the importance of these men did not rest on their actions but on their place next to the ruler and that

[265] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 288; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 199b.

the title of seneschal was suspiciously general in its use.[266] Two centuries later in England, a similar general use of this title seems to have prevailed. To be a steward during John's reign was not to hold a specific place in the household. It was to hold an important place next to the king.

It was due to the flexibility in their function that King John could alter his stewards' role and divert them from domestic responsibilities. The reason John made this change lies beyond the history of the household. In late 1201, when Peter of Stokes was appointed steward of the royal household, John was king of England, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine and count of Anjou. By Peter's death in the summer of 1206, John had lost almost all of his continental possessions, managing to salvage Gascony and South-Western Poitou in the summer of 1206.[267] Until the autumn of 1206, the recovery of his continental lands was John's chief obsession. After the campaign in France in that year, however, John's attention was firmly on England, albeit with the long-term aim of re-claiming his continental lands. Taxes were raised and there was a marked increase in efforts to recover outstanding debts at the Exchequer from reliefs, wardships and marriages.[268] John also implemented reforms of the English coinage, moved the treasury from Winchester to Westminster, and established castle treasuries.[269] This period was a transitional phase during John's reign when he brought many aspects of his government under his immediate control. The household did not escape unscathed from this period of change and the decline of the steward's domestic responsibilities was a key way in which John's altered the arrangements of his household to suit his personal method of ruling.

To be appointed as a steward during the latter part of John's reign, was not to be appointed head of the household in any practical sense. It was a title which conferred upon its holder status, which signified the man's relationship with the king. John

---

[266] Crouch, *Image of the Aristocracy,* pp. 283, 303.
[267] F. M. Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy, 1189-1204: Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire,* 2nd edn (Manchester, 1960), esp. ch. vi; J. C. Holt, 'The End of the Anglo-Norman Realm', *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 61 (1975), 223-65.
[268] Holt showed that John raised feudal incidents, increased profits and increments above the county farm, raised profits from forest lands and demanded the re-payment of debts, see Holt, *Northerners,* pp. 143-174. For a detailed look at the taxes during John's reign, see S. K. Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III* (London, 1914), pp. 17-118. For an analysis and overview of the John's revenues, see N. Barrett, 'The Revenues of King John', *EHR,* 111 (1996), 835-55.
[269] Jolliffe, 'Castle Treasuries', pp. 117-42; R. A. Brown, ''The Treasury' of the Later Twelfth Century', in *Studies Presented to Hilary Jenkinson,* ed. by J. Conway Davies (London, 1957), pp. 35-49. Also, see Warren, *King John,* pp. 172; J. Gillingham, 'John (1167–1216)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14841, accessed 1 Aug 2013].

bestowed the title of steward on his most trusted and able men. Stewards, for example, stored and oversaw the delivery of royal treasure, such as the twenty thousand marks delivered to Brian de Lisle from Devizes castle in 1213.[270] John entrusted his stewards with diplomatic missions, such as when Brian de Lisle and Falkes de Bréauté took three thousand marks for the 'defence' of Flanders. John's trust in these men is evidenced by the 'quod ratum' clause found in the letter patent outlining the mission; this clause ensured that John would ratify whatever his envoys arranged with the count of Flanders.[271] Moreover, amongst a number of other prominent members of the lay and ecclesiastical nobility, William de Cantilupe was sent to the Emperor Otto IV in May 1212, King John asked the Emperor to believe what these 'men of quality' had to say.[272] In October 1215, Falkes spoke on the king's behalf when he delivered plans for the castle garrisons at Berkhamsted Bristol, Corfe, Devizes, Exeter, Marlborough, Northampton, Oxford, Sherborne Winchester and Windsor.[273] The stewards were also trusted during the civil war to receive fines for peace and negotiate safe conduct for those who wished to come to terms with the king.[274] Like William Brewer, who was described as knowing his master's mind and was fully able to explain King John's wishes, the stewards were sent to speak or negotiate on the king's behalf.[275]

During the civil war, the actions of the stewards suggest that John had shrewdly assessed their loyalty. At least one sixth of John's household knights deserted him and joined the baronial opposition. Men of prominent positions throughout the reign, such as Robert of Ropsley and John of Bassingbourne, jumped to the rebel ship.[276] Each steward remained steadfast in his support for the royalist cause. Even when faced with direct threats from the rebels, these men maintained their loyalty to John.[277] Church explained the stewards' loyalty in terms of their wealth and status in

---

[270] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 138b.
[271] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 139b; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 99; Benham, *Peacemaking*, p. 119.
[272] *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice: Part I: Documents and Interpretations*, ed. by P. Chaplais, 2 vols (London, 1982), p. 49, no. 36.
[273] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 156b. For Falkes negotiating and delivering plans, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 124b, 179b, 193, 194b. For Brian de Lisle negotiating on the king's behalf, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 129b; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 164b, 192b.
[274] *Rot. Fin.*, pp. 588, 601. *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 126b, 156b, 164b, 167b, 170, 173b; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 183.
[275] *The Chronicle of the Election of Hugh Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds and Later Bishops of Ely*, ed. and trans. by R. M. Thomson (Oxford, 1974), pp. 162-3.
[276] Church, *Household Knights*, pp. 104-112.
[277] *Chron. Maj.*, ii, p. 587-8.

the localities, which meant they were not as vulnerable to the influences of lordship, kinship and neighbourhood as the less exulted men of the household.[278] This wealth and status, however, was a result of John's trust in, and relationship with, these men. What the stewards proved during the civil war was that John's trust had been well placed, as they remained loyal throughout.

By the end of John's reign, a steward was a man whose title implied a close, intimate connection to the king. The services that stewards rendered were administrative and martial, but, only on rare occasions, domestic. By 1279, however, there appears to have been a reversal of the stewards' role, as the ordinance of that year shows they fulfilled regular duties in the household, overseeing the nightly accounts of the provisioning offices. Jolliffe concluded his analysis of the Angevin steward with 'his future is in the household and not in the kingdom'.[279] Meanwhile, the role played in the localities by the stewards, Brian de Lisle, Falkes de Bréauté and William de Cantilupe, certainly suggest that the stewards were to play a major role in the realm beyond the household. Yet, the history of the steward did not continue along the path that John had set it on. The reason for this change may lie in the impact of the minority of Henry III. When Henry III came to the throne he was a child and his country was placed under the control of a minority government. Just as it would have been impossible for the new king to run his country, he could not have given the authority and direction needed to organise the domestic arrangements of his vast household. As a result the role of steward regained its domestic focus. In May 1218, Eustace de Greinville and John Russell were the household stewards.[280] Both men played a part in the household, but Eustace's role seems to have been particularly focused on domestic responsibilities at court.[281] Eustace, for example, purchased bread and received wheat, wine, *bacons*, almonds, spices and wax from purveyors.[282] He also received money from the treasury to pay the expenses incurred by the household during its journeys.[283] The stewards did not fulfil these domestic responsibilities in the later years of John's reign. The minority of Henry III had placed the steward's role back into the household, where it was destined to stay.

[278] Church, *Household Knights*, p. 112.
[279] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, p. 225.
[280] For the career of Eustace de Greinville, see *EEA IX*, pp. 203-6.
[281] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 388.
[282] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 355, 364, 371, 443.
[283] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 359b, 365, 367b, 401b, 465b, 468.

With this conclusion, the question must remain who performed the steward's domestic function in John's household. The answer to this conundrum will be revealed in the following chapters.

Chapter 5: The Purveyance of Food

To have the privilege of eating at the king's expense was a characteristic of membership of the medieval royal household. There were reciprocal benefits to this giving and receiving of food and drink. The king demonstrated his ability to provide good lordship by feeding the members of his household; he displayed his wealth and his benevolence, and he showed the wider world the strength of his following.[1] The recipients acquired status, as the receiving of food denoted their relationship with the king and their attachment to his affinity, through which they were entitled to his support and protection.[2] The *Constitutio Domus Regis* contains details of this process. There were approximately one hundred and fifty officials, mentioned by name or alluded to in the document, who were entitled to differing alimentary allowances of bread and wine. They received either 'customary food', 'double rations' or simply had the right to dine in the king's household. This arrangement was also documented in the household ordinance of 1318. In this ordinance, at least two hundred and fifty officials received a combination of wine, ale, bread and meat.[3] These were the men who served as the domestic officials of the king's household. They worked in the king's chamber, hall, chapel, buttery, kitchen, pantry and larder. They were the chamberlains, the ushers, the marshals, the butlers, the cooks, the chaplains and the dispensers.

In the *Constitutio*, only those officers employed in the king's hunt were treated differently from the main body of the household. Instead of being assigned allowances for food and drink, huntsmen were given money. This money was likely the enumerated equivalent of the food and drink allowance to which other officers were entitled. This enumeration was probably a practical solution to the problem of feeding men attached to the king's hunt, as sections of the hunt often separated from the main body of the household. The misae roll, for 1212 to 1213, records numerous occasions when the royal hunt travelled independently from the household.[4] It must

[1] Carpenter, 'Household Rolls', pp. 20-1.
[2] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. lviii-lix.
[3] The likelihood is that this number is far higher. The ordinance lists at least 250 people, but on many occasions a plural word is used but no indication of how many men were employed in this capacity. For example, there was a groom for every horse in the household yet we do not know how many horses were in the household.
[4] For examples of the hunt separating from the household, see *Docs. of English History*, pp. 231-56 *passim*; Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 37-8.

have been a far simpler process to provide these huntsmen with the money to buy food than attempt to supply it through the same operation used for the rest of the household.

The *Constitutio* does not provide a complete picture of all the people living within the king's household; it lists just those officials whose responsibilities were essentially domestic. There were many other people for whom the king provided sustenance when they were in attendance at court. The *Constitutio* can, however, provide a suggestion of what the total number of people fed within the household might have been. The *Constitutio* explains that there were four bakers serving in turn in the household; two would dine in, whilst the other two would travel ahead. The two who travelled ahead received forty pence to buy a Rouen measure of wheat, from which they produced forty loaves of king's bread. Each loaf was shared between four men, providing a sufficient quantity to feed one hundred and sixty men. A further one hundred and fifty salted loaves were also baked; each of these loaves was to be shared between two men, so this would feed an additional three hundred men. Finally, the bakers prepared two hundred and sixty ordinary loaves, each of which fed one man. The *Constitutio* does not explicitly state that all these loaves were to be baked every day; but the *Constitutio* is a document concerned with daily payments. We may, then, surmise that the forty pence due to the baker was intended to produce sufficient bread to feed seven hundred and twenty men each day; significantly more than the one hundred and fifty domestic officials whose daily allowances are described.[5]

These additional people were the king's wider *familia*, which included his household knights.[6] At any given time, the number of knights in King John's household would have varied; the total number has been estimated at two hundred men. Their presence, along with their own smaller retinues, would have made a substantial

[5] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 200-1; Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 143. This number is either 700 or 720. The difference stems from inconsistency between the surviving manuscript copies. The manuscript copies in the 'Red Book of the Exchequer' in TNA E164/2 and in Hargrave MS 313 state that 150 salted loaves were baked. The 'Little Black Book of the Exchequer' in TNA E164/12 makes the number 140.

[6] In the 1318 household ordinance, thirty serjeant at arms are mentioned, four of whom assisted the usher of the chamber, see Tout, *Edward II*, pp. 281-2. No other household knights are mentioned in the ordinances.

addition to the royal household.[7] The household also employed clerks. In the *Constitutio*, only the master clerks of the domestic offices were listed, but there would have been many more employed in the chamber and chancery (the writing offices of the household). In the thirteenth century, these offices could have employed up to a hundred clerks, many of whom might also have been entitled to sustenance in the household.[8]

Visitors to the court might also have been the beneficiaries of royal hospitality. The author of the *Histoire des ducs de Normandie et des rois d'Angleterre* stated that John 'gave plenty to eat, and did so generously and willingly; people never found the gate or the doors of John's hall barred against them, so that all who wanted to eat at his court could do so'.[9] These visitors would have included nobles of the realm, who came to the court to seek patronage, justice or to give counsel, and foreign dignitaries, who came to negotiate marriages and alliances. The entourages of these visitors could have made a weighty addition to the royal household; David Crouch estimates that William Marshal's entourage numbered forty to fifty people.[10] These visiting parties would have been the recipients of the king's generosity; this gave the king the opportunity to demonstrate his wealth and munificence to the wider world.

The surviving misae rolls reveal many other attendees at the king's court. The rolls record dozens of messengers who travelled to and from the household; these men would likely have received food during their stay.[11] The misae rolls also record the feedings of paupers. Although not members of the household, they might still have consumed food procured by household officials.[12] These misae rolls record that John

---

[7] S. D. Church, 'The Knights of the Household of King John: A Question of Numbers', in *TCE IV,* ed. by P. R. Cross and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 151-65.
[8] A roll of liveries, dated to 1234 to 1237, lists ninety-seven clerks in the household of Henry III. See Wild, 'A Truly Royal Retinue', pp. 134-5.
[9] *Histoire des Ducs*, p. 105. Translation from J. Gillingham, 'The Anonymous of Béthune: King John and Magna Carta', in *Magna Carta and the England of King John,* ed. by J. S. Leonard (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 27-44 (p. 39).
[10] D. Crouch, *William Marshal: Court, Career and Chivalry in the Angevin Empire, 1147-1219* (London, 1990), pp. 133-49; *Dialogus and Constitutio*, p. lvii. Walter Map also suggests barons were due set allowances in the household of Henry I, see *De Nugis*, pp. 438-9.
[11] For examples, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 109-71 *passim*; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 231-69 *passim*. For messengers of the court, see M. C. Hill, *The King's Messengers, 1199-1377* (London, 1961).
[12] *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 113-171. For the almsgiving in general and the reign of Henry III in particular, see S. Dixon-Smith, 'The Image and Reality of Almsgiving in the Great Hall of Henry III', *Journal of British Archaeological Association,* 152 (1999), 79-96; S. Dixon-Smith., 'Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: The *pro anima* almsgiving of Henry III' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 2002); H. Johnstone, 'Poor Relief in Royal Household of Thirteenth-Century

spent three shillings every day, from May 1209 to May 1210, on feeding paupers. At times, John fed up to five hundred paupers on any one day.[13] Furthermore, on the occasions when John flouted the rules concerning the eating of meat on certain religious days or Fridays, his penance was to feed an additional hundred paupers.[14] On special religious occasions, such as Maundy Thursday in 1210, John fed a thousand paupers.[15]

The number of people for whom the household had to procure victuals fluctuated enormously. On the great feast days of the Christian calendar, when the household swelled to absorb additional guests, household officials might have had to arrange food and drink for up to two thousand people. Even on a day of no great importance, the household could not have been less than seven hundred.[16] Contemporary observers of the court could not fail to be aware of the complexities involved in feeding so many people.[17] Historians, too, have appreciated that the logistics of purveyance must have been 'staggeringly difficult'.[18] Prestwich saw that the demands for food by Edward I's household must have been 'very impressive' and the scale of provisioning was vast; but Prestwich also viewed the arrangements in place to meet these demands as efficient.[19] Jolliffe took a different view, he suggested 'that the problem of provisioning even so large a convoy was then easier than we are inclined to suspect'.[20] Purveyance, however, for hundreds or even thousands of people in the royal entourage must have required operations throughout the country on an enormous, complex scale. On any day, it would have been an exceptionally difficult task to ensure all hunger was satisfied, all thirsts were quenched and all bodies were kept warm. To add to these complexities, there were additional obstacles caused by the itinerary and the dispersal of the household over a wide geographical area.

England', *Speculum,* 4 (1929), 149-67; D. A. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of King Henry III and Louis IX', in *TCE X*, pp. 1-30 (pp. 16-9).

[13] *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 110, 115, 120, 133, 170.

[14] *Rot. Lib. John.,* pp. 110, 117.

[15] *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 161-2; Church, 'Royal Itinerary', p. 42.

[16] The lowest estimate is based on the bread calculation of the *Constitutio*. For other estimates, see Church 'Royal Itinerary', p. 42; Crouch, *Image of the Aristocracy,* p. 294; Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 24-5.

[17] For the court described as 'hundred-handed giant', see Map, *De Nugis,* pp. 2-3.

[18] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. lvii. For the problems of purveyance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', pp. 145-63.

[19] Prestwich, *Edward I,* pp. 157-60.

[20] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis:* Part II', p. 356.

The household was, of course, not static. John's household, in particular, was frenetic in its journeying, rarely staying in one place for more than a night or two.[21] The difficulty of feeding this vast number of people was exaggerated by the logistics of the royal itinerary. One element of this problem is that the household did not always travel as a whole. The hunt, as has been mentioned, often travelled separately. Yet this was not the only example of the splintering of the household. Sections of the stables, for example, also travelled or lodged separately. On 29 August 1212, for example, an allowance for money, hay, oats and litter was provided for a squire, ten grooms and nineteen of the king's horses when they stayed at Durham for one night, whilst the king was one hundred and thirty miles away at Laxton.[22] Moreover, on 25 August 1212, a squire, five grooms of the stables and eight horses stayed at Nottingham for seventeen days whilst John journeyed from Kingshaugh to Scrooby, Pontefract, York, Crayke, Northallerton, Darlington, Durham, Knaresborough and finally back to Nottingham, where this section of the stables presumably re-joined the household.[23]

Another way the household divided was by the king travelling with a small entourage away from his court.[24] A famous example of this separation was in October 1216, when John is thought to have travelled with a contingent of his *familia* to Wisbech, whilst his baggage train made a disastrous attempt to cross the Wash in their journey from King's Lynn to Swineshead. John's baggage was pulled into the quicksand losing 'wagons, carts and packhorses' laden with 'all the things the king valued too highly in the world'.[25] The difficulties of feeding the royal household must have been felt even more acutely when sections of it were hived off and travelled apart from the main body of the court.

There is no evidence that John's wife, Isabella of Angoulême, was assigned a personal source of income. She was not allowed control over estates and did not receive the revenue from Queen's Gold (the increment of one gold mark owed to the

[21] For a discussions of John's itinerary, see Church 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 31-45; Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 111-76.
[22] *Docs. of English History,* p. 239.
[23] *Docs. of English History,* p. 241; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 664. Also, see *supra,* pp. 50-1.
[24] For the king's separation from his household, see *infra,* pp. 53-4.
[25] For this quote and these events, see Warren, *King John,* pp. 278-85. Also, see J. C. Holt, *Magna Carta and the Medieval Government* (London, 1985), ch. v.

queen and added to all voluntary fines over a hundred silver marks).[26] Consequently, it seems likely the king was financially responsible for purchasing food consumed in her household, both when she travelled with the king and when they were separated. The many messengers that were sent between the king and queen suggest the two did not always travel together.[27] At times, Isabella's itinerary can be discerned from the records. Early in 1206, for example, she travelled between Marlborough, Ludgershall and Winchester with her own household and, in April 1205, improvement works were undertaken Windsor where the queen was staying.[28] The queen's household would have further complicated the logistics of food purveyance for the royal establishment.[29]

Even when all these different sections of the household were technically travelling together, we ought to remember that, due to the size of this entourage, it is unlikely that it would have been feasible to accommodate everyone in one place.[30] The jurisdiction of the later court of the verge gives some indication that the household's 'domain' would have had at least a twelve-mile radius.[31] The operations in place to ensure that the household was adequately fed, therefore, must have had the capacity to feed many different contingents over an uncertain and extensive geographical area.

Another factor in understanding the difficulty of the task of purveyance is the constant peregrinations of the household. Jolliffe, in his *Angevin Kingship*, described the itinerary of twelfth-century kings as a steady, pre-planned progress.[32] Church has shown, however, that this could not have been the case as, by the very nature of their positions, medieval kings were reactive to events in their realm.[33] During John's reign, the stirring of rebellion and the discontent of the baronage caused sudden and drastic changes to the royal itinerary. In August 1212, for example, as John prepared

---

[26] N. Vincent, 'John's Jezabel: Isabella of Angouleme', in *King John: New Interpretations*, ed. by S. D. Church (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 165-219, (p. 192).
[27] *Rot. Lib. John*, pp. 132, 167.
[28] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 28b, 64.
[29] For the impact of the queen's household in the thirteenth century on the numbers at court, see Wild, 'A Truly Royal Retinue', pp. 140-2.
[30] Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 40-1.
[31] W. R. Jones, 'The Court of the Verge: The Jurisdiction of the Steward and the Marshal of the Household in late Medieval England', *Journal of British Studies*, 10 (1970), 1-29.
[32] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, p. 140.
[33] Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 31-45. For a full discussion of the existing historiography on the nature of the king's itinerary, see Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 22-7.

to put down a revolt rising in Wales, he heard of a conspiracy plotting his death by a group of northern barons.[34] John's preparations before August 1212 had been focused on mustering food supplies at Chester. After hearing of the plot, the records show that there was a re-direction of food to Nottingham, where John arranged to meet with the northerners and quell the growing discontentment.[35] In addition to these unpredictable events, we should not suppose that the king's itinerary, once planned, was kept to, for the simple reason that the king changed his mind.[36] The royal household functioned around the whim of the king. Whether it be his decision to go hunting or to march north in the depths of winter, the household followed the king's wishes. Royal officials might have expected the itinerary to be planned a few days ahead. They might also have expected to know where great feasts would take place, but certainly more detailed plans than this would have been difficult, if not, impossible. The purveyance system in place, and the officials that facilitated purveyance, must have had the flexibility to deal with any sudden change in the king's itinerary.

In short, what we know is that there was a body of people whose capacity waxed and waned, whose itinerary was potentially erratic, and who could disperse and come together as directed by the king. We also know that all these people needed to be fed. The *Constitutio* makes it clear that there was a hierarchy within the household that determined what food an official was entitled to, based upon their status and position.[37] The most basic allowance must have consisted of bread and ale; but for many people within the household meats and wines would also have been available. The king's household was the most rich and lavish in the realm. For another household to emulate or compete with the wealth of the king was to invite direct criticism.[38] In Roger of Howden's description of William de Longchamps' household in the year that led to his downfall, he describes how 'there was neither that which is hunted for on land, fished for in the water, or flying in the air which

---

[34] Holt, *Northerners*, pp. 79-108.
[35] *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 27; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 122.
[36] For the influence of the Henry II's whim on the itinerary, see *Petri Blesensis Opera Omnia*, ed. by J. P. Migne, Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series latina, 207 (Paris, 1855), no. 14.
[37] The senior members of the household were entitled to 'best wine' and the 'king's bread'; whilst the lowliest servants were entitled to just 'customary food' or 'double rations'. The watchmen had each morning two loaves of ordinary bread, a cooked dish and a gallon of ale. See *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 196-215.
[38] For John's anger at Hubert Walter's lavishness, see *Rogeri de Wendover Chronica: sive Flores Historium*, ed. by H. O. Coxe, 4 vols (London, 1841-2), iii (1841), p. 165.

was not compelled to be at the service of his table.'[39] Longchamps was eating like a king and ensuring his household did the same. This manner of eating, Howden claimed, was so lavish that if Longchamps stayed just one night with an abbot or bishop, then the religious house which hosted him could not fully recover to its former state for three years.[40] This estimation was surely hyperbole, but the point is clear: Longchamps' household was huge and its consumption of food was on a kingly scale. The impact of John's household can have been no less dramatic. The arrival of the royal court, to any great house or castle, must have required frenzied preparations, fast purchases and, undoubtedly, anxiety, perhaps even panic.[41]

By understanding the size and scope of the royal household, the problem of feeding it becomes apparent. To add further context to this problem, some idea of quantity of food needed to feed a royal household can be gained from the Black Book of Edward IV. The Black Book can be used as a tentative frame of reference, rather than evidence of a definite quantity of stock needed for the royal household during John's reign. The evidence is not directly comparable as the royal household underwent a series of changes during the years which separated the reigns of King John and Edward IV. It became more sedentary and, as a consequence, more bloated with superfluous hangers-on less easily shaken off by daily travels. To help bridge this gap, we can use the evidence compiled by Given-Wilson concerning the purchasing of grain and livestock during the reigns Edward III, Richard II and Henry IV.[42] The surviving household accounts from these reigns make such an analysis possible. For John's reign, by contrast, such detailed descriptions of purchasing are entirely unrecoverable from the surviving record sources. Yet, it is a valuable exercise to examine the evidence for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in order to gain some perspective on the task of feeding a royal household.[43]

[39] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. by W. Stubbs, 4 vols (London, 1868-71), ii (1869), p. 142.
[40] *Rogeri de Hoveden*, ii, p. 72.
[41] For a discussion of this impact, see Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 37-42.
[42] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 163.
[43] For an early medieval perspective in the household of Otto I in the tenth century, see J. Campbell, 'Anglo-Saxon Courts', in *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages: The proceedings of the First Alcuin Conference*, ed. by C. Cubitt (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 155-69 (pp. 158-9). This household is described as having consumed 1,000 pigs and sheep a day, 2,700 gallons of wine, the same in beer, 1,000 measures of grain and other food stuffs.

The Black Book of Edward IV states that the household should not need more than 1,825 quarters of wheat a year. Each quarter contained nine bushels and a bushel could produce thirty loaves of bread, so, in theory, the household needed 328,500 loaves of bread annually – making a total of nine-hundred loaves a day.[44] Given-Wilson's findings reveal that on average the household consumed 2,250 quarters of wheat a year (with considerable fluctuations on this average). This quantity of wheat could have produced 1,643 loaves of bread a day, significantly more than the amount described in the Black Book. Given-Wilson claims, however, that as much as half of this wheat might have been used to make other products such as cakes and sauces.[45] It will also be recalled that the *Constitutio* suggests that the daily bread requirement of Henry I's household was seven hundred and twenty loaves. From this evidence, it seems the royal household required 720 to 900 loaves of bread a day; it is quite possible that a similar quantity was required in John's household.

Given-Wilson's figures also record the yearly cash spent on livestock. In order to estimate the actual quantities of livestock consumed by the king's household, the cash spent can be divided by the average cost of oxen or sheep in the fourteenth century. The figures Given-Wilson identified for the money spent on livestock varied year on year; to allow for these variations, the maximum, minimum and average spends have been calculated. The greatest spend on livestock in any one year from 1377 to 1413 was £6,000; the lowest was £1,400, with an average nearer the lower end at £2,550.[46] Based on these figures, the yearly maximum number of oxen that might have been bought was 5,220, the minimum was 812 and the average was 1,775. The yearly maximum number of sheep which might have been bought was 26,880, the minimum was 3,528 and the average was 8,225.[47] Perhaps the most

[44] Myers, *Household of Edward IV,* p. 165. This neat figure of nine hundred loaves reveals the ideal calculations this ordinance was based on.
[45] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', pp. 146, 152. Given-Wilson's account, however, does not include any wheat that may have been taken from stock, as such his figures may only give us a minimum amount of wheat used in the household. The extent to which stock was used in the fourteenth century is uncertain and, therefore, we cannot calculate the impact of its exclusion from these accounts. For a discussion of stock in the thirteenth century, see Carpenter, 'Household Rolls', pp. 32-3. For another estimate of consumption, see Prestwich, *Edward I,* pp. 157-8.
[46] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 146.
[47] For the total amount spent in these years and the costs of livestock, see Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 146. The calculations of the most, least and average number of livestock are based o on a ratio of oxen to sheep (1:10), which is derived from the numbers in the Black Book. The maximum estimate is calculated by the greatest figure divided by the lowest cost of sheep/oxen, the minimum estimate is calculated by the smallest figure divided by the highest cost of sheep/oxen; and the average estimate is calculated by dividing the averages of the two.

useful figures here are the averages, which we can compare with the levels of consumption outlined in the Black Book. The Black Book states that 1,200 oxen and 12,000 sheep should be consumed each year.[48] These figures are not greatly different from the averages obtained by Given-Wilson. From this evidence, it is possible that a royal household consumed 8,000 to 12,000 sheep a year and 1,200 to 1,700 oxen. The rearing or purchasing of such a large quantity of livestock must have been a substantial part of the purveyance operations of the household throughout the medieval period.

There were three identifiable methods of purveyance used during John's reign. These methods worked simultaneously in order to provide food for the king's household. The evidence for each method is not, however, equally balanced. There survives a disproportionate amount of evidence concerning purveyance undertaken by local officials. The reason for this distortion is obvious: the household officials used chancery correspondence to communicate with local officials who bought victuals. The pipe rolls, too, reveal the money allowed against the Exchequer accounts of local officials which they had spent on food for the household. It is, therefore, purveyance conducted by local officials which is clearly evidenced in the surviving documentation. Other methods of purveyance are less easy to discern from the available evidence, but were also vital to the purveyance process.

Farming victuals on the king's estates was the second key method used in supplying the household. Knowledge of this practice is derived largely from the records of the cost of transporting such victuals. The third method used to procure food for the household was to send household officials into the localities in the immediate vicinity of the court to purchase comestibles. Evidence from the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries can be used as an indication of how this final method of purveyance was used during John's reign.

The various methods of purveyance used to supply the household with all its necessary food provisions were controlled centrally within the household. In the years 1201 to 1206, the steward, Peter of Stokes, controlled much of this activity, by warranting writs which commissioned the purchasing of victuals and the hiring of

[48] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 146.

carts for their transportation to royal residences.[49] Peter also authorised writs of *computate* on behalf of officials who had spent money on provisions for the household.[50] After Peter's death, no other steward assumed this direct role within the operation of household purveyance. For most of the reign, the man in immediate charge of ensuring grains were bought and ground to make flour for bread, and that animals were killed, salted and stocked in larders across the country, and that ponds, rivers and seas were sourced for fresh and salt-water fish, was King John. The king played an active role in every facet of purveyance. He sent orders for victuals to be procured and transported to royal residences; he also ensured that payments or allowances were made to the officials who made the purchases.[51] Other ministers, such the justiciar, Geoffrey fitz Peter, the administrator, William Brewer, or the serjeants of the household would also make these arrangements, but their involvement was far less regular than that of the king.[52] For the most part, it is the king's warrant which appears on orders concerning victualing for the household. Other officials would assist in this task at moments when large quantities of food were required in preparation for a great feast. On these occasions, the king called upon men, such as his long-standing steward, William de Cantilupe, to help make the required arrangements.[53]

For King John to have been the direct and immediate controller of many aspects of his domestic establishment he must have kept well informed about the stock and expenditure of each household office. When the steward's focus shifted away from court, there was no intermediary between John and his household offices. To compensate for this, greater responsibility appears to have been placed on individual household officials to account for their expenditure. B.L. Wild has pointed to entries on the misae roll for 1212 to 1213, which contain grouped accounts for a number of days for the expenses of household carters. These interpolations stand out in an otherwise chronological document. Wild argued that these interpolations are evidence of an early system of a household audit that foreshadows the later wardrobe

---

[49] Examples are shown throughout this chapter. Also, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 15, 20b, 25, 26, 30, 32, 58.

[50] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 37, 71, 84; *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 54.

[51] For examples for grains, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 31, 136, 62b, 261b, 273b. For meats, see *ibid.*, pp. 39b, 122b, 136, 145, 181b, 184b, 195, 285. For fish, see *ibid.*, pp. 22b, 37, 213b.

[52] *Rot. Lib John,* p. 7; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 27, 30b, 79, 128.

[53] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 157-157b.

accounts. Moreover, Wild adds, an inventory of King John's plate, which was in the custody of Hugh de Neville from 1207 to 1208 could be the 'sole example of a sophisticated system of audit and allowance that was developing during the final years of the reign of King John'.[54] There are, however, a number of other pieces of evidence from which it is possible to substantiate and extend Wild's proposition.

In the first instance, the interpolations on the misae roll do not only appear for the cartermen of the household. Similar grouped accounts are included for the expenses of the king's hunt. On 23 May 1212, for example, there appears an account for kennel keepers, huntsmen, greyhounds, berners and grooms who spent three nights at Chertsey, Stratford and Guildford. The account is written up and the total costs for each individual night were paid to William fitz Richard, the master of the hunt; this payment was given by the king's warrant.[55] A similar interpolation can be found in the following month, on 9 June, when the expenses of hounds, grooms and huntsmen for one night in Winchester, three nights travelling from Chertsey to Huntingdon, one night in Huntingdon, and two nights travelling to Knaresborough were all paid to William fitz Richard by the king.[56] These interpolations suggest the existence of subsidiary account-keeping by William Fitz Richard for the hunt, which was presented to the king for audit and allowance.[57] Another interpolation explicitly states that accounts were being heard for the expenses of the hunt. On 6 February 1213, at Northallerton, the misae roll reveals an account for the expenses of hounds, grooms and huntsmen who had travelled for six days from Lincoln to Scarborough, then one day in Whitby and thirteen days in Northallerton. This account was heard in the presence of Richard Marsh, Aymer archdeacon of Durham and Philip of Oldcotes. The total cost of the expenses was £17 12*s* 6½*d*, of which sixteen marks

---

[54] *Wardrobe Accounts*, ed. Wild, pp. xxvii-xxx.
[55] *Docs. of English History*, p. 232. William Fitz Richard features frequently on the misae roll for 1212 to 1213 in relation to the king's hunt, receiving most payments for its expenses. William appears to have taken over this senior position from Henry Fitz Count. In the praestita roll for 1210 to 1211, after the Irish campaign in which Henry fitz Count was a paymaster for sailors, he returns to the household and is in receipt of expenses concerning the king's dogs. In this roll, William fitz Richard is described as Henry Fitz Count's man. For Henry's role in the hunt, see *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 231, 233, 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 245.
[56] *Docs. of English History*, p. 233.
[57] For William fitz Richard not accounting for his debts at the exchequer, see *supra*, p 35. This system of providing prests to the hunt and accounting at the chamber may have been in place since 1205, as prests for huntsmen appear on the dorse of the praestita roll of that year, see *Docs. of English History*, p. 276. Further prests for the royal hunt appear on the praestita roll of 1210 to 1211, see *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 248-52.

were paid out of the wardrobe. The remaining cost of these expenses was paid by Aymer and Philip (presumably from their funds as keepers of the archbishopric of York), for which they received a writ of allowance. This transaction was authorised 'by the king'.[58] This misae roll entry reveals that there was an internal audit procedure for the king's hunt, consisting of accounts being heard before the king and a chamber official, such as Richard Marsh, who gave an allowance from the wardrobe (or chamber) cash.[59]

We may then look for other evidence of internal audits and accounts. The account of William the tailor, which appears in full on the dorse of the misae roll for 1212 to 1213, may be another example of an individual's account which was audited at the chamber and for which an allowance was paid.[60] Moreover, the accounts of the king's water-carriers show details of baths taken and the number of days for which the water-carrier ought to receive a half-penny; a record likely to have been kept throughout the year and presented thrice-yearly at the chamber for an allowance.[61] The misae roll of 1209 to 1210 also records payments for the education of Henry, the son of the Duke of Saxony, a noble living in John's court. These payments were made to Walter the tutor, apparently in the form of wages, throughout the year 1209 to 1210. Sometimes only a small gap of thirteen days separate these payments. On other occasions sixty days passed before the tutor received payment.[62] It is seems likely that a record was keep elsewhere of what was owed to Walter. He would then go to the chamber to account for his work and receive his payment. It is possible that a record of these wages was kept on the *rotuli de liberacionibus*, of which there are mentions from 1210 but no extant examples.[63] Moreover, the praestita rolls record payments for advances of wages to household servants. These advances suggest there was a system in place whereby household servants would later account for these prests against a record of the wages to which they were entitled.[64]

---

[58] *Docs. of English History*, p. 253.
[59] The additional presence of the archdeacon of Durham and Philip of Oldcotes was undoubtedly due to their assistance in paying for these expenses rather than a reflection of any regular part in this process.
[60] *Docs. of English History*, p. 267. A shorter account, which may show the earlier stage of this process, can be found on the dorse of misae roll for 1209 to 1210, see *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 170-1.
[61] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 115, 137, 170; *Docs. of English History*, pp. 237, 249, 262.
[62] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 114, 141, 148, 152, 155, 158-9, 163, 166, 169.
[63] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 233, 235, 244.
[64] For examples, see *Docs. of English History*, p. 275; *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 230, 242.

Another internal subsidiary household roll, of which no examples are extant today, was the roll of expenses. This roll is mentioned in relation to the expenses incurred by Alexander the son of the king of Scotland in May 1212. The misae roll reveals that the details of these expenses had been kept on the dorse of the expenses roll; this information might have been used as a means to account for the money spent and receive payment at the chamber.[65] Wardrobe rolls were also being kept by 1212, most likely as a record of expenditure specific to that office.[66] We have no examples of these subsidiary rolls, yet, in the light of the evidence for the hunt and the carters, which strongly suggests there was a system of internal record keeping and account at the chamber, it may be reasonable to suppose these rolls were further elements to this system.

Wild states that there are comparatively far fewer interpolations on the 1209 to 1210 misae roll than its counterpart two years later. Wild sees that, in the middle years of John's reign, there was a shift from oral testimony to written account in the procedure of household audit.[67] Wild credits this shift to the development of the wardrobe, however, it appears to have been part of a wider change to the household structure; with the removal of a domestic steward, accounts for each household office were presented directly to the king and a chamber clerk, increasingly in a written format. This household accounting structure echoes that described in *Fleta* and the household ordinance of 1279, which describes that each household office accounted to the keeper of the wardrobe and the steward.[68] During the reign of King John, this arrangement was in its embryonic form and the accounts were presented directly to the king and his chamber.

This hypothesis may be extended to the provisioning offices of the king's household. For the king to control the domestic arrangements of his household it would have been necessary to deliver information to him through a network of household serjeants and clerks. Men such as Geoffrey the salser would have kept John informed about spices; the bakers, William and Henry, would have outlined the grains required to make sufficient bread; William de Chesney, the clerk of the buttery, would have informed the king about the quantities of wine and ale that had been dispensed and

[65] *Docs. of English History,* p. 232.
[66] *Docs. of English History,* p. 239.
[67] *Wardrobe Accounts,* ed. Wild, p. xxix.
[68] Tout, *Chapters,* ii, pp. 160-1; *Fleta,* ii, pp. 126-7.

what remained in stock.[69] In the light of this evidence of an internal accounting procedure, it seems plausible that this information from the provisioning offices was presented to the king at the chamber, where officials would have accounted for their spending and received coin for future expenditure.

To return to the difficulties presented by the task of purveying victuals for the king's household, we should consider the additional burden created by military activity or courtly festivities. During periods of war, for example, activities surrounding the acquisition of food were increased as demand reflected the swelling size of the household, as it drew into its orbit the nucleus of the king's army.[70] On these occasions, however, it is difficult truly to distinguish between food purchases made for the household and those made for the wider army. Without the means to make this distinction, the evidence surrounding military preparations cannot be used to draw conclusions about how the king's household routinely acquired food. Another circumstance which required extraordinary purveyance was preparations for the great feast days of the Christian calendar. On these days, the household was enlarged by additional mouths to feed. Given the splendour of these occasions, it is also likely that they inspired a greater demand for luxury foods. The evidence surrounding the preparations for feast days, therefore, provides an exaggerated version of the process of routine purveyance. Orders were made on a grander scale, but via the same methods as used during the rest of the year.

In preparation for feasts, instructions were sent by the king or one of his ministers to officials in the localities. To take an example from the year 1204, John held his Easter court at his royal hunting lodge at Woodstock. In preparation, eight cows were purchased by William de Cantilupe, the sheriff of Worcestershire; a further ten

[69] For Geoffrey, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 101b-102; for William the baker, see *ibid.*, p. 58; for Henry the baker, see *ibid.*, p. 31; for William de Chesney, see *Docs. of English History*, p. 271.
[70] For military purveyance, see M. C. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972), pp. 114-35; S. J. Burley, 'The Victualing of Calais, 1347-65', *Historical Research*, 31 (1958), 49-57; G. L. Harris, *King, Parliament and Public Finance to 1369* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 376-83. R. F. Walker, 'The Anglo-Welsh Wars, 1217-1267: With special reference to English Military Development' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1954). Purveyance is discussed throughout this thesis but as a preface to the challenges of military purveyance, see pp. 19-25. For examples of purveyance for the Irish campaign in 1210, see *Pipe Roll 12 John*, pp. 39, 63, 149.

cows were bought by William Marshal, the sheriff of Gloucestershire. This livestock was delivered to Woodstock ready for the Easter celebrations.[71]

Certain royal officials appeared to be particularly capable of procuring a large quantity of comestibles. In the later part of the reign, John Fitz Hugh, the king's custodian of various ecclesiastical and lay lands, was frequently directed to make purchases in preparation for feast days, such as for the Christmas court at York in 1210.[72] John fitz Hugh's exchequer account for the manor of the abbot of Abbotsbury records the money he spent on 10,000 herring, 1,800 whiting, 1,900 haddocks and 3,000 lampreys, along with expensive spices for making sauces.[73] Reginald of Cornhill, the sheriff of Kent was also frequently commissioned to make purchases for feast days. In preparation for Christmas at Windsor in 1213, for example, Reginald was instructed to obtain two hundred pigs' heads, a thousand hens, spices and almonds. Reginald had also been instructed by Philip of Longborough to send fifteen thousand herring and other fish to Windsor for Christmas; these fish were to come 'from our parts', presumably meaning that Reginald was to gather them from the king's resources rather than purchase them.[74] On the same day, 17 December 1213, Henry of Braybrooke and Matthew Mantel were also sent writs with instructions to purchase pigs and hens in preparation for Christmas.[75]

These instructions concerning the supply of the king's household for great feasts provide an insight into purveyance undertaken by local officials. This evidence also reveals that these officials often had a connection to the household. It was out of the county farm controlled by the steward, William de Cantilupe, that cows were

---

[71] *Pipe Roll 6 John,* pp. 88, 146. D. L. Farmer, in his analysis of prices of livestock in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, calculated the cost of these cows was 8*s* 6*d* for those from Worcestershire and 9*s* 10½*d* for those from Gloucestershire. These prices were uncommonly high for the period and Farmer suggested that such prices would not be seen again until the 1270s. See, D. L. Farmer, 'Prices and Wages', in *The Agrarian History of England and Wales II, 1042-1350,* ed. by H. E. Hallam (Cambridge, 1988), p. 746. Perhaps, however, rather than John paying the highest rates for livestock in a hundred years, the cost of the cows was closer to the standard 6*s* 6*d,* which Farmer calculated for the thirteenth century, and the remaining money let against the farm was for the cost of transporting these cows to Woodstock; Worcester was fifty miles and Gloucester forty-five miles away, a significant distant which would have incurred costs

[72] *Infra,* pp. 197-8.

[73] *Pipe Roll 13 John,* pp. 109-10.

[74] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 157-157b.

[75] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 157b. For purveyance work of Reginald of Cornhill and John fitz Hugh, see *infra,* ch. v.

brought for Easter in 1204.[76] Another steward, Peter of Stokes, held the county of Northampton from 1203 to 1206, from which came the pigs provided for Christmas in 1204.[77] In another example, Brian de Lisle (a household knight, then steward) was frequently instructed to use the profits of his custodianship of Knaresborough to purchase victuals for the household. In 1210, for example, oats and salt were bought and sent to York for the Christmas court.[78] In these examples, it is possible to see how a strong connection to an official of the king's household might have led to an additional burden on the local areas that also came under that official's control. The king had a relationship of trust with the members of his household, in particular his stewards. As a result he relied on these men for many tasks. That they should have been called upon to make household purchases seems practical: they knew of the household's high demand for food and they had the means to procure large quantities of food in the localities.

Despite often calling upon his trusted household officials to procure food for the household, on many occasions an instrument of control was needed to ensure the honesty of these transactions at a local level. This security was provided by the 'view and testimony of law-worthy men' from the area. In March 1215, for example, the sheriff of London was instructed to find payment to hang and pickle the king's *bacons* at the Tower of London. This was to be done by the view of law-worthy men of the vill.[79] This system echoes that outlined in a statute from the early years of Edward III, which insisted upon four men of the vill overseeing transactions concerning royal purveyance.[80] These men must have been trusted local figures with some knowledge of the fair cost of food. The names of these men sometimes appear on the pipe rolls. Robert fitz Nigel and William fitz Ailwin, for example, provided testimony for pigs purchased in 1204.[81] This clause appears regularly in the letters close and the pipe rolls, which suggests that the services of these men could be called upon when purchases were made for the household. This evidence reveals some of the local people who assisted in procurement of food for the royal household. The

[76] *Pipe Roll 6 John*, p. 88.
[77] This sheriffdom was only held by Robert de la Saucey, see *List of Sheriffs*, p. 92. Given Peter's connection to the county, he would have had knowledge of the livestock available in Northamptonshire. It is Peter's warrant attached to the writ to Robert de la Saucey.
[78] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 89.
[79] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 192.
[80] Harris, *King, Parliament and Public Finance*, pp. 376-9.
[81] *Pipe Roll 7 John*, p. 255. For another example, see *Pipe Roll 10 John*, p. 62.

evidence of chancery and exchequer records largely reveals the surface of the purveyance structure, but often conceals those men who assisted the sheriffs, bailiffs and custodians in their payment and procurement of victuals for the household. These law-worthy men of the vill were one aspect of this wider network of officials in the localities, which are revealed in the records.

Seasonal variations and the concentration of victuals in particular areas would have had an impact on the scale and scope of the work undertaken by local purveyors. For example, the waters around Cambridgeshire were a rich source of eels, which the king was happy to plunder. In preparation for the Christmas celebrations in 1212, for example, Roger de Neville, a landholder in Essex and Cambridgeshire, was instructed to send ten thousand salted eels and all the fresh fish he could find to Westminster. Roger would have undoubtedly used local fisherman to source these fish. Roger was also told to pay for these by the view of law-worthy men.[82] In December the following year, the sheriff of Cambridgeshire, William earl of Salisbury, was directed to send ten thousand salted eels to Windsor for Christmas.[83] Areas which provided a rich source of victuals, such as Cambridgeshire for eels and Yarmouth for herring, would have required many local men to help source sufficient quantities for the king's household.

Local officials purchased preserved fish throughout the year. In March 1205, for example, Peter des Roches was instructed to buy herrings in East Anglia for the castles at Northampton and Southampton.[84] John had visited both these castles in the recent weeks before these instructions were sent; it seems, he was re-stocking his kitchens after their supplies were depleted following the royal visit. For this reason, we may suppose that the herrings sent to these castles were salted and preserved, rather than fresh, as they would have had to be stored for some time before the household returned. This practice of stocking castles was a key way in which John ensured his royal residences were kept in a state of readiness for a household visit. Many favoured residences were kept stocked with staple non-perishable foods, such as wheat, preserved meat and fish.

---

[82] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128.
[83] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 157b; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 71.
[84] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 22b.

On occasion, it is necessary to distinguish between stocks of foods sent to castles during times of conflict to provide food for the garrison, and food which was intended for the king's household during a visit to a castle. The pipe roll for 1212, for example, reveals that the sheriff of Yorkshire, Gilbert fitz Reinfrey, stocked Scarborough castle with six hundred *bacons*, sixty ox carcasses, ten lasts of herrings, forty measures (*asces*) of salt, together with wheat and hay. Non-food produce including wine and iron were also sent to Scarborough. The total cost of this stock was a substantial £172 3*d*. Pickering castle was also supplied with *bacons*, wheat and wine totalling £25.[85] These supplies may perhaps be seen in the context of the conspiracy against the king's life which emerged during preparations for an expedition into Wales, in August 1212. Local officials were instructed to make these purchases to strengthen the king's castles in an area of the country threatened by rebellion. In such instances, it seems unlikely the king intended to take his household to these castles; instead this food was purchased for the garrison at the castle.

For the most part, however, the evidence suggests that it was the king's practice to re-stock royal residences once the household departed, so that the castle or manor house would be prepared to receive the royal party again. In March 1215, for example, after John's visit to Northampton castle, Henry of Braybrooke, the sheriff of Northampton, was instructed to purchase forty quarters[86] of grain and eighty *bacons* that were to be placed in stores at Northampton.[87] A week later, the same sheriff was instructed to increase this stock to two hundred quarters of grain and three hundred *bacons*. These additional supplies were purchased by the 'view and testimony of law-worthy men' and the amount spent was accounted to the sheriff at the Exchequer.[88] Similarly, on 13 and 14 April 1215, John and his household visited Wallingford castle and, as he left, he sent a writ of *computate* to the barons of the Exchequer with instructions to account to the clerk of the sheriff of Berkshire for cash spent on two hundred *bacons* and a hundred *summae* of grain.[89] John returned

---

[85] *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 27.

[86] Woolgar sees there were eight bushels in a quarter, see *Great Household*, p. 235. There were fifty pounds in each bushel, so we may estimate a quarter was four hundred pounds, see R. D. Connor, *Weights and Measures of England* (London, 1987), pp. 154-5.

[87] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 193.

[88] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 195b.

[89] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 195. A *summae* was the measure used to described the amount a pack horse could carry, for the estimate that this equated to 100 to 150 kilograms, see H. Fairbairn, 'The Value

to Wallingford just two weeks later on 30 April, when, presumably, he found his castle suitably stocked as no other bulk purchases were requested from the sheriff. This arrangement did not only apply to castles. Royal manors were also kept stocked in a similar fashion. From 24 to 28 February 1205, John stayed at his residence at Laxton and, as he departed, a writ was issued to the sheriff of Lincoln for half a *summa* of beans to be sent to Laxton, likely to re-stock after the king's visit.[90] Here we can see how John, after leaving a royal residence, would send instructions for the sheriff of the county to purchase staple foods to maintain an adequate level of stock in the royal residence.

Local officials also prepared residences with victuals before the king's arrival. In early 1201, King John made an expedition to the north of England. From 13 to 15 February, he was at Bamburgh, in Northumberland; from 21 to 23 February, he travelled to Carlisle in Cumbria. At Michaelmas 1200, for example, the sheriffs of Northumberland, Westmorland and Cumberland were allowed cash against their Exchequer accounts for stock bought for the castles at Bamburgh, Appleby, Brough and Carlisle.[91] These purchases included sixty pounds spent on two hundred *summae* of wheat and one hundred and twenty *bacons*, which were placed in the stores at Carlisle castle. There is no evidence which directly places John at Appleby and Brough; but, on 25 February, he was just seventeen miles from Appleby at Kirkoswald, making it appear likely that he intended to visit these castles on his journey north.[92] John's journey into the north of England was unusual. English medieval kings rarely ventured to this part of the country. Consequently, it is likely that, in this instance, it would have been necessary to prepare for this trip a few months in advance. Pre-planning ensured that these northern castles, which were much less regularly used by the king, were suitably stocked for the household's arrival. Local officials in the northern counties were a tool in these preparations, as they conducted a proportion of the necessary purveyance for food.

Important as these officials were, it is evident the king and his household would have required many more victuals than those which are revealed to us through the letters

---

and Metrology of Salt in the Late Eleventh Century', *Yorkshire Numismatist,* 4 (2012), 171-8 (pp. 172-4).

[90] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 20b.

[91] *Pipe Roll 2 John*, pp. 2, 33, 242.

[92] Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 433.

to local officials. If we consider again the example of the household's visit to Laxton for four days in February 1205, the only victuals which a local official was instructed to purchase, to replenish the stores at Laxton, were half a *summa* of beans.[93] It is very clear, however, that over four days the royal household would have consumed a lot more than just these beans. Purchases made by local officials make up just one aspect of routine purveyance, but one which is disproportionately represented in the sources, as it is well-documented on the sorts of records which have survived. The quantities mentioned in this evidence, however, were simply not sufficient to provide for the whole household: other methods of purveyance must also have been used.

The second method used to supply the royal household was conducted through the gathering of food produced on the king's estates. This method of purveyance is revealed to us from the records of preparation and transportation costs. The costs of transporting victuals to royal residences were often met by local officials; as a result these activities were recorded on the chancery and exchequer records. The evidence reveals that the practice of stocking royal residences after a household visit was not only conducted through local officials purchasing food, but also through food gathered from the king's estates. On 16 March 1200, for example, John visited Northampton castle. By 19 March he had travelled to his hunting lodge at Clipstone. The pipe roll of that year records a payment of 10*s* 10*d*, which had been spent on transporting the king's *bacons* from Clipstone to Northampton. This money was only for transportation, not for the cost of purchasing these *bacons.* As such it is possible to infer that they might have been produced on the Clipstone estate.[94] We may envisage that John, having depleted supplies at Northampton, sent meat from the larder of the next place he visited, Clipstone. Similarly, from 27 February to 10 March 1200, John travelled from Portsmouth to Woodstock. The pipe roll records a payment to William de Breteuil for 31*s* for transporting *bacons* from Woodstock to Portsmouth.[95] From 25 to 27 March 1205, John visited Woodstock. A couple of days later (29 March) the sheriff of Oxfordshire was instructed to send three hundred *bacons* from Woodstock to Southampton, where John had stayed in the previous

[93] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 20b.
[94] *Pipe Roll 2 John*, p. 7. It is possible that these *bacons* had been purchased at a different time, by a different official. However, this seems unlikely, it seems more sensible that they were produced from pigs on the Clipstone estate.
[95] *Pipe Roll 2 John*, p. 21.

month. A total of 65*s* 6*d* was allowed against the sheriff of Oxford's account at the exchequer for cost of carting these *bacons*.[96] In these examples, the distances such *bacons* covered were substantial. Between Clipstone and Northampton lies a distance of seventy miles; there are seventy-three miles from Woodstock to Southampton, and eighty-five miles from Woodstock to Portsmouth. On another occasion, *bacons* were transported from Northampton to Portsmouth – a distance of one hundred and twenty miles.[97] These distances were necessary as *bacons* had to be stored across the country in many royal residences. Pigs were reared on the royal estates, such as Woodstock and Clipstone, which had an abundance of woodland (making them suitable for pannage). The produce from such estates was sent to the larders of many other royal residences which themselves lacked the ability to rear sufficient pigs of their own.

The season for pannage was in the autumn and early winter; the pigs would be fattened for slaughter, then salted later in the winter. Naturally then, in February and March, royal manors such as Clipstone and Woodstock would have had an abundance of *bacons*. Pork in its preserved form was well-suited to long-term preservation. During the summer, when it was considered dangerous to eat fresh pork, large stocks of *bacons* would have been kept in the larders of royal residences.[98] This process was undertaken across many of the king's estates. In 1211, for example, John fitz Hugh spent £9 11*s* 6*d* on killing, salting and transporting 376 pigs for the larder at Windsor, and one hundred pigs at each of the king's manors of Woodstock, Odiham and Guildford.[99] John fitz Hugh continued this work in the following year, evidenced by the pipe roll, which reveals that John had 1074 pigs prepared and salted 'for many larders'.[100] These pipe roll entries demonstrate that pigs were being reared, slaughtered and prepared for king's larders from his own estates. The preparation and transportation costs were covered by local officials. In this way a yearly, sustainable production of meat (unquantifiable from the surviving

[96] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 25; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 146.
[97] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 52.
[98] U. Albarella, 'Pig Husbandry and Pork Consumption in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition,* ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron (Oxford, 2006), pp. 72-87 (pp. 73, 77, 84).
[99] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 111.
[100] *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 45.

record evidence but, nonetheless, evidently there) was provided for consumption in the royal household.

Pigs were not the only livestock reared on royal estates. That other animals were also kept on the king's estates is appreciable from the scattered references throughout the pipe rolls to cash equivalents being allowed against the county farm for missing stock that should have been on particular estates. In 1200, for example, Pocklington in Yorkshire was missing cows, boars and oxen; the total amount allowed against the account was ninety shillings.[101] In that same year, Congresbury in North Somerset was missing 203 sheep, thirty-one cows and thirty-three boars, the amount allowed against the account was £7 9*s*.[102] In 1206, Melbourne in Nottinghamshire was missing sheep, cows, bulls, boars.[103] It was common for the replenishment of livestock on royal estates to occur after a visit from the king or a tour of the area by royal justices.[104] King John, as he travelled between his royal residences, made orders for repairs to buildings and to improve stock. In August 1205, for example, after visiting Powerstock John ordered the sheriff of Dorset and Somerset to make repairs to 'our house' at Powerstock and to stock 'our manor'.[105] P.D.A. Harvey has argued that when livestock was bought for royal estates it was to increase stocks so that rents could be raised.[106] The description of the livestock as 'defalta', as found in each of the examples given, however, suggests missing rather than additional stock. That such replenishments feature frequently on the pipe rolls, encourages the view that the king was actually using lands under his control to rear livestock to produce food for the royal household.[107]

The king's hunt also played a significant role in stocking royal larders. Hunting in the medieval period has often been viewed as simply a courtly pursuit, a sport for royalty and nobility.[108] But the hunt was also an essential domestic service by which

---

[101] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 102.
[102] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 92.
[103] *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 76.
[104] P. D. A. Harvey, 'The Pipe Rolls and the Adoption of Demesne Farming in England', *Economic History Review*, 27 (1974), 345-59 (p. 345).
[105] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 57b.
[106] Harvey, 'Demesne Farming', p. 350.
[107] The replenishment of stock may also have been undertaken when the king returned land he had only temporarily held.
[108] The historiography on medieval hunting is extensive. For a general overview of the social history of hunting, see E. Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066* (London, 2007); R. Almond, 'Medieval Hunting: Ruling Classes and Commonality', *Medieval History,* 3 (1993), 147-55.

the members of the household were fed. The presence of large numbers of huntsmen, hound handlers, horn-blowers and archers in the *Constitutio* demonstrates that the hunt was part of the domestic sphere of the royal household.[109] The itinerary of the hunt has been previously discussed; it followed the general course of the household's perambulations, but also veered away to hunt on nearby estates or the land of the royal forest.[110] The king's hunt was a major operation comprising huntsmen, hound handlers with their lymers, brachets, harriers, greyhounds; falconers and austringers with their birds of prey. All apparatus for the hunt was transported by horse-drawn carts and cared for by grooms.[111] Arrangements for the expenses of the hunt feature regularly in the letters close. The costs were met by officials, such as the king's chief forester, county sheriffs and custodians of vacant ecclesiastical lands. Huntsmen and their packs were also the recipients of many payments from the chamber, which are recorded on the surviving misae and praestita rolls. These rolls, for example, record the robes and expenses given to Ferling the huntsmen and Thomas de Porkereciis with their dogs and grooms.[112] Many payments were also made to William fitz Richard, who was likely the master of the hunt.[113] William issued payments from the chamber to members of the hunt. He received money for hunt expenses, and he accompanied sections of the hunt when they separated from the household.[114]

Groups of huntsmen and dogs were sent to forest lands, royal parks and demesne estates to hunt for game. Earl Aubrey de Vere, for example, received the king's greyhounds at Romford in May 1213. De Vere might have been expected to send this hunting party to the large deer park nearby at Havering. The catch of this hunting party was to be killed, salted and sent to Reginald of Cornhill, the custodian of Rochester castle, to prepare for the royal visit to that castle the following week.[115] Knepp castle was built as a hunting seat by the De Braoses in the early years of the thirteenth century; after the De Braoses' fall from favour, John used the area for his

[109] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 212-15.
[110] Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 37-8.
[111] For a full description of the king's hunt, see Barlow, *William Rufus,* p. 119-28. Also, see F. Barlow, 'Hunting in the Middle Ages', *Transactions of Devonshire Association,* 113 (1981), pp. 1-11.
[112] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 141, 150, 248; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 244, 246, 248, 250, 253.
[113] *Supra,* p. 125, note 55.
[114] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 245; *Rot. Litt. Claus,* i, p. 154; *Docs. of English History,* pp. 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 240, 241, 243, 244, 246, 248, 253.
[115] *Rot. Litt. Claus,* i, p. 134b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 683.

own huntsmen.[116] In 1213, Roland Bloet, the custodian of Knepp castle, received a group of seven huntsmen with seven horses, one hundred and fifteen dogs, eight hound-handlers and five grooms for hunting in Knepp forest.[117] Similarly, in November 1214, three huntsmen with brachet hounds, greyhounds and a number of archers were sent to Fulk de Cantilupe to hunt for eighty deer in Leyland park.[118] On other occasions, huntsmen and their dogs were sent to catch deer on land under the control of Philip of Oldcotes in Northumberland, John Marshal in Blackmore forest in Dorset, and Peter de Maulay in Dorset and Somerset.[119]

The practical function of the king's hunt did not cease during a continental campaign. In May 1214, it was arranged for two of the king's regular huntsmen, Richard of Bradmore and Gilbert de Montibus, to have a 'good and secret ship' to take them to Poitou. Richard and Gilbert were accompanied by four horses, sixty greyhounds and forty other dogs. Instructions were sent to the sheriff of Hampshire to provide the necessary victuals for their sustenance for forty days.[120] A number of other huntsmen were also present on campaign. In August that same year, the king sent his huntsmen Guy, Nigel, Walter and Geoffrey with forty-eight hounds to the seneschal in Gascony. This hunting party was to catch deer and pigs, which had pastured in the summer in Gascony; the animals caught were to be killed, salted and sent quickly to the king.[121] That a large section of the royal hunt accompanied the king on campaign demonstrates its importance in supplying food for the household.

Records of salt purchases can provide further information regarding the movement of the hunt. Large quantities of salt were often bought by local officials. This method of payment brings the activities of the king's hunting service on to the records. Commonly, salt was bought in August and September, so that animals could be slaughtered and salted ready for the winter months.[122] Salt was often bought by local officials in an area which the household had recently visited. Following a visit to

---

[116] C. M. Burrell, 'Documents Relating to Knepp Castle', *Sussex Archaeological Society,* 3 (London, 1850), 1-12.
[117] *Rot. Litt. Claus,* i, p. 134b. A similar group was sent to hunt at Knepp in December 1214, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 158b.
[118] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 177.
[119] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 188b, 225b, 226, 275.
[120] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 206b. Game hunted and salted in England was also transported to the continent, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 171b.
[121] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 171.
[122] Woolgar, *Great Household,* p. 112.

Bere-Regis from 18 to 21 August 1205, for example, Peter of Stokes commissioned the sheriff of Somerset to find salt for the king's serjeants in that area.[123] During a royal visit in September 1205, Walter Buistard purchased salt for the king's meat at Brill.[124] In September 1209, as the household travelled around the environs of Dorset, salt was bought for the larders at Cranborne, Silverstone, Bere-Regis and Dorchester.[125] After game was salted it could be stored for long periods. The game produced in areas of good chase in the south of the country was used to supply the larders of many royal residences. The cost of carting game appears on the pipe rolls. In 1210, for example, the pipe roll records the cost of hiring a ship to take the king's game from Tewkesbury to York, probably in preparation for the Christmas festivities at York that year.[126] At Michaelmas 1210, John fitz Hugh was allowed a total of £7 14*s* 2*d* against his exchequer account for the farm of Windsor, for the costs of transporting game (with other victuals) 'to many places'.[127] The royal hunt was an important domestic service which supplied larders across the country. The great supplies required by the household were gained by sending separate hunting parties to fertile forests and parks during the high season (between summer and spring). The hunt was set to rest in March for a couple of months each year.[128] The royal hunt acted as an extension of the household and played an important role in the purveyance of victuals from the royal demesne and forest lands.

Another source of food used for the royal household from the king's estates was freshwater fish. There are many references in the pipe rolls of the costs of building or improving fish ponds on the king's estates. In 1215, for example, William de Lisle provided timber for repairing the bay of the fish pond at the king's manor at Brigstock, in Northampton.[129] In 1216, fifty shillings were spent on the deteriorating fishpond at Marlborough.[130] These fishponds were stocked with freshwater fish,

---

[123] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 47b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 517.
[124] *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 68; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 50b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 517.
[125] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 130, 131, 133.
[126] *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 89.
[127] *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 121.
[128] Church, 'Royal Itinerary', p. 38, note 39; J. Birrell, 'Procuring, Preparing and Serving Venison in Late Medieval England', in *Food Medieval England,* ed. Woolgar *et al,* pp. 176-88 (p. 178).
[129] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 191b.
[130] *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 59. For a greater discussion of medieval royal fishponds, see J. M. Steane, 'The Royal Fishponds of Medieval England', in *Medieval Fish, Fisheries and Fishponds,* ed. by M. Aston (Oxford, 1988), pp. 39-68. For the consumption of fish in the medieval period, see J. McDonnell, *Inland Fisheries in Medieval Yorkshire 1066-1300,* Borthwick Institute of Historical

which was used to supply the king's household. During Lent, from 30 March to 1 April 1204, when fish would have been in high demand, King John stayed at Marlborough. It seems likely that fish would have been caught in the fishpond in that estate; this, however, might not have been sufficient as two of the king's serjeants were also sent to Tewkesbury. The sheriff of Gloucestershire was to provide these serjeants with an allowance whilst they caught one hundred and forty bream.[131] The pipe roll reveals that these serjeants actually caught two hundred and twenty bream and sent them the fifty miles to Marlborough.[132] The waters around Tewkesbury were a rich source of freshwater fish. Salmon were also caught there in 1205, which were sent to Clarendon where the king was spending Pentecost.[133] The evidence suggests it was a preferable, if not always possible, to incur transport costs and expenses for serjeants, rather than to purchase fish in the area the household was staying.[134] Freshwater fish was an expensive luxury which, according to Woolgar, was reserved for the most extravagant households.[135] The cost of purchasing fresh fish might have been considerably higher than the costs incurred in the expenses and carts for royal fisherman.

Unlike preserved fish which could be stored for several months, freshwater fish needed to be eaten almost immediately. As a result, rather than re-stocking after a royal visit, fresh fish was often sent in advance of the king's arrival. On 28 February 1205, letters were sent to the sheriff of Lincoln with instructions to deliver one cart of fish to Nottingham, ready for the household's visit in March.[136] The royal fishponds were also a source of food for the queen and her entourage when she travelled apart from the king. When the queen was at Marlborough in May 1215, the constable was instructed to seize all the fish in the royal preserve for the queen's use – so that she could have roach and small pike.[137] By using the produce from the royal demesne, the king was able to support the parts of his household travelling with him

Research (York, 1981); J. M. Steane, 'The Medieval Fishponds of Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past and Present,* 4 (1972), 299-310.

[131] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 88.

[132] *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 146.

[133] *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 103.

[134] For the transportation of fresh water fish to supply aristocratic households, see C. Dyer, 'The Consumption of Fresh Water Fish in Medieval England', in *Medieval Fish,* ed. Aston, pp. 27-38 (p. 32).

[135] Woolgar, *Great Household,* p. 120; Dyer, 'Fresh Water Fish', pp. 27-31, 33-4.

[136] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 20b. The fish was *grampus*.

[137] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 213b.

and those travelling separately. In this instance the queen's household was supplied with the luxury of freshwater fish without the expense of purchasing it locally.

Freshwater fish was sometimes bought from local fisherman; but this method was often limited to occasions when much greater supplies of fish were required, such as for feast days or during Lent. In preparation for the Christmas court at Westminster in 1212, Roger de Neville was told to procure as much freshwater fish as possible. He was to pay the customary price for it and then account at the exchequer.[138] This type of purveyance must have been costly and the evidence suggests that in terms of regular consumption of fish, such as salmon, bream and lampreys, the king relied largely on his own fish ponds. During Lent, however, when the eating of meat was forbidden, fish had to be bought more frequently and in greater varieties to compensate for the loss of meat at the table. At mid-Lent Sunday in 1205, for example, Reginald of Cornhill was commissioned to acquire twenty good pieces of sturgeon.[139] Sturgeon was the most expensive and luxurious fish to be served at the royal table. Its great size (around three metres) may explain why it was purchased in pieces rather than whole.[140] King John also had a sturgeon at his Christmas court in 1210, which had been caught in the Thames and transported to Crayke, near York. The cost of the carriage and the rich spices which accompanied the fish was a substantial 20*s* 10*d*.[141] During Lent in 1207, the custodians of Ramsey abbey were instructed to allow the king to have fish at Cambridge, where the household spent Ash Wednesday that year.[142] The misae rolls also provide some insight into the eating habits of the king during Lent and on other religious days when meat was forbidden. These rolls record regular penitential payments of alms to paupers for the dietary transgressions of the king and his closest associates.[143] The king did not strictly adhere to the rules that were imposed upon his diet by the church. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the household would have been supplied with fish

[138] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128.
[139] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 22.
[140] *Beyond the Catch: Fisheries in the North Atlantic, the North Sea and the Baltic,* ed. by L. Sicking and D. Abreu-Ferriera (Leiden: Brill: Biggleswade, 2008), pp. 22, 309, 321.
[141] *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 110. This evidence suggests that only the king's chief purveyors of luxury items, Reginald of Cornhill and John fitz Hugh provided sturgeon for the royal household. The sturgeon's association with luxury prevails today as its roe is known as caviar, the modern-day delicacy.
[142] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 79.
[143] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 110.

rather than meat on these religiously important days, which would have generated a very high demand for fresh or salted, preserved fish.

Unlike freshwater fish, which could be reared and caught in the king's own fish ponds, salt water fish had to be caught at sea. Herrings, for example, were particularly abundant off the East Anglian coast.[144] To procure salt water fish, John retained his own fisherman, of whom we can see glimpses in the record sources. There are, for example, records of the costs incurred by Simon, the king's fisherman, to transport fish.[145] Moreover, we can see the wages paid by the steward to Charles, the royal fisherman. Robert the fisherman is mentioned when a robe, a rouncey and other necessities, including a net, were given to him by the king.[146] The amount of salt water fish required by the household evidently exceeded the capacity of the royal fishermen. Herrings were one of the most commonly eaten fish in the thirteenth century. Each individual in the household could be expected to consume three or four herrings at one meal. During Lent, when the household was heavily reliant on salted herrings, thousands could be consumed each day.[147] As a result, regular purchases of herrings were needed to meet demand. In March 1205, for example, Peter des Roches bought 300,000 herrings in East Anglia. John de Gray, the bishop of Norwich, was instructed to send these herrings to Northampton and Southampton. Both of those castles were places John had visited the previous month, suggesting that these herrings were required to boost their stock.[148] During John's visit to Laxton, from 4 to 7 February 1206, the custodian of that manor purchased three thousand herrings along with other 'necessary expenses' for the king's stay.[149] King John also requested herrings to be sent to him on the continent. In early 1203, the sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk, Philip de Mealton, sent 'across the sea' to the king thousands of herrings, worth £63 4*s* 11*d.*[150] Logically, it seems these herrings would have been preserved rather than fresh. Herrings were a seasonal catch in late summer to early autumn. To preserve supplies, herrings were either salted, which made them

[144] J. Campbell, 'Domesday Herrings', *East Anglia's History,* ed. by C. Harper-Bill, C. Rawcliffe and R. G. Wilson (Woobridge, 2002), pp. 5-18.
[145] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 26.
[146] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 289b; *Docs. of English History,* p. 275.
[147] D. Serjeantson and C. M. Woolgar, 'Fish Consumption in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England,* ed. Woolgar *et al*, pp. 102-130, (p. 122); P. Hammond, *Food and Feast in Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1993), p. 19.
[148] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 22b, 37.
[149] *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 79; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 533.
[150] *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 235.

available in the months immediately after the season, or they were smoked, which suited long-term preservation, and allowed herrings to be eaten throughout the year.[151]

Herrings were also imported from North-Western Europe and sold at English markets. Reginald of Cornhill bought herrings for the king's household from London markets, where he conducted much of his purveyance. On 9 November 1213, for example, Reginald was directed to send five thousand herrings along with three pounds of saffron. The saffron was used as a method of colouring the fish and was notoriously expensive. These fish and spices were then sent to Oxford, where the household spent St. Edmund's Day (16 November) that year.[152] Salt water fish could not be sourced from the king's estates; instead the household was supplied through fisherman retained in the king's service, or through purchases made by local officials. These officials would have needed to rely on a network of purveyors operating in the localities to procure such victuals. In the early fifteenth century, Given-Wilson has shown that the purveyance of fish was contracted to regional men with connections to local fishermen. From these fishermen, local officials could procure a range of fish and supply sufficient quantities for the king's household.[153] The sources available for John's reign cannot reveal this lower stratum of local purveyors, but the king's sheriffs and custodians would undoubtedly have needed local men to find suppliers, negotiate prices and transport victuals.

This evidence suggests that the procuring of salt water fish was reactive to the needs of the household. There is, however, some indication of a more proactive, systematic approach, which was conducted through the use of food rents, paid by local men from fishing areas. The men of Dunwich, a coastal town in Suffolk, for example, rendered account for their farm £120, 1*m* and 14,000 herring. In 1203, the men of Dunwich obtained other estates for which they rendered account two hundred marks and five thousand eels.[154] How the king and his household came to consume this fish from Dunwich is uncertain. It is possible that the cost of transporting the fish to the

[151] Woolgar, *Great Household,* p. 119.
[152] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 155; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 687; For another example when Reginald purchased one last of herrings, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128b.
[153] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', pp. 149-50.
[154] *Pipe Roll 1 John,* p. 274; *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 131; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 129; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 236.

king fell to the men of Dunwich or, perhaps, it was factored into the yearly value of their farm. During John's reign, there is little other evidence for the existence of the systematic collection of food in this manner.[155] Yet, we have already seen a number of examples of the household consuming victuals, such as fish and meat, from royal estates. This process is also visible when an estate was held by a custodian who was responsible for accounting for all the receipts and issues of that estate, rather than holding it at a fixed annual farm. In these instances, we can see that victuals were given 'for the king's use' and noted on the pipe rolls.[156] This evidence is revealed because of the method of accounting for the estate's profits. In light of this evidence, it seems possible that estates held at farm similarly supplied the royal household. The financial impact of this activity might have been factored into the annual rents due from the king's estates. As a result, consumption of food by the king and his household would not have required a record on the pipe rolls against the custodian or sheriff's accounts.

Grains, such as wheat, rye, barley and oats, were a staple source of food in any medieval household.[157] Grains were used to produce bread and ale, the main substance of the household's diet. The *Constitutio* records that each domestic officer of the royal household was assigned an allowance of bread. The quality of this bread varied, between 'ordinary bread' and the 'lord's bread'. The type dispensed was dependant on the recipient's status. This distinction highlights the need for different qualities of grain. Wheat, or sometimes rye, would have been used to make the best bread. Malted grains, especially barley, might also have been needed, if the household made its own ale.[158] Another grain required in great quantities, was oats. These oats could be used to make a number of food dishes. They might also have been used to feed the hundreds of horses attached to the royal household.[159]

---

[155] For food rents before the Norman Conquest, see P. Stafford, 'The 'farm of one night' and the Organisation of King Edward's Estates in Domesday', *Economic History Review,* 33 (1980), 491-502; Campbell, 'Anglo-Saxon Courts', p. 159. According to the account of Richard fitz Nigel, the practice of paying food rents was given up during the reign of Henry I, see *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 63-5.
[156] *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 4; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 9.
[157] D. J. Stone, 'The Consumption of Field Crops in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England,* ed. Woolgar *et al,* pp. 11-26.
[158] For a discussion of the purveyance of ale, see *supra,* pp. 26-8.
[159] For examples of purchases of oats, see *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 150; *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 112; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 124, 134.

Wheat was certainly purchased in great quantities. For the years 1362 to 1413, Given-Wilson found that the average number of quarters of wheat bought per year was 2,250.[160] Such totals cannot be discovered from the evidence for the early thirteenth century. An impression of how John's household was supplied with grains, however, can be discerned from the record sources. The procurement of grains drew together the three key methods by which the household acquired food. Firstly, grains could be gathered from the king's demesne estates. The evidence for this activity is relatively scant in comparison with what can be known about the consumption of freshwater fish or livestock from royal estates. The reason for this lack of evidence may lie in the nature of crop growing, as it required no building work, such as fish-ponds, nor did animals have to be bred and reared. Fisheries and stock rearing incurred additional costs, which were often met by local officials. As a result, payments relating to these activities have left their mark on the surviving record sources. Nevertheless, there is still some direct evidence that grains were being grown on the lands held by the king, and that such grain was then consumed by the household. For example, in 1214 and 1216, corn produced on the estates of the vacant abbey of Cirencester was given 'for the king's use'. This information appears amongst records of other corn that was sold; the profits of these sales of corn were accounted at the exchequer.[161] Even though the direct evidence is scant, we may infer from what we know that grains were farmed on lands held in the king's hands, and that the royal household consumed some of these victuals.

Another method used to purvey grains was through purchases made by local officials. At Michaelmas 1209, for example, Brian de Lisle purchased eight quarters of wheat and fifty-five quarters of oats, the cost of which was allowed against the farm of Laxton.[162] John and his household stayed at Laxton on 8 April 1209, it was presumably for this night or to replenish the stores after this visit that these purchases were made.[163] After John stayed at Knepp Castle, from 21 to 24 January 1215, the custodian, Roland Bloet, paid for some of the king's household expenses, including fifty-three quarters of oats. On 29 January, after John had departed, a writ

[160] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 152.
[161] *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 4; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 9; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 163.
[162] *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 112.
[163] Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 597.

of *computate* was written to the barons of the exchequer to account to Roland.[164] Grains were also bought by local officials and sent to the continent. In 1202, Richard de Mountfiquet, the sheriff of Essex, spent £175 20*s* on 760 *summae* of grain, which were to be sent to Poitou. In the same year, the sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk spent a further £88 on 240 *summae* of grains to be sent to Rouen.[165] Like preserved fish and meat, grains were sent to be stocked in royal castles. In 1215, for example, Northampton and Wallingford castles were both stocked with grains.[166] Earlier in the reign, the sheriff of Wiltshire, William earl of Salisbury, bought 'forty *summae* of wheat for the stock of the same [Salisbury] castle'.[167]

The evidence concerning the acquisition of grains for the royal household also brings to light the third key method of purveyance: the use of household officials for procuring food in the area surrounding the household. In this instance, it is the activities of the king's bakers which demonstrate the existence of this arrangement. The *Constitutio* describes an arrangement whereby there were four bakers serving in turn, two in the household and two travelling ahead to purchase wheat.[168] This arrangement appears still to have been in place in the early thirteenth century. Certainly, there were bakers sent ahead of the household to prepare for the king's arrival. On 27 May 1216, John issued a writ to the bailiffs and reeves of Winchester to cause his baker to have twelve quarters of grain for making bread. On this occasion, John was at Bramber in West Sussex, the baker had been sent just over fifty miles to Winchester to prepare the king's bread, ready for his arrival the following day.[169] On 20 November 1205, Reginald of Cornhill was instructed to allow William the king's baker to have twelve *summae* of wheat. Reginald was also to ensure that the baker had access to an oven, either in Wimbledon or elsewhere within the lands of the archbishopric of Canterbury.[170] Presumably, this would have been a public oven or an oven of a local bake-house, which Reginald was to make available for the royal baker. Whilst William the baker was in London, John was

[164] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 185. For the Bloet family, see Crouch, *William Marshal*, pp. 139, 198; D. Crouch, 'Bloet family (*per. c.*1080–*c.*1300)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/54499, accessed 22 July 2013]; D. Crouch, 'Bloet, Nest (*d.* 1224/5)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47222, accessed 22 July 2013].
[165] *Pipe Roll 4 John*, pp. 104, 259.
[166] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 193, 195.
[167] *Pipe Roll 5 John*, p. 13.
[168] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, p. 199.
[169] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 273b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 747.
[170] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 58.

over eighty miles away in Cricklade, but the household travelled near London to Lambeth a week later. This week must have allowed sufficient time for grains to be gathered, milled and turned into the large quantities of bread required during the household's stay at Lambeth.[171]

Evidence of the king's bakers' activities also comes to light when local officials were instructed to meet the ensuing costs. For example, Henry the king's baker[172] was sent to Taunton where the bailiffs were told to provide him with his allowance.[173] In an earlier writ to the bailiffs of Taunton, the bailiffs were instructed to have one hundred quarters of wheat threshed and cleansed and cause flour to be ground with bran. The results of this work were to be placed into casks so that it was not ruined. These grains (and a large quantity of oats) were to be given to Richard de Mara, the king's serjeant. The bailiffs were to ensure Richard had sufficient carts to take these victuals to Dartmouth, where John would visit the following month.[174] In this instance, however, the pipe roll provides the additional information that these grains were due to be sent to Poitou, probably as part of the supplies for the planned, but failed, expedition to the continent that year.[175]

This evidence clearly suggests that the system described in the *Constitutio* continued into the thirteenth century: bakers were sent ahead of the court to prepare the household's bread. Yet, it is only on the occasions when local officials were asked to procure the wheat or pay for the bakers' expenses that this process is revealed to us through the letters and writs recorded on the chancery rolls. This process, however, must have routinely functioned without the need for such letters; the baker must have been had the means to make payments or requisition grains from royal lands without the intervention of local officials. In short, the baker would have had a supply of coin from the household to make necessary payments or to cover expenses when separated from court. Only when this routine system fell short were local officials used to provide coin and necessities. The money generally used by the bakers would undoubtedly have been provided by the chamber. For evidence concerning the

[171] Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 519.
[172] 'Dominicum pistorem', see *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. 201, note 16. For the production of *dominica panes,* see *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 110.
[173] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 31.
[174] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 31.
[175] *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 133.

transfer of cash from the chamber to the other household departments to pay for food and expenses we must look to the reign of Henry III.

The household rolls which have survived from the reign of Henry III onwards give us some idea of household purchasing in the thirteenth century. As David Carpenter has explained, the household rolls of Henry III were produced to inform the exchequer where sums of money, which had been sent to the household, were spent.[176] In these daily rolls against each household office is a record of its cash expenditure. This cash was not for the amount spent on a specific day. Rather these rolls record the amount of money it would have cost to purchase all the food consumed on that day. For example, the costs recorded on Christmas day would have naturally been very high, as so much food would have been consumed, but the food would have been purchased more slowly over the course of the previous days and weeks. What the rolls do not include is the value of any food which came from 'stock'. Carpenter has clarified exactly what was meant by 'stock': it included all food eaten from the king's lands or purchased by local officials. Food gathered from the king's estates was not paid for; the money spent by local officials on food was accounted for at the exchequer. Essentially, both of these means of procuring food did not incur costs to the household. As the purpose of Henry III's household rolls was to demonstrate the spending of the household at the exchequer, only victuals that directly cost the household money were of interest.

During John's reign, the only examples of accounts which recorded household expenditure are the misae and praestita rolls. The nature of praestita rolls is uncertain. Their title suggests that they recorded a list of loans made by the household. The content and an analysis of the pipe rolls, however, demonstrate that these loans were only recalled on the rarest of occasions. Nonetheless, there was an element of debt attached to the money given on the praestita rolls. Consequently, copies were sent to the exchequer, as this was where debts could be recalled.[177] There is nothing in this process which would suggest that King John's household was in any way being audited by the exchequer. Misae rolls are slightly more straight-forward documents. They clearly list expenditure from the king's chamber.

[176] For what follows, see Carpenter, 'Household Rolls', pp. 22-45.
[177] For a full discussion of the praestita rolls, see *supra,* pp. 30-5; Church, '1210 Campaign', pp. 47-57; *Pipe Roll 17 John,* pp. 71-80.

Misae rolls were not used as a tool in an audit of household spending at the exchequer. Here is the crux of the difference between the household accounts which survive from the reign of Henry III and those of John's reign. The misae rolls were internal household documents; they were not intended to be used at the exchequer. Whereas Henry III's household rolls were produced for the purposes of an exchequer audit.[178] The reason for this difference is the result of far more than mere luck in the survival of documents. A roll which acted as a means for the household to be audited by the exchequer would not have existed during John's reign. There was a change in the relationship between the king and his exchequer, during the minority of Henry III, which led to the household's accountability at the exchequer for at least some of the money spent by it. Under John, the money held in the treasury and controlled by the exchequer officials was as much the king's money as the cash held in his household. John would have seen no reason to explain his household spending to those who held his other money at the exchequer.[179] During the minority, the king's personal control of his finances was lost and only partially regained during his majority. Increasingly household spending came under the spotlight of exchequer officials as the king's household expenditure became accountable to men other than the king.[180]

The household rolls of Henry III are revealing documents in terms of highlighting the increase in the exchequer's concern for household spending. Moreover, these rolls reveal that, during Henry III's reign, it was common practice for officials to use household cash to purchase victuals. It seems likely this was a continuation of the practice under King John. In the later medieval period, Given-Wilson found this

---

[178] For a full discussion of the exchequer audit of the household and wider wardrobe rolls from the reign of Henry III, see *Wardrobe Accounts,* ed. Wild, pp. xxv-xlvii.

[179] For the exchequer's relationship to the king and the centrality of the king's needs in twelfth and early thirteenth-century government, see S. D. Church, 'Talking to itself: Royal Records and the Angevin Kings in England, 1154-1216', in *Comparative Studies of Medieval Documents in Japan and England*, ed. by H. Tsurushima, (Tokyo, 2008), pp. 71-104.

[180] For the view that the growing financial capacity of the wardrobe led to its audit at the exchequer, see B. L. Wild, 'Royal Finance under King Henry III, 1216-1272: The Wardrobe Evidence', *Economic History Review* (2012), 1-23 (pp. 3-4). For the wardrobe being characterised by greater links to the administrative structure of the realm, which should be seen in comparison to the chamber's links to the peripatetic household, see Warren, *Governance,* p. 174. For the separation and specialisation of the household and central government under Henry III, see Warren, *Governance*, pp. 188-90. For the changes to government and increased focus on accounting procedures under Henry III, see M. H. Mills, 'Experiments in Exchequer Procedure, 1200-32', *TRHS* 4th series, 8 (1925), 151-170; M. H. Mills, 'The Reforms at the Exchequer (1232-42)', *TRHS* 4th series, 10 (1927), 111-33; D. A. Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff, 1194-1258', *EHR,* 111 (1976), 1-32.

system was the main source of victuals for the household. He showed that there was a daily, systematic procurement of victuals conducted through officials gathering food on a village-to-village or, even, house-to-house basis.[181] The same system very likely operated under John, yet, it is almost completely invisible from the record evidence. This gap in the records exists because any record that might have been produced to document the activities of household purveyors will have perished through lack of incentive to preserve. Without the need to make copies of household records and send them to the exchequer, where record management practice may have ensured their survival for posterity, such accounts would never have survived to modern times. Like so much else when studying John's household, we are forced to wait for moments when household activities were drawn away from court for them to leave a mark on the types of records that have survived from his reign.

The lack of evidence for household officials procuring food in the localities around the household can now be understood in the context of the nature of the documents that have survived from John's reign. There is little reason to suppose that John's household did not retain purveyors in its offices: the kitchen, buttery, and the dispensary. We have in the bakers one example of household officials who purchased victuals in the localities. Other foods, such as milk, cheese, hens, eggs, fruit and vegetables must also have been purchased on a daily basis in the towns and villages through which the household passed.[182] Purveyors of these victuals were unlikely to travel more than a few hours ahead of the household. Unlike the bakers who needed to travel a day or two ahead of the household, due to the preparation time required to ensure grains were ground and sufficient bread was baked for the whole household, other purveyors bought victuals that were ready to eat. Bakers were separated from the court for a number of days. As a result, they sometimes incurred expenses which were paid by local officials. These payments drew the king's bakers into the light of the record evidence. Other purveyors would not have incurred these costs and as such they remain hidden within the long shadow cast by the household.

[181] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', pp. 145-55.
[182] For the purchase of hens for the king's falcons, see *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 146, 154, 156, 160.

We have only the rarest glimpses of household purveyors. In September 1205, for example, Peter of Stokes sent a writ to the bailiffs of Taunton to meet the expenses of Master Ralph our 'emptor'; unfortunately, there is no hint as to what Master Ralph was responsible for buying.[183] Tranters were employed by the king and travelled apart from the household. The only record of such men appears in instructions to town bailiffs to provide help (or not to hinder) the work of these men. In March 1215, a letter to the bailiffs of Carlisle reveals that two of the king's tranters, William and Hugh, were sent to requisition salmon and other victuals.[184] Another victual purveyed by household officials was salt. In 1209, the task of purveying this salt was given to three men, William Colomise, Robert Dawtrey and Robert de Alta Ripa. They received money to pay for salt for the meat in various royal larders.[185] On the whole, however, the names and responsibilities of purveyors are rarely found in the record sources.

Evidence surrounding this third method of purveyance through household officials is very limited, but this should not deflect from the logic of such a system. There must have always been a need to acquire food from the area around the household, in addition to the preserved meats, fish and grains that were routinely stored in royal residences. The household also transported some foods in its baggage train. A cart carrying fruit, for example, accompanied the household in October 1212. The cart travelled with the main body of the household from Gillingham to Bath, to Bristol, to Lacock, to Easton and beyond.[186] It is difficult, however, to envisage great quantities of food travelling in this way. Food must have been bought in local towns and villages on a daily basis by household staff. Walter Map describes how, in the reign of Henry I, a market followed the king 'whithersoever he moved his camp'.[187] An itinerant body of merchants who followed the household must have provided another convenient source of victuals for the household.

The means by which the household purveyors paid for victuals have inspired much commentary. The task of a royal purveyor was characterised by high demand and

[183] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 48b.
[184] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 191b. The same letter was also sent to the bailiffs of William of Hereford, Robert of Tudenham and *Gamel'* another tranter.
[185] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 130-1, 133; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 124.
[186] *Docs. of English History*, pp. 244-6.
[187] Map, *De Nugis*, pp. 438-439, 472-3.

complicated by large numbers of people and the frequent journeying of the household. Due to these difficulties, purveyors took a ruthless approach in their work in order to meet demands. Consequently, they attracted the attention of a number of twelfth-century commentators. Eadmer, William of Malmesbury and the author of the Peterborough version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle all give some impression of the fear with which people were filled when the royal purveyors came to town. These narratives also reveal the tendency of purveyors to plunder towns and take more than what was deemed reasonable for the king's needs.[188] Complaints concerning purveyance were not unique to the twelfth century. Given-Wilson saw that 'the political unpopularity of the household sprang largely from its domestic sphere of activity…the abuse of its power is one of the constant themes of the history of the royal household'.[189] The unpopularity of royal purveyance is apparent during the reign of Edward III's reign. In 1362, the Great Statute of Purveyors produced legislation which controlled the amounts which could be taken from vendors and tried to ensure payments were received. This statute was enacted precisely because purveyance had become a source of complaint at every parliament between 1343 and 1355. Royal purveyors were said to be impoverishing and destroying the king's subjects, especially by taking victuals without payment.[190]

These complaints have been the impetus for much of the historiography on the subject of purveyance, most notably, Given-Wilson's seminal article, which examined the methods of purveyance in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and showed that complaints correlated to the abuse of the credit system used by royal purveyors. Given-Wilson demonstrated that complaints were not at their highest as a result of the household's seemingly superfluous spending. Instead, they correlated directly to when the household was cash-poor – when the household was unable promptly to pay its creditors. In short, people were not critical of the king's desire for a lavish household; what they objected to was not being paid for its lavishness.[191]

---

[188] For these twelfth-century criticisms of purveyors, see Church, 'Royal Itinerary', pp. 35-7. For Walter Map's description of how Henry I tried to overcome these problems, see Map, *De Nugis*, pp. 470-473.
[189] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 12.
[190] Harris, *King, Parliament and Public Finance,* pp. 376-9.
[191] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', pp. 156-62.

There has been no previous study of royal purveyance in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries; but, it seems, the tensions caused by the delicate balance between the king's need for victuals and the population's desire to be treated fairly in the process of royal purveyance was active in these centuries, too.[192] The presence of clause twenty-eight in Magna Carta demonstrates there must have been at least some concern over non-payments for chattels by constables and other royal officials.[193] Moreover, the burden on urban communities in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is evidenced through borough charters issued to these communities. Such charters highlight many towns' desire for freedom from this burden. Cities, including Bristol, Colchester, Canterbury, Dublin, Grimsby, Ipswich, King's Lynn, Lincoln, London, Northampton, Norwich and Yarmouth were all granted charters in this period. They declared that the burgesses were not required to give royal hospitality unless they wished to do so. Based on the Oxford borough charter (which proved to be a template for other charters issued to urban communities that sought the status of borough), the hospitality clause developed towards the end of the twelfth century to make the specific point that bread, ale and other victuals should not be taken 'by force'.[194] The implication of this clause is that victuals had been habitually taken against the wishes of the people and in a manner that was creating a heavy burden on the town. One is reminded here of Eustace of Boulogne's visit to England in 1051, when his men attempted forcefully to find billets in Dover. As a result, a fight ensued causing the deaths of townsmen and men of Eustace's entourage.[195] Evidently, enforced hospitality from towns was a recurring problem. The borough charters, however, that were issued with this hospitality clause during John's reign all date to the years 1199 to 1200, surely suggesting they were more a reflection of previous practice than responsive to specific grievances during John's reign.[196] Given the degree to which King John was criticised by contemporaries, it is interesting that there is only the clause in Magna Carta to suggest that there was fear

---

[192] For complaints of Henry III's slow payment for prise, see *Baronial Reform Movements*, ed. Saunders, pp. 86-7.

[193] 'No constable or any other of our bailiffs shall take any man's corn or other chattels unless he pays cash for them at once or can delay payment with the agreement of the seller', see Holt, *Magna Carta*, p. 325

[194] *British Borough Charters, 1042-1216*, ed. by A. Ballard (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 86-89; Church, 'Royal Itinerary', p. 36.

[195] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, rev. trans. by D. Whitelock, D. C. Douglas and S. I. Tucker (London, 1961), pp. 116-9.

[196] There is one exception of Yarmouth in 1208 that simply follows the same format as the borough charter for King's Lynn, see *Borough Charters*, p. 88.

and abuse of the purveyance arrangements during his reign. The reason for this may lie in the wealth of the chamber during John's reign.

The cash used to pay for victuals purchased by household officials in the area around the household was provided by the king's chamber. Had it come from any other source we would be able to detect some trace of it in the surviving evidence. During King John's reign, the chamber enjoyed a period of bountiful wealth. Cash frequently bypassed the exchequer entirely and was placed directly in the chamber. John re-directed the profits of entire estates and placed the spoils of fines and justice in the chamber's coffers.[197] In short, John's chamber would have been sufficiently cash-rich to make daily purchases for the hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of people attached to the king's household. Given that John's chamber was cash-rich for much of his reign, there might have been little need to operate a system of credit for the household.

During John's reign, the only direct evidence for the use of credit can be seen in letters to Henry de Braybrooke, Matthew Mantel and Reginald of Cornhill to make purchases by tally at market. Instructions, such as these, were very rare. On the whole, the records do not record the means of payment that officials used in their purveyance work. The first of these letters was warranted by William de Cantilupe, the longest serving steward of John's household. The recipient, Reginald of Cornhill, sheriff of Kent, was the most frequent purchaser of goods in London for the household.[198] There can have been no two men more familiar with the processes of household purveyance, which makes it seem unlikely that this instruction would have been necessary had 'tally at market' been a routine way of purchasing victuals for the household. Essentially, the arrangement of using credit through tallies at markets must have been unusual, or William de Cantilupe would not have needed to instruct Reginald to use it. These writs were issued in December 1213 in the midst of John's vigorous money-saving measures designed to prepare his coffers for war with France. John was deferring payments wherever possible, to make cash more readily available during war preparations. Almost every aspect of King's John reign has inspired criticism, either by his contemporary or modern commentators, yet there is

---

[197] Jolliffe, 'Castle Treasuries', pp. 117-142; Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, pp. 226-55.
[198] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 157-157b.

very little to suggest that John's purveyors inspired the people with the same fear as described by Eadmer during the reign of Henry I.[199] We might, then, step tentatively onto hazardous ground and use lack of evidence as evidence, to suggest that John did not regularly employ a system of credit in his household purveyance. The chamber was rich and John used this money to pay for the daily victuals purchased by his household officials.

[199] *Eadmer*, ed. Rule, pp. 192-3.

<u>**Chapter 6: The Buttery: the Purveyance of Wine**</u>

Contemporary commentators vilified King John for a multitude of vices, yet even his severest critics reflected positively on his generosity towards his household. When, for example, Henry III made cutbacks to the expenses of his court in a bid to save money for his crusade, Matthew Paris criticised these actions in the context of John's generosity, claiming Henry had 'shamefully deviated from the footsteps of his father'.[1] This generosity certainly extended to dispensing wine to many people attached to his household. Our knowledge of the wine bought for John's household comes, for the most part, from instructions sent from the chancery. These instructions contain commissions to royal officials in the localities to purchase wine at seaports or transport wine to royal residences. These sources do not provide a complete picture of all wine procurement conducted for the household. There was a system of purveyance in place that functioned without the need for continuous intervention by letters and writs from the king's chancery. What the surviving chancery documentation reveals is additional instructions sent to local wine officials, evidence of extraordinary purveyance made in preparation for great feasts, and specific requests for wine to be sent to individuals and particular residences. These letters also provide evidence of the stocking of royal cellars to prepare for the household's arrival. Although this evidence does not specifically outline how routine purveyance was conducted, it reveals the names, function and hierarchy of officials in the main wine-purchasing centres. From this evidence the whole process of purchasing and supplying wine to the royal household can be surmised.

What the sources cannot reveal is the overall quantity of wine supplied to the royal household during the reign of King John. The wine which the records show was bought for the king's household is only a portion of an unknowable total. Another difficulty in determining the quantity of wine purchased and drunk in the royal household lies in the lack of a defined uniform measuring system. In the *Constitutio,* wine is described as being dispensed by the 'sextarium'. Either 'best' or 'ordinary' wine was dispensed to household officials, depending on their status, as part of a daily allowance given in return for their service.[2] Additional provisions of wine were

[1] *Chron. Maj.*, v, p. 114. For a discussion of the chroniclers' treatment of King John, see Warren, *King John,* pp. 3-17.
[2] For these translations, see *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 196-7, note 6.

also made when an officer dined away from the household. The steward, the master chamberlain, the master butler and the constables all received one *sextarium* of best wine and one *sextarium* of ordinary wine if they dined outside the household. This was reduced to only the ordinary wine if they were at court. Those officials of a slightly lower status, such as the master bread dispenser, received a full *sextarium* of ordinary wine when serving out of the household and half a *sextarium* when dining at court.[3] The *Constitutio* shows that twelve-and-a-half *sextarii* of ordinary wine were supplied to those eating in the household. When all officers dined outside the household this increased to seventeen-and-a-half *sextarii*.[4] The question which must be asked, however, is how much wine was in a *sextarium*? Church, the most recent editor of the *Constitutio,* suggested that the *sextarium* equated to the Anglo-Norman *sestier,* which was the equivalent to just over five pints.[5] Johnson, the previous editor of the *Constitutio,* saw the *sextarium* as probably meaning four gallons; six times the amount described by Church.[6] There exists no definite evidence for the twelfth century of the quantity of wine contained in a *sextarium.* As such, the evidence provided by the *Constitutio* does not greatly aid our understanding of how much wine was consumed by a royal household.

The ordinance of 1318 also lists the wine allowance for domestic officials in the household of Edward II.[7] In this ordinance wine was reserved for those of a higher status, being granted to all clerks, knights and noblemen serving at court. Ale was the staple drink of the household at large. It was provided by the gallon or half-gallon to all men of the household, including menial servants and low-status visitors at court.[8] The daily allowances of wine in 1318 were measured by *sexte* or *piche*. The steward and the treasurer each received a *sexte* of wine each day.[9] The chamberlain, the controller, the cofferer and the clerk of the privy seal each took half a *sexte* for their chamber.[10] Knights, such as the two knight marshals of the hall, received a *piche* of wine each. The clerks of the kitchen, marshalsea and pantry each

[3] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 200-1.
[4] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 196-211.
[5] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. 196, note 5.
[6] *Dialogus,* ed. Johnson, p. 129. Johnson acknowledges that the *sextarium* has been given many other values.
[7] Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 270-314.
[8] *Infra,* pp. 26-8.
[9] Tout, *Edward II,* p. 270.
[10] Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 271-3.

received half a *piche* of wine.[11] Other domestic officials, including the fruiterer, the poulterer and the saucerer, also received half a *piche* of wine.[12] Tout, who printed the 1318 ordinance, provided no indication of the value of these quantities. By the fourteenth century, however, there had been some attempts to standardise the measures of wine, establishing a sester (*sexte*) of wine as four gallons, with fifty-two sesters in a tun of wine.[13] It is likely a *piche* of wine was less than a *sexte* as this quantity was provided to those officials of the household of a lower status.

The measures used in the records for John's reign are, for the most part, the *dolium* or the *tonellus*, which are used as synonyms, as the same price is consistently paid for both quantities.[14] On only one occasion was wine bought for the royal household by the *sextarium*. In July 1207, a writ of *computate*, which contained the details of commodities purchased by Reginald of Cornhill for the king's household stated that eleven *sextarii* of French wine had been drawn from barrels and purchased at 2½*d* per gallon, and nine *sextarii* of red wine at 2*d* per gallon.[15] The total amount given in this writ includes the cost of transporting the wine, so it is not possible to calculate the number of gallons in a *sextarium* from this evidence. The confusion over the quantity of wine contained in these measures was familiar to contemporaries who also sought to resolve the issue. In 1196, King Richard proclaimed an assize stating that there should be a uniform measure for liquids, but there was a proviso that the measure was to be 'according to their nature', which appears to have rendered the assize inadequate for its purpose.[16] Towards the end of John's reign, the problem was still real, which is evidenced by clause thirty-five in Magna Carta which sought to standardise the measuring of wine and ale.[17] It seems unlikely that the *dolium* or the *tonellus* always contained a fixed amount wine. As such, it is only possible to use an estimate in this chapter. Studies of weights and measures have seen the ancient standard for a tun of wine as 252 gallons.[18] *Fleta*, however, tells us that there were four gallons in a sester and fifty-two sesters in a tun, which allows 208 gallons to the

[11] Tout, *Edward II*, pp. 283, 284, 290, 297.
[12] Tout, *Edward II*, pp. 276, 294, 296.
[13] *Fleta*, ii, p. 120.
[14] For an example of *tonellus* of prise wine being bought at twenty shillings, see Pipe *Roll 5 John*, p. 144. For a *dolium* of prise wine also being bought for twenty shillings, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 217b.
[15] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88b. Wine was probably not bought in this measurement as it was too small.
[16] *Rogeri de Hovedene*, iv, pp. 33-4.
[17] Holt, *Magna Carta*, pp. 460-1.
[18] Connor, *Weights and Measures*, pp. 170-1.

tun.[19] For the purposes of this chapter, *dolium* and *tonellus,* which have both been translated throughout as ‘cask’, are estimated to contain between 200 and 250 gallons. This estimate allows for the variability which appears to have faced contemporaries in their day-to-day lives.

The household ordinances from the twelfth and fourteenth centuries reveal that it was tradition for the king’s domestic entourage to receive wine as part of its daily allowance. They do not reveal the daily total amount of wine consumed by the entire household. Wine must also have been supplied to other members of court beyond the domestic officials, such as knights, clerks and visiting nobles and foreign dignitaries. As the size of the household waxed and waned so, too, did the quantity of wine consumed, especially when the royal court hosted important guests. For example, when William the Lion, king of Scots, visited the court of King Richard, a daily allowance of four sesters of the best wine and eight sesters of ordinary wine was provided to him and his entourage.[20] We cannot be precise concerning the quantities required by the royal household each day, week or even year. The amount needed must have varied. Only the degree of its enormity remained consistent. Each day the household would have consumed hundreds of gallons of wine.

The provenance of wine consumed in the royal household is not always stated in the record sources of the early thirteenth century. Many references to wine are simply generic. Despite the limitations of the evidence, it is still a valuable exercise to consider the source of the wines served at the king’s table and the wider royal household, insofar as they are revealed to us. Wine-producing royal estates were a feature of the viticulture of England in the early Middle Ages, which is evidenced by the presence of forty-two vineyards on the king’s demesne lands at the end of eleventh century, as recorded in Domesday Book.[21] The vineyards on the royal estates in Gloucestershire were praised in the early twelfth century by William of Malmesbury, who claimed its ‘wines do not make the drinker grimace at their bitter taste, indeed when it comes to sweetness, they are little inferior to those of Gaul’.[22] By the late twelfth century, however, much of the evidence of English royal

[19] *Fleta*, ii, p. 120.
[20] *Rogeri de Hoveden*, iii, p. 245.
[21] E. M. Carus-Wilson, ‘The Effects of the Acquisition and Loss of Gascony on the Wine Trade’, *Historical Research*, 21 (1947), 145-54 (p. 147).
[22] *William of Malmesbury Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 2007), p. 445.

vineyards is limited to references in pipe rolls of payments to master vintners and their workers, and for improvements to the vineyards. In 1205, for example, money was allowed against the Tewkesbury account for the repair of a grape presser.[23] Such records reveal the continued existence of some vineyards in England into the thirteenth century.

During John's reign, the only estates with recorded vines appear in the accounts for Huntingdon, Hereford, Tewkesbury and Windsor.[24] There is little appreciable evidence that the wine produced on these estates was consumed by the royal household. Once, in 1206, a payment was made for transporting wine from Tewkesbury to Woodstock; we cannot, however, be certain whether this wine had actually been produced on the king's manor at Tewkesbury.[25] Yet, wine produced in English vineyards appears to have been a valued commodity in the fourteenth century, when the vines at Windsor produced wine of such high quality that Edward III gave it as gifts to Alice Perrers and the queen in 1377.[26] It is possible that King John's household consumed wine produced on the royal demesne, but it is unlikely that the surviving records would reveal any evidence of this consumption. The reason for this gap in the evidence is because, as with ale, wine produced on the vineyards of the royal demesne was unlikely to have required monetary payment. We might, however, expect to find instructions to local officials to arrange the transportation of wine from royal vineyards to the king's residences, as this would have incurred costs. Yet, there is little indication of such instructions or payments, which strongly suggest that if English wine was drunk by the royal household it was in small quantities when the household visited the residence attached to the vineyard.

This conclusion is made more likely when seen in the context of the evidence for imported wines bought for the king's household. Wine bought for the royal household was imported in large quantities from the continent, largely through the

---

[23] *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 103.

[24] For Huntingdon, see *Pipe Roll 1 John,* p. 153; *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 163. For Hereford, see *Pipe Roll 1 John,* p. 214; *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 240; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 264; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 272; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 55; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 16; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 271. For Windsor, see *Pipe Roll 1 John,* p. 257; *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 186; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 197; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 3; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 45; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 57; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 76; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 226. For Tewkesbury, see *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 128; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 55; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 41; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 103; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 18; *Pipe Roll 9 John,* p. 219.

[25] *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 103.

[26] Brown, *King's Works,* ii, p. 881, note 4.

ports of Rouen, La Rochelle, and Bordeaux.[27] The *recta prisa regis* was a tax on imported wines which gave the king's officials the means to procure large quantities at less than market prices.[28] The earliest record of these regulations dates to *c*.1130 when the type of merchant ship determined the quantity of wine that the merchant could be compelled to part with at prise prices.[29] A ceol, a small flat-bottomed ship, was required to give up three casks of wine – two before the mast and one behind. All other ships, including the hulc, gave two casks – one before and one behind the mast. The changing size of the ceol and hulc eventually made these distinctions outdated and, in the late twelfth century, a new mode of assessment was introduced based on a ship's capacity. Essentially, the more a ship could carry, the greater the prise claimed by the king.[30]

The price the king paid for this prise was reflective of the provenance of the wine. An assize of 1199 stated that a cask of wine from Poitou should be sold for twenty shillings. For Angevin wine the price was twenty-four shillings, for French wine twenty-five shillings and for the unidentified 'best wine' two marks (26*s* 8*d*).[31] Gras, in his study of early English customs, saw Bristol as being the exception to this rule, where a standard cask of wine was sold for fifteen shillings. However, this rests on a single entry in 1210 in which Engelard de Cigogné purchased four casks of red wine for sixty shillings.[32] During John's reign, the cost of wine fluctuated enormously, as the prices laid out in the assize were not strictly adhered to.[33] Roger of Howden, who recounts the assize, stated that merchants could not bear the restrictions and that they

---

[27] For the English wine trade, see Carus-Wilson, 'Wine Trade', pp. 145-54; A. L. Simon, *A History of the Wine Trade in England,* (London, 1906); S. Rose, *The Wine Trade in Medieval Europe, 1000-1500* (London, 2011). M. K. James, *Studies in the Medieval Wine Trade* (Oxford, 1971).

[28] N. S. B. Gras, *The Early English Customs System: Documentary Study of the Institutional and Economic History of the Customs from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge Mass, 1918), p. 14.

[29] J. J. McCusker, 'The Wine Prise and Medieval Mercantile Shipping', *Speculum* (1966), 279-96 (p. 279). Prise before 1130 was conducted arbitrarily to relieve the crown's needs. See H. Hall, *A History of the Custom Revenue in England: From Earliest Times to the year 1827* (London, 1885), pp. 90-1.

[30] The rule was set that a ship carrying nine or less casks was required to provide no prise wine. Ships carrying ten to nineteen casks were required to sell one cask at prise price. Ships carrying twenty or more casks were required to sell two casks at prise price. For this description, see McCusker, 'Wine Prise and Mercantile Shipping', p. 280.

[31] *Rogeri de Hoveden,* iv, pp. 99-100. The price of a gallon of wine was set at 4*d* for Poitevin wine and 6*d* for white wine. These amounts were soon increased to 6*d* and 8*d*, respectively.

[32] Gras, *Early Customs,* p. 41.

[33] For the prices of wine, see P. Latimer, 'Early Thirteenth-Century Prices', in *King John,* ed. Church, pp. 41-73 (pp. 50-2, 67)

were immediately given leave to charge more.[34] Despite these difficulties, the purveyors of wine for the king's household were able to take advantage of low prices permitted by *recta prisa regis*. In 1205, for example, forty-two pounds were allowed against the Southampton account for forty-two casks of wine; the following year, forty-four casks were purchased for forty-four pounds.[35] In August 1204, the treasurer was instructed to give Ralph Molendarius, a keeper of the king's wine at Southampton, twenty shillings per cask for twenty-two casks of Gascon wine.[36] Wine from Gascony was not mentioned in the assize, but John's purveyors were able to purchase it at the lowest rate for prise. The rate given for the best prise wine (two marks) was used consistently for the wines of Auxerre, in Burgundy. In 1210, the men of Southampton were allowed against their account at the exchequer £40 1*m* for prise wine, from which they had purchased thirty-eight standard casks at a pound per cask, and for two casks from Auxerre each costing two marks.[37] The different prices used for prise wine can also be seen in June 1215, when the king instructed the barons of the exchequer to account to the reeves of Southampton for forty-eight casks of wine. For each cask of wine from Gascony or Anjou, the reeves had paid twenty shillings, but for wine from Auxerre they had paid the higher price of two marks.[38]

The financial benefits of the king's right to prise are clearly appreciable, especially when seen in comparison to market rates. In 1211, for example, twenty-one casks of prise wine from Auxerre were bought at the standard cost of two marks. A further thirty-nine casks were also bought for 193 marks, costing almost five marks per cask. In the same entry, Gascon wine sold for 27*s* ½*d* for each cask, significantly more than the twenty shillings paid for prise Gascon wine.[39] The king's right of prise enabled his purveyors to requisition large quantities of wine at two-thirds or even half of the market value of the wine.

The assize of 1199 and the evidence concerning the price of imported wine provide some impression of the provenance of wines consumed in John's household. Where

[34] *Rogeri de Hoveden*, iv, pp. 99-100.
[35] *Pipe Roll 7 John*, p. 131; *Pipe Roll 8 John*, p. 156.
[36] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 5b.
[37] *Pipe Roll 12 John*, p. 193.
[38] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 217b. For other examples of prise wine from Auxerre, see *Pipe Roll 14 John*, pp. 45, 98.
[39] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 110.

the evidence is explicit, we find that Gascon wine was being purchased in great quantities. In August 1204, for example, Ralph Molendarius acquired fifty-nine casks of wine from Gascon merchants at Southampton.[40] In 1211, John fitz Hugh made an enormous purchase of over three hundred casks of Gascon wine.[41] The following year, in May 1212, the treasurer was instructed to release one hundred and fifty marks to Gerald of Bordeaux for fifty casks of wine.[42] Two months later, a further £144 was given to another merchant, Nicholas, for eighty casks of Gascon wine.[43] In that same year, John fitz Hugh purchased a further 267 casks of wine from Gascony.[44] In April 1215, 220 casks of Gascon wine were purchased from four merchants at Bristol.[45] The importance of wine from Gascony for John's household is also evidenced by the fact that John was actively cultivating the wine trade with Gascony early in his reign. John, for example, granted lands in Bordeaux with the intention that they should be converted into vineyards.[46] John also encouraged his justiciar, Geoffrey Fitz Peter, to pay the merchants of Gascony quickly and sufficiently, so that they should be pleased and bring their wines freely, 'for if not we may suffer a shortage of wine because of them'.[47] By the end of John's reign, his preference for wines from Gascony is reflected in the enormous debt left outstanding to merchants of that province upon his death.[48]

An account of the transactions of Ralph Molendarius, from 1202, reveals wines from Anjou and Poitou were also being received at Winchester and Southampton. For example, one hundred and five casks of wine are recorded as coming from Poitou and being received at Southampton.[49] Letters sent to wine custodians by the king or one of his ministers with instructions to send gifts of wine to individuals also reveal the provenance of wine in the king's cellars. In May 1207, for example, Daniel the king's butler was instructed to give two casks of Angevin wine to William Brewer, which the king had granted to him as a gift.[50] Letters to the bailiffs of Southampton

---

[40] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 5b.
[41] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 110.
[42] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 133b.
[43] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 119.
[44] *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 45.
[45] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 193b.
[46] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 63.
[47] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 60. Quoted in R. Mortimer, *Angevin England, 1154-1258* (Oxford, 1994), p. 192.
[48] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 481.
[49] *Pipe Roll 4 John*, pp. 82.
[50] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 84.

reveal that they were also called upon to procure wine from these regions for the queen; the bailiffs were instructed to find the 'best' Angevin wine and 'strong' Poitevin wine for her use at Marlborough.[51] Wine from Le Blanc, in the Indre département near Poitiers,[52] was also imported to England. Evidence of Ralph Molendarius' account suggests that wine from Le Blanc was consumed in the royal household, as one hundred and fifty casks were received at Southampton before Michaelmas 1202.[53] Later in the reign, wine from Le Blanc was still being stored in the king's cellars at Southampton, as the wine custodians were ordered to send two casks of wine from Le Blanc to Hugh de Neville and John fitz Hugh.[54]

Wines from other regions in France were also imported into England and purchased for use in the king's household. From our limited evidence regarding the provenance of wines, those described generically as 'French' were purchased in relatively large quantities. At Michaelmas 1207, for example, Reginald of Cornhill requisitioned thirty-six casks and eleven sesters of French wine for the royal household.[55] At Michaelmas 1211, John fitz Hugh, purchased one hundred and fifty-five casks of French wine. The following year, the same purveyor bought fifty-four casks of French wine.[56] Individual casks of wine were also purchased by local officials during a royal visit. For example, one cask of wine from Orléans was purchased by Roland Bloet, constable of Knepp Castle, for the royal household's visit to Knepp on 23 January 1215.[57]

The wine-growing regions, inland from the coast across southern France, which were accessible from the port of Bordeaux by the waterways of the Garonne that lead to the Gironde estuary, also reached King John's wine cellars. In 1204, for example, Hugh de Neville was instructed to send strong carriages to Southampton for transporting wine which had come from Albi (département Tarn) to Freemantle, Ludgershall and Marlborough.[58] In 1214, the custodians of the king's wines at Southampton were instructed to send one cask of wine from Gaillac (département

[51] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 7.
[52] '*vin de Blanc*'. For the translation, see *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List: From British and Irish Sources,* ed. by R. E. Latham (London, 1980), p. 513.
[53] *Pipe Roll 4 John*, p. 82.
[54] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 220.
[55] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88b.
[56] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 110; *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 45.
[57] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 185. For other examples, see *ibid.*, pp. 2, 64b, 128b, 151, 220b.
[58] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 41b.

Tarn) to the Earl of Chester.[59] In February 1206, a writ of *computate* was issued for the money Reginald of Cornhill had spent on wines from Moissac (départment Tarn) which he sent to Guildford and Oxford.[60] The following year, in 1207, Reginald of Cornhill paid for thirty-six casks of wine from Moissac and ten casks from La Réole (départment Gironde), ready for Easter that year.[61] In December 1213, Reginald purchased wine from the vineyards of Gaillac for the king's Christmas feast.[62]

This evidence concerning wines from the vineyards of southern France in the regions of Gascony and Toulouse suggests that they had a degree of exclusivity. They were less likely to be purchased at Southampton or Bristol; instead, they were bought by the household's purveyors of luxury imported items – Reginald of Cornhill and John fitz Hugh. On occasions, when the quality of wine was of particular concern, John also turned to men beyond Southampton and Bristol. In April 1206, for example, John commissioned Reginald of Cornhill to buy ten casks of 'strong' red wine, John's concern for the quality of this wine is reflected in his instructions to Reginald that if no good wine was in his stores he should seek it out.[63] Moreover, early in 1208, the king instructed William of Cornhill to purchase twenty casks of 'good and durable' red wine for the stores at Nottingham and Tickhill.[64]

Unusual wines often took unusual routes into England. In November 1214, for example, a merchant of La Réole entered England at Sandwich, there selling ten casks of wine for use in the royal household; only then did this merchant travel on to the usual wine port at Southampton, where the royal butler purchased a further ten casks of wine for the king.[65] In January 1214, a ship landed at the port of Orwell in Suffolk with wine from Gaillac. The bailiffs of the port were commissioned to send a ship to Nicholas fitz Robert in Dunwich to take this wine from Gaillac to Portsmouth, where supplies were being mustered for the impending campaign to the continent.[66] Merchants selling wines from Gascony and Toulouse also used the great fair at St. Botolph's, in Lincolnshire, to sell their wares. In July 1207, for example,

[59] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 163.
[60] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 64b.
[61] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88b.
[62] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 157.
[63] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 52.
[64] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 104b.
[65] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 179, 180. Sandwich was a cinque port regularly used as a point of entry, but not for settled trade, see *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. xliv.
[66] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 160b.

John fitz Jordan purchased at this fair four casks of wine from Moissac, which he was instructed by William Brewer to send on to Brian de Lisle who was to distribute it to the royal manors at Clipstone, Scrooby and Laxton.[67] In November 1212, the treasurer was instructed to pay a merchant, Peter Mantusel, for thirty casks of wine from the Île d'Oléron. This method of payment suggests these wines had not being purchased through the usual routes of purveyance at Southampton and Bristol.[68]

Wine that came from the wine-producing region of Burgundy around Auxerre appears to have been of special importance to King John and his household. Wine from Auxerre could be transported up the Yonne river to a junction with the Seine then onto Rouen for shipment to England.[69] A poem written around 1224, by Henri d'Andeli, describes a battle between wines for the prize of being chosen the favourite of the King of France. Wine from Auxerre was described in this poem as having a strong reputation 'without any trace of bitterness and as clear as a sinner's tears'.[70] Wine from Auxerre was also praised by a travel writer of the mid-thirteenth century, who described it as 'white or sometimes golden, with both body and aroma, and a full and exquisite taste which rejoiced the heart of man'.[71] King John's appreciation of the quality of the wine from Auxerre is evident in the sources. Wine from Auxerre was often characterised as 'good' or 'best', it was also consistently the most expensive wine purchased during John's reign. It was generally bought in smaller quantities than wines from Anjou, Poitou or Gascony, signifying its exclusivity.[72] In June 1215, for example, the reeves of Southampton purchased forty-eight casks of Gascon and Angevin wine along with just one cask of wine from Auxerre.[73] Earlier in the reign, in 1205, Reginald of Cornhill was instructed to send twenty casks of wine to Oxford, of which one was to be a 'good' cask from Auxerre. A further ten casks of wine were to be sent to Nottingham and, once again, only one was expected to come from Auxerre.[74] On another occasion, Reginald of Cornhill was instructed to pay 'any money' for the best casks of wine from Auxerre he could procure.[75]

[67] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 88b, 89.
[68] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 126.
[69] Rose, *Wine Trade*, p. 91.
[70] Rose, *Wine Trade*, p. 15.
[71] Rose, *Wine Trade*, p. 91.
[72] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 2, 129.
[73] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 217b.
[74] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 21. 52.
[75] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 129.

Wine from Auxerre was purchased in small quantities at Southampton, but like other rarer wines, wine from Auxerre was also often procured by the household purveyors, who specialised in luxury commodities, a further indication of the wine's exclusive status.[76]

An anecdote told by the anonymous author of the *Chronique des rois de France* describes King John's visit to Fontainebleau in 1201, when Philip Augustus put his wine cellars at the disposal of John's entourage. After John had departed, Philip and his people were said to have laughed when they saw that John and his court had drunk all the bad wines and left all the good.[77] In the light of the evidence concerning wines consumed by John's household, it seems surprising that John's taste in wine should have laughable to the French courtiers; the evidence of the records shows this jibe to have been a scurrilous one. Wine served in John's household came from vineyards across all France.[78] The varying quantities, costs, and the methods used to purchase wines act as indication of the differences in the quality and availability of wines. Once wine reached the household we know, from the evidence of the *Constitutio,* that it was divided between 'best' and 'ordinary' wine. We may infer from the evidence concerning the provenance of wines bought for John's household that 'best' during that reign may have included wines from Auxerre in Burgundy; Moissac and Gaillac in Toulouse; La Réole in Gascony; Albi and the Île d'Oléron. The ordinary wine may have been that bought in much larger quantities from Anjou and Poitou and other areas in Gascony.

Although the exclusive, rarer wines could be purchased by various officials in London and at special fairs, the vast majority of wine purveyance for the royal household was conducted through two principal purchasing centres – Bristol and Southampton. These two trading centres formed the cornerstones of English wine administration, and it was through their constables, reeves, sheriffs and other specifically employed officials that the vast majority of the king's wine was acquired. In Jolliffe's *Angevin Kingship,* he cited the buttery as an example of how

[76] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 21, 25, 52, 88b, 128b, 185, 220b; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 110; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 45.

[77] *Chronique des Rois de France,* ed. by L. Delisle, in *Recueils des Historiens de Gaulle et de la France,* ed. by M. Bouquet, 24 vols (Paris, 1864-1904), xxiv (1904), p. 760.

[78] For wines of different origins, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 64b. For Rhenish wine, see *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 45. For wine which is described as 'our furthest acquired wine' from *Andinton,* see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 57b.

offices of the royal household employed a network of officials in the localities to fulfil the needs of the large, itinerant body of men who travelled with the king. Jolliffe recognised that it was men who were not permanently employed in the royal household who conducted most wine purveyance.[79] Jolliffe briefly discussed the function of officials at Southampton and Bristol in the purchasing of wine. But, much more can be discerned regarding the system of wine purveyance.

Three key services were undertaken by the officials of these towns: the purchasing, the storage and the transportation of wine to royal residences around the country. Each part of this operation required direction and control. In Southampton, for most of the John's reign, these three tasks were directed by Daniel the king's butler. Daniel first appears in the record evidence in October 1203, when Geoffrey fitz Peter was ordered to release to Daniel (styled Daniel Pincerna) the land of Guérin de Glapion at Seaford in Sussex.[80] Guérin de Glapion, who had previously been the seneschal of Normandy from 1200 to 1201, transferred his allegiance to Philip Augustus in 1203. Guérin's fees in Seaford were part of a body of lands which escheated to King John, and in the months of October and November they were dispensed to royal officials and servants.[81] Daniel was a beneficiary of Guérin's defection. We can discover nothing of Daniel's background, his wealth, family, or position in the king's household before October 1203. This date may have marked the start of his tenure as butler, as it was at this time that he was provided with a number of other land grants, which appear to have been intended to sustain him in royal service.[82] Sometime before May 1204, Daniel had received lands in South Yorkshire, including ten bovates in Goldthorpe, four-and-a-half bovates in Swinton and four bovates in Billingley.[83] These lands and a mill at Wormhill were confirmed to Daniel and his heirs by charter in December 1204. The charter stipulates that

---

[79] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 195-221.
[80] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 67. Daniel held land in Seaford until at least 1212, see *Book of Fees*, p. 72. In 1220, however, the land is recorded as previously held of Guérin de Glapion with no mention of Daniel, see *CFR 1219-20,* no. 96. Seaford does not pass to Daniel's son William, see *CFR 1223-4,* no. 77; *CFR 1226-7,* no. 105; *CFR 1234-5,* no. 440; *Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1216-25*, (London, 1901), p. 353.
[81] Power, 'Guérin de Glapion' pp. 153-92.
[82] Daniel is first styled 'pincerna noster' in May 1204, see *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 104. However it seems likely he was in this position at least a year previously
[83] *Rot. Lib, John.,* pp. 103-4. Although, it seems Daniel had some difficulty gaining full seisin of these lands, as the king issued a letter close to the sheriff of York in March 1205 instructing him to give seisin to Daniel, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 22. Trouble continued in 1207, when another letter close was sent to the sheriff of York to order him not to dispel Daniel or his men from these lands, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 84.

Daniel was to hold these lands in return for one pair of wine containers, large enough for a sester of wine, annually. This unusual type of service is a clear indication of Daniel's specific connection to butler service.[84]

Daniel retained his position as the butler in charge of wine purveyance at Southampton until in April 1215, when he was still being described as 'our faithful Daniel the butler'. From this date, there is no further record of his activities. Daniel's lands in South Yorkshire had escheated to the king by 1219. His lands in Seaford also returned to royal control.[85] Daniel's son, William, fined for his father's mill at Wormhill in 1224, then again in 1227 along with his lands in South Yorkshire.[86] There appears to have been some dispute over William's legitimacy, which initially barred his path to his inheritance.[87] It is not clear if Daniel died *c.*1215 and his lands escheated to the crown, due to some doubt surrounding his son's birth, or whether Daniel defected to the rebel cause in 1215, causing his land to escheat to the crown.[88] Whatever the answer, Daniel's long career as the king's butler came to an end in 1215, and as a result a new butler, Colin de Routot, was appointed. In October 1215, Colin was described as 'our beloved and faithful serjeant', when he was granted the lands of Eustace de Burne in Lancashire.[89] This grant of lands may mark the start of his tenure as butler, in much the same way as lands given over to Daniel in 1203 to 1204 appear to signify the beginnings of his buttery service. It is not until April 1216, however, that Colin was described as a butler. A letter of August 1216 confirms he was the king's butler.[90] Given the brevity of Colin's tenure as butler, and the somewhat limited nature of the surviving record sources during the civil war period, little can be discerned about Colin's functions and responsibilities at this time.

Daniel's base of operations was at Southampton from where he directed royal wine purveyance. His warrant seldom appears on letters or writs produced in the royal

---

[84] *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 140-140b.
[85] *CFR 1219-20,* no. 96; *Book of Fees,* p. 249.
[86] *CFR 1223-4,* no. 77; *CFR 1226-7,* no. 105.
[87] *Book of Fees,* p. 35. Daniel's brother, Walter, may have inherited part of Daniel's lands in Swinton. Walter later quitclaim his lands in Swinton to Daniel's son, William, see *A Monastic Community in Local Society: The Beauchief Abbey Cartulary,* ed. by D. Hey, L. Liddy and D. Luscombe (London, 2011), no. 104.
[88] Daniel does not appear in the list of *reversi.*
[89] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 230.
[90] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 283; *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 178.

chancery, as he rarely travelled with the itinerant court. Daniel's warrant is attached to just five letters close during his tenure as butler, four of which were writs of *computate* concerning the purchase or transport of wine.[91] The *Constitutio* reveals that there was an expectation that the master butler of the household would serve out of court.[92] It seems that by John's reign, Daniel was performing his service almost entirely *extra curiam.* Daniel may have gained his authority for action from the household title bestowed upon him by the king, but it seems unlikely that he performed specific domestic duties actually within the household. The title of the king's butler was a stamp of royal authority for a man who, for the most part, was a local official. The vast majority of wine procurement was conducted by men who, like Daniel, did not travel with the itinerant court; it was a task for local reeves, bailiffs, sheriffs and specifically appointed men with knowledge of purchasing wine.

Daniel, and presumably afterwards Colin, had charge of an extensive system of wine purveyance. A significant degree of trust would have been held in these officials and the king must have relied on their knowledge and expertise regarding wine. That Daniel was a trusted royal servant with specialist knowledge of wine is evidenced by the events of November 1205, when he was sent from his usual base in Southampton to Bristol. The letter to the constable of Bristol, Robert of Ropsley, tells us that Daniel was sent there so that he could pick out twenty of the best casks of wine in the city.[93] That there was no one in Bristol at this time who could be trusted to pick out these wines demonstrates the expertise of the king's butler. Usually, it was the constable of Bristol castle who assumed overall authority for wine purveyance in that town. The constables of Bristol during John's reign were William Marshal (1198-1200, 1203-1204), John la Warre (1200), Robert of Berkeley (1200-1203), Robert of Ropsley (1204 to 1208), Gerard d'Athée (1208 to 1209), Engelard de Cigogné (1209-1212), Peter de Chanceaux (1212-1215) and Philip d'Albini (1215-1216).[94] Many of these men are known to have held trusted positions within the king's

---

[91] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 55b, 60b, 93b, 100b, 138b. The only letter which was not a writ of *computate* contained instructions to Alex of Wareham, concerning the storing and transporting of wine. This letter was issued from Freemantle, just outside Southampton. It was warranted by Daniel and attested by the king. It seems likely that Daniel had briefly joined the court as it passed near to Southampton.

[92] *Dialogus and Constitutio,* pp. 204-5.

[93] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 58-58b.

[94] *Accounts of the Constables of Bristol Castle: In the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries,* ed. by M. Sharp, Bristol Record Society, 34 (1982), p. 79. John la Warre continued to work in Bristol with responsibilities in wine purveyance.

familia. Robert of Ropsley was a household knight; Gerard, Engelard and Peter were all men of Touraine, whose closeness to King John is evidenced by the criticisms heaped upon them in clause fifty of Magna Carta.[95] The constable was expected to have a general picture of the quantity of wine available at Bristol. In August 1212, when the king wanted to know the total amount of wine at Bristol, it was to the constable that he turned for this information.[96] There is no other evidence that Daniel was sent to Bristol to oversee the purchase or choosing of wine, which suggests that, for the most part, this was entrusted to the constable.

Daniel and each constable of Bristol who served during the reign must have had the necessary administrative abilities to co-ordinate the complex system of wine purveyance. At Southampton, Daniel had overall authority over the purchasing of wine and its transportation to royal residences. Daniel provided instructions to the town's bailiffs and reeves to carry out orders relating to supplying wine for the king's household. Most of these orders must have been given in person or through local messengers and, as such, no record of them has survived. We can infer that this hierarchy between the officials in Southampton and Daniel existed, however, as occasionally the system did not work perfectly and their relationship is drawn into the light by the chancery sources. In a number of instances, the orders given to local officials by Daniel had to be re-enforced by the steward, Peter of Stokes, or by the king. In July 1205, for example, Peter of Stokes issued a letter to the bailiffs of Southampton to find strong carts for carrying wine 'just as Daniel our butler said to you'.[97] Later that same year, Peter issued a letter to the sheriff of Southampton for the same reason, to find carts for forty casks of wine, an order which Daniel had already given.[98] Similarly, in November 1205, Daniel had instructed William of Cornhill to pay for wine, but William did not make this payment, so Peter of Stokes sent a letter to ensure Daniel's order was carried out.[99] Later in the reign, King John intervened to ensure that Daniel's orders were executed. In April 1215, Daniel had ordered the reeves of Southampton to find carriages for taking wine to Winchester, Clarendon and Corfe. A letter from the king, however, was required to ensure that

[95] Holt, *Magna Carta,* pp. 464-5; N. Vincent, 'Who's Who in Magna Carta Clause 50', in *Le Médiéviste et la Monographie Familiale: Sources, Méthodes et Problématiques*, ed. by M. Aurell (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 235-64.
[96] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 121.
[97] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 41.
[98] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 55b.
[99] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 57.

this order was implemented.[100] These examples demonstrate that Daniel was frequently dispensing orders to the local officials in Southampton and that he had control over all wine purveyance in that city, even if on occasion he required the support of the king or the steward to ensure his orders were carried out.

These examples also have a secondary purpose. They demonstrate that all Daniel's authority for action stemmed from the household, specifically from the king or his steward who were the driving force behind the system of wine purveyance. Purveyance of wine was, for the most part, the business of local officials. The ordering of wine, however, was the business of the household. In the early years of the reign (1201 to 1206), it was the steward, Peter of Stokes, who ordered wines to be purchased and transported to specific royal residences to ensure the household was adequately stocked during its perambulations. Peter, for example, issued numerous orders to the constable of Bristol castle, Robert of Ropsley.[101] In November 1205, Peter ordered Robert to send wine to Melkesham, Tewkesbury and Witham Charterhouse, with a proviso that if there was not enough wine in the stores at Bristol, then Robert was to buy more.[102] Peter of Stokes also warranted writs of *computate* sent to the exchequer, instructing the barons to account to Robert of Ropsley for money he had spent on transporting wine out of Bristol. In February 1205, for example, the barons were to account for 41*s* 6*d* that Robert had spent on sending wine to St. Briavels and Winterborne.[103]

After the death of Peter of Stokes in 1206, the ordering of wine was conducted by the king. King John directly provided the orders to his officials in the main wine purchasing centres. This task was no longer delegated to his steward or another household official. The king's involvement can especially be seen during Peter de Chanceaux's constableship, from 1212 to 1215.[104] At this time, every letter close sent to the constable concerning the purchasing or distribution of wine from Bristol was attested by the king. King John sent orders to Peter de Chanceaux to deliver wine to other royal officials, such as, in June 1213, when Peter was instructed to

[100] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 196.
[101] The records are at their fullest after 1204, for this reason it is the working relationship between Peter of Stokes and Robert of Ropsley which is most clearly discernible in the record sources.
[102] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 57b.
[103] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 20b.
[104] The king's involvement can be seen most clearly after 1212, following the lacuna in the chancery rolls from 1208 to 1212.

provide John fitz Hugh with twenty casks of wine.[105] The king was also involved in returning poor quality wine. When Philip the clerk at Bristol purchased fifty-five casks of bad wine, John issued a letter to Peter de Chanceaux to tell him to return the wine to Philip.[106] Even in the midst of political unrest the king continued to be involved in the work of his buttery. On 13 May 1215, John ordered Peter de Chanceaux to send wine to the royal castles at Marlborough and Devizes. The household was at Marlborough from 12 to 17 May and, so, John was ensuring there was enough wine for his household's visit.[107] King John was involved in the intricacies of these provincial offices of wine purveyance to an extraordinary degree, which is symptomatic of his depth of interest in every facet of his government. King John played a significant part not just in the greater mechanics of Angevin government but he concerned himself with the minutiae of the domestic sphere of his household.

All orders given for wine to be bought emanated from the household to the local officials at the ports of Southampton and Bristol, specifically to Daniel the butler and the constables of Bristol castle. In this capacity, Daniel naturally purchased large quantities of wine for the king's household. The sources rarely provide details concerning Daniel's purchases. Instead what we can see is money allowed against the farm of Southampton for wine purchased by Daniel 'for the king's use'.[108] A few surviving writs of *liberate* help to expand this sparse evidence. In July 1212, the treasurer was instructed to release to Nicholas de Castile and his servants £144 for eighty casks of Gascon wine bought by Daniel and Philip of Oldcotes for the king's use. A further twenty-four pounds was to be paid to William Ruffus for twenty casks of wine, bought by the same men. A couple of months earlier, in May 1212, the treasurer was instructed to pay Gerald of Bordeaux one hundred pounds for fifty casks of wine bought for the king's use, which had been delivered to Daniel.[109] The appearance of Philip of Oldcoates in these transactions highlights the fluidity of the personnel who were able to assist with the purveyance of wine. Many trusted officials were used in the great task of procuring wine for the household, in addition

---

[105] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 135.
[106] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 149b, 150.
[107] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 199b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 727.
[108] *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 156; *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 193.
[109] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 119, 133b.

to the men employed specifically as wine officials.[110] One man who appears to have been attached to Southampton on a relatively permanent basis was Ralph Molendarius. Ralph's responsibilities included making purchases from merchants. In August 1204, for example, the treasurer was instructed to pay the merchants of Gascony £83 13*s* 4*d* for forty-nine casks of wine, which had been purchased by Ralph Molendarius.[111] Ralph also travelled further afield. In 1200, he received £12 19*s* 8*d* for buying twenty casks of Angevin wine and five casks of wine from Auxerre from the market at St. Botolph's, in Lincolnshire.[112]

Working under the command of Daniel at Southampton was a multitude of officials who made purchases of wine at that port, based on the orders given by the king or Peter of Stokes. The reeves and bailiffs of the town were especially valuable to the operation at Southampton as they purchased wine and provided carts for its transportation; the costs they incurred were balanced by writs of *computate*.[113] King John witnessed such a writ in June 1215, which instructed the barons of the exchequer to account to the reeves of Southampton for forty-eight casks of wine from Gascony and Anjou and one cask of wine from Auxerre.[114] The king also sent direct orders to the reeves or bailiffs to purchase wine which was required immediately.[115] The king also ordered the reeves of the city to send wine to royal residences, such as four casks of wine from Gascony and Poitou, which were sent to Clarendon ready for the household's visit there on 10 August 1215.[116] Daniel oversaw the arrangements of wine purveyance at Southampton, but it was on the orders of the king or his steward that purchases were made for the household.

Much of the evidence concerning purchasing of wine at Southampton is derived from writs of *liberate* or *computate,* but this does not give us is a full picture of all the wine bought at Southampton. Evidence of the cash spent on wine can provide some further indication of the total quantity that was bought. The farm of the men of

---

[110] This use of royal officials is particularly apparent in the areas of the country not supplied by Bristol and Southampton, see *infra,* pp. 185-6.
[111] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 5b.
[112] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 89. For other examples, see *Pipe Roll 6 John,* pp. 176, 219.
[113] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 84, 100b, 163.
[114] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 217b.
[115] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 7. For other orders to the bailiffs of Southampton, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 45, 55, 61, 78, 86b, 121, 150b.
[116] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 225. For other orders to the reeves of Southampton, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 46, 55, 98b, 99b, 187b, 196, 199b, 242b, 248b, 263b, 266.

Southampton and the county farm of Hampshire were both frequently used as a ready means of cash for the king's wine. In 1209, for example, £150 19*d* was allowed against the farm of Southampton and, in 1214, £74 15*s* 8*d* was allowed from the same account.[117] Officials in Southampton also received cash from alternative revenues to pay for wine. In October 1204, for example, the keepers of the profits of the fifteenth tax, paid two hundred pounds to the clerk of the sheriff of Southampton.[118] On 24 June 1205, Nicholas de Quevilly proffered one hundred and sixty pounds and one cask of wine from Auxerre to hold the farm of the Winchester exchange for one year.[119] This money was initially entrusted to the sheriff of Southampton. A few months later, however, it was given to Daniel the butler 'for buying our wine'; the extra one cask of wine was given to the king's chamber.[120] The port of Southampton had a steady supply of cash pouring into its coffers which enabled the officials in that city to purchase and provide transport for the large quantities of wine required for the household.

Significant sums of cash were also paid to the wine officials at Bristol. Most notably, in April 1205, William of Cornhill paid a huge sum of 596 marks to the keepers of the king's wine at Bristol.[121] The town farm was also a frequent source of revenue for the purchasing of wine. In March 1205, for example, Robert of Ropsley paid out of his farm sixty-five pounds to merchants whose wine had been bought for the king's use.[122] Money was also sent to Bristol directly from the treasury. In July 1213, a writ of *liberate* was sent to the treasurer to pay Philip the clerk of Bristol for fifty-five casks of wine which he had purchased for the king.[123] In both Bristol and Southampton, there were many local officials who made purchases of wine for the household. The money to pay for these came from various sources. There appears

117 *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 172; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 126. For other examples, see *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 79; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 131; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 156; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 183; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 98.

118 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 10. For other sources of revenue used to pay for wine, see Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 199.

119 Winchester was also an important centre for the wine trade, the significant revenues received from the port for the fifteenth tax on the property of merchants was largely as a result of wine, see *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. xliv.

120 *Rot. Fin.,* p. 303; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 50b, 84. For other examples, see *Rot. Fin.,* pp. 317, 367; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* pp. xxx-xxxi, 12, 129-30; J. D. Brand, *The English Coinage 1180-1247: Money, Mints and Exchange* (London, 1994), p. 56. For the De Kivilly's, see *infra,* p. 187.

121 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 26b.

122 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 24.

123 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 145. This was later cancelled as the king sent the wine back due to its poor quality, see *ibid.,* pp. 149b, 150.

not to have been a fixed source of income allocated for the king's wine, King John directed fines, taxes and cash from county farms into the hands of Daniel in Southampton or the constable in Bristol to cover the costs of the great system of wine purveyance.[124]

After wine had been purchased, it needed to be stored until it was ready to be delivered to the appropriate place for the household's consumption. There were a number of officials serving in Southampton whose role it was to keep and safely store the king's wine. These included William Anglicus, Robert Hardwin and Benedict. Robert Hardwin was holding office in Southampton as early as 1200, for which he had fined in a hundred marks.[125] Jolliffe suggested that William Anglicus was a servant of the chamberlain of the treasury.[126] It seems likely he had some involvement paying in money at the treasury, as, in 1203, he paid in £6 4*d* from the profits of the king's wine, which had been sold by Ralph Molendarius.[127] Yet, it is only in the years 1205 to 1206 that all three of these men can be firmly identified as keepers of the king's wine.[128] In 1205, these keepers were instructed by the king's steward, Peter of Stokes, to send wine to individuals, such as Geoffrey fitz Peter and Thomas of Sandford. The wine sent to Geoffrey was to be 'our furthest acquired wine' and that sent to Thomas was from Le Blanc, both types were relatively unusual, which suggests that these were probably gifts from the king.[129] William Anglicus and Robert Hardwin also seemed to have provided law-worthy testimony for the money spent by other officials on the purchase or transportation of wine, such as, in October 1205, when wine was kept and transported by the reeves of Southampton 'by the view and testimony' of these 'law-worthy men'.[130]

After 1206, there are no other specific mentions of these keepers, with letters and writs being addressed generically to the 'custodians of the king's wine at Southampton'.[131] The instructions given to these custodians include sending wine to individuals; such as a gift of one cask of wine sent to William de Cantilupe in

---

[124] For King John's general practice of directing money so that it was not received at the exchequer, see Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* pp. 247-52; Vincent, *Peter des Roches,* pp. 58-61.
[125] *Rot. Fin.,* p. 109; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 114.
[126] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p.199.
[127] *Pipe Roll 5 John,* p. 139.
[128] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 44.
[129] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 44, 57b. For another example, see *ibid.,* p. 69.
[130] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 55. For another example, see *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 156.
[131] For examples, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* pp. 199b, 218, 220.

January 1215, and another to John fitz Hugh for the king's use.[132] Other letters sent to the custodians instructed them to release wine to the reeves of Southampton. The reeves then ensured that this wine was delivered to various royal residences.[133] The custodians must have had responsibility for safely storing the king's wine and keeping record of the amount of wine entering and leaving the royal cellars. In this capacity, the custodians worked directly for Daniel the butler, who had responsibility for paying the wages of officials who kept the king's wine at Southampton.[134] The letters addressed to Daniel and the custodians, also demonstrates the close proximity in which these men worked.[135]

At Bristol, the keepers of the king's wine were under the command of John la Warre, who had three assistants: Roger the cordwainer, Walter the vintner and Jordan Ruffus.[136] Like the keepers in Southampton, these men were instructed to release wine to be sent to individuals. In May 1205, John la Warre was told to give Henry Biset one cask of wine, which the king had promised to his wife. The next month, John la Warre was told to send two casks of wine to the king's brother, the earl of Salisbury.[137] The custodians at Bristol also sent bulk loads of wine to local officials so that it could be distributed to other royal residences.[138] After 1207, there are no men called the custodians of the king's wine at Bristol. Roger the cordwainer eventually becomes the mayor of Bristol, but the other officials disappear from the records. The role of these men must have been brought under the direct authority of the constable of Bristol after 1207. After this time, the constable took overall responsibility for knowing how much wine was at Bristol, received the orders to send wine to individuals as gifts, and sent large quantities of wine to royal residences.[139] From 1206 to 1207, at both Bristol and Southampton there appears to have been a decision to bring the role of the keepers more directly under the control of the butler and the constable. From this time, letters close warranted by the king were addressed directly to the senior men at each port. This shift towards a more streamlined system coincides with many other changes occurring in these years, as

[132] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 118, 185b.
[133] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 119b.
[134] *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 230.
[135] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 45b, 117b.
[136] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 70b.
[137] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 31, 38, 49. For another example, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 51b.
[138] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 23b, 49, 49b.
[139] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 92b, 121, 195.

the domestic arrangements of the household came to be more directly under the king's direct control. Seemingly, as a result, the system shed excess layers of communication: the king sent orders directly to the men in charge and they delegated tasks and responsibilities.

Selling excess wine was not an activity often undertaken by the officials at Southampton and Bristol. Wine seems only to have been sporadically sold by John la Warre before 1207. In August 1205, for example, John la Warre was instructed to send wine to Worcester and Bridgnorth for making 'our profit', the money from which he was instructed to account for at the exchequer.[140] John la Warre, on two other occasions, paid money into the chamber from wine which had been sold.[141] There is some indication that surplus wine was not always sold. In July 1213, for example, Geoffrey de Lucy delivered wine to the constable of Bristol, Peter de Chanceaux, to be given to the 'sick and poor houses', if it could not be distributed by other means.[142] Only in 1202 was there was a large-scale sale of the king's wine by two Southampton officials, Ralph Molendarius and Master Serlo. Ralph Molendarius was active in wine purveyance from 1200 to 1206, purchasing wine at markets and from merchants. For a brief time in 1202, however, Ralph's main responsibility appears to have been selling wine. At Michaelmas of that year, Ralph and Master Serlo had an account in the pipe roll under the heading 'concerning the king's wine', which appeared within the county account of Hampshire.[143] In this account, Master Serlo and Ralph were said to have received 717½ casks of wine from various towns and cities in the South-West and the Midlands, including Wiltshire, Hampshire, Dorset and Northamptonshire. This wine had been handed over to Ralph and Serlo by officials, such as John fitz Hugh at Windsor and Hugh Bardulf at Nottingham. Of these casks, 568 were sold in towns, including Freemantle, Marlborough, Woodstock and Guildford. The total money received was £692 11*d*, for which Ralph and Serlo accounted at the exchequer.[144]

---

[140] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 47. There is no record of John la Warre accounting for wine he sold at the exchequer, but in the following month he paid £26 5s 9d into the chamber, see *ibid.,* p. 49.
[141] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 70b, 77b.
[142] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 147.
[143] For what follows, see *Pipe Roll 4 John*, pp. 82-4.
[144] *Pipe Roll 5 John,* pp. 148, 149; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 128. Ralph and Serlo also gave casks of wine as prests to William de Cantilupe and Hugh de Neville. They were later held account for these prests at the exchequer, see *Pipe Roll 4 John*, p. 82; *Pipe Roll 5 John*, pp. 39, 162.

This account of the king's wine in the pipe roll is unique during John's reign.[145] From 1206 it is difficult to detect any selling of the king's wine in Southampton, Bristol, London or any other major port. We may, then, ask why Ralph and Serlo sold such large quantities of wine in 1202. Many of the places from which Ralph and Serlo received these 717½ casks of wine were royal residences which the king frequently visited whilst in England. From May 1201 to December 1203, King John was on the continent. One explanation of this bulk selling of the king's wine in 1202 may be that the king and his household were simply not able to drink it as they were not in England. The evidence provided by this account may, then, be the best surviving indication of the quantity of wine King John's household drank in a year, as what this account may show is the total wine the household would have consumed in 1202 had it been in England. We can estimate that these 717½ casks contained between 140,000 to 180,000 gallons of wine, enough for between 400 and 500 gallons a day. Given-Wilson calculated for the period 1362 to 1413, for which we have much more complete records, that the royal household purchased between 600 and 1,700 casks of wine each year.[146] With this calculation as a comparison, it seems entirely likely that King John's household could have consumed just over seven hundred casks of wine in a year.

Accommodating the royal itinerary was a crucial aspect of supplying wine to the royal household. Wine had a relatively long shelf life and, unlike ale, it could be bought in advance of the household's need for it and placed in royal residences ready for the king's arrival. Jolliffe stated that it is possible to detect royal houses being stocked six weeks or two months in advance of the king's arrival, for which he cites only one example: on 11 July 1205, Hugh de Neville sent 'good and strong' carriages to Southampton to transport wine to Freemantle, Marlborough, Gillingham and Ludgershall.[147] When we look at the royal household's visits to these royal residences around July 1205, we can see they were at Ludgershall from 30 June to 2 July, then not again until the 6 November; at Marlborough from 2 to 3 July, then again from 14 to 17 September; at Freemantle from 26 to 28 July and again from 18

[145] After 1206, like the wine custodians, Ralph and Serlo disappear from the record sources, perhaps due to the change in communication methods between the household and the ports.
[146] Given-Wilson, 'Purveyance', p. 146. The Black Book of Edward IV suggests it may have been possible for the household to consume only three hundred casks of wine each year, see Myers, *Household of Edward IV,* pp. 59, 176.
[147] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 41b. Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship,* p. 200.

to 19 September.[148] This example, cited by Jolliffe, does not demonstrate that wine was being stocked in residences six weeks to two months in advance of the household's arrival. This example shows that there was a system in place in which wine stores were replenished after a royal visit. Or, as in the case of Freemantle, wine could be sent two weeks in advance of the king's arrival. Two weeks should, perhaps, be considered a far more realistic time frame in which wine was sent ahead of a royal visit. Planning further ahead than this was very problematic for a medieval king.[149] Often, no more than a few days' notice was given to send wine to prepare for the king's arrival, especially at times of political unrest. For example, on 8 August 1215, the reeves of Southampton were instructed to send four casks of Gascon or Poitevin wine to Clarendon, ready for the king's visit from 13 to 16 August that year.[150] A writ of *computate* issued on 6 March 1204 shows that wine had recently been sent to Bridgnorth and Worcester; the household subsequently visited Bridgnorth from 13 to 15 March, and Worcester on 16 March.[151] Wine could even be requested from the major wine ports when the king had already arrived at a location. During the household's long stay in Worcester from 12 to 21 August 1204, Peter of Stokes requested, on 15 August, that the sheriff of Gloucester immediately send, presumably from Bristol, eight casks of wine to Worcester.[152] This method of supplying the household was reactive to its immediate needs; yet, this was not how the vast majority of wine consumed by the household was provided.

On planned expeditions, such as to the north in early 1201, or in preparation for great feasts such as Christmas or Easter, further notice may have been feasible, but for the majority of the time the king's itinerary was simply not predictable enough to plan far ahead. For this reason, a constant stock of wine was stored in popular royal residences, in much the same way as we find with non-perishable foods, such as salted meat and grains. The stocking of royal residences with wine was done in two ways. Firstly, large quantities of wine were sent out in bulk to royal manors and castles. Secondly, after a royal visit, orders were given to ensure that wine was sent to replenish dwindled stores.

[148] Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 516-8.
[149] *Supra*, pp. 119-20.
[150] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 225; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 729.
[151] *Rot. Lib. John*, p. 83; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 493.
[152] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 5.

Southampton and Bristol had flexible, yet recognisable, boundaries to the areas of the country for which they were responsible. Southampton's routes of supply were mainly, but not exclusively, focused on the counties of Wiltshire, Somerset, Devon, Dorset and Hampshire. From Bristol, wine was most commonly sent to Worcestershire, Shropshire, Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire. Wine must have been routinely sent about the country to various royal residences within the geographical remit of Bristol and Southampton on the orders of Daniel the butler or the constable at Bristol. This process is evidenced on the pipe rolls, which record money allowed against the county farms for the cost of transporting wine from Bristol and Southampton 'to many places for the king's use'.[153] The process also comes to light when the king, or his ministers, intervened and requested that wines go to specific residences, as this is recorded on the roll of letters close. In July 1207, for example, Peter des Roches instructed the bailiffs of Southampton to send fourteen casks of wine to Clarendon, Bere-Regis, Gillingham, Sherborne, Marlborough, Dorchester and Portchester.[154] In January 1215, King John ordered the sheriff of Southampton to send a total of sixty-three casks of wine to Corfe, Bere-Regis, Winchester, Clarendon, Marlborough, Ludgershall and Freemantle.[155] Similar orders were sent, although less frequently, to the constable of Bristol. In November 1205, Peter of Stokes instructed the constable, Robert of Ropsley, to send wine to Malmesbury, Tewkesbury and Witham Charterhouse.[156]

There is no evidence to suggest that the stocking of royal manor houses and castles was based upon a fixed royal itinerary. What is more likely is that popular residences kept a high level of wine in their cellars, maintained in case the king and his household visited. This method of maintaining levels of stock can be seen most clearly in the days immediately after a royal visit, when dwindled stores were replenished. When the household visited Winchester, for example, from 18 to 21 June 1204, the day the household moved on the sheriff of Hampshire was asked to send ten casks of wine from Southampton to Winchester. [157] Later in the reign, after the household's visit to Reading from 10 to 12 May, and Wallingford from 12 to 13

---

[153] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 190; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 79; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 221; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 156; *Pipe Roll 11 John,* p. 172; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* p. 183.
[154] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 86b.
[155] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 185b.
[156] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 57b.
[157] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 1b.

May 1215, King John ordered the custodians of his wine at Southampton to release ten casks of wine to be sent to Wallingford and six to Reading. The reeves of Southampton were instructed to find the necessary carriages for these casks to be transported.[158] Moreover, when the household was at Malmesbury, on 19 November 1205, the next day Peter of Stokes issued a letter to Robert of Ropsley to send four casks of wine to replenish the cellar there.[159] For those royal residences which were frequently used it must have been the simplest way to maintain an adequate level of stock to limit any restrictions placed on the household's itinerary by its high demand for food and drink. By having staple food and wine permanently stocked in favoured royal residences household purveyors would only need to requisition fresh produce from the localities.

Bristol and Southampton supplied wine to a large geographical area in England, covering the South, the West and the Midlands. The transport of wine across these parts of the country can be traced in the pipe rolls. Although, the counties of Hampshire and Gloucester paid for a large proportion of wine transportation, it was also occasionally expected that the county where the wine passed through would provide the cash for the transport. In 1200, for example, when wine was transported from Woodstock to Northampton and Silverstone, the cost was met by the sheriff of Oxfordshire for which he accounted at the exchequer.[160] In 1205, seven casks of wine were sent from Worcester to Feckenham, the cost of which was met from the county farm of Worcestershire.[161] Throughout the reign, the pipe rolls are littered with such entries. This evidence gives some impression of how wine moved about the country by being passed between royal residences.

Transport links about the country enabled a wider geographical area to be covered by the two main wine ports. The River Severn provided a route from Bristol into the Midlands. Wine was frequently sent by a 'small ship' up to Bridgnorth in Shropshire, where it was received by Thomas of Erdington, who sent it on to Nottingham. Moreover, in March 1205, John la Warre in Bristol sent forty casks to

[158] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 199b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 727.
[159] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 58.
[160] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 21.
[161] *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 266.

the sheriff of Nottingham, Robert de Vieuxpont.[162] Nottingham was also supplied by Southampton, although less frequently, as it did not have such a convenient method of transportation by water. In September 1212, it required twenty cartermen, each with three horses, to take the king's wine from Southampton to Nottingham, to restock the cellar after the king's long visit there in the preceding month.[163] The pipe rolls attest to the fact that from Nottingham wine was sent 'to many places'.[164] Nottingham acted as a distribution centre across Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Staffordshire and Yorkshire.[165] This distribution can be seen, on 28 September 1205, during the household's visit to Nottingham, when Robert de Vieuxpont sent wine (which had originally come from Bristol) to Lichfield, Melbourne, Horsley, Tickhill, Durham, Lowdham, Clipstone, Mountsorell and Laxton.[166] The central position of Nottingham made it an ideal centre for storing and distributing the king's wine to various royal residences in the surrounding areas. Most of these places were within twenty miles of Nottingham, but some were further afield in Yorkshire and County Durham.

Not all the wine supplied to the king's household was purchased at Bristol or Southampton. Another place which provided an important source of wine was London. Many of the purchases of wine in London were undertaken by the household's chief purveyor, Reginald of Cornhill. Orders appear throughout the reign for Reginald to send wine to various royal residences. This distribution from London can be seen in February 1206, when Peter of Stokes issued a writ to the barons of the exchequer to account to Reginald for thirty-three casks of prise wine costing £33 13*s* 4*d*, and eighteen ordinary casks costing £46 6*s* 8*d*. A further £6 8*s* 6*d* was also owed to Reginald for the cost of transporting this wine to Ongar, Havering, Waltham, Guildford, Westminster, Windsor, Oxford, Lambeth, Dogmersfield, Walthamstow, Melton and Mortlake.[167] Wine purchased in London was also regularly sent the sixty-five miles to one of John's most favoured royal

[162] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 23b. For other examples, see *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 221; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 152, 177b.
[163] *Docs. of English History,* p. 241.
[164] *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 89; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 161; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 221.
[165] For wine sent to Bridgnorth, see *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 83; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 146; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 49. For wine received and sent to Nottingham by Thomas of Erdington, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 58b; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 109.
[166] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 51.
[167] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 64b. The pipe roll for 1201 also records money allowed against the farm of London for wine sent to many places, see *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 259.

castles, Northampton. On 21 May 1205, for example, Reginald of Cornhill sent five casks of wine to Northampton ready for a great council held at that castle.[168] The purchasing of wine in London appears to have been conducted under the eye of Reginald of Cornhill. There does not seem to have been a body of officials with direct responsibility of buying, storing or delivering the king's wine at London. All these functions must have been undertaken by men under the control of Reginald of Cornhill.

The main areas of the country not regularly supplied by Bristol, Southampton or London were the far north and the east. That royal residences in these areas were not routinely stocked with wine, as we find in the south and west of the country, is not surprising in light of the king's itinerary. The north and East Anglia are parts of the country which were not passed through when en route elsewhere. Specific journeys had to be made to visit them. During John's reign, we know of just eleven nights the household spent in Norfolk and eighteen in Suffolk. Whilst in the north, the household was in Cumberland for at least twenty days and in Northumberland for at least forty-two days. At the other end of the spectrum, the household spent at least 544 nights in Hampshire and 441 nights in Wiltshire.[169] With these figures in mind, it is understandable why certain parts of the country were less equipped to procure large quantities of wine. Nonetheless, there were occasions when the household deviated from its usual progress, such as during the king's expedition to the north in February 1201. For this expedition the royal castles at Appleby and Brough in Westmorland were stocked with nine casks of wine, which had been bought at King's Lynn. The cost of transporting this wine the two hundred miles from East Anglia to the North are found in the pipe roll account for Westmorland.[170]

Wine was purchased periodically in other areas of the country, which lay outside the geographical remit of Bristol and Southampton. St. Botolph's fair, in Holland (Lincolnshire), provided an occasional source of wine for the king's household.[171] On 24 June 1205, Peter of Stokes issued a letter to William of Wrotham archdeacon

---

[168] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 29b. For other examples of wine sent from London to Northampton, see *Pipe Roll 1 John,* p. 129; *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 80; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 93; *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 158; *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 21.
[169] Kanter, 'Itineraries', pp. 765-74.
[170] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 33.
[171] Lincoln, however, was an important port for foreign traders, as shown by the large amounts of revenue raised on fifteenth tax on imported cargo in 1202 to 1204, see *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. xliv.

of Taunton instructing him to purchase one hundred pounds worth of wine at this fair.[172] In 1207, William of Cornhill was told to release wine purchased in Holland to Brian de Lisle for storing at Knaresborough and to Gilbert fitz Reinfrey for storing at York.[173] Brian de Lisle, then a household knight, not only placed wine at Knaresborough, where he was custodian, but was also frequently given wine purchased at St. Botolph's to send on to other royal residences.[174] Brian de Lisle also paid for carts for wine bought in Lincolnshire to places across the Midlands. In 1212, for example, Brian paid for wine to be sent to Chester, in preparation for the Welsh campaign of that year, which had to be subsequently sent to Nottingham in the wake of the conspiracy against the king's life which changed the household's itinerary.[175] From this evidence, it is possible to see that wine purchased in Lincolnshire, especially from the yearly fair at St. Botolph's, was used to supply the parts of the country which were not easily accessible from southern ports.

Church has previously pointed to the involvement of other household knights in wine purveyance, highlighting the activities of Brian de Lisle, Thomas Esturmi, Geoffrey Luttrell and Thomas le Bret, to whom we can add Robert Peverel and Thomas of Sandford.[176] Although, Brian became the king's steward in 1210, the role he played in the purveyance and transportation of wine was very different to that of Peter of Stokes. Brian was functioning as a local official in the north and Midlands, not as a steward of the household. The evidence concerning Brian de Lisle and the other household knights, who were involved in the king's buttery, demonstrates how the king could use capable men across the country to ensure wine was properly supplied to the household. Although, the officials at Southampton and Bristol supplied much of the necessary wine to the household, on occasion, other work such as additional local purchases or overseeing the transportation between royal residences needed to be undertaken. It was these miscellaneous tasks that the king could delegate to his household knights. They seized wine as and when it was

---

172 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 39.
173 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 90.
174 *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 89.
175 *Pipe Roll 14 John,* p. 169.
176 Church, *Household Knights,* pp. 67-8. For Robert Peverel, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 80b, 159b. For Thomas de Samford, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 44, 58, 61, 70b, 80b, 95, 101b, 111, 173b. Although Thomas de Samford was only called a household knight under Henry III, his activities certainly suggest he also held this position during John's reign. It is also worth noting that Robert of Ropsley was a household knight during his time as constable of Bristol.

required and sent it on to the household. In 1208, for example, Thomas le Bret seized wine for the king's household during a visit to Winchester. Another household knight, Geoffrey Luttrell, issued an order to the mayor of Winchester to cover the costs of this wine.[177] Household knights also ensured wine was delivered to royal residences, such as when Robert Peverel was ordered to pay for two casks of wine to be sent from to St. Edmunds ready for the household's arrival.[178]

Other royal officials provided similar support for the system of wine purveyance. At times the cellars at a royal residence were not adequately stocked for a household visit, a local sheriff or other official was asked to buy wine in the surrounding area. Often the officials asked were closely connected to the king's *familia*. William de Cantilupe, the king's long-standing steward, was called upon just before the household's visit to Kinver in Staffordshire, in August 1207, to send two casks of wine for the king's use.[179] When the household visited Durham, in September 1212, additional wine was required. This was bought by Philip of Oldcoates, the king's custodian of the bishopric of Durham.[180] The purveyance of wine for the royal household was a complex, large scale operation. The vast majority of the work was undertaken by officials in Southampton and Bristol. However, the king had a network of his *familia* working in the localities, which could be called upon to breech any gap.

Wine was also procured by members of the household buttery, who travelled with the itinerant court. Our evidence for this activity comes from writs or letters instructing payments to be made to merchants who had sold their wine directly to the household. In May 1206, for example, Michael Belet requested Geoffrey fitz Peter pay two merchants of La Rochelle forty-five marks for fifteen casks of wine purchased for the king's use.[181] In the following year, Michael Belet instructed the bailiffs of York to pay £6 16*s* 8*d* to a vintner for wine he had supplied during the household's visit to York in May.[182] Michael Belet was an assistant royal butler. In 1206, he fined in one hundred pounds for a buttery serjeanty previously held by his

---

[177] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 104, 104b.
[178] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 80b.
[179] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 89b.
[180] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 124.
[181] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 72.
[182] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 84. For Michael Belet's other activities within the buttery, see *ibid.*, pp. 84, 86, 98b.

father. His connection to that household office continued until his lands were confiscated in 1208.[183] Part of the service Michael performed for the household was purchasing wine from the vicinity surrounding the household or from merchants following the court looking to sell their wares.

During John's reign, a few other men with the title of butler can be identified. These men appear to have had a place in the household buttery. In early 1214, for example, Hugh the butler warranted a letter close to Reginald of Cornhill with instructions to supply drinking vessels for the household and to provide an allowance for Walter Lunge Eschine, a serjeant of the buttery, who had been sent to Reginald to receive the drinking vessels.[184] Earlier in the reign, another butler, John, was in receipt of wages arranged for him by Robert of Thurnham, the king's steward.[185] The household office of the buttery was also staffed with an usher, William de Quevilly, who fined in forty marks for the ushership of the buttery in 1199.[186] The De Quevillys had a family connection to the buttery since the reign of Henry I.[187] Nicholas de Quevilly, who was the custodian of the Winchester exchange, also provided cash to Daniel the butler and wine to the bailiffs in Southampton during John's reign.[188] In February 1207, for example, Nicholas provided thirteen casks of wine, which were distributed to various royal residences in the South-West.[189] It was the De Quevilly's tradition of royal buttery service, which must have enabled William to take his ushership within the household, which entailed guarding the carts with the buttery utensils and the wine.[190]

The buttery also contained a number of cartermen who took responsibility for the transportation of the buttery carts. They received all the necessary horse and cart

---

183 *Rot. Fin.*, p. 358. For the Belet family and their buttery serjeanty, see R. V. Turner, 'Richard Barre and Michael Belet: Two Angevin Civil Servants', in his *Administrators and the Common Law in Angevin England* (London, 1994), pp. 180-98; Vincent, 'Court of Henry II', pp. 300-1; Round, *Serjeants*, pp. 141-45, 165-7; S. D. Church, 'Belet, Michael (*d.* in or before 1247)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1987, accessed 10 April 2013].
184 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 141b.
185 *Rot. Norm.*, p. 27. In 1216, lands that had been previously held by John the butler were given to Reginald de Drumar, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 262.
186 *Pipe Roll 1 John*, p. 109.
187 Henry de Kivilly was an usher of the buttery before 1130, see Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 145; Round, *King's Serjeants*, pp. 183-5.
188 *Supra*, p. 175.
189 *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 78. In 1200, the two De Kivillys, William and Nicholas, rendered an account together for ten pounds for holding seisin of two manors, see *Pipe Roll 2 John*, p. 99.
190 *Pipe Roll 1 John*, p. 109.

apparatus to ensure that wine could be moved about the country safely.[191] Robert, a carterman of the buttery, for example, received saddles, girdles, reins, halters, breast plates, bridles and shoes for the horses of the king's buttery.[192] The buttery, like the other major household offices also had a clerk, who commissioned Reginald of Cornhill to make purchases for buttery equipment.[193]

These officials of the household buttery appear only fleetingly on the surviving record sources for John's reign. We can glimpse at only a very small portion of the work they undertook. As with so much household business, it is only at the moments when the work of officials reached beyond the confines of court that they are brought into the light of the record sources. For the most part the internal mechanisms of the king's buttery are hidden from the historian. As we have seen, however, the vast majority the work involved in supplying the household with wine was conducted by men who worked out of court. The purveyance of wine was conducted by men who were local officials, endowed with the king's authority to acquire wine from ports and fairs across the country.

---

[191] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 80; *Pipe Roll 6 John*, pp. 89, 93; *Pipe Roll 7 John*, pp. 5, 120; *Pipe Roll 11 John*, pp. 27, 163; *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 261; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 17b, 18b, 68, 156b, 190, 262b.
[192] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 158b.
[193] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 158b. A clerk of the buttery is named as William de Chesney, who received a prest in June 1205, see *Docs. of English History*, p. 271.

Chapter 7: The Purveyance of Luxuries: the Role of the Cornhill family

A central way in which a medieval king's household was made distinctive from its surrounding society was by the presence of an abundance of luxuries, those expensive, unnecessary things which demonstrated the king's material wealth.[1] Rich spices, fine wines, exotic fruits and nuts filled the king's tables; delicate cloths, silks, and expensive furs dressed his associates. These items worked to produce the most magnificent display of wealth and prestige of its day. The royal household was the epitome of extravagance, the leader of conspicuous consumption, setting the fashions and desires of the wider society. By engaging with cultural perceptions of objects, the king could project an impression of his court to its observers. Imported luxury goods were largely for the aristocracy. Their exotic origins and the long distances they travelled made them hugely expensive. These qualities put them out of reach of most of society, making them unobtainable objects of desire. The ostentatious manner in which they were consumed in the royal household accentuated the royal court's difference from even the greatest noble households in the realm.

From the Anglo-Saxon period, a conspicuous spectacle of luxury had been part of royal court culture. James Campbell has seen in aspects of Eddius Stephanus' account of the life of St. Wilfrid a 'needful reminder of the grandeur of the early court'.[2] Robin Fleming has revealed the special importance of silk in court display. Silk was a signifier of prosperity and power; rulers and wealthy men in Anglo-Saxon England demonstrated their importance by purchasing, deploying and, even, destroying it.[3] After the advent of Normans, flaunting wealth through purchasing and displaying precious objects continued to be a characteristic of court. Judith Green has described how Henry I found 'passionate delight' in his 'exotic curiosities and rare animals', but he also enjoyed the statement that they made about his powerful, wealthy position.[4] England was not unique in this regard: the opulence of kingly and

---

[1] For the difficulty of defining 'luxury', see C. Dyer, 'Luxury Goods in Medieval England', in *Commercial Activity, Markets and Entrepreneurs in the Middle Ages,* ed. by B. Dodds and C. D. Liddy (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 217-38 (pp. 217-9)

[2] Campbell, 'Anglo-Saxon Courts', p. 161. Also, see J. Wallace-Hadrill, 'The Graves of Kings: A Historical Note on some Archaeological Evidence', in *Early Medieval History*, ed. by J. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1975), pp. 39-59.

[3] R. Fleming, 'Acquiring, flaunting and destroying silk in Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe,* 15 (2007), 127-58.

[4] J. Green, 'Henry I and the Origins of the Court Culture of the Plantagenets', in *Plantagenêts and Capétiens: Confrontations et Héritages,* ed. by M. Aurell and N. Tonnerre (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 485-

princely courts can be witnessed across Europe in the Middle Ages, in part because the magnificence of a ruler's domestic establishment was 'one of the yardsticks by which his political authority was judged'.[5] Two fundamental aspects of the royal household were, firstly, to provide essential daily necessities, and secondly, to glorify the majesty of the ruler.[6] It is the means by which King John's household procured those luxuries, ensuring the glorification of his majesty, which is the focus of this chapter.

By the fourteenth century, the purveyance of these luxuries for the royal household was clearly evidenced in the accounts of the great wardrobe.[7] By 1361, the great wardrobe was located near Baynard's castle in London, where its keeper oversaw the purchasing and storing of all non-perishable luxuries for the royal household, including cloth, spices, wax, jewels, plate and the trappings of the king's horses.[8] The origins of this royal office were traced by Tout, who explored the gradual development and separation of the great wardrobe from the general wardrobe during the thirteenth century.[9] What Tout drew attention to is that, even in the first years of the minority of the Henry III, there was a discernible separation between the activities of the wardrobe as a financial office of the household and the element of the wardrobe that was concerned with the purchasing and storing of non-perishable commodities. This separation can be clearly seen in the evidence. In April 1223, for example, a writ of *liberate* was sent to the treasurer to release money to the wardrobe clerks, Peter of Rivaux and Walter of Brackley, for acquitting household expenses. In the same writ, money was released to William the tailor for robes for the king's knights during Pentecost.[10] Due to this separation, it is possible to talk about the activities of officials concerned with the purveyance of luxury items without being

---

95 (p. 492); *William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum,* ed. and trans. by R. A. B. Mynors, completed by R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998-9), ii (1999), pp. 740-1.

[5] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* p. 1.

[6] M. Vale, 'Provisioning Princely Households in the Low Countries during the Pre-Burgundian period, c. 1280-1380', in *Alltag Bei Hofe,* ed. by H. von Werner Paravicini, (1995), pp. 33-40 (pp. 33-34, 40).

[77] For the purchases of the great wardrobe in the late thirteenth century, see Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries', pp. 49-87.

[8] Given-Wilson, *King's Affinity,* pp. 80-1. For a full example of great wardrobe account, see *Records of Wardrobe and Household, 1286-1289,* ed. by B. F. Bylerly and C. R. Bylerly (London, 1986), pp. 246-8.

[9] Tout, *Chapters,* iv, pp. 349-437.

[10] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 543. Robes consisted of up to six different garments, which were always worn together, see Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries', pp. 143-4.

distracted by the intricacies of the development of the wardrobe as the main financial office of the household.

Tout saw the origins of the great wardrobe of the fourteenth century as lying in the Angevin chamber and, specifically, with the king's tailor, William. Tout claimed that William's accounts on the dorse of the misae rolls provided definite evidence that 'great wardrobe articles' were being separately dealt with by a special household office during the reign of King John.[11] Whilst it is true that there was a special provision for the purveyance of these types of commodities during John's reign, it was not the responsibility of William the tailor. William's accounts on the dorse of the misae rolls were, for the most part, a description of clothes made up for the king and his associates. The account gives no indication that William was concerned with other items of apparel which fell in the great wardrobe's remit, such as spices, wax, plate or jewels; he was only concerned with cloth. Nor does it suggest that William was regularly responsible for the purchasing or storing of that cloth.[12] William's role, until 1215, was as a tailor in the traditional sense of the word – he turned cloths and furs into robes for the king and his *familia.* During the civil war, from 1215 to 1216, King John bestowed lands upon his tailor and used him in the supply of arms and armour.[13] William's competence as an administrator, as well as a tailor, was clearly recognised by King John in the latter years of his reign.

This recognition of William's talents continued under the minority government of Henry III, when his role expanded to become a receiver of non-perishable luxury items into the household. At the same time, the remit of the wardrobe also expanded in the years from 1216 to 1219. Commissions for spices, cloths, wax and almonds were made under William Marshal's attestation to the chamberlain of London, Hugh of Sibton, or to the sheriff of London. These items were then delivered to William the tailor for use in the household. In these years, the king's wardrobe and chamber continued their practice of overlapping and working together without a definite difference between the two offices. As such, the tailor worked alongside William of Haverhill, probably a clerk of the wardrobe, or Nicholas of the king's chamber to

---

[11] Tout, *Chapters,* iv, p. 354; Jolliffe saw Ralph Parmenter as the forbearer of the officers of the great wardrobe, see *Angevin Kingship*, p. 263. For Ralph's role in purveyance, see *infra,* pp. 199-201.
[12] *Rot. Lib. John.,* p. 170; *Docs. of English History,* p. 267.
[13] For lands, see *Rot. Chart.,* p. 213, *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 229, 279. For armour, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 229, 229b, 232, 282b.

receive these luxury items into the household for storing.[14] From 1220, William's position further expanded from a receiver to a purchaser of luxury goods. He received cash directly from the treasury to pay for household expenses, repair regalia and purchase items. For example, he bought robes from fairs in St. Ives, King's Lynn and Winchester, and furs from the fair at St. Botolph's in Lincolnshire.[15] Commissions to the sheriff or chamberlain of London became less frequent as William the Tailor became the first wardrobe official to have responsibility for purchasing non-perishable luxuries. In this sense, William was very much the forbearer for the buyer of the household found in the household ordinance of 1279 and the keeper of the great wardrobe in the fourteenth century.[16] It was, perhaps, due to William the tailor's role under Henry III that Tout focused on his account in the misae roll as evidence of these activities during John's reign. In this, however, Tout gave too great a credence to the power of the wardrobe office under John and failed to highlight the importance of Reginald of Cornhill and his son, who were the purveyors of luxury, non-perishable goods for the royal household throughout much of John's reign. This chapter examines the function of the Cornhill family in royal purveyance and the impact that their purchases had on the spectacle of the king's household. In this we will see how it was not until the minority of Henry III that the wardrobe had any specific responsibility for the luxury items that later were so closely associated with it.

The Cornhill family were not only purveyors. They also had held a prominent role in royal administration from the reign of Henry II onwards. Yet, they probably came from a much longer line of successful, rich London merchants who specialised in the trading of cloth.[17] During the reign of Henry II, purveyance for the household in London was largely conducted by Edward Blund. From 1163 to 1185, Blund used money received from sheriffs to purchase vessels and wine for the royal buttery, cloth for the chamber, and utensils for the kitchen. He was especially active during preparations for the Young King's coronation. Blund did not travel with the itinerant

---

[14] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 383, 384, 409, 412, 412b, 429b, 430, 446b, 448.
[15] For purchases at fairs, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 493b, 502, 506, 508b, 562. For other writs of *liberate* to the treasurer for William the tailor, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 431b, 441b, 457, 459b, 471b, 482, 483, 492b, 495, 497, 543, 578. St. Ives was considered one of the best places to buy robes, see *Walter of Henley*, ed. Oschinsky pp. 398-9.
[16] Tout, *Chapters*, i, p. 159.
[17] P. D. A. Harvey, 'Cornhill, Gervase of (*c.*1110–1183/4)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52168, accessed 13 June 2011].

court and witnessed no charters for Henry II. Lally described Blund as 'an important man amongst his fellow Londoners but a small, if indispensable man at the royal court.'[18] In some ways, Reginald of Cornhill was Blund's successor, as they shared a common responsibility for providing the household with luxury items from London. Reginald's brother, Henry of Cornhill, had also conducted purveyance for the Henry II's household, purchasing cloths, silks and jewels.[19] Blund was a buyer for the royal household, but in so far as we can tell he never held the status within royal service enjoyed by members of the Cornhill family.

Reginald of Cornhill was first active in royal service in 1191, when he fined in a hundred marks to have the lands and offices of his brother Henry. Amongst these was the shrievalty of Kent. Reginald held this shrievalty without interruption for a notably long tenure, from 1191 until his death in 1210. The length of Reginald's custodianship of this county is testimony of his importance to the Angevin kings. In 1210, after Reginald's death, his son of the same name, by payment of an enormous relief of ten thousand marks, continued the family's hold over Kent until 1215. Subsequently, in the days immediately after the sealing of Magna Carta, the county of Kent was confiscated when Reginald deserted the king to join the rebel barons. It might have been Reginald's desertion which prompted to the king to bestow additional responsibilities on his tailor, William. William was, perhaps, acting to compensate for the loss of Reginald in the king's purveyance structure.

Before Reginald's defection, the king and the Cornhill family had maintained a strong and beneficial relationship. Under Richard I, for example, Henry of Cornhill was put in charge of preparing the king's fleet for the crusade.[20] The Cornhill family were an administrative force in London upon whom the king could rely. King John's closeness to Reginald is illustrated by the appearance of his name in Roger of Wendover's list of evil counsellors who assisted the king during the interdict and encouraged him 'not towards reason but will'.[21] Much has been made of this list, but

---

[18] Lally, 'Court and Household of Henry II', pp. 61-6 (quote, p. 65).
[19] Jolliffe, '*Camera Regis*: Part II', pp. 355-6. Jolliffe saw the Cornhills as part of a longer tradition of London brokers, including William Cade and Edward Blund. For Richardson's criticism of Jolliffe's assessment of William Cade, see 'Chamber under Henry II', pp. 605-11.
[20] Warren, *King John*, p. 124.
[21] *Flores Historium*, iii, pp. 237-8. Wendover names Henry of Cornhill, but this was corrected to Reginald by Matthew Paris, see *Chron. Maj.*, ii, pp. 532-3. This list may refer to either of the Reginalds as it represents the situation at court *c*.1210 when the elder Reginald died.

whatever its interpretation, most have agreed that it is in essence a list of some, though not all, of the men closest to the king around the year 1210.[22] The misae rolls are also testimony to the relationship between King John and Reginald, as there are many recorded payments for messengers being sent between the two men.[23] Reginald was a provincial sheriff, but his influence should not be underestimated.[24] As Jolliffe wrote, men, such as Reginald, could enter into court and directly into the king's inner counsel. Their regular absence was not detrimental to their importance.[25] The loss of Reginald's loyalty in 1215 must have been felt acutely by King John, in this defection the crown lost a key figure in the household's purveyance of luxuries.

Before 1215, the intimacy that both Reginalds shared with the king was undoubtedly spurred on by their efficacy in royal administration. At various points throughout John's reign, Reginald was given custodies and offices, some of which were the most prestigious in the kingdom. Reginald was, for example, custodian of the vacant archbishopric of Canterbury and the wealthy see of Winchester.[26] He also collected scutage in 1199, tallage in 1200 and served as a royal justice.[27] Along with William of Wrotham, the archdeacon of Taunton, Reginald had control over naval matters. In 1204, for example, they dispersed galleys around the coast of England. They were also named as the 'keepers of the king's ports' and had the right to issue licences for the trade of wool, wheat and wine.[28] Reginald, William of Wrotham and William Furnell were also given charge of collecting a fifteenth tax levied on the property of merchants in the ports of England.[29] Once again, working alongside William of Wrotham, the two men were charged with control over the English exchange. They held the profits of the London exchange, and received money from fines made for

---

[22] N. Vincent, 'King John's evil counsellors (*act.* 1208–1214)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/theme/95591, accessed 16 April 2013]; P. D. A. Harvey, 'Cornhill, Gervase of (*c.*1110–1183/4)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52168, accessed 11 July 2013]

[23] *Rot. Lib. John.*, pp. 134, 141, 144, 146, 158; *Docs. of English History*, p. 241.

[24] In 1208, John ordered the men of Kent to believe whatever Reginald of Cornhill told them regarding the meeting between Master Simon de Langton and the bishops concerning the appointment of Stephen Langton to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 80. This event indicates the confidence which the king had in Reginald.

[25] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, pp. 149, 289.

[26] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 48b; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 62.

[27] *Pipe Roll 1 John*, p. 181; *Pipe Roll 2 John*, p. 214.

[28] Warren, *King John*, p. 125; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 60, 61b, 62, 62b.

[29] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 42-3. For the revenue of the tax, see *Pipe Roll 6 John*, p. xliii.

other exchanges in Northampton, York, Cirencester and Winchester.[30] Reginald regularly worked alongside William of Wrotham until 1208, when Wrotham's focus turned to naval matters more permanently.[31] Reginald also worked with another member of the Cornhill family, William, who was possibly his son or nephew. William first appears in the records in 1203, as a clerk. He also joined Reginald as custodian of the vacant bishopric of Winchester in 1205, and became archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1207.[32] In addition to the family's longstanding hold over Kent, in 1213, the younger Reginald was granted the shrievalty of Surrey.[33] Moreover, King John also entrusted Reginald with the custodianship of the mighty castle of Rochester. It was Reginald's surrender of this castle to William d'Aubigny that led to the long siege of that strategically vital stronghold in 1215.[34]

The Cornhill family provide much material for the study for the historian of royal administration. The elder Reginald was especially adept, serving the king in a multitude of capacities.[35] The many offices and custodies bestowed upon Reginald inevitably brought significant wealth. Typical of the Angevin kings' pragmatic innovation, King John often utilised the profits of Reginald's estates directly for royal purveyance. Jolliffe, in his *Angevin Kingship*, mused that had contemporaries been asked what the main financial institutions of the realm were, they would have answered the exchequer, the chamber and Reginald of Cornhill.[36] With this Jolliffe was suggesting that the income from Reginald's various offices and custodies acted

[30] *Rot. Fin.*, pp. 294, 299, 303; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 32, 44, 60, 60b. The exchange was confiscated following Reginald's deflection in 1215, see *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 146.
[31] F. W. Brooks, 'William de Wrotham and the Office of the King's Ports and Galleys', *EHR*, 140 (1925), 570-9 (pp. 57-9).
[32] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 39; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 23b, 87. Also, see M. J. Franklin, 'Cornhill, William of (*d.* 1223)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6331, accessed 21 Aug 2013]
[33] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 96.
[34] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 138. For Reginald as a prisoner after the siege, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 241b. For the responsibilities of Reginald of Cornnhill and Stephen Langton to Rochester castle, see I. W. Rowlands, 'King John, Stephen Langton and Rochester Castle, 1213-15', in *Studies in Medieval History presented to R. Allen Brown*, ed. by C. Harper-Bill, C. J. Holdsworth and J. L. Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 267-79.
[35] W. R. Powell, 'English Administrative Families in the 12th and 13th centuries: With special reference to the Cornhill family' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1952). This thesis outlines much of the administrative work undertaken by the Cornhill family during the reigns of the Angevin kings. Whilst acknowledging that the family played a significant part in purveyance, it makes no attempt to fully investigate this aspect of their careers.
[36] Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, p. 292. With this being said, many writs of *liberate* and *computate* also reveal that Reginald often used coin from the treasury for this purchases.

as another purse for the king.[37] Out of this purse, King John instructed Reginald to pay sailors, provide the liveries for crossbowmen and give 'necessities' for royal serjeants visiting London.[38] And, importantly, a large proportion of Reginald's income was expended on goods for the royal household.

Reginald regularly paid money to the king's stewards to cover the household's expenses. In December 1203, for example, when the household was at Ongar and then at Rochester, a writ of *computate* was sent to the barons of the exchequer to allow the money Reginald had spent against his account on expenses.[39] In the following year, a writ of *liberate* was sent to the treasurer with instructions to send cash to Reginald, as he had paid for household expenses during a royal visit to one of William Brewer's estates.[40] Reginald's large income was a convenient source of cash for the king, which he might later repay via a writ of liberate from the treasury or have it allowed against Reginald's account. Reginald was especially useful when the household visited royal houses in the environs of London. For example, during a visit to Guildford at Easter 1208, Reginald spent over sixty pounds on the expenses of the royal household.[41] In these instances the expenses are not explicated. However, for the majority of the letters close concerning the money spent by Reginald of Cornhill we are given a relatively full account of the items he bought for the king or the people whose wages he paid.

The Cornhill family's dominance in this area of royal purveyance was absolute for much of John's reign. The limitations of the chancery rolls before 1204 make it difficult to gain an impression of who was responsible for the purchasing of royal luxuries at this time.[42] Before 1204, however, there would naturally have been less purveyance undertaken for the king's household in England, as from May 1201 to December 1203, King John was on the continent. This absence explains the change in expenditure recorded against Reginald of Cornhill's farm for Kent. In these early years, the allowances made against the account were for arms, castle repairs along

[37] Reginald paid substantial sums of cash into the king's chamber, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 38b, 39, 60b, 63b, 71, 108, 189.
[38] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 24, 25, 106.
[39] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 79.
[40] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 14.
[41] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 109b.
[42] The *liberate* rolls, although the first of the close rolls series, do not reveal a great deal concerning the Cornhills and purveyance.

the south coast of England and staple foods, such as bacon and wheat, being sent over to Rouen.[43] Whereas, from 1204 onwards, the farm of Kent was used for robes, cloths, silks, furs, spices and other imported luxuries. These types of commodities continue to be found in the account for Kent until Reginald of Cornhill, senior, died around October 1210. Thereafter a lapse followed before his son, Reginald, assumed his father's former responsibilities in purveyance.[44]

Unfortunately, the handover between father and son falls in those years from 1208 to 1212 when the chancery records have not survived, making it more difficult to get a clear view of the situation. The pipe rolls, however, do shed some light on royal purveyance during these years. The accounts of the younger Reginald of Cornhill suggest, in so far as the evidence is revealed to us, that he did not continue the business of purchasing luxuries for the king until 1213. For two years, John fitz Hugh appears to assume a key role in royal purveyance. John fitz Hugh was a powerful baron during John's reign, like the Cornhills he was bestowed with offices and lands from which he enjoyed substantial revenues.[45] In 1207, John fitz Hugh was made sheriff of Surrey and he also held the farm of Windsor, Cocham and Bray, and accounted for the king's lands at Odiham.[46] John was custodian of ecclesiastical lands, notably he held the lands of the abbot of Eynsham and Abbotsbury.[47] Throughout the reign, King John had given John fitz Hugh responsibility for overseeing repairs to royal residences, such as the king's houses at Oxford, Odiham, Windsor and Guildford.[48] In 1211, John fitz Hugh used the profits of his many offices to pay for a vast array of luxury items, such as spices, textiles, fruits, nuts, fresh fish, wine and wax. This account also shows that he arranged for a great deal of metalwork to be undertaken, such as the repair of cups and dishes, for five drinking

---

[43] *Pipe Roll 2 John,* p. 208; *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 283; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* p. 211.

[44] Reginald senior's death date is based on his son's fine for his offices and debts. The fine was made on the Sunday following after the feast of St. Luke (18 October) in 1210, see *Pipe Roll 12 John,* p. 120.

[45] For the career of John fitz Hugh, see *Interdict Documents,* ed. by P. A. Barnes and W. R. Powell (London, 1960), pp. 12-4.

[46] *Pipe Roll 3 John,* p. 197; *Pipe Roll 4 John,* pp. 2-3; *Pipe Roll 5 John,* pp. 45, 140; *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 57; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* pp. 76, 127; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 226; *Pipe Roll 9 John,* p. 188; *Pipe Roll 10 John,* pp. 61-3, 92-5; *Pipe Roll 11 John,* pp. 142-4; *Pipe Roll 12 John,* pp. 121, 161-2; *Pipe Roll 13 John,* pp. 104-112, 248; *Pipe Roll 14 John,* pp. 40-5, 99; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* pp. 122-5. In 1211, John fitz Hugh rendered account for the London mint and the profits of the tallage imposed on the Jews at Bristol.

[47] *Pipe Roll 12 John,* pp. 1-2. *Pipe Roll 14 John,* pp. 40-5.

[48] For examples, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 28b, 55b, 61b, 86, 97; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 115; *Docs. of English History,* p. 273.

horns to be ornamented with silver, and for the king's drinking horn to be ornamented with gold. Jewels, including emeralds, rubies and sapphires were also purchased by John fitz Hugh. He paid £226 13*s* 4*d* to two merchants of Piacenza for precious stones and rings. John also purchased items which were given as gifts, such a gilded cup for the messenger of the duke of Saxony, and three gold rings with sapphires for the king of Norway, his brother and the archbishop of Norway. Furthermore, John fitz Hugh's account on the pipe roll for 1211 included the purchase of horse and cart apparatus for the king's household and payments for the carriages for the king's paraphernalia.[49]

In total, the expenses recorded on John fitz Hugh's account for 1211 amounted to an enormous £6348 6*d*. Such an undertaking could not have been accomplished by a novice to royal purveyance. John fitz Hugh can be seen in the years preceding 1211 to have conducted some household purveyance, yet on smaller scale. In May 1208, for example, a writ of *computate* was sent to the barons of the exchequer to account to John fitz Hugh for two cart covers for long carts bought for the royal wardrobe.[50] Moreover, the account of 1211 contained purchases dating from previous years. Twenty-three pounds, for example, was spent on the expenses of the Christmas feast in 1201.[51] For the most part John's account refers to the year 1211, but this example demonstrates the length of time he had been involved in purveyance.

In 1212, John's work in purveyance continued. His account in the pipe roll for that year records purchases for spices, bed linen for the king's chamber, repairs to jewels, furs, wine and musical instruments.[52] During these two years, John fitz Hugh acquired an extraordinary array of luxury items for the royal household. John fitz Hugh must have been the epitome of an onmicompetent servant. To find, purchase and deliver all these items to the king's household would have taken great organisation and planning. That the king was able to rely upon John to fulfil this task, amongst the many other offices he held from the king, makes clear his value to the king. In 1213, John was part of the entourage which travelled to Flanders to forge an alliance against Philip Augustus.[53] At that same time, John's sheriffdom in Surrey

[49] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, pp. 106-12.
[50] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 117b.
[51] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 107.
[52] *Pipe Roll 14 John*, pp. 43-5.
[53] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 100b, 101; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 145b.

passed to Reginald of Cornhill. This change marks the renewal of the Cornhills' involvement in purveyance.[54] Reginald continued in this role until his defection to the rebel barons in 1215.

Given the family's long association with the cloth trade in London, the Cornhills understandably bought cloths, silks and furs in abundance. Of the surviving commissions to Reginald and his son to purchase textiles most were attested by King John, suggesting he was personally concerned with the purveyance of cloths for his household.[55] During the tenure of his stewardship, Peter of Stokes also made a commissioned Reginald of Cornhill to buy robes for household officials. In 1205, for example, Peter ordered a scarlet robe with deer fur hood to be sent to king's valet Geoffrey de Caux, and another robe for the king's serjeant Robert de Barre.[56] After Peter's death in 1206, the stewards' role in the purveyance of textiles for the household greatly decreased. William de Cantilupe played a very intermittent role in acquiring these luxuries, mainly providing assistance when the king was absent from the England. In November 1214, for example, when the king was on the continent, a writ of *computate* was sent to the barons of the exchequer regarding household items, including cloth that Reginald had purchased; this writ was attested by Peter des Roches and William de Cantilupe.[57] At other times, when the king's attention would have been focused away from his household, such as in March 1213, as the king tried to muster ships to deal with the potential threat of invasion by Philip Augustus's son Louis, William Brewer commissioned cloth to be bought by Reginald for the household.[58]

For the most part, however, commissions to Reginald to purchase textiles for the household came directly from the king. It was the officials of the king's chamber who were concerned with the receipt of these items. Ralph Parmenter, a serjeant of the king's chamber, was responsible for receiving cloths, silks, robes and hoods into the chamber.[59] Ralph either travelled to London to collect the goods from Reginald

---

[54] *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 96. John Fitz Hugh continued to pay household expenses later in the reign, see *Pipe Roll 16 John*, pp. 122-5.
[55] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 55, 60b, 82, 89, 106b, 111b, 144b, 184b.
[56] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 25, 42b.
[57] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 175.
[58] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 128b, 155, 175b-176.
[59] Ralph's surname *Parmenter* suggests his connection with textiles as the word later comes to be used for a tailor, see *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List*, pp. 331-2.

or they were sent to the household and received by him.[60] The patronage bestowed on Ralph suggests the king was keen to establish him with strong connections to London, as he was an important link in the purveyance of luxuries from that city. These connections were forged in part by property. In December 1205, King John ordered the mayor of London and Reginald of Cornhill to ensure that Ralph received a house in London which had belonged to William Fitz Thurstan.[61] John further consolidated Ralph's position by arranging his marriage to the grand-daughter of the Mayor of London.[62] Ralph also received a second house from the king in Winchester, another important centre of household purveyance.[63] This evidence suggests Ralph was something of a go-between with Reginald of Cornhill and the household, ensuring that luxuries textiles were securely delivered.

Another chamber official, the king's tailor, William, was also responsible for receiving cloths and furs, so that he could produce clothes for the king and his closest associates. On some occasions, when the king wished to give luxurious gifts of fine textiles, Reginald bought the materials and delivered them to William for tailoring. In November 1214, William was provided with silk cloths, quilts, squirrel furs, scarlet cloth, linen, grey cloth for a coverlet, six pairs of fasteners, a gilded saddle with silk cloth and gilded bridle reins.[64] All these items were for Peter des Roches who had been left the governance of England during King John's ill-fated campaign to the continent in 1214.[65] These gifts were perhaps a demonstration of gratitude as they coincided with the king's return.

Ralph Parmenter and William the tailor were the two main officials who received textiles into the chamber. The chamber clerks arranged for payment or allowances at the exchequer to be made to Reginald for his textile purchases. During Peter des Roches' tenure as a chamber clerk, he issued writs of *liberate*. For example, he warranted a writ instructing the treasurer to send £209 8*s* 11*d* to Reginald as repayment for robes he had bought for Christmas 1204.[66] Richard Marsh, the chief chamber clerk in the middle years of the reign, warranted numerous writs of

[60] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 4b, 25, 101b.
[61] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 60b.
[62] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 95; *Book of fees,* p. 68.
[63] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 82.
[64] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 175.
[65] Vincent, *Peter des Roches,* pp. 100-13.
[66] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 18.

computate following the king's commissions to Reginald for luxurious furs, cloths, capes, hoods, gloves, hose, fur-lined undergarments and robes for the household. In November 1207, for example, Richard Marsh issued a writ of *computate* (attested by the king) for £39 16*s* 11*d* that Reginald of Cornhill had spent on these luxury items.[67] In this evidence it is possible to detect the whole process of purveyance of luxury textiles: the king or steward commissioned Reginald to purchase items which were received by the tailor or a chamber serjeant, and then a clerk warranted a writ to the exchequer to complete payment.

In March 1208, Reginald purchased various cloths and furs which were to be distributed to members of the king and queen's households as liveries.[68] The practice of a lord giving liveries to his retainers can be traced back to Anglo-Saxon England, but it is not until the advent of the pipe rolls that we can attain any great detail of the type of cloths and furs which were used to dress the king's followers.[69] Whether these liveries were given in the form of gifts or regular allowances is not clear until the evidence of Edward I's household ordinance in the late thirteenth century, which outlines the liveries due to a number of domestic household officials.[70] The impression given by this ordinance is that the dispensing of liveries was an expected element of lordship, not an arbitrary gift. King John certainly gave liveries, however, the evidence is not sufficiently complete to conclude whether this was common practice or a gesture of the king's generosity and lordship.[71]

There were reciprocal benefits to liveries. The king was able to enhance his dignity by demonstrating his wealth and largesse. Liveries also provided a visual group identity to all those visitors and observers of the court, which signified the strength of the king by the unity of his following. For the recipient, the livery represented their relationship with their lord and the benevolence they enjoyed in his company.[72] Certainly, by the end of the thirteenth century, liveries defined status. This is evidenced by the varying amounts of money due to household officials in the 1279 household ordinance: the more money one received, the more sumptuous cloths and

[67] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 97b. For other examples of Richard Marsh issuing writs of *computate*, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 101b, 103b.
[68] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 109.
[69] Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries', pp. 186-219.
[70] Tout, *Chapters*, ii, pp. 158-60.
[71] For John giving robes to knights, see *Chron. Maj.*, ii, pp. 475, 520, 571.
[72] Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries', p. 285.

furs could to be bought for robes.[73] Wild has shown that there was a strict hierarchal use of cloth as a signifier of status during the reign of Henry III. A roll of liveries, which has been dated to between May 1234 and October 1236, shows that colour was used to distinguish the different responsibilities and strata of people in the royal household.[74] Distinctions between classes through the use of liveries have also been identified on the continent in Flanders and Brabant in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In the princely establishments of these provinces, knights wore green, clerks wore blue and squires had striped or rayed cloth.[75]

Few indications of status can be inferred from the colours of robes given to officials in King John's household. Stewards, for example, received black and brown robes.[76] Royal huntsmen received blue and green cloth for their robes.[77] Many other household servants also received green robes, including a nurse, washerwomen and valets and large quantities of green cloth were purchased by Reginald of Cornhill for the household.[78] Early in the reign of Henry III, much of the royal household was also dressed in green, which was perhaps a continuation of earlier practice under John.[79] In the early thirteenth century, indicators of status through clothing had not been fully defined. It is only possible to detect elements of the system in its early form. Clothing as a signifier of membership of the King John's affinity is more appreciable in the evidence; through the wearing of green robes the unity of John's household might have been visually enforced.[80] Royal officials were not constantly dressed in green, rather this might have been the colour of their robes at times of special importance, such as during the Christmas and Easter courts when the household was inflated with visitors. Or, at times when the strength of the king needed to be visually enforced, the image of a collective following might have been achieved through uniform liveries, which surrounded the king and created a symbolically powerful weapon against his enemies.

---

[73] Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries', pp. 206-9.
[74] Wild, 'A Truly Royal Retinue', pp. 135-6. For the use of colour in liveries as an indicator of status, see Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liveries', pp. 220-47. Such distinctions do not appear to have always been used during the reign of Henry III. Early in Henry's reign, much of his household was clothed in green robes, see *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 21.
[75] Vale, 'Provisioning Princely Households', pp. 39-40.
[76] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 103b.
[77] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 97b.
[78] *Rot. Litt. Claus,* i, pp. 4b, 25, 43b, 63b-4, 88b, 97b, 104, 109, 184b,
[79] *Pipe Roll 17 John,* p. 21.
[80] For examples, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 25, 109.

There is also limited evidence of liveries in the queen's household. In so far as the evidence is revealed to us, there appears to have been no uniformity in the colour distributed to her officials. The purchases made by Reginald of Cornhill inform us that the queen's chamberlain had two-and-a-half marks worth of brightly coloured cloth for making a robe, along with two hoods with rabbit fur, in total costing eighteen shillings. The queen's nurse received seven ells of green cloth and a hood lined with rabbit fur. For the queen's six grooms, they received just twenty-seven ells of plain cloth for making their robes. Ladies-in-waiting appear to have worn black, accompanied with either rabbit fur or lamb's wool.[81] On one occasion, the king purchased a black robe for the lady-in-waiting, Susanna, who was described as 'amice domini regis', and had it lined with an unusual saffron coloured cendal.[82] Reginald of Cornhill also made purchases of cloths and furs for the queen to wear, the quality of which represented her status. The furs she received were mainly miniver and ermine, although she also received deer and rabbit fur.[83] The queen was given scarlet and peonaz (violet) cloths, along with the popular colour of the king's household – green.[84] For a number of years, King John also seems to have met the costs of dressing the household of his first wife, the countess of Gloucester. Out of the profits of the farm of Kent in 1204, 1205, 1206 and 1208, Reginald of Cornhill purchased robes for the countess, her knights, her ladies-in-waiting and other servants spending between £20 and £28 in each of those years.[85]

For the most part, the purchasing of cloths and furs for robes for the household was undertaken sporadically in large quantities. Great Christian feast days, especially Christmas and Easter, however, appear to have regularly inspired the generosity of the king. King John's practice of robe-giving at Christmas time was noted by Roger of Wendover; and his generosity remarked upon by the author of *Histoire des ducs de Normandie et des rois d'Angleterre*.[86] The amount of money spent in preparation for Christmas certainly encourages a belief in this generosity. A writ of *liberate*, for example, was sent to the treasurer for £209 8*s* 11*d* for Reginald after he purchased

[81] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 104, 109; *Pipe Roll 10 John,* p. 96; *Pipe Roll 16 John,* p. 27. By the end of Henry III's reign, an ell was fixed at 2¼*m* by 27¼*m*, see *Fleta*, ii, p. 120.
[82] *Docs. of English History,* p. 267.
[83] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 10b, 63b-64, 88b, 89, 104, 109.
[84] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 63b-64, 88b, 104.
[85] *Pipe Roll 6 John,* p. 213; *Pipe Roll 7 John,* p. 112; *Pipe Roll 8 John,* p. 47; *Pipe Roll 10 John,* p. 97.
[86] *Histoire des Ducs,* p. 105.

cloths for Christmas 1204. For the following Christmas, £80 113*s* 10*d* was spent on robes from the profits of the London exchange.[87] For Christmas at Windsor in 1207, Reginald spent £296 7*s*, much of which was used to buy materials for nearly three hundred fur lined hoods.[88] The cheapest of these hoods were lined with rabbit fur, of which eighty-nine hoods were purchased, each costing 7*s* 6*d* each. These hoods were probably intended for the use of the household serjeants. A further 182 hoods lined with deer fur were also purchased, each costing nineteen or twenty shillings. Deer fur was a relatively expensive; its quality and the quantity in which it was bought suggest that it was perhaps intended for the household knights and squires. Geoffrey de Caux, initially one of the king's squires, who was knighted later in the reign, received had received a hood lined with deer fur in 1205, demonstrating that this fur was appropriate for his status.[89] Ten hoods lined with squirrel fur, each costing 13*s* 4*d* were also bought for Christmas 1207. Squirrel fur was often imported from Ireland and Scotland. Although still an expensive commodity, the relative proximity of England to the origin of these furs helped keep costs lower than those furs that came from the colder lands in the north. The most expensive hoods purchased in 1207 were fur lined with miniver, of which eleven were bought, and sable, of which five were bought. The difference in the cost of these furs is considerable, costing three times as much as a deer fur hood, at around £2 13*s* each. These furs must have been reserved for the highest echelons of the court. In John's household, through the attachment of fur to robes status appears to have been visually demonstrated. Furs were used to signify the subtle differences in status. The furs used were from native animals such as rabbits and sheep, as these would have provided the warm, luxurious element to their robes, without the greater costs of using imported furs.

Reginald's knowledge of purchasing furs was essential to the magnificence of the royal household. Reginald must have had access to the very best furs in London markets. In October 1205, Reginald's awareness of the fur available in England is revealed in the record sources. William Anglicus, a trader from Rouen, who brought sable furs to England, claimed that they were the very best furs available. The king

[87] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 18, 60b.
[88] The county farm for Kent was £412 7*s* 6*d* blanch and £145 13*s* 4*d*. Reginald paid in nothing in 1207, a large amount was spent on these hoods and other on household items. For the following discussion of hoods, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 103b.
[89] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 25. For Geoffrey as a knight, see *Rot. Lib. John*, p. 165.

instructed Reginald to buy three of them providing truly there was not better in England as William had claimed.[90]

William the tailor's accounts on the dorse of the misae rolls serve as a source of information for the fabrics and colours used for the robes of the king and his senior associates, who enjoyed the privilege of having robes made by the chamber tailor. These accounts do not state that all the textiles were bought by Reginald of Cornhill. But there is other evidence that clearly demonstrates that Reginald sent textiles to the tailor. During the household's visit to New Temple London in early March 1213, for example, Reginald supplied gold lace to William for making a surcoat for the king.[91] The misae roll also shows that, on some occasions, cloths and furs were bought directly with coin from the chamber in the vicinity of the household. When the household was at Winchester on 22 February 1210, for example, a miniver fur was bought for making a nightgown for the king.[92] The king's chamber functioned with a significant degree of autonomy from the wider household and, so, it did not always utilise the same routes of supply. The chamber received all the cloths and furs for the household, in this role it was largely supplied by Reginald of Cornhill. The materials used for making robes the king and his closest associates were also, however, purchased in the localities surrounding the household. The evidence of this local purveyance is incomplete. Yet, the accounts of William the tailor are illustrative of the types of cloths and furs which were being used by the chamber officials.[93]

For the Easter celebrations in 1213, William the Tailor made three 'blood red' robes for the king, the queen and the earl d'Albini. A ruby red robe lined with green cendal was given to the king by Hugh de Boves. A matching robe was made by the tailor for the household knight, Brian de Lisle. Such a gift must be seen as a mark of Brian's status and favour in the household. Red was an expensive pigment which has been worn by royal men and women throughout the ages. Wearing red was part of a conspicuous display of wealth which marked out the highest nobility. The king also wore the popular colour of green. William's account reveals that he made green robes for the king, Robin de Samford, John le Chat, Richard, the king's son and Henry de Tracey. More robes lined with green cendal were made for the king and the

[90] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 55.
[91] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128b.
[92] *Rot. Lib. John.*, p. 151.
[93] For what follows, see *Docs. of English History*, p. 267.

earl of Salisbury. Robes made of *burnet* were also made for the king and his knights. Russet coloured robes were also popular. One was made for the king, the earl of Salisbury, Richard the king's son, Robin de Samford, John le Chat and Roger de Thony; only the king's, however, was lined with ermine.

One of the most striking aspects of this account is the variety of colour worn by the king and his companions. Yet, the king was distinguished by the superior quality of his robes. The king's blood red robe, for example, cost 10*d* to be made up, whereas the same coloured robe made for the earl d'Albini cost 8*d*. The fur used to line the king's robes were the highest quality ermine; a soft, white fur which could only be found in the far north of Russia and some Scandinavian forests and must have been imported into England at great cost.[94] The cendal used to line these robes was a light-weight silk. A gift of silk was a great indicator of the benevolence the king felt for the recipient. Silk was a symbolically important commodity in medieval England. From the Anglo-Saxon period onwards, it was used to wrap relics and cover the tombs of saints. This association with saintly cults made silk part of a spiritual experience. By dressing in silks, King John provided a pointed reminder to both his supporters and his opponents of not only his wealth but the sacerdotal power of kingship.[95] Overall the account of William the tailor, combined with the evidence of Reginald of Cornhill's purchases, enables an image of a colourful, sumptuous royal court to emerge from the sources. The king's court must have stood in stark contrast to the wider society, being a visual spectacle designed to amaze and subdue those people that came into contact with it.

The conspicuous raiment of the king was further enhanced by his jewels and the household was made more magnificent by the presence of gold and silver cups, plates and dishes lining its tables.[96] In the years that John fitz Hugh conducted purveyance for the household, he was especially concerned with purchasing gold, jewels and plate. John, for example, bought one hundred and fifty gold leaves for the gilding of 567 lances, which would have been used as part of a theatrical display

---

[94] E. M. Veale, *English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2003), p. 62.
[95] Fleming, 'Silk', pp. 147-57.
[96] For King John's jewels, see Warren, *King John*, pp. 139-40; A. V. Jenkinson, 'The Jewels Lost in the Wash', *History,* 8 (1923), 163-6. For jewel accounts from the reign of Henry III, see B. L. Wild, 'Secrecy, Splendour and Statecraft: The Jewel Accounts of King Henry III of England, 1216-1272', *Historical Research,* 83 (2010), 409-30.

rather than for fighting.[97] John also possibly had custody of a large quantity of the king's plate in the later part of the reign. In December 1213, William de Cantilupe instructed John to send to Windsor cups and pitchers for the upcoming Christmas feast.[98] Moreover, in preparation for the Easter celebrations in 1216, the king instructed John to send cups and pitchers to Reading.[99] Earlier in the reign, Hugh de Neville had custody of King John's plate collection at Marlborough. An inventory of the plate from 1207 to 1208 describes the contents of this collection, including items such as bowls decorated with figures, flowers and lions. In total the inventory records 128 cups and eight bowls.[100] The fate of some of this royal plate is recorded in a letter close from June 1216, which reveals the instructions sent to Hubert de Burgh to melt down the king's plate to pay troops at Dover.[101]

Reginald of Cornhill also probably had a store of the king's plate. On Hugh de Neville's account of 1207 to 1208, a golden cup was said to have come from the custody of Reginald. Reginald of Cornhill was, for much of the reign, the central figure in the purveyance of luxurious adornments, such as jewels, gold and silver for the king and his household. In this function, Reginald corresponded with, and took instruction from, the king and his chamber officials. In March 1205, a senior chamber clerk issued a letter, witnessed by the king, to Reginald that contained orders to place sapphires, topaz, garnets and a ruby on gold jewels, which Ralph Parmenter had sent to him.[102] Chamber officials also issued writs of *computate* to the barons of the exchequer for money Reginald had spent on the purchases and repairs of these adornments. In August 1207, for example, Richard Marsh warranted a writ to allow £1 13*s* 9*d* against Reginald's account after he paid for an alms dish to be repaired. That such a vast amount was spent on just repairing this dish alludes to its magnificence.[103] In 1208, Ralph Parmenter also issued a writ of *computate*, witnessed by the king, for gold purchased by Reginald to decorate his armour tunics and royal banners. Later in the reign, in April 1215, the king commissioned Reginald to have armour and banners made with 'good beaten gold'.[104] In the early months of

[97] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 108.
[98] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 157b.
[99] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 259b.
[100] *Memoranda Roll 10 John*, pp. 119-125.
[101] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 274b-5.
[102] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 22b.
[103] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 89b.
[104] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 193b.

1215, as unrest across the country grew, the image of a great, wealthy king would have been especially important as it demonstrated a symbolic power to the opposition. By cladding himself in gold and jewels the king reminded those who would stand against him of his power – his position as the lord's anointed on earth.

When the king did not personally attest commissions and writs of *computate*, the task was often entrusted to his administrator, William Brewer. In January 1213, William sent a writ of *computate* to the barons of exchequer for a ring and a brooch purchased by Reginald.[105] A couple of months later, William sent another writ concerning the money Reginald had spent on having a silver cup made 'to serve' the king's household, which was perhaps intended to be used at communion. This writ also mentions the purchase of gold used for making a case for the king's 'ambergris apples', an early pomander – a rarity in early thirteenth-century England.[106] Items, such as these, were what differentiated the royal household from any other in the realm. Luxury items represented the king's expensive tastes and bolstered his omnipotent image by visually demonstrating his wealth to the visitors at court.

The evidence concerning the purveyance of cloths and jewels for the king's household might lead one to suspect that it was the Angevin chamber which was responsible for storing and distributing other non-perishable luxuries, but this was not the case. There was a division of labour in the household, which is shown explicitly on 3 February 1208. On this day, two writs of *computate* were issued to the barons of the exchequer for money expended by Reginald of Cornhill. The first writ was witnessed by Geoffrey de Neville the chamberlain and warranted by Richard Marsh, the chief chamber clerk. It listed items which Reginald had purchased including hoods with deer fur, lamb's wool, rabbit fur, *burnet* and grey cloths for coverlets. The second letter was warranted by the king's steward, William de Cantilupe, and listed items such as firewood, charcoal, saddles and spices.[107] Both these letters were sent to the barons of the exchequer to allow money against Reginald's account. That two letters were written demonstrates that the chamber staff and stewards were concerned with different types of goods coming into the household. This division was not rigid, there are occasions when the stewards issued

[105] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128b.
[106] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128b.
[107] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 101b-102.

writs of *computate* that included money spent on cloths, and chamber staff issued writs concerning items such as wax. Nonetheless, there was clearly a separation between those household officials concerned with the purveyance of non-perishable luxuries, such as spices, almonds, preserved figs and wax and the chamber staff, who were concerned with cloths, furs and jewels. As we have previously seen, each individual steward played a very different role in supporting the king, but Peter of Stokes and William de Cantilupe were both important to the process of purveying certain luxuries. In the later years of his reign, as the domestic role of the steward declined, King John was the sole commissioner of luxuries for his household from Reginald of Cornhill.

The term 'spices' encompassed different food stuffs, including almonds, figs, rice, as well as those items traditionally thought of as flavouring spices. These items were all grouped together in the medieval mind as one type of commodity, as such they were often procured together.[108] The way in which the steward or the king ordered spices for the household can be seen most clearly in the preparations for Christmas, Easter and Lent. For these important Christian days, just as King John purchased expensive, lavish robes and furs to clothe his followers to create a display of splendour and wealth, he also served a rich feast of colourful, highly spiced foods that enhanced the majestic experience of court for all those guests who were attracted to court by the celebrations. Spices were one of the defining characteristics of an upper class diet, their presence at a medieval lord's table represented the opulence of his household. The foreign origins from the Mediterranean, India and East Asia gave spices an exotic allure that inspired the medieval imagination.[109] Most people would have had to be content with locally produced flavourings such as garlic and mustard and, perhaps on special occasions, the cheaper spices, such as cumin and pepper.[110] The nobility and especially the king's household, however, enjoyed a wide variety of spices all year round. There has been some suggestion that spices were used to preserve meat; however, this could be done much more cheaply and effectively through salting, pickling or smoking.[111] Richly spiced food was a luxury that was out

[108] Dyer, *Standards of Living*, p. 62.
[109] P. Freedman, *Out of the East: Spices and the Medieval Imagination* (Yale University Press, 2008), p. 5.
[110] Dyer, *Standards*, p. 63.
[111] Freedman, *Out of the East*, p. 3.

of the reach of most in society. By the lavish provision of such food at his table, the king demonstrated his generosity and wealth.

During Lent, the royal household was greatly reliant on fish and great quantities of spices, nuts and dried fruit to compensate for the loss of other luxury foods stuffs, mainly meat, which was banned during this period of abstinence. For much of society, the royal household's period of asceticism during this time, would have still have represented the highest example of a luxurious diet.[112] From 21 to 24 March 1205, when the household visited Worcester for a feast on the middle Sunday of Lent, preparations were made two weeks previously by Peter of Stokes, the king's steward. Peter arranged for Reginald to send spices, including one-and-a-half pounds of cloves, two pounds of nutmeg, four pounds of cinnamon, four pounds of ginger, a quarter of a pound of galangal and mace, two hundred pounds of almonds and six pounds of rice.[113] Similar preparations can also be seen a week before Lent, in February 1206, and two weeks before Lent in 1208, when Reginald provided spices and almonds for the household, on the instruction of the king's stewards Peter of Stokes and William de Cantilupe. When the household visited the New Temple in London during Lent, from 2 to 4 March 1213, Reginald provided almonds, cloves, ginger, cinnamon and cumin.[114] It was customary that, in preparation for Lent each year, additional stocks of spices were purchased. The evidence reveals that the household was reliant on Reginald for these spices throughout much of John's reign.

Christmas inspired equally lavish spending on spices. In preparation for Christmas at Winchester in 1206, Geoffrey de Neville, during his brief tenure as the king's steward, made a large order for various spices for the feast, including pepper, cloves, mace and saffron. This order was attested by Geoffrey fitz Peter, the justiciar. The lack of the king's attestation is explained by his absence from England until December 1206. The arrangements for this Christmas feast were being made in preparation for the king's return.[115] Later in the reign, on 17 December 1213, the preparations for the Christmas court show that William de Cantilupe instructed Reginald to purchase fifty pounds of pepper, two pounds of saffron and almonds.[116]

[112] Dyer, *Standards,* p. 65.
[113] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 21b, 22.
[114] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, pp. 64b, 101b-102, 128b.
[115] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88b.
[116] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 157-157b.

The evidence demonstrates that Reginald was able to procure a variety of spices at short notice. In the final case, the letter was sent to Reginald on Tuesday 17 December and he was instructed to send the spices to Windsor by the following Saturday or Sunday before Christmas, allowing only three or four days' notice. This urgency was not unique to the Christmas period. On Saturday 9 November 1213, for example, the king issued a letter to Reginald, to send three pounds of saffron (along with wax and herrings) to Oxford by Friday 15 November, when the household was to travel there for a two-day visit.[117] When the transport time is factored in for both the letter to arrive and the spices to be sent, Reginald must either have had immediate access to these spices from merchants in and around London or he must have kept a store of spices ready for the king's use. Evidently, the king's chief purveyor of luxury goods required little, if any, knowledge of the long-term plans for king's itinerary. Luxury commodities could, it seems, be supplied on very short notice.

Spices, such as pepper, ginger, saffron and nutmeg, were received into the household by the king's saucer, Geoffrey. The first recorded mention of Geoffrey appears in September 1201, described as Geoffrey the saucer 'our serjeant', he was the only man to have this title during the reign, and it is to him that Reginald of Cornhill was instructed to send spices.[118] When the household visited London in October 1213, for example, the king sent a letter to Reginald to purchase pepper, cumin, cloves, cinnamon and ginger, which were to be immediately released to Geoffrey.[119] Geoffrey's position would have been one of great trust and importance as the king's spices were expensive, highly prised commodities. A man in charge of this aspect of the king's household was no menial domestic servant, which is revealed by the patronage bestowed upon him. In July 1203, he was the recipient of the various lands of Benedict, a Jew in Lincoln, and Godard of Antioch in London. In 1205, these lands were confirmed to him in perpetuity.[120]

Despite being procured together, other 'spices', such as almonds, were not received into the household by Geoffrey. Instructions to purchase almonds were given by the

[117] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 155; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 687.
[118] *Rot. Lib. John,* p. 20.
[119] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 156b.
[120] *Rot. Lib. John,* pp. 49, 108; *Rot. Chart.,* pp. 155-155b.

serjeant, Richard de la Lande.[121] In 1207, for example, the barons of the exchequer were instructed to account to Reginald of Cornhill for the money he had spent on one hundred pounds of almonds for Easter and thirty-nine pounds of almonds later in the year; these orders had been given ‘by the hand of Richard de la Lande’.[122] In January the following year, Richard ordered fifty pounds of almonds in the household at Guildford.[123] Some of Richard de la Lande’s other activities are also mentioned in the record sources. In January 1214, for example, Richard sent instructions to Reginald of Cornhill to supply dishes for the king’s kitchen.[124] In March 1214, alongside a squire of the chamber stables, Hugh de St. Ouen, Richard delivered some of the king’s horses to Northampton. In July 1207 and May 1215, Richard was also received wax bought by Reginald of Cornhill for the household.[125] Most of these glimpses of information suggest that Richard was involved in the purveyance work of Reginald of Cornhill. Richard, evidently, worked within the household receiving items that Reginald had purchased, yet the evidence does not allow us to ascertain his affiliation with any particular household office.[126] Richard appears not to have had an attachment to the king’s wardrobe; the office which, from the minority of Henry III onwards, received all non-perishable luxuries into the household. During the reign of King John, receipt of these luxuries was undertaken by a number of different officials across many household offices, all overseen by the king or his steward.

Wax was another expensive commodity purchased in abundance for the royal household. In 1213, a pound of wax cost 5½*d*, only slightly less than a pound of pepper.[127] The importance of wax to those in the royal household is demonstrated by its central place in the *Constitutio*, in which the allowance due to domestic officials included candles. The quantity of wax received was reflective of the recipient’s status.[128] Lighting through candles was a sign of affluence. The large quantities of

---

[121] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 49b. Richard’s position in the royal household continued into the reign of Henry III, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 345b.
[122] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88b.
[123] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 101b-102.
[124] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 160b.
[125] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 88b, 190b; *Memoranda Roll 10 John*, p. 132.
[126] A little can be discovered about Richard’s rewards for his service in the household. In 1205, he received lands in Wanbridge. In 1213, he received the land of William of Pilkington, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 49b, 136.
[127] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 152. For wax as a luxury, see Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 202.
[128] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 196-8, 204-10.

candles supplied by Reginald were probably used to light the household during the night, this custom having apparently been restored by Henry I after the licentious behaviour inspired by the dark nights in the court of William Rufus.[129] Wax candles were also lit and placed before relics. In August 1212, for example, three candles were purchased and placed next to relics for three nights whilst the household was at Bridgnorth.[130] Much of the wax used in the royal household would have been beeswax rather than tallow wax, which was much more expensive but would burn cleanly without an unpleasant smell.[131]

Wax was also a vital for communications, as it was required for seals. Michael Clanchy has seen the quantity of wax purchased as an indicator of the volume of documents being produced in the reign of Henry III. Clanchy's findings demonstrate the vast amount of wax that was required by the scriptorium of the royal household.[132] In addition to wax, parchment, quills and feathers were purchased for the clerks of the household. Parchment was frequently bought directly with coin from the chamber rather than by Reginald.[133] Many local officials were used in the purveyance of wax for the household. Local reeves and sheriffs were called upon to requisition wax when the household passed through the lands under their control. When the household went to Northampton from 27 to 29 September 1213, for example, the reeves of that city were asked to provide seventy pounds of wax. On 30 September, King John issued a writ of *computate* to the barons to allow the money the reeves had spent against their account.[134] Even in the mutinous atmosphere of the days preceding Magna Carta, the king put his attestation on an order to the reeves of Winchester to send two hundred pounds of wax to the household.[135] During John fitz Hugh's brief tenure as chief royal purveyor, £126 16*s* 2½*d* was allowed against his account at the exchequer for an enormous 7,600 pounds of wax, which he had

---

[129] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum,* pp. 714-5.
[130] *Docs. of English History,* p. 237. For the display and conspicuous consumption of relics, see N. C. Vincent, 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings, 1154-1272', in *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan,* ed. by C. Morris and P. Roberts (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 12-45; N. C. Vincent, *The Holy Blood: King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic,* pp. 7-19; D. L. Bethell, 'The Making of a Twelfth-Century Relic Collection', *Studies in Church History,* 8 (1972), 61-71.
[131] Most references to wax or candles for the royal household uses the word *cera*, suggesting beeswax rather than tallow wax was commonly used, see *Dialogus and Constitutio,* p. 197, note 7.
[132] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record,* pp. 60-64; 80-2.
[133] *Rot. Lib. John,* p. 30, 111, 120, 128, 134, 142, 148, 150, 153, 158, 162, 164, 167.
[134] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 152; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 686.
[135] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 214b.

bought and transported to the king's household.[136] This great quantity of wax was perhaps bought over a number of years, as we know that John fitz Hugh was active in purveyance from the early years of the reign.

Although, many local officials were used in the purveyance of wax, Reginald was still the purveyor most frequently called upon for this commodity. When the household visited Nottingham from 27 to 29 March 1205, Reginald sent a thousand candles along with hair cloth and cord for the binding candles. The steward, Peter of Stokes, ordered the treasurer to release money to Reginald for those candles and another payment for five hundred candles that had been sent to Winchester and Westminster.[137] In February the following year, Peter of Stokes issued a writ of *computate* for two hundred pounds spent on ten thousand candles that Reginald had bought for the household.[138] Extra stores of wax were especially needed over the winter period, as there was less natural light. In September 1207, William de Cantilupe commissioned Reginald to buy three or four hundred pounds of wax, along with pepper and cumin 'for the coming winter'.[139] In the later part of the reign, as the stewards' involvement in the domestic activities of the household reduced, Reginald took his instructions directly from the king. In December 1213, for example, the king ordered Reginald to 'quickly' send five hundred pounds of wax to Reading.[140] Reginald was often given no more than a few days' notice to send substantial quantities of wax to the household. In preparation for Christmas at Windsor in 1213, for example, Reginald was given just four days to deliver five hundred pounds of wax.[141] Reginald was well equipped to supply the household at short notice, as he had custody of a store of the king's wax in London, so would not have needed to procure large quantities at short notice.[142]

There was also a serjeant who received wax into the household. In February and March 1213, Reginald purchased five hundred candles for use in the king's household at Lincoln and a further three hundred pounds of wax for the household at New Temple, it was Matthew le Marten who received these deliveries of wax into

---

[136] *Pipe Roll 13 John*, p. 107.
[137] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 25.
[138] *Pipe Roll 7 John*, p. 112; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 64.
[139] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 91b; *Pipe Roll 9 John*, p. 31.
[140] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 156b.
[141] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 157-157b.
[142] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 89.

the household.[143] Later the same year, in September, Matthew received a further one thousand pounds of wax from Reginald.[144] Matthew was the main receiver of wax for the household after 1213. He also had responsibility for receiving other items into the chandlery, such as horse and cart equipment for the office. An order by William de Cantilupe to Reginald for equipment for the chandlery included a saddle, girth and cart cover, which was all released to Matthew.[145]

As has been shown in the previous chapter, officials at Bristol and Southampton largely undertook the purveyance of wine for the king's household. Reginald of Cornhill, however, also made a contribution to the king's wine supplies. Similar to other luxury items for the household, Reginald's instructions regarding the purchasing of wine came directly from the king or from his stewards. The stewards were also responsible for ensuring that the money Reginald spent on wine was accounted to him at the exchequer. The contribution Reginald made to the purveyance of wine for the royal household was largely as a result of King John entrusting the collection of all the prise wine entering London to him in 1205.[146] This responsibility appears to have been held by Reginald until at least 1213, when the king wrote specifically to Reginald to allow William le Engleis to enter London with his wine without any being seized in prise.[147] Reginald received letters directly from the king, instructing him to distribute prise wine to individuals outside the household, such as to the bishop of Bath, who received three casks and the archdeacon of Worcester, who received two casks.[148] Reginald also sent wine to royal residences to replenish stocks after a royal visit. Often these places were within relative proximity of London. After the household's visit to Reading from 22 to 24 January 1205, for example, Reginald supplied two casks of wine; a writ of *computate* was subsequently sent to the barons on 5 February.[149] Reginald also regularly paid for wine consumed by the household whilst in London. In the early part of the reign, it was the responsibility of the king's steward, Peter of Stokes, to instruct the treasurer to repay Reginald for this wine.[150] After the death of Peter of

[143] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128b; Kanter, 'Itineraries', p. 680.
[144] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 151b.
[145] *Rot. Litt. Claus.,* i, p. 175.
[146] *Rot. Litt. Pat.,* p. 63b.
[147] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 138.
[148] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 82b, 102. For other examples, see *ibid.,* pp. 1, 51, 58b, 138b, 153b.
[149] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 18b.
[150] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 18.

Stokes, the stewards played significantly less part in the purveyance of wine through Reginald. On occasion, William de Cantilupe still issued writs of *computate* or commissioned purchases, but this was done alongside the king's attestation and amongst large orders of other luxuries. For the most part, all instructions concerning Reginald's wine purveyance came directly from the king.[151] Reginald was the most frequent supplier of special wines from Auxerre in Burgundy, La Réole, Moissac and Gaillac from Aquitaine.[152] Wine was a luxury commodity in any form, but it was Reginald who was able consistently to procure those rarer, expensive types that must have found their way directly to the king's table.

Reginald of Cornhill and his son were also purveyors of some practical, essential items, such as transport apparatus for horses and carts, which facilitated the peripatetic practice of John's household. There is evidence of Reginald of Cornhill, senior, buying pieces of transport equipment intermittently up until the break in the chancery rolls in 1208. He purchased large carts for hauling, saddles for baggage horses, girths for keeping the saddles in place and bridle-reins.[153] In the years from 1213 to 1215, however, the younger Reginald of Cornhill consistently bought much larger quantities of horse and cart equipment for almost every household office. In March 1213, Reginald equipped the king's kitchen, wardrobe, marshalsea and armoury with most requisites for transportation, including saddles, saddle bags with girths, cord and back bands for keeping the baggage in place; bridle reins, halters, collars, shoes and stirrups for equipping the horse for riding; canvas and leather for cart covers; and curry combs for grooming the horses. William Brewer issued a writ of *computate* to ensure the barons of the exchequer accounted to Reginald for these purchases.[154] Later in the year, in October 1213, Brian de Lisle commissioned Reginald with another large order of horse and cart equipment for the kitchen, hunt, buttery and dispensary. The equipment purchased was designed to prepare horses for haulage, including saddles with a surcingle, girth, crupper strap and breeching; everything required for a horse to securely transport a heavy load of baggage. All apparatus intended for the horses and carts of the king's wardrobe was released to the head carter Odo. Whereas, all the equipment for the other offices was received

[151] For William de Cantilupe, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 103b, 157-157b, 175. For the king's commissions, see *ibid.*, pp. 14, 52, 96b, 109, 129, 158, 182, 188.
[152] See *supra*, pp. 164-6.
[153] *Pipe Roll 7 John*, p. 5; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 88b, 103b, 109.
[154] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 128b.

into the household by Robin the saddler, revealing the division between the wardrobe and the wider household.[155]

From 1213 to 1215, Reginald frequently purchased large amounts of equipment for horses and carts. Letters close concerning these purchases were issued in March, October, November and December of 1213. An especially large order of transport equipment was made in January 1214. This purchasing of horse and cart apparatus ceases whilst the king was on the continent during 1214. Once the king returns, similar commissions to Reginald for more transport equipment can be seen in the letters close from November 1214 to March 1215.[156] The abundant quantities of transport equipment purchased in these years must be seen in the light of the campaign to the continent. To prepare for a foreign expedition, the king needed his domestic household offices to be robust and durable to meet the challenges of the campaign. The purchases we can see that were made on the king's return were likely to replace items that had been damaged, lost or simply worn down during the course of the war.

Reginald was commissioned by the king or the steward to buy other miscellaneous equipment for the household offices. For Christmas at Winchester in 1206, for example, Geoffrey de Neville instructed Reginald to purchase six pails, weights for three measuring vessels, two trivets, lattices, four table knives and cloths.[157] Linen used for making tablecloths regularly appears amongst large orders for other luxury and practical items. In December 1213, William de Cantilupe ordered a thousand ells for linen for making tablecloths, ready for Christmas that year.[158] Reginald often supplied the kitchen with new equipment, including cauldrons, dishes and pans. In early 1214, for example, Reginald was instructed to cause William, a serjeant of the king's kitchen, to have ten pans and to provide William with his essential allowance while he brought them to the household.[159] For the buttery, Reginald purchased bottles and casks and released them to Walter Lunge Eschine, a serjeant of that household office.[160]

[155] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 153b-154, 156b, 178b.
[156] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 128b, 140, 141, 153b-154, 156b, 158b, 160, 160b, 178b, 183b, 188, 190.
[157] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 88b; *Pipe Roll 7 John*, pp. 5-6.
[158] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 157-157b.
[159] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 160b.
[160] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 141b.

Other practical items that Reginald of Cornhill and his son intermittently purchased were firewood and charcoal. Reginald was certainly not a key procurer of firewood or charcoal for the household. When Reginald was called upon for these goods, it coincided with when the household was at London. When the household visited Lambeth on 22 and 23 January 1208, for example, William de Cantilupe ordered firewood from Reginald. Robert the sculler and Thomas the vintner were the officials who received the wood and charcoal from Reginald for the kitchen, hall and chamber.[161] It was unusual for Reginald to be called upon to purchase firewood and charcoal. But as it was January, the coldest month of the year, and the household was in London, it was perhaps convenient to use the household's chief purveyor when stocks ran low. In general, purchases for firewood rarely appear in the record sources. A large order appears in November 1205, when Peter of Stokes instructed the sheriff of Oxford to send fifty carts of firewood and thirty carts of charcoal to the king's manor house at Oxford.[162] One other mention occurs on the misae roll for 1209 to 1210, which records that 10*s* 3½*d* was spent on firewood for the chamber and kitchen. In this entry, it is explained that in the future it was the responsibility of Hugh de Neville to find sufficient firewood for those household offices. Hugh's position as the chief forester perhaps explains his access to large quantities of firewood. For the most part, we may assume that firewood was gathered from the king's estates and forest lands. As this method would not have incurred purchasing costs, it has made little impact on the surviving records.

The evidence surrounding the purveyance undertaken by the Cornhill family can inform us about the structure of the royal household and the nature of the king's involvement in its domestic arrangements. King John took a personal interest in almost every aspect of the purveyance undertaken by Reginald, which is evidenced by his attestation and warrant on letters commissioning Reginald to buy commodities for the household. John must have interested himself in the minutiae of his household: he must have had an awareness of the levels of stock available in his wine stores, what spices were being kept by his saucer and how much wax was in the chandlery. John had overall control of the purveyance conducted by Reginald, but within the household offices there was a division of labour. The officials of the

[161] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, pp. 101b-102.
[162] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, i, p. 58.

chamber were responsible for all the textiles needed for making up the robes for the king and his *familia.* They were also concerned with the purchase or repair of jewels and received these expensive items into the chamber for storing. Whereas, the stewards, and then later the king, commissioned orders for spices, almonds, figs, wax, rare wines and practical items such as horse and cart equipment, kitchen utensils and table cloths. It was the responsibility of various household officials to ensure that these items were safely received from Reginald and stored in the household.

In 1216, at the start of the minority, there was a clear break in this system, with the emergence of the king's wardrobe as the main storage office for all non-perishable luxuries. This new arrangement developed over the course of the thirteenth century into the separate entity – the great wardrobe. We can see that, even by the second half of John's reign, the wardrobe was gaining distinction from the chamber; it was emerging as an independent office.[163] Whilst a fully functioning monarch, however, held the throne, who took a keen interest in every aspect of his domestic household, the control over the purveyance of luxury goods remained firmly in the king's hands. After the death of King John, the new king was a child with a minority government dealing with an administrative system which was in chaos due to civil war. This situation gave both the reason and the means for the dynamic of the royal household to be altered, as the focus of control shifted away from the king, and more responsibility was delegated to officials, causing more rigid departmentalism. The receipt of non-perishable items into the household was forged into one household office, the wardrobe, with William the tailor emerging as the key figure in this new role. It is from this point in history, which we can truly begin to see the origins of the great wardrobe. Before this change, the purveyance of non-perishable luxuries fell under the king's immediate remit rather than being an administrative officer of the wardrobe.

[163] The growth of the wardrobe office, see *supra*, pp. 60-3.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis has been to explore the domestic arrangements of the household of King John. What I hope I have shown is the centrality of the king to the operation of his household and the influence he held over its structure and its function. The household was not a static institution simply fulfilling the basic daily needs of the monarch. It was a flexible body comprising of men who worked to serve their master in his immediate, specific needs. The personal preferences and requirements of the king were the directing force behind all actions in the household. In essence, the household had one defining purpose - to serve the king. As a consequence, when the king's needs changed from day-to-day, year-to-year or, especially, from reign-to-reign, so, too, did the household. Certainly, many of the basic requirements stayed the same – the household would always have needed to provide food, wine, ale, horses, carts, firewood and candles – but the processes by which these tasks were completed evolved to suit the master of the household.

The malleability of the household to the king's needs is especially evident in the example of the royal chamber. From the twelfth to fourteenth century, the financial and administrative functions of the chamber underwent a number of changes. What this thesis has shown is that the domestic arrangements of the chamber also witnessed many developments. During John's reign, the work of the chamber had extended beyond its traditional domestic function as the king's sleeping quarters to include roles which required the establishment of chamber offices for a special kitchen, a dedicated stables and an armoury. The diverse functions of John's chamber ensured that the chamber officers had the means to provide for the king's essential daily needs without the continuous support of the wider household. The structure of the chamber created a space within the household which allowed the king to live separately from the hustle and bustle of court. King John was, like others of the greater nobility of Western Europe, participating in a movement towards increasing privacy, a trend that we may witness across the princely courts of Europe from the twelfth century onwards. The division between the chamber and the hall enabled John to manipulate the power within his court by restricting access to his person – the font of patronage. John's troubled relationship with his baronage and his inability to successfully inspire loyalty and trust through the dispensing of lands and feudal privileges has been seen as a fundamental weakness to his reign.[1] The structure of John's chamber, as we now know it, might have provided the ideal ground in which the seeds of this discontent were sown.[2]

The flexibility of the household is not readily apparent in the household ordinances of the twelfth to fourteenth century. These documents encourage an impression of departmentalism and continuity in the household structure. Yet, when the evidence available for John's reign has been interrogated these rigid structures weaken. The ordinances conceal the true complexity of household. The *Constitutio,* for example, describes senior ministers who were a near permanent feature of the itinerant court, including the stewards, the master chamberlain and the master butler.[3] The household ordinance produced during the reign of Edward II also contains these officials, which suggests that there was a significant degree of continuity across the twelfth to fourteenth centuries.[4] In John's reign, however, those men who were titled chamberlain had little function in the office from which they took their name. The chamberlains were employed as seneschals of the king's continental lands, they served on military campaigns and were constables of royal castles. Their duties rarely brought them into contact with the royal chamber. The king's senior butler also permanently served out of court during John's reign. Daniel the butler was based in Southampton and acted as the controller of all wine purveyance at that important seaport. The household butlers who remained within the household had lost the pre-eminence enjoyed by their predecessors during the Norman period as depicted in the *Constitutio*.

During the stewardship of Peter of Stokes (1201 to 1206), much of the organisation of the royal household was delegated to him. He sent orders to wine officials in Southampton and Bristol and commissioned Reginald of Cornhill to buy luxuries. Peter also instructed sheriffs and other local officials to purchase food and directed them to where these supplies should be stored for future use. Peter also paid the wages of many household officials and ensured that there was care provided for sick household officials. After Peter's death, the steward's domestic responsibilities

[1] Holt, *Northerners*, pp. 217-250.
[2] Warren saw the expansion of John's chamber as a result of John's desire conduct his business through his confidantes, see *Governance,* p. 188.
[3] *Dialogus and Constitutio*, pp. 196-215.
[4] Tout, *Edward II,* pp. 270-314.

diminished, and as a result the stewards of the later part of the reign, Brian de Lisle, William de Harcourt and Falkes de Bréauté, were rarely at court, being instead a force of royal power in the localities.

By the middle years of John's reign, most of the senior officials described in the *Constitutio* had shifted away from domestic duties within the itinerant household. This process appears to echo events after the Norman Conquest. In the earliest stages of the Anglo-Norman rule, officers of the court began to take on an honorary cast, finding their function out of the household and deputies were employed to fulfil their domestic responsibilities.[5] Over the course of the following hundred years, the next generation of senior officials also moved away from their domestic duties. This movement created a situation whereby, at end of John's reign, the steward, the chamberlain and the butler were rarely in attendance at court. The titles these men held gave them with the necessary royal authority to complete the tasks the king delegated to them. These titles are indicative of the relationship between the king and his servant and not of the role they played in the domestic sphere of the household.

This shifting focus of the household's senior officials acts as a reminder to us that we should not look for a linear development of the royal household over the medieval period. By seeing continuities between the surviving household ordinances of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, it is possible to create a paradigm of a royal household with clear and recognisable lines of development through the medieval period. It is through such constructions that constitutionalist historians looked to trace the structures of the medieval royal household to the great offices of state in the early twentieth century.[6] Such an approach, however, does not allow for a crucial factor in the history of the royal household – the personal will of the king.[7]

After the death of Peter of Stokes in 1206, the nature of the stewards' role changed and King John became directly involved in the domestic arrangements of his household. In many aspects of his rule, King John was keen to focus authority on his

[5] F. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England,* 3rd edn (Oxford, 1971), p. 639.
[6] Round, *King's Serjeants,* pp. 52-264; *Red Book,* pp. ccxciii-ccxcvii; G. H. White, 'The Great Officers of State', *The Genealogists' Magazine,* 11 (1954), 499-534; White, 'Household of the Norman Kings', pp. 127-55.
[7] For a comparison with noble households, see R. G. K. A. Mertes, 'The Secular Noble Household in Mediaeval England, 1350-1550' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1981), p. 314.

own person.[8] The twentieth-century biographers of King John have also seen the year 1206 as a pivotal moment in which John swept up the power of the kingdom more directly under his own control. In the years before 1204, the government and administration of England had remained largely the same as that found under John's predecessors – his brother and father. From 1204 to 1206, John's focus was on the preparations for an expedition to regain his lost continental possessions. After the campaign in Poitou in 1206, John's attention was focused fully on England for the first time.[9] Warren saw the years which followed this campaign as characterised by the king's domination over all aspects of government. In these years, the 'management of the realm was bought under the King's *curia*, the 'bench' was suspended, the exchequer overseen by *familiares* and the role of the justiciar diminished'.[10] Having lost the vast majority of his continental lands, John became intensely focused on the government and administration of England.

This desire for control also manifested itself in the arrangements of his household: John drew within his own direct remit the organisation of the domestic sphere of his household, thereby negating the need for a steward to whom the king had traditionally delegated that responsibility. This shift towards kingly control can be seen as part of a common theme throughout this thesis. In chapters three to five the purchase of all types of necessities and luxuries for the household ceased, for the most part, to be commissioned by the steward or other household ministers. Instead it is the king's warrant which we find solely attached to the chancery documents which record these orders to local officials and purveyors. King John's meticulous attention to detail extended beyond the great system of Angevin administration to the minutiae of his household.

John sent orders to local officials, such as sheriffs and reeves, to buy victuals available in their bailiwick to ensure that his household was adequately stocked during its perambulations. He ordered staple foods, such as *bacons* and wheat, to be stored at his favoured manor houses, hunting lodges and castles. In preparation for great feasts, John instructed Reginald of Cornhill to send luxury items, such as

[8] Warren, *King John*, pp. 135-45.
[9] Gillingham, 'John', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14841, accessed 1 Aug 2013]. Holt placed the crucial moment at the loss of the continental lands in 1204, see *The Northerners*, p. 144.
[10] Warren, *King John*, pp. 172,

spices, special wines, nuts and cloths to his household. After his household left a royal residence, John ordered the local officials to replenish his stores and cellars, so that many of his favoured residences were kept in a permanent state of readiness. The purveyance undertaken by local officials was supplemented by household officials who travelled ahead of the itinerant court to prepare foods, especially bread, which had to be consumed soon after production. John ensured these officials had the required ‘necessities’ for their task by issuing instructions to his men in the localities to provide them with food, money or transportation. After 1206, King John took full and direct responsibility for ensuring that his household was adequately stocked with provisions as it itinerated through the country. Naturally, there were those officials to whom the king would, on occasion, delegate tasks, such as his loyal servant William Brewer or his long-standing steward, William de Cantilupe. From 1206 onwards, however, in the overwhelming majority of cases, King John personally administered the domestic arrangements of his household.

Warren and Holt were the architects of the perception of King John as a dynamic administrator driving the machine of government with ‘energetic imperiousness’.[11] John Gillingham and Ralph Turner, whilst not necessarily disputing this aspect of John’s personality, were wary of using this criterion to characterise John as a ‘good king’.[12] They questioned whether this interpretation was anachronistic as, to contemporaries, great attention to administration might not have been deemed a praise-worthy kingly virtue. Gillingham claimed that contemporaries must have viewed John’s determination to be personally involved in every aspect of his government ‘as, at best, a nuisance’.[13] Be it a virtue or a nuisance, King John grasped the reins of control over the domestic sphere of his household with the same vigour as he claimed immediate control over almost every aspect of royal finance, justice and administration in England after the loss of his continental lands.

[11] Warren, *Governance,* p. 177.
[12] R. Turner, *King John* (London, 1994), p. 19; Gillingham, ‘John (1167–1216)’, *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14841, accessed 1 Aug 2013].
[13] Gillingham, ‘John (1167–1216)’, *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14841, accessed 1 Aug 2013].

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

The National Archives, Kew

C 47/3/15	'le ordenement del hostel le rex'
C53	charters rolls
C54	close rolls
C60	fine rolls
C62	liberate rolls
C66	patent rolls
E 101	exchequer, king's remembrancer, accounts various
E 164/12	Black Book of the Exchequer
E164/2	Red Book of the Exchequer
E372/73	Pipe Roll 13 Henry III
TNA E 368/368	Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer Exchequer Memoranda Roll
TNA E 159/110	King's Remembrancer Exchequer Memoranda Roll

British Library, London

BL Add. MS. 32097	'Ordinances for the household of Edward II'
BL Cotton Tiberius E. VIII	'Ordinationes de hospitio R. Edwardi II'
BL Hargrave MS. 313	'Constitutio Domus Regis de Procurationibus'

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Bodleian, Ashmole. 1147, iii 'The household ordinances of Edward II'

Bibliotheque royale de Belgique, Brussels

MS 3897-3919 'Varie Histoire'

Rouen Archives Department Seine-Maritime, Rouen (by courtesy of N. C. Vincent)

18HP28 Le Valasse Cartulary

Printed Primary Sources

A Monastic Community in Local Society: The Beauchief Abbey Cartulary, ed. by D. Hey, L. Liddy, D. Luscombe (London, 2011)

Accounts of the Constables of Bristol Castle in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries, ed. by M. Sharp, Bristol Record Society, 34 (Gloucester, 1982)

Ancient Charters Royal and Private Prior to AD 1200: Part 1, ed. by J. H. Round, Pipe Roll Society, 10 (London, 1888)

Angevin Acta Project: Count John's Charters and King John's Charters – unpublished. My thanks go to N. C. Vincent for allowing me access to this material.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, rev. trans. by D. Whitelock, D. C. Douglas and S. I. Tucker (London, 1961)

British Borough Charters, 1042-1216, ed. by A. Ballard (Cambridge, 1913)

Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, 6 vols (London, 1903-27)

Calendar of the Liberate Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1226-1240 (London, 1916)

Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1216-1234 (available both on the Henry III Fine Rolls Project's website (http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk) and within *Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1216–1234*, ed. by P.

Dryburgh and B. Hartland, technical ed. by A. Ciula and J. M. Vieira, 3 vols (Woodbridge, 2007)

Cartae Antiquae Rolls 1-10, ed. by L. Landon, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 17 (London, 1939)

The Chancellor's Roll for the Eighth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First: Michaelmas 1196, ed. by D. M. Stenton, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 45 (London, 1930)

The Chronicle of the Election of Hugh Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds and Later Bishop of Ely, ed. by R. M. Thomson (Oxford, 1974)

Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hoveden, ed. by W. Stubbs, 4 vols (London, 1868-71)

Chronica Monasterii Sancti Albani, ed. by H. T. Riley (London, 1865)

Chronique des Rois de France, ed. by L. Delisle*, in Recueils des Historiens de Gaulle et de la France,* ed. by M. Bouquet, 24 vols (Paris, 1864-1904)

Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1227-31 (London, 1902)

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reigns of Richard I, John, Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 17 vols (London, 1922-)

De Necessariis Observantiis Scaccarii Dialogus: Qui Vulgo Dicitur Dialogus de Scaccario, ed. by C. Johnson (London, 1950)

De Nugis Curialium, ed. and trans. by M. R. James, 2nd edn, rev. by C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983)

Dialogus de Scaccario, and Constitutio Domus Regis: The Dialogue of the Exchequer, and The Establishment of the Royal Household, ed. and trans. by Emile Amt and S. D. Church (Oxford, 2007)

Diplomatic Documents preserved in the Public Record Office, 1101-1272, ed. by P. Chaplais (London, 1964)

Documents Illustrative of English History in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, ed. by H. Cole, Record Commission (London, 1844)

Documents of Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267, selected by R. F. Treharne, ed. by I. J. Saunders (Oxford, 1973)

Dugdale, W., *Monasticon Anglicanum,* ed. by J. Caley, H. Ellis, and B. Bandinel, Record Commission, 6 vols (London, 1846)

Eadmer Historia Novorum in Anglia et Opuscula duo de Vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam Miraculis ejus, ed. by M. Rule (London, 1884)

Early Yorkshire Charters, 10 vols. 1-3, ed. by W. Farrer, (Edinburgh, 1914-16), 4-10, ed. by C. T. Clay Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, Extra Series (Edinburgh, 1935-55)

The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, ed. by M. Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969-80)

English Episcopal Acta IX: Winchester 1205-1238, ed. by N. Vincent (New York, 1994)

English Historical Documents, c. 500-1042, ed. by D. Whitelock, 2nd edn (London, 1979)

English Historical Documents, 1042-1189, ed. by D. C. Douglas and G. Greenway, 2nd edn (London, 1981)

English Historical Documents, 1189-1327, ed. by H. Rothwell, (London, 1996)

Excerpta e Rotulis Finium in Turri Londinensi Asservatis, AD 1216-1272, ed. by C. Roberts, Record Commission, 2 vols (London, 1835-6)

A Calendar of the Feet of Fines for Bedfordshire, preserved in the Public Record Office, of the Reigns of Richard I, John, and Henry III, ed. by G. H. Fowler, Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, 6 (Aspley Guise, 1919)

Fines sive Pedes Finium sive Finales Concordiae in Curia Domini Regis, 1199-1214, ed. by J. Hunter, Record Commission, 2 vols (London, 1835)

Fleta, Vol II, ed. by H. Richardson and G. O. Sayles (London, 1955)

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et cuiuscunque generic Acta Publica, ed. by T. Rymer, 2 edn, rev. by A. Clark and F. Holbrooke, Record Commission, 3 vols (London, 1816-30)

Gesta Stephani, ed. by K. R. Potter (London, 1955)

L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, ed. by A. J. Holden and trans. by S. Gregory, historical notes by D. Crouch, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 3 vols (London, 2002)

Histoire des Ducs de Normandie et des Rois d'Angleterre, ed. by F. Michel, Société de l'histoire de France (Paris, 1840)

Interdict Documents, ed. by P. A. Barnes and W. R. Powell (London, 1960)

Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle, ed. and trans. by R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981)

L'Estoire des Engleis, ed. by A. Bell, Anglo-Norman Text Society (Oxford, 1960)

Liber Feodorum. The Book of Fees Commonly Called Testa de Neville, 3 vols (London, 1920-31)

The Life of King Edward who rests at Westminster, ed. and trans. by F. Barlow (Oxford, 1992)

The Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln, ed. by D. L. Douie and Hugh Farmer, 2 vols (London, 1961-2)

Life Records of Chaucer: Volume II Chaucer as Valet and Squire to Edward III, ed. by F. J. Furnivall, Chaucer Society (London, 1876)

List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, Public Record Office, Lists and Indexes 9 (New York, 1963)

Magna Rotuli Scaccarii Normaniae sub Regibus Angliae, ed. by T. Stapleton, Society of Antiquaries of London, 2 vols (London, 1840-4)

Mattaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora, ed. by H. R. Luard, Rolls Series, 7 vols (London, 1872-83)

The Memoranda Roll for the Michaelmas Term of the First Year of the Reign of King John, 1199-1200, ed. by H. G. Richardson, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 21 (London, 1943)

The Memoranda Roll for the Tenth Year of King John (1207-8), ed. by R. Allen Brown, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 31 (London, 1955)

Memoriale fratris Walteri de Coventria: The Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry, ed. by W. Stubbs, 2 vols (London, 1872-3)

Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1216-25, (London, 1901)

Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1225-32, (London, 1903)

Petri Blesensis Opera Omnia, ed. by J. P. Migne, Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series latina, 207 (Paris, 1855)

Pipe Roll 17 John and Praestita Roll 14-18 John ed. by R.A. Brown and J. C. Holt, Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 37 (London, 1961)

Pipe Rolls: Citations to Pipe Rolls are to the regnal year of the reigning kings and published by the Pipe Roll Society, London.

The Pipe Roll of Bishopric of Winchester, 1210-1211, ed. by N. R. Holy (Manchester, 1964)

Pleas Before the King or his Justices, 1198-1212, ed. by D. M. Stenton, Seldon Society, 83-4, 2 vols (London, 1966-67)

Radulfi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum, ed. by J. Stevenson, Rolls Series (London, 1875)

Records of Wardrobe and Household, 1285-1286, ed. by B. F. Bylerly and C. R. Bylerly (London, 1977)

Records of Wardrobe and Household, 1286-1289, ed. by B. F. Bylerly and C. R. Bylerly (London, 1986)

Red Book of the Exchequer, ed. by H. Hall, Record Commission, 3 vols (London, 1896)

Regesta Regum Anglo Normannorum 1100-1135, ed. by C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne (Oxford, 1913)

Revised Medieval Latin Word-List: From British and Irish Sources, ed. by R. E. Latham (London, 1980)

Rogeri de Wendover Chronica: sive Flores Historium, ed. by H. O. Coxe, 4 vols (London, 1841-2)

Roll of Divers Accounts for the Early Years of the Reign of Henry III: Account of Escheats for the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth years of the Reign of Henry III; Wardrobe Receipt Roll and Fragments of Household Roll of 10 Henry III, ed. by F. A. Cazel, Pipe Roll Society, 82 (London, 1982)

Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati, ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1837)

Rotuli Curiae Regis: Rolls and Records of the Court held before the King's Justiciars or Justices, ed. by F. Palgrave, Record Commission, 2 vols (London, 1835)

Rotuli de Liberate ac de Misis et Praestitis Regnante Johanne ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1844)

Rotuli de Oblatis et Finibus in Turri Londinensi Asservati, ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1835)

Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati, ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission, 2 vols (London, 1833, 44)

Rotuli Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londinensi Asservati, ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1835)

Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londenensi Asservati, ed. by T. Duffus Hardy, Record Commission (London, 1835)

Three Yorkshire Assize Rolls for the Reigns of King John and King Henry III, ed. by C.T. Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, 44 (Leeds, 1911)

Victoria History of the Counties of England, ed. by H. A. Doubleday, W. Page, L. Salzman, R. B. Pugh and C. R. Elrington (Oxford, 1900-)

Vita Edwardi Secundi: The Life of Edward the Second, ed. by W. R. Childs (Oxford, 2005)

The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III, ed. by B. L. Wild, Pipe Roll Society New Series, 58 (London, 2012)

Walter of Henley and other Treatises on Estate Management and Accounting, ed. by D. Oschinsky, (Oxford, 1971)

William of Malmesbury Gesta Pontificum Anglorum, ed. and trans. by M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 2007)

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum,* ed. and trans. by R. A. B. Mynors, completed by R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998-9)

Secondary Literature

Almond, R., 'Medieval Hunting: Ruling Classes and Commonality', *Medieval History,* 3 (1993), 147-55.

Althoff, G. and trans. by C. Carroll, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2004)

Albarella, U., 'Pig Husbandry and Pork Consumption in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition,* ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron (Oxford, 2006), pp. 72-87

Baldwin, J. W., *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986)

'The Capetian Court at Work under Philip Augustus', in *The Medieval Court in Europe,* ed. by E. R. Haymes (Munich, 1986), pp. 71-91

Barlow, F., ‘Hunting in the Middle Ages’, *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 113 (1981), 1-11

The Feudal Kingdom of England, 1042-1216, 4th edn (London, 1988)

William Rufus (London, 2000)

Barratt, N., ‘The Revenue of King John’, *English Historical Review,* 443 (1996), 835-55

‘The revenues of John and Philip Augustus revisited’, in *King John: New Interpretations,* ed. by S. D. Church (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 75-99.

Bates, D., ‘The Prosopographical Study of Anglo-Norman Charters’, in *Family Trees and Roots of Politics: The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century,* ed. by K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 89-102.

Benham, J., *Peacemaking in the Middle Ages: Principles and Practice* (Manchester, 2011)

Bennett, J., *Ale, Beer and Brewsters in England: Women’s Work in a Changing World, 1300-1600* (New York, 1996)

Bent, I., ‘The English Chapel Royal Before 1300’, *Royal Musical Association,* 90 (1963-1964), 77-95

Bethell, D. L., ‘The Making of a Twelfth-Century Relic Collection’, in *Studies in Church History,* 8 (1972), 61-71

Binski, P., *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London 1986)

Birrell, J., ‘Procuring, Preparing and Serving Venison in Late Medieval England’, in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition,* ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron (Oxford, 2006), pp. 176-88

Bloch, M. and trans. by L. A. Manyon, *Feudal Society,* 2nd edn (London, 1962)

Brand, J. D., *The English Coinage 1180-1247: Money, Mints and Exchange* (London, 1994)

Brooks, F. W., 'William de Wrotham and the Office of the King's Ports and Galleys', *English Historical Review*, 140 (1925), 570-9

Brown, R. A., '"The Treasury" of the Later Twelfth Century', in *Studies Presented to Hilary Jenkinson*, ed. by J. Conway Davies (London, 1957), pp. 35-49

Castles, Conquest and Charters: Collected Papers (Woodbridge, 1989)

Burley, S. J., 'The Victualing of Calais, 1347-65', *Historical Research*, 31 (1958), 49-57

Burrell, C. M., 'Documents relating to Knepp Castle', *Sussex Archaeological Society*, 3 (London, 1850), 1-12

Campbell, J., 'Domesday Herrings', *East Anglia's History,* ed. by C. Harper-Bill, C. Rawcliffe and R. G. Wilson (Woobridge, 2002), pp. 5-18.

'Anglo-Saxon Courts', in *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages: The proceedings of the First Alcuin Conference*, ed. by C. Cubitt (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 155-69.

Carpenter, C., 'Political and Constitutional History: Before and After McFarlane', in *The McFarlane Legacy*, ed. by R. H. Britnell and A. J. Pollard (Stroud, 1995)

Carpenter, D. A., 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff, 1194-1258', *English Historical Review*, 111 (1976), 1-32

'The Fall of Hubert de Burgh', *Journal of British Studies*, 19 (1980), 1-17

The Minority of Henry III (London, 1990)

The Reign of Henry III (London, 1996)

'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', in *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2003,* ed. by M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 1-30

‘The English Royal Chancery in the Thirteenth Century’, in *English Government in the Thirteenth Century*, ed. by A. Jobson (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 49–70

‘The Household Rolls of King Henry III (1216-1272)’, *Historical Research,* 80 (2006), 22-46

‘‘In Testimonium Factorum Brevium': The Beginnings of the English Chancery Rolls’, in *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm,* ed. by N. Vincent (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 1-28

Carr, A. D., ‘Llywelyn ab Iorwerth (*c.*1173–1240)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Carus-Wilson, E. M., ‘The Effects of the Acquisition and Loss of Gascony on the Wine Trade’, *Historical Research,* 21 (1947), 154-54

Cazel, F. A., ‘Intertwined Careers: Peter des Roches and Hubert de Burgh’, *The Haskins Society Journal,* 1 (1989), 173-81.

Chaplais, P., *English Royal Documents: King John to Henry VI, 1199-1461* (Oxford, 1971)

English Medieval Diplomatic Practice: Part 1, Documents and Interpretation, 2 vols (London, 1982)

Piers Gaveston: Edward II’s Adoptive Brother (Oxford, 1994)

English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages (London, 2003)

Chibnall, M., ‘Mercenaries and the *Familia Regis* under Henry I’, *History,* 62 (1977), 15-23

Church, S. D., ‘The Knights of the Household of King John: A Question of Numbers’, in *Thirteenth Century England IV: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference, 1991,* ed. by P. R. Cross and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 151-65

‘The Rewards of Royal Service in the Household of King John: A Dissenting Opinion’, *English Historical Review,* 110 (1995), 277-302

‘The 1210 Campaign in Ireland: Evidence for a Military Revolution?’, A*nglo-Norman Studies*, 20 (1998), 45-57

The Household Knights of King John (Cambridge, 1999)

ed., *King John: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 1999)

‘Some Aspects of the Royal Itinerary in the Twelfth Century’, in *Thirteenth Century England XI: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference, 2005,* ed. by B. Weiler and others (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 31-45

‘Returning to the Text: Reflections on the *Constitutio Domus Regis*’, *Archives*, 34, no. 118 (2008), 1-13

‘Talking to itself: Royal Records and the Angevin Kings in England, 1154-1216’, in *Comparative Studies of Medieval Documents in Japan and England*, ed. by H. Tsurushima (Tokyo, 2008)

‘King John’s Testament and Last Days of his Reign’, *English Historical Review,* 125 (2010), 505-528

‘Lisle , Sir Brian de (*d.* 1234)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

‘Belet, Michael (d. in or before 1247)’, *Oxford Dictionary National Biography*

Clanchy, M., *From Memory to Written Record: England From 1066 to 1307,* 3rd edn (Chichester, 2013)

Colvin, H. M., R. A. Brown and A. J. Taylor, ed., *The History of the King’s Works: The Middle Ages*, 2 vols (London, 1963)

Connor, R. D., *Weights and Measures of England* (London, 1987)

Conway Davies, J., ‘The First Journal of Edward II’s chamber’, *English Historical Review,* 30 (1915), 662-80

Crouch, D., *The Beaumont Twins: The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1986)

William Marshal: Court, Career and Chivalry in the Angevin Empire 1147-1219 (London, 1990)

The Image of the Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300 (London, 1992)

The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154 (Harlow, 2000)

Bloet family (*per. c.*1080–*c.*1300)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

'Bloet, Nest (*d.* 1224/5)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Dixon-Smith, S., 'The Image and Reality of Almsgiving in the Great Hall of Henry III', *Journal of British Archaeological Association,* 152 (1999), 79-96

Duffy, S., 'King John's Expedition to Ireland, 1210: the Evidence Reconsidered', *Irish Historical Studies,* 30 (1996), 1-24

Dyer, C., 'The Consumption of Fresh Water Fish in Medieval England', in *Medieval Fish, Fisheries and Fishponds,* ed. by M. Aston (Oxford, 1988), pp. 27-38.

Standards of Living in the later Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1989)

'Luxury Goods in Medieval England', in *Commercial Activity, Markets and Entrepreneurs in the Middle Ages,* ed. by B. Dodds and C. D. Liddy (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 217-38

Eyton, R. W., *Court, Household and Itinerary of King Henry II* (London, 1878)

Fairbairn, H., 'The Value and Metrology of Salt in the late Eleventh Century', *Yorkshire Numismatist,* 4 (2012), 171-8

Farmer, D. L., 'Prices and Wages', in *The Agrarian History of England and Wales II, 1042-1350,* ed. by H. E. Hallam (Cambridge, 1988)

Farrer, W., *Honors and Knight's Fees*, 3 vols (London, 1923-5)

Fleming, R., 'Acquiring, Flaunting and Destroying Silk in Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe,* 15 (2007), 127-58

Francia, S., ‘The Spice of Life? The Multiple Uses of Cumin Medieval England’, *The Local Historian,* 41 (2011), 203-15

Franklin, M. J., ‘Cornhill, William of (*d.* 1223)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Freedman, P., *Out of the East: Spices and the Medieval Imagination* (New Haven, 2008)

Galbraith, V. H., *Studies in the Public Records* (London, 1948)

Gillingham, J., ‘The Anonymous of Béthune: King John and Magna Carta’, in *Magna Carta and the England of King John,* ed. by J. S. Leonard (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 27-44

‘Historians without Hindsight: Coggleshall, Diceto and Howden on the early years of King John’, in *King John: New Interpretations,* ed. by S. D. Church, pp. 1-26.

‘John (1167–1216)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

The Angevin Empire, 2nd edn (London, 2001)

Given-Wilson, C., ‘Purveyance for the Royal Household, 1362-1413’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 56 (1983), 145-63

The Royal Household and the King’s Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England 1360-1413 (London, 1986)

Gras, N. S. B., *The Early English Customs System* (Cambridge, 1918)

Green, J. A., *The Government of England under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986)

‘Henry I and the Origins of the Court Culture of the Plantagenet’s’, in *Plantagenêts et Capétiens: Confrontations et Héritages,* ed. by M. Aurell and N. Tonnerre (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 485-95

Griffin, E., *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066* (London, 2007)

Hall, H., *A History of the Custom Revenue in England: From Earliest Times to the year 1827* (London, 1885)

Court life under the Plantagenets: Reign of Henry the Second (London, 1890)

Hammond, P. W., *Food and Feast in Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1993)

Harris, G. L., *King, Parliament and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369* (Oxford, 1975)

Harvey, B., *Living and Dying in Medieval England, 1100-1540* (Oxford, 1993)

'The Aristocratic Consumer in the Long Thirteenth Century', in *Thirteenth Century England VI: Proceedings from the Durham Conference, 1995,* ed. by M. Prestwich, R. H. Britnell and R. Frame (1995), pp. 17-38

Harvey, P. D. A., 'The Pipe Rolls and the Adoption of Demesne Farming in England', *Economic History Review,* 3 (1974), 345-59

Cornhill, Gervase of (*c.*1110–1183/4)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Haskins, G. L., 'Charter Witness Lists in the Reign of King John', *Speculum,* 13 (1938), 319-325

Heiser, R., 'The Royal *Familiares* of King Richard I', *Medieval Prosopography,* 10 (1989), 25-50

Hill, M. C., *The King's Messengers, 1199-1377* (London, 1961)

Holt, J. C., *Magna Carta* (London, 1965)

'The End of the Anglo-Norman Realm', *Proceedings from the British Academy,* 61 (1975), 223-65

'Feudal Society and the Family in Early Medieval England: IV. The Heiress and the Alien', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 5th series, 35 (1985), 1-28

J. C. Holt, *Magna Carta and the Medieval Government* (London, 1985)

The Northerners: A Study in the Reign of King John (Oxford, 1992)

Hooper, N., 'The Housecarles in England in the Eleventh Century', *Anglo-Norman Studies,* 7 (1984), 161-76

Hoyt, R., *The Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History, 1066-1272* (Ithaca, 1950)

Jobson, A., ed., *English Government in the Thirteenth Century,* (Woodbridge, 2004)

James, M. K., *Studies in the Medieval Wine Trade* (Oxford, 1971)

Jenkinson, A. V., 'The Jewels Lost in the Wash', *History,* 8 (1923), 163-6

Johnson, J. H., 'The King's Wardrobe and Household', in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336 Vol. I: Central and Prerogative Administration,* ed. by J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris (Cambridge Mass, 1940), pp. 206-49

Johnston, S. H. F., 'The Lands of Hubert de Burgh', *English Historical Review,* 50 (1935), 418-32

Johnstone, H., 'Poor Relief in Royal Household of Thirteenth-Century England', *Speculum,* 4 (1929), 149-67

Jolliffe, J. E. A., 'The Chamber and the Castle Treasuries under King John' in *Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke,* ed. by R. W. Hunt (London, 1948), pp. 117-42

'The Camera Regis under Henry II: Part I', *English Historical Review,* 68 (1953), 1-21

'The Camera Regis under Henry II: Part II', *English Historical Review,* 68 (1953), 337-362

Angevin Kingship, 2nd edn (London, 1963)

Jones, W. R., 'The Court of the Verge: The Jurisdiction of the Steward and the Marshal of the Household in late Medieval England', *Journal of British Studies,* 10 (1970), 1-29

Kanter, J., Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of John and Henry III', in *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings from the Paris Conference, 2011,* ed. by J. Burton, F. Lachaud and P. Schofield (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 11-26.

Knafla, L. A., 'Tate, Francis (1560–1616)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Lachaud, F., 'Liveries and Robes in England, *c.*1200-*c.*1330', *English Historical Review,* 111 (1996), 279-98.

'Order and Disorder at Court: The Ordinances of the Royal Household in England in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', in *Hofe und Hofordnungen, 1200-1600,* ed. by H. Kruse and W. Paravicini (Sigmaringen, 1999), pp. 103-16

Lally, J. E., 'Master Roger of Tamworth: A Royal Clerk of the Twelfth Century', *Transactions of the South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society,* 15 (1973), 33-9

'Secular Patronage in the Court of Henry II', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 49 (1976), 159-84

Landon, L., *Itinerary of King Richard I,* Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 13 (London, 1935)

Larson, L. M., *The King's Household in England before the Norman Conquest* (Madison, 1904)

Latimer, P., 'Early Thirteenth-Century Prices', in *King John: New Interpretations,* ed. by S. D. Church, pp. 41-73

Le Patourel, J., *The Norman Empire* (Oxford, 1976)

Mack. K., 'The Stallers: Administrative Innovation in the Reign of Edward the Confessor', *Medieval History,* 12 (1986), 123-34

Mason, E. 'Maritagium and the Changing Law', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 49 (1976), 286-9

McCusker, J. J., ‘The Wine Prise and Medieval Mercantile Shipping’, *Speculum* (1966), 279-96

McDonnell, J., *Inland Fisheries in Medieval Yorkshire 1066-1300,* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research (York, 1981).

Mills, M. H., ‘Experiments in Exchequer Procedure, 1200-32’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th series, 8 (1925), 151-170

‘The Reforms at the Exchequer (1232-42)’, *Transactions of Royal Historical Society,* 4th series, 10 (1927), 111-33

Mitchell, S. K, *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III* (London, 1914)

Mortimer, R., *Angevin England, 1154-1258* (Oxford, 1994)

Milsom, S. F. C., ‘Inheritance by Women in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries’, in *On the Laws and Customs of England: Essays in Hounor of Samuel E. Thorne*, ed. by M. S. Arnold, T. A. Green, S. A. Scully and S. D. White (Chapel Hill, 1981), pp. 61-89.

Murray, H. J. R., ‘The Medieval Game of Tables’, *Medium Aevum,* 10 (1941), 57-69

Myers, A. R., *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478* (Manchester, 1959)

Norgate, K., *John Lackland* (London, 1902)

Painter, S., *The Reign of King John* (Baltimore, 1949)

Pollard, A. F., ‘Neville, Geoffrey de (d. 1225)’, rev. by S. D. Church, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Poole, R. L., *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1912)

Power, D. J., ‘Bréauté, Sir Falkes de (d. 1226)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries (Cambridge, 2004)

‘Guérin de Glapion, Seneschal of Normandy (1200-1): Service and Ambition under the Plantagenet and Capetian Kings’, in *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm,* ed. by N. Vincent (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 153-92

Powicke, F. M., *The Loss of Normandy, 1189-1204: Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire,* 2nd edn (Manchester, 1960)

Prestwich, J. O., ‘The Military Household of the Norman Kings’, *English Historical Review,* 96 (1981), 1-35

‘The Place of the Royal Household in English History, 1066-1307’, *Medieval History,* 1 (1991), 37-52.

Prestwich, M. C., *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972)

Edward I (London, 1988)

Ray, M., ‘Three Alien Stewards in Thirteenth-Century England: The Careers and Legacy of Mathias Bezill, Imbert Pugeys and Peter de Champvent’, in *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2003,* ed. by M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 51-68

Richardson, H. G., ‘The Chamber under Henry II’, *English Historical Review,* 69 (1954), 596-611

Rose, S., *The Wine Trade in Medieval Europe, 1000-1500* (London, 2011)

Round, J. H., ‘The Officers of Edward the Confessor’, *English Historical Review,* 19 (1904), 90-92

The King’s Serjeants and Officers of State: With their Coronation Services (London, 1911)

Rowlands, I. W., ‘King John, Stephen Langton and Rochester Castle, 1213-15’, in *Studies in Medieval History presented to R. Allen Brown,* ed. by C. Harper-Bill, C. J. Holdsworth and J. L. Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 267-79.

Russell, J. C., ‘Social Status at the Court of King John’, *Speculum*, 12 (1937), 319-329

'Charter Witness Lists Again', *Speculum*, 14 (1939), 108-109

Serjeantson, D. and C. M. Woolgar, 'Fish Consumption in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition,* ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron (Oxford, 2006), pp. 102-130

Sicking L. and D. Abreu-Ferriera, *Beyond the Catch: Fisheries in the North Atlantic, the North Sea and the Baltic* (Leiden: Brill: Biggleswade, 2008)

Simon, A. L., *A History of the Wine Trade in England,* (London, 1906)

Stacey, R. C., *Politics, Policy and Finance under Henry III, 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987)

Stafford, P., 'The "Farm of One Night" and the Organization of King Edward's Estates in Domesday', *Economic History Review,* 33 (1980), 491-502

Stamp, A. E., 'Some Notes on the Court and Chancery of Henry III', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait,* ed. by J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith and E. F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), pp. 305-311

Steane, J. M., 'The Medieval Fishponds of Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past and Present,* 4 (1972), 299-310.

'The Royal Fishponds of Medieval England', in *Medieval Fish, Fisheries and Fishponds,* ed. by M. Aston (Oxford, 1988), pp. 39-68.

Steel, A., 'English Government Finance, 1377-1413', *English Historical Review,* 51 (1936), 29-51

Stenton, F. M., *Anglo-Saxon England,* 3rd edn (Oxford, 1971)

Stone, D. J., 'The Consumption of Field Crops in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition,* ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron (Oxford, 2006), pp. 11-26

Stubbs, W., *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development,* 3 vols (Oxford, 1874-8)

Summerson, H., 'Thurnham, Robert of (*d.* 1211)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biograpghy*

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

Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England: The Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals, 6 vols (Manchester, 1920-1933)

Turner, R. V., *Men Raised from the Dust: Administrative Service and Upward Mobility in Angevin England* (Philadelphia, 1988)

King John (London, 1994)

'The Household of the Sons of Henry II', in *La Cour Plantagênet 1154-1204,* ed. by M. Aurell (Poitiers, 2000), pp. 49-62

'Richard Barre and Michael Belet: Two Angevin Civil Servants', in *Administrators and the Common Law in Angevin England,* ed. by R. V. Turner (London, 1994), pp. 180-98

Vanlandingham, M., *Transforming the State: King, Court and Political Culture in the Realms of Aragon 1213-1387* (Leiden: Boston: Cologne, 2002)

Vale, M. G. A., 'Provisioning Princely Households in the Low Countries during the Pre-Burgundian Period, *c*.1280-1380', in *Alltag Bei Hofe,* ed. by H. von Werner Paravicini, (1995), pp. 33-40.

The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380 (Oxford, 2001)

Veale, E. M., *English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2003)

Vernon-Harcourt, L. W., *His Grace the Steward and Trial of Peers* (London, 1907)

Vincent, N. C., *Peter des Roches: An Alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge, 1996)

'John's Jezabel: Isabella of Angouleme' in *King John: New Interpretations,* ed. by S. D. Church (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 165-219

The Holy Blood: King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic (Cambridge, 2001)

'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings, 1154-1272', in *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan,* ed. by C. Morris and P. Roberts (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 12-45

The Lucys of Charlecote: The Invention of a Warwickshire Family, 1170-1302, Dugdale Society Occasional Papers, 42 (Warwickshire, 2002)

'Who's Who in Magna Carta Clause 50', in *Le Médiéviste et la Monographie Familiale: Sources, Méthodes et Problématiques,* ed. by M. Aurell (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 235-64

'Why 1199? Bureaucracy and Enrolment under John and his Contemporaries', in *English Government in the Thirteenth Century,* ed. by A. Jobson (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 17-48

'King John's Evil Counsellors (*act.* 1208–1214)', *ODNB*

'The Court of Henry II', in *Henry II: New Interpretations,* ed. by C. Harper Bill and N. Vincent (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 278-333

ed., *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm* (Woodbridge, 2009)

Wallace-Hadrill, J., 'The Graves of Kings: A Historical Note on some Archaeological Evidence', in *Early Medieval History,* ed. J. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1975), pp. 39-59

Warren, W. L., *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England, 1086-1272* (London, 1987)

King John (London, 1961)

Henry II (London, 1973)

Waugh, S. L., *The Lordship of England: Royal Wardships and Marriages in English Society and Politics, 1217-1327* (Princeton, 1988)

Weiss, M., 'The Castellan: The Early Career of Hubert de Burgh', *Viator,* 5 (1974), 235-52

White, G. H., 'The Royal Household under Henry I', *Notes and Queries,* 151 (1926), 363-365

'The Household of the Norman Kings', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th series, 30 (1948), 127-55

'The *Constitutio Domus Regis* and the King's Hunt', *Antiquities Journal,* 30 (1950), 52-63

'The Great Officers of State', *The Genealogists' Magazine,* 11 (1954), 499-534

Wild, B. L., 'Secrecy, splendour and statecraft: the jewel accounts of King Henry III of England, 1216-1272', *Historical Research,* 83 (2010), 409-30

'A Truly Royal Retinue: Using Wardrobe Rolls to Determine the Size and Composition of the Royal Household of Henry III of England', *The Court Historian,* 16 (2011), 127-43

'Royal Finance under King Henry III, 1216-1272: The Wardrobe Evidence', *Economic History Review* (2012), 1-23

Woolgar, C. M., *Household Accounts of Medieval England,* 2 vols (Oxford, 1992-3)

The Great Household in Medieval in Medieval England (London, 1999)

Woolgar, C. M., D. Serjeantson and T. Waldron, ed., *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition* (Oxford, 2006)

Unpublished dissertations and theses

Dixon-Smith, S., 'Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: The *pro anima* Almsgiving of Henry III' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 2002)

Edwards, J. B., 'The English Royal Chamber and Chancery in the Reign of King John' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1973)

Given-Wilson, C., ‘The Court and Household of Edward III, 1360-1377’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 1976)

Kanter, J. E., ‘Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of the Thirteenth-Century English Kings’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, King’s College London, 2011)

Lachaud, F., ‘Furs, Textiles and Liveries: A Study of the Material Culture of the Court of Edward I, (1272-1307)’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1992)

Lally, J. E., ‘The Court and Household of Henry II, 1154-1189’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Liverpool, 1970)

Mertes, R. G. K. A., ‘The Secular Noble Household in Mediaeval England, 1350-1550’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1981)

Powell, W. R., ‘English Administrative Families in the 12th and 13th centuries: With special reference to the Cornhill Family’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1952)

Preen, M., ‘The Acta of John, Lord of Ireland and Count of Mortain: With a study of his Household’ (unpublished master’s thesis, University of Manchester, 1949)

Rogers, A., ‘The Royal Household of Henry IV’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham, 1966)

Walker, R. F., ‘The Anglo-Welsh Wars, 1217-67: With special reference to English Military Developments’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1954)