

‘A Newly Discovered Anglo-Lusignan Truce (8 January 1222)’

Amicie Péliissié du Rausas and Nicholas Vincent

In the spring of 1220, a royal wedding took place in Poitou with wide-ranging consequences for local and international politics. Isabella, King John’s widowed queen and in her own right countess of Angoulême, married Hugh X de Lusignan (d.1249), count of La Marche.¹ The match triggered a flurry of diplomatic correspondence involving the Pope, the young king’s councilors, and the bishops of Aquitaine. The marriage was scandalous in many ways. Not only had Isabella (born 1184 X 1191) been promised, before 1200, as wife to Hugh’s father (Hugh IX ‘le Brun’, d.1219), but her own daughter by King John, Joan (born 1210), had since 1214 been promised as wife to Hugh himself. As a result, the match created both a legal and a genealogical maze.² Although Isabella continued after 1220 to claim her ancestral inheritance as countess of Angoulême together with the dower lands in England and elsewhere promised to her by King John, she and Hugh refused to relinquish the lands adjoining Angoulême and the Angoumois that had been entrusted to Hugh in 1214 as Joan’s future marriage portion.³ For good measure, the newly-weds held on to little Joan, if not precisely as a hostage then in effect as a prisoner of her own mother and step-father (once her intended husband).

The Politics of Matrimony (1220-1222)

These complications were in theory resolved in January 1222 by the terms of an agreement between Hugh, Isabella and her son, King Henry III of England, newly rediscovered, of which a text survives in two later thirteenth-century copies, one (entirely legible) in the Exchequer cartulary known as ‘Liber A’ (TNA E 36/275 fos.116r-117r), the other in a (partially illegible) single-sheet recital now amongst the miscellanea of the chancery, reciting both the 1222 agreement and an earlier settlement, made in 1177, between Henry III’s grandfather, King Henry II, and the then ruler of La Marche, count Audebert (TNA C 47/29/2/14).⁴ Neither the 1177 nor the 1222 settlement attracted notice from the editors of Thomas Rymer’s great collection of English medieval treaties, the *Foedera*. Both were also overlooked by Pierre Chaplais, recent editor-in-chief of all matters English, medieval and diplomatic.

The document that forms the subject of this essay was discovered in 2018 independently by the two authors. The text that follows was drafted by Amicie Péliissié du Rausas, as preliminary work towards her PhD thesis ‘De guerre, de trêve, de paix: les relations franco-anglaises de la bataille de Taillebourg au traité de Paris (années 1240-années 1260)’ (Université de Poitiers, 2020). Additions were made subsequently by Nicholas Vincent, who is also responsible for the edition and translation of the Latin text.

¹ On Isabella, see N. Vincent, ‘Isabella of Angouleme : John’s Jezebel’, in S. Church (ed.), *King John : New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 1999), 165-219. Her marriage to Hugh, and its consequences, receives full treatment in D. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990), 154-6, 193-6, 200-2, 216-17, 221, 267-8, 279-80. For the Lusignans in general, the most recent survey is that by C. de Vasselot, ‘Le Parentat Lusignan (X^e-XIV^e)’, Unpublished Phd thesis (Université de Nantes, 2018), i, esp. pp.199-203. The authors thank Clément de Vasselot, Elisa Mantiennne, and Rowan Watson, for generously sharing their expertise.

² The details of Joan’s betrothal are in *Rotuli chartarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*, ed. T.D. Hardy (London 1837), 197b-8. Thomas Rymer, *Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et cujuscunque generis acta publica*, revised by A. Clarke and F. Holbrooke (4 vols in 7, London, 1816-39), vol.1 part i, 125, gives an erroneous version by affiancing Isabella to Geoffrey de Lusignan.

³ Isabella’s letter announcing her marriage and claiming her English dower is printed as *Diplomatic Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office: I (1101-1272)*, ed. P. Chaplais (London, 1964), 65-6 no.84, requesting the restoration to Hugh of Niort, the castles of Exeter and Rockingham, and a sum of 3500 marks said to have been willed to Isabella by the late King John.

⁴ The 1177 settlement is now published, from this and an (inferior) copy inserted in the chronicles of Roger of Howden, in *The Letters and Charters of Henry II King of England 1154-1189*, ed. N. Vincent and others (8 vols, Oxford 2020-1), vi, 366-7 no.4502.

Up to the point at which the agreement of 1222 was drafted, all attempts to solve the crisis, beginning in May 1220, had either failed or devolved into bickering. Although Hugh and Isabella had surrendered Joan in October 1221, this had only been achieved by the English government restoring Isabella to her English lands. Isabella's continental dower, and Joan's marriage portion of 1214, remained the object of ongoing dispute. As David Carpenter has commented, although Hugh had surrendered his former fiancée, he still intended to pursue 'two marriage portions with one marriage'.⁵ Tensions had built throughout 1221, with the English government withholding Niort, a city in theory part of Isabella's dower, as long as the couple refused to return Joan's marriage portion as defined in the 1214 agreement: principally, the city of Saintes with its surrounding region (the Saintonge), and the Île d'Oléron. Oléron, some 30 miles south of the île de Ré which remained in English hands, formed a northern extension to the estuary of the river Garonne and was therefore crucial in maritime communication between the trading centres of La Rochelle, Saintes and Bordeaux⁶. By the end of the year, Henry III's government had once again seized Isabella's English dower lands; Hugh was besieging Mersins, next to the town of Cognac on the river Charente, both of which he now claimed as parts of Isabella's inheritance in the county of Angoulême, and the couple had been excommunicated at the command of Pope Honorius III.⁷ Their marital complications thus threatened to spread havoc in Poitou, to the point of deterring Savaric de Mauléon, Henry III's newly nominated seneschal for Poitou, from taking up office.⁸

By April 1222, however, the deadlock had been broken. The English government released Isabella's English dower lands, with King Henry was publicly rejoicing in 'the benevolence, the affection and the fidelity' of Hugh de Lusignan. In November 1222, further royal letters urged that the peace be restored before the 30th of that month.⁹ The key to this new-found cordiality as well as to the otherwise mysterious deadline of 30 November can be found in the agreement of January 1222, the existence of which has been previously assumed but until now never proved.

Our newly discovered settlement was issued at Vouillé outside Niort on 8 January 1222, negotiated between the English government and Hugh and Isabella through the mediation of Pandulph, bishop-elect of Norwich, formerly papal legate to England, and a group of southern bishops (Saintes, Poitiers, Limoges, Bazas). In July 1221, Pandulph had resigned his legatine commission and his role as regent in England. He is therefore styled in our document merely as bishop-elect and 'papal chamberlain', although as Carpenter notes, his mission to Poitou reveals that he had by no means entirely abandoned his service to the English crown.¹⁰ The

⁵ Carpenter, *Minority*, 193, 221.

⁶ The exact allegiance of Ré and Oléron are not easy to determine prior to the Anglo-French settlement of 1243 which followed the battle of Taillebourg-Saintes. Ré was nominally part of the duchy of Aquitaine. However from 1145 onwards, it was controlled by the Mauléon family, who switched sides several times before 1243. Throughout the periods of military conflicts in Poitou it appears as an essential outpost for the French and the English. For more, see : Mickaël Augeron *et. al*, *Histoire de l'île de Ré des origines à nos jours* (Saintes, 2016).

⁷ The sentence, imposed by the bishops of Saintes and Limoges and the dean of Bordeaux is recorded both in our newly discovered document, below, and in a letter from Honorius to the count, wrongly dated to 1223 by Rymer, in reality of 25 June 1222: *Foedera*, 169, whence *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. P. Pressutti (2 vols, Rome 1888-95), ii, 82 no.4054.

⁸ Carpenter, *Minority*, 267.

⁹ *Foedera*, 166-8.

¹⁰ Carpenter, *Minority*, 266, and for Pandulph more generally, a southern Italian, papal chamberlain since 1217, see N. Vincent, 'The Election of Pandulph Verraclo as Bishop of Norwich (1215)', *Historical Research*, 68 (1995), 143-63.

bishops named were the principal local diocesans, including William Prévost bishop of Poitiers (formerly a chaplain of William de Mauléon), Bernard de Savène bishop of Limoges, Pons bishop of Saintes, and Arnaud ‘de Pinibus’ bishop of Bazas, this latter cited in the preamble but absent from the list of those who physically sealed the truce.¹¹ Of all of those named it was Pons of Saintes who was perhaps most directly implicated.¹² As early as November 1218 we find the then bishop of Saintes licenced by the Pope to live in exile from his see, to escape the oppressions of Hugh de Lusignan, and by 1220 we find Bishop Pons acting in company with the bishops of Poitiers, Angoulême and Périgueux to rein back Hugh de Lusignan’s aggression.¹³ Conspicuous by their absence in January 1222 are William Testaud, since 1206 bishop of Angoulême, and above all William archbishop of Bordeaux, the local metropolitan.¹⁴ The bishop of Angoulême was no mere catspaw, so that his absence remains unexplained. The archbishop had embarked on the crusade to Damietta from 1218 until after October 1221, and in 1219 had been falsely rumored to have died in the east.¹⁵ Also absent in the east was the vicomte of Fronsac, explaining why the truce refers not to the vicomte but to his wife, the vicomtesse.¹⁶ In general, however, it was not the Fifth Crusade but the more local papal venture against the heretics of Toulouse and the Albigeois that loomed tacitly but significantly over the negotiations of 1222. In commanding excommunication and interdict, the Pope had been acting not merely as an ally to his former ward, the English King Henry III, but to bring peace to a region crucial to the fragile politics of northern Gascony, directly bordering lands still the object of intense papal concern in the aftermath of the death of Simon de Montfort and the restoration to power of Henry III’s young cousin, Raymond VII of Toulouse.¹⁷

The aim of the deal now brokered was twofold. Pandulph’s commission from 1221 empowered him to negotiate ‘an extended truce’ (‘diffusas treugas’) with Hugh and Isabella, so that Savaric de Mauléon might have time to accept appointment as seneschal.¹⁸ To achieve this, however, required detailed arrangements over the disputed lands. The document, describing itself as a ‘composicio’, has all the characteristics of the medieval truce or settlement, part way on the road to full-blown treaty or peace.¹⁹ It is limited in time, as all truces were (and remain), with an expiry date set for 30 November 1222. It also seeks the restoration of a fragile but existing equilibrium, itself based on a binary logic.

¹¹ For these identifications, see *Gallia Christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa*, ed. D. de Sainte-Marthe, P. Piolin and others, 16 vols (Paris 1715-1874), i, 1199; ii, 527-8, 1007, 1073, 1183; L. de Boutetière, ‘Note sur Guillaume Prévost, évêque de Poitiers (1214-1224)’, *Bulletins de la Société des Antiquaires de l’Ouest*, 13 (1874), 56-9.

¹² For his identity, see *Gallia Christiana*, ii, 1073; *Diplomatic Documents*, ed. Chaplais, 71-2 no.95, 79-80 no.111.

¹³ *Regesta Honorii III*, i, 281 no.1688; *Diplomatic Documents*, 67-8 no.88, 70-2 nos.92, 95, 76-81 nos.105-6, 110-11, 113.

¹⁴ C. Piveteau, ‘Les Évêques d’Angoulême aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles’, *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de la Charente* (1983 part 2), 122.

¹⁵ *English Episcopal Acta IX: Winchester 1205-38*, ed. N. Vincent (Oxford, 1994), 93-4 nos.113-14.

¹⁶ *Diplomatic Documents*, ed. Chaplais, 75-6 no.103, an appeal for aid from Henry III by William Gumbaudo, styling himself seneschal of Fronsac, Bourq and Mirambeau.

¹⁷ For English interventions here, see N. Vincent, ‘England and the Albigensian Crusade’, *England and Europe in the Reign of Henry III (1216-1272)*, ed. B.K.U. Weiler and I.W. Rowlands (Aldershot, 2002), 67-97, esp. pp.78-81.

¹⁸ *RLC*, i, 477b.

¹⁹ On the medieval laws of truce, see M.H. Keen, *The Laws of War in the Middle Ages* (London, 1965), 206-17, and the collection of documents assembled by P. Chaplais, *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice Part I: Documents and Interpretation* (2 vols, London, 1982), ii, 558-612 nos.268-86. Chaplais’ proposed discussion of these formed part of the second, uncompleted volume of his *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003).

First, we are informed, Hugh de Lusignan had sworn an oath of fealty to Henry III. No real-life meeting took place between them. Instead, vows had been exchanged in Poitou between Hugh and Henry's representatives, themselves forming quite a crowd comprising Pandulph, four suffragan bishops of the province of Bordeaux, and 'many other local prelates and barons'. The count's pledge was public. In return, the sentence of excommunication and interdict was to be lifted. Thereafter, the truce was framed according to a reciprocal logic. Hugh's obligations to come before the king's justice occupy the larger part of the document, but it is then stated that if the King fails to do justice to Hugh, Hugh shall be released from his fealty. As long as the King renders justice to Hugh, and as long as Hugh reasonably agrees to come before the King's court for justice, neither party should move against the other. Further such reciprocity is to be found in the clause regulating the fate of 'evil doers' ('malefactores'). Here, neither party ('neutra pars') should shelter malefactors from the other, and if matters demanded resolution, Hugh should be ready to answer to the King's seneschal, and 'vice-versa' (the king's seneschal to Hugh). Provision was also made for the 'faidini' (translated below as 'disputants', from 'faida' or 'enmity', whence 'feud/feuding'). These too were to be received within the truce by both sides.

Such formulas are typical of the medieval truce and can be found, *mutatis mutandis*, in many such arrangements brokered between the kings of France and of England across the long thirteenth century. Perhaps most significantly in the present context, they mirror arrangements in the Anglo-French truce of September 1214 that had brought an end to King John's disastrous expedition to Poitou, there referring not to 'faidini' or 'malefactores' but to murderers, outlaws and those determined upon open warfare ('murtrarius aut aliquis qui fuerit forbanitus <aut> faciendo guerram aperte'): a settlement witnessed by Hugh de Lusignan, his father, and half a dozen of the Poitevin noblemen specifically named in the truce of 1222.²⁰ In turn, the terms of the 1214 Anglo-French truce had been specifically reiterated when that truce was renewed for a further four years, in March 1220, under the auspices of the legate Pandulph and in circumstances that were surely well known to most of those attending Pandulph's negotiations two years later.²¹

In order to create as clear a situation as possible in which each person answered to a lord who would be responsible for possible infractions and/or restitutions, truces typically named individuals included in such agreements. In the present context, this has the added value of allowing us to establish which of the southern nobles were considered adherents of Hugh de Lusignan requiring special guarantees from Henry III, here naming William L'Archevêque (lord of Parthenay), G(eoffrey IV) de Rancon (lord of Taillebourg), William Maengot (lord of Surgères), G(eoffrey) and Aimery de Lusignan (count Hugh's cousins), P. L'Evêque, Chalo de Rochefort and his sons. Set against these seven names, we have a longer list of those, presumably considered loyal to the King of England, to whom Hugh was expected to extend his peace: (Aimery) vicomte of Thouars, his sons and his brother Hugh de Thouars, Savaric

²⁰ *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, ed. A. Teulet, H.-F. Delaborde and E Berger (5 vols, Paris, 1863–1909), i, 405-6 no.1083, with commentary by N. Vincent, 'Feature of the Month: September 2014 - The Treaty Between King John and Philip Augustus, 18 September 1214', *The Magna Carta Project* <http://magnacartaresearch.org/read/feature_of_the_month/Sep_2014_3> (accessed 05 April 2021), witnessed, amongst others, by Hugh IX and X de Lusignan, Savaric de Mauléon, Renaud de Pons elder and younger, and Hugh de Thouars, as well as by the then representatives of the families of Martel and L'Archevêque.

²¹ *Foedera*, 158-9; *Layettes*, i, 496-7 no.1387, specifically repeating the clauses relating to murderers and outlaws (This is where I (humbly) suggest referring to my chapter on truces where I analyze the composition of AF truces from Thouars 1206 to Taillebourg 1243, it's p. 394-397. If you agree of course.

(de Mauléon), Hugh de Vivonne, A(imery) and R. de Rancon (presumably kinsmen of Hugh de Lusignan's ally Geoffrey), R(enaud) de Pons the elder and the younger (the elder one-time seneschal of Gascony), G. de Pons, the vicomtesse of Fronsac, and the vicomte of Castillon(-la Bataille), Savaric de Rochefort, G(efforey) and Helie Ridet, R. de Montaut, (Archambaud II) count of Périgord, R. de Talmont, B. de Maurienne, G. Martel, Arnulf Airaud and to Ralph de Amaio. By contrast to Hugh de Lusignan's supporters (chiefly concentrated in the northern parts of Poitou, in the modern département of Deux-Sèvres), these twenty-one individuals were mostly based further south, in the case of Fronsac and Castillon, as far south as the river Dordogne and the frontiers of Gascony. Finally, the truce granted freedom of movement to merchants and to all travelling through the lands either of the King or of Hugh as count of La Marche: another essential clause to many such deals, designed to recreate, if only temporarily, the required conditions for a return to commercial and political circumstances as they had existed before the outbreak of hostilities.

Apart from these more general terms, the composition of January 1222 was intended to pave the way towards the settlement of disputes over land. As its opening lines enunciate, at stake here were Joan's marriage portion ('hiis que receperat cum sorore domini regis') and the dower ('dotalicio') of Isabella: lands to which Hugh laid claim as Isabella's husband and as Joan's one-time fiancé turned step-father. The distinction between these two estates was crucial to the deal struck in 1222. Of the first estate, Joan's marriage portion agreed in 1214, Saintes, Merpins and Cognac were to remain with Hugh pending a more permanent settlement to be negotiated before 30 November 1222. This despite the fact that, as the composition notes, Hugh and Isabella's claims to Merpins and Cognac were said to involve the spoliation of others of the King's faithful men, here presumably referring to Renaud de Pons who claimed kinship to the heiress of Cognac's last hereditary lord.²² Saintes, meanwhile, although included in Joan's marriage portion of 1214, had already been assigned in 1200 as dower to Joan's mother, Isabella, so that here there was indeed good reason for Hugh, now acting as Isabella's husband, to press his suit.²³ Importantly, the composition of January 1222 did not recognize Hugh's right to any of these lordships. Even though Hugh was permitted to retain control over them for a further eleven months, this was a concession necessitated by the military situation on the ground, where Henry III and his agents had little hope of prevailing against Hugh's local advantage. Apart from this strategic retreat, and a promise that these lordships would be judged according to 'the uses and customs of Poitou' (presumably as an alternative to judgement by English law), should Hugh and Isabella refuse whatever judgement was offered, after November 1222 the threat remained that excommunication and interdict would be re-imposed pending the King's coming of age: a sentence potentially extending into the late 1220s, until Henry III's 21st birthday in October 1228.

The other estate in dispute here, Isabella's dower, requires rather more careful handling. The Île d'Oléron, the city of Niort, the stannaries ('stagnaria', i.e. the tin mines of the English west country) and Aylesbury ('Ellesberes') are here described as Isabella's dower for which satisfaction was due to Hugh de Lusignan as Isabella's husband. Pending a settlement under Poitevin custom for lands in Poitou, and English custom for lands in England, King Henry would retain Oléron, the stannaries and Aylesbury, save for whatever in Oléron might pertain to Hugh de Lusignan as count of Angouleme and lord of Cognac, this latter a reference to

²² Carpenter, *Minority*, 267-8, 279-80; P. Martin-Civat, 'Les Seigneurs de Cognac, Jarnac et Merpins dans l'empire anglo-angevin', *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Cognac et du Cognaçais*, i (1957), 53-67, and especially the detailed narrative in 'Registre des comptes d'Alfonse, comte de Poitiers', ed. A. Bardonnnet, *Archives Historiques du Poitou*, iv (1875), 21-2, as drawn to our attention by Rowan Watson.

²³ *Rotuli Chartarum*, 74b, 197b.

lands on Oléron, comprising a quarter of the Île, that was indeed recognized to belong to the counts of Angoulême, apparently by hereditary right.²⁴ In reality, and despite the specific assertions of the January 1222 truce, none of these lands, save for Niort, had been included in Isabella's dower as assigned by King John from 1200 onwards.²⁵ On the contrary, Oléron had been assigned long before this as dower to Henry II's widow, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and thereafter, from 1191 onwards, as prospective future dower for Berengaria of Navarre, wife of King Richard I.²⁶ Following Eleanor's death in 1204, and Berengaria's subsequent defection to the French, there was little prospect that Berengaria's claims to dower would be honoured either in England or in the English king's possessions in Poitou or Gascony. In 1214, indeed, Oléron had been reassigned by King John as part of the marriage portion of his daughter Joan on her betrothal to Hugh de Lusignan.²⁷ As such, it should have been packaged in 1222 together with Saintes and the other lands in theory voided to the English crown following the collapse of Hugh's proposed marriage to Joan. Certainly it had been so packaged as recently as March 1220, in letters from Henry III to Hugh seeking to secure Hugh's loyalty in the face of attempts by Philip Augustus to lure him into the Capetian orbit.²⁸ In reality, however, Oléron now fell into the same murky confusion as the various parts of Berengaria's dower that King John had in effect assigned to multiple female dependents.²⁹ Not only this, but we may well doubt whether it offered any substantial profits to its prospective possessors, given the significant depletion of resources there resulting from grants made there by Eleanor of Aquitaine and others, before 1200.³⁰

This same confusion enveloped others of the estates mentioned in our truce. There is no evidence that either the stannaries or the manor of Aylesbury, to which Isabella of Angoulême, King John's widow, was later to lay claim, had ever formed parts of the dower of any of the three queens whose rights were so closely interlinked: Eleanor of Aquitaine, Berengaria or Isabella, widows of Henry II, Richard I, and John. On the contrary, the stannaries seem to have been treated throughout John's reign as a perquisite of the crown.³¹ Aylesbury had in April 1204 been granted to Geoffrey fitz Peter and his heirs at a perpetual

²⁴ *RLC*, i, 44, transferred in July 1205 to Bonin son of Benedict the Jew (of La Rochelle), and Deusaye, Benedict's nephew, and cf. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls ... 1232-47* (London, 1906), 156, and for the quarter part, below n.XYZ.

²⁵ For Isabella's dower, see *Rotuli Chartarum*, 74b-5 (Poitou and Anjou), 128 (England and Normandy).

²⁶ For Eleanor's rights in Oléron, following a period when authority there seems to have been exercised by Otto of Brunswick, Richard I's nephew, see *Gascon Register A*, ed. G.P. Cuttino (3 vols, Oxford, 1975-6), ii, 494-5 no.159, 497-9 nos.161-2; *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France Illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. J.H. Round (London, 1899), 390-1 nos.1100-1, 394 no.1108; *Rotuli Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londinensi asservati*, ed. T.D. Hardy (London, 1835) (henceforth *RLP*), 60b. For the assignment to Berengaria in May, due to take effect after Eleanor's death, see *Les Registres de Philippe Auguste*, i, ed. J.W. Baldwin and others (Paris, 1992), 469-70 no.28, at pp.471-2 no.30 also listing Berengaria's English dower.

²⁷ *Rotuli Chartarum*, 197b, following a period from May to July 1214 when it had been entrusted to Hugh de Thouars: *RLP*, 116, 119.

²⁸ *Foedera*, 159, *inter alia* congratulating Hugh for his refusal of Philip's offer of the lordship of Issoudun in Berry.

²⁹ For such confusion more generally, see Vincent, 'Isabella of Angoulême', 184-91.

³⁰ Cf. *Rotuli Chartarum*, 9, 63b, 72; *RLP*, 60b; *RLC*, i, 509b, detailing grants (of a quarter of the Île) to the monks of Montierneuf, besides more recent alienations by Otto of Brunswick (to Grace-Dieu) and Eleanor of Aquitaine (to Fontevraud, of at least 130 livres poitevines in rents, and possibly an additional 100 livres angevines). For another quarter part apparently claimed as a hereditary right of the counts of Angoulême, see below n.XYZ.

³¹ See in particular King John's grant of liberties, 29 October 1201, assigning the stannaries of both Devon and Cornwall as parts of the royal demesne, see *Foedera*, 85 (also in *Calendar of the Charter Rolls ... 1226-57* (London, 1903), 380).

fee farm of £60.³² Only in the exceptional circumstances of civil war, after King John's death in 1216, were both of these estates temporarily assigned to Isabella of Angoulême: the Devon stannaries in February 1217, and the £60 fee farm (rather than the manor) of Aylesbury from January 1218.³³ There can be no certainty here, but the intention may well have been to compensate Isabella for those parts of her dower originally assigned in the regions of Normandy and Anjou that since 1204 had fallen under Capetian rule and that therefore lay beyond the power of England's kings. Certainly, this was the justification supplied much later, in 1224, for their subsequent more permanent transfer to Isabella.³⁴ In the meantime, however, the assignment of 1217-18 remained subject to administrative whim so that the Devon stannaries were by October 1219 no longer under Isabella's direct control.³⁵ Instead, with echoes of the situation over Oléron, in July 1220 they were in theory earmarked to supply part of a financial settlement promised to Berengaria, long denied her claims to dower, now at last offered compensation for her long years of waiting.³⁶ In practice, their proceeds were diverted to Isabella's former servant, Waleran the Teuton, who year by year, from February 1221, paid the crown 200 marks for whatever he could extract in profits from Devon mining.³⁷ Isabella's £60 from Aylesbury lingered somewhat longer. But this too was recovered for the crown in September 1221, as part of the wider seizure of Isabella's dower intended to bring pressure to bear on Hugh de Lusignan as Isabella's husband.³⁸

As for the city of Niort, ever since 1200 promised to Isabella as dower from King John and more recently brought under direct attack by Hugh de Lusignan, the composition of January 1222 specified an exchange in land elsewhere, to be assessed by Pandulph acting as arbiter. Whether or not any such arbitration took place remains unclear, although the suggestion here must be that Henry III and his ministers hoped for a settlement in which Niort, and its fortress, key to the defense of northern Poitou, would remain under the rule either of the King's seneschal or the local townsmen. Certainly, these resources should not be allowed to pass into the hands of the Lusignans who would thereby stamp their authority from the Dordogne as far north as the Sèvre, leaving La Rochelle a dangerously isolated Plantagenet outpost on the coast. Meanwhile whatever money the men of La Rochelle, Niort or Saint-Jean-d'Angély had offered Hugh de Lusignan, effectively to forestall military operations against them, was to remain unpaid for so long as Henry III continued to offer justice to Hugh.

³² *Rotuli Chartarum*, 127b-8.

³³ *Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III* (2 vols, London, 1901-3), i (henceforth *PR 1216-25*), 34, 83; *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*, ed. T.D. Hardy (2 vols, London 1833-44) (henceforth *RLC*), i, 297b, 305b, 349b, following a period from April 1217 when Aylesbury was in the keeping of Waleran the Teuton, himself a close associate of Isabella.

³⁴ *PR 1216-25*, 431-2.

³⁵ *RLC*, i, 433b; *PR 1216-25*, 283, albeit with continued oversight there by Terric and Waleran Teutonicus, previously Isabella's agents.

³⁶ *PR 1216-25*, 243-5; Carpenter, *Minority*, 200-1.

³⁷ *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Fifth Year of the Reign of King Henry III*, ed. D. Crook, Pipe Roll Society n.s. 48 (1990) (henceforth *Pipe Roll 5 Henry III*), 72-3; *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Sixth Year of the Reign of King Henry III*, ed. G.A. Knight, Pipe Roll Society n.s. 51 (1999), 15, at pp.130-1 noting that, in 1221, 500 marks had been diverted from the proceeds of the Cornish stannaries towards the settlement of Berengaria's dower.

³⁸ *PR 1216-25*, 302. The £60 farm from Aylesbury was still being paid to Isabella at Michaelmas 1220 but had reverted to the royal treasury by the following year's account: *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Henry III*, ed. B.E. Harris, Pipe Roll Society n.s. 47 (1987), 2; *Pipe Roll 5 Henry III*, 195; *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Eighth Year of the Reign of King Henry III*, ed. E. Amt, Pipe Roll Society n.s. 54 (2005), 92.

A Peace Not Secured (1222-4)

What of the aftermath of the truce of January 1222, so prodigal in loose ends awaiting resolution? Whatever arbitration was left to Pandulph went unfulfilled. Pandulph himself seems to have headed for the papal curia, where in May 1222 he at last obtained consecration as bishop of Norwich.³⁹ In the meantime, his presence behind the scenes in Rome is suggested by papal letters of 26 February 1222, issued at the request of King Henry III, exempting the men of La Rochelle, Niort and Saint-Jean-d'Angély from any attempt to summon them before papal judges in enemy territory.⁴⁰ Again, in late June and early July 1222, we find the Pope threatening Hugh de Lusignan, Isabella, and William L'Archêvêque with a renewal of their earlier excommunication, should they fail to come to terms with Henry III before the agreed deadline of 30 November.⁴¹ Such threats achieved little, since Hugh de Lusignan and his allies held all the trump cards. On 9 November, three weeks before the truce was due to expire, we find the King writing to the bishops of Saintes and Limoges and the dean of Bordeaux, the prospective enforcers of the threatened papal excommunication, commanding them to delay any such sentence pending the dispatch of envoys to Hugh de Lusignan empowered to extend the truce either to June or August 1223.⁴² The truce thereafter agreed, to 1 August 1223, did not so much prolong as supercede the arrangements of January 1222.⁴³ In effect, having played for time, Hugh de Lusignan now obtained precisely what he had been seeking from the outset.

On 30 July 1223, the eve of the truce's expiry, and having pledged faithful service to the King, Hugh was promised control over Saintes, Cognac, Merpins and 'Boem(ont)' (unidentified, but perhaps Beaumont-sur-l'Osse, far south of Saintes, in the Agenais), for so long as the King remained a minor.⁴⁴ Six months later, on 15 January 1224, Hugh and Isabella were jointly promised the stannaries of Devon, the £60 farm from Aylesbury, 3000 livres tournois (£800 sterling) payable over the next three years, a further 100 marks a year in compensation for their claims over Niort, and the lands in Oléron that Hugh claimed by right as count of Angoulême and lord of Cognac.⁴⁵ Although excluding Niort and parts of Oléron, and although conferred not in perpetuity but conditionally to Easter 1228 or the King's coming of age, this was in effect to give Hugh and Isabella all, or almost all, that they had been seeking for the past four years. By 27 March 1224, when these arrangements were formerly ratified, they had been improved yet further. Aylesbury and the Devon stannaries were now specifically described as compensation for Isabella's lost dower in Normandy. The compensation for Niort was doubled to 200 marks; the 3000 livres were to be paid within two

³⁹ *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard (5 vols, London, 1864-9), ii (Waverley), 296, where the consecration is dated to 29 May, Trinity Sunday, incidentally the same feast day on which Archbishop Stephen Langton had been consecrated (also in Rome) in 1207, and Thomas Becket had been consecrated in 1162.

⁴⁰ *Regesta Honorii III*, ii, 45 no.3815.

⁴¹ *Foedera*, 169, whence *Regesta Honorii III*, ii, 82 no.4054, 85 no.4072.

⁴² *PR 1216-25*, 389, also in *Foedera*, 168 (including a personal postscript from Henry III to his mother, dripping with disappointment), following attempts by Henry III's government in late August to persuade Hugh to attend a meeting with Peter des Roches and others on the island of Guernsey: *Foedera*, 167-8, merely calendared in *RLC*, i, 517b, but recording (p.509b), from a day before this, attempts to recover rents owing to the nuns of Fontevraud from the Île d'Oléron.

⁴³ The terms of this new truce negotiated by the envoys dispatched in November 1222 are known only from the King's letters of February 1223: *PR 1216-25*, 366.

⁴⁴ *PR 1216-25*, 379, and for Beaumont, attachment to the Lusignans presently unexplained, see below n.XYZ. Other possibilities, a great deal closer to 'home', would be Beaumont (Charente, cant. Charente-Champagne, com. Criteuil-la-Magdeleine) 5km east of Archiac, or Beaumont (Charente, cant. Boixe-et-Manslois, com. Vars) overlooking the Charente, 15km north-west of Angoulême, with thanks here for assistance from Rowan Watson.

⁴⁵ *PR 1216-25*, 422, whence Carpenter, *Minority*, 345.

months, rather than three years; Hugh's future possession was extended from Easter to Whitsun 1228, even should Isabella die in the interval, and Saintes and Cognac were brought within these arrangements since Hugh was promised possession of whatever he had held in November 1223, in effect licencing his retention of the whole marriage portion of Isabella's daughter Joan that had first sparked dispute. Not only this, by the King undertook to have the settlement ratified by the Pope. The archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, himself issued letters confirming these conditions.⁴⁶

By this time, of course, Henry III and his administration found themselves menaced not just by Hugh and Isabella but by more momentous developments elsewhere. Philip Augustus of France had died in July 1223. At Easter 1224 (14 April), the Anglo-French truce, in place since 1220 was due to expire. The new King, Louis VIII, was determined to consolidate Capetian power south of the Loire. Meanwhile, English politics had been thrown into chaos by the dismissal of various of the King's ministers, by attempts to have Henry himself declared of age, and by ongoing tensions between the old guard and those around Archbishop Langton and Hubert de Burgh, newly installed at the head of the King's council. Having outmaneuvered all initiatives from England over the past ten years, at Bourges, in May 1224, Hugh de Lusignan, ever the opportunist, stepped nimbly from the Plantagenet into the Capetian orbit. Abandoning Isabella's dower lands in England and what had been Henry III's still only temporary recognition of his claims to Saintes and Oléron, he instead received Saintes and Oléron in perpetuity from Louis VIII, together with generous compensation for his wife's lost English dower, and best of all, a promise that should Bordeaux now fall to the French it was to be Hugh's to possess. Completely wrong-footed, and embroiled in a prolonged siege of Bedford Castle, Henry III and his ministers watched powerless as Louis and his army moved out from Tours in late June, taking Niort on 5 July, Saint-Jean-d'Angély thereafter, and on or shortly after 3 August La Rochelle, one of the principal jewels in Henry III's crown.⁴⁷

Our truce of 1222 did not permanently alter Anglo-Poitevin politics. It is nonetheless of significance as an early instance in a long series of written agreements by which the Lusignans bargained their fidelity in exchange for land and monetary wealth, each time raising the stakes both with the Plantagenets and the Capetians. This in itself confers interest. There is also the question of its survival to be considered, which in turn adds to the document's significance. As is now recognized, and despite the efforts of the administrations both of King John and of Henry III to ensure the enrolment of a high proportion of their routine outgoing letters, the enrolment of documents beyond such routine remained far from systematic. This applies to the enrolment of laws, most notoriously in the case of the greatest of all thirteenth-century English legal documents, Magna Carta. We have to wait until the late 1290s for any even semi-official enrolment of Magna Carta.⁴⁸ The same applies to many other proclamations or statutes.⁴⁹ Despite the best efforts of the Plantagenet secretariat to preserve original treaties and truces, together with other evidences of diplomacy, it applies with particular force in the case of treaties or truces negotiated overseas, under pressure of

⁴⁶ *PR 1216-25*, 431-2; *Foedera*, 172, whence Carpenter, *Minority*, 348-9.

⁴⁷ Carpenter, *Minority*, 343-75, esp. pp.358, 370-5. The terms of Louis's grant of Oléron to Hugh, and of Hugh's subsequent grant of privileges to the men of the Île, were later preserved by English royal government, these letters still surviving as originals in 1322 copied into *Gascon Register A*, ed. Cuttino, ii, 509-11 nos.175-6, and cf. *The Gascon Calendar of 1322*, ed. G.P. Cuttino, Camden Society 3rd series 70 (1949), 69 nos.735, 739-40.

⁴⁸ N. Vincent, *Magna Carta: Making and Legacy* (Oxford, 2015), 161-86, 233, 242.

⁴⁹ For instance the 1233 Statutes of the Jewry: H.G. Richardson, 'Glanville Continued', *Law Quarterly Review*, 54 (1938), 381-99, at p.393.

circumstance, or in the absence of the staff of the English royal chancery.⁵⁰ In consequence, many of the more significant diplomatic exchanges involving King John or Henry III would remain undocumented were it not for the survival of texts in foreign or semi-official sources. For particular instances here, we might cite the Anglo-French truce of September 1214: a text of fundamental significance, not recorded in any English source but known only from an original of King John's charter preserved in the French royal archives, and from French copies of the reciprocal charter from Philip Augustus, preserved in the Capetian chancery registers.⁵¹ The so-called 'Treaty of Lambeth' ending the Civil War of 1215-17 is known only from unofficial (and in some senses contradictory) sources surviving in Rouen and Aberystwyth.⁵² In the same way, our knowledge of Anglo-Spanish relations, from the 1230s through to the 1270s depends very largely upon sources preserved in Spain or in the archives of the count-kings of Champagne-Navarre, entirely unreported in English Exchequer or chancery enrolments.⁵³ Likewise, Henry III's two great diplomatic initiatives of the 1250s, the so-called 'Sicilian Business', and the negotiation of the 1259 Treaty of Paris, are both illuminated by English documents surviving in the archives of the popes, the counts of Savoy, or the kings of France, that otherwise go unnoticed in any specifically English source – although, by then, more systematic care seems to have been taken with preserving the diplomatic paper tail.⁵⁴ Even for those periods of the 1230s and 1250s for which we have official English 'Treaty Rolls', there is a wealth of documentation not reported in such rolls, not least for negotiations between Henry III and the Emperor Frederick II for which we depend upon unofficial, foreign, ecclesiastical or even private seigneurial archives.⁵⁵ Given such confusion, in what particular circumstances did the truce of January 1222 survive?

1224-1289: The Politics of Documentation

The peace of 1222 was supplied with all the physical attributes of a diplomatic instrument intended to impress. In particular, it bore seven seals: of Pandulph the papal chamberlain, of the bishops of Poitiers, Saintes and Limoges, of Hugh de Lusignan and Isabella, and of Savaric de Mauléon, Henry III's seneschal in waiting. This sealed original was still in existence in the late 1280s when the first and most legible of our two copies was made, transcribed into the Exchequer cartulary known as 'Liber A' (TNA E 36/274, fos.116r-117r): a collection of several hundred acts bearing on English diplomacy, and in particular intended to defend the rights of the English King, Edward I. The context here is significant. By the Treaty of Paris (1259), Louis IX of France had been recognized as overlord of the English king for Gascony. Meanwhile, and following the Capetian victory of Taillebourg in 1242, the former Lusignan lands disputed in 1222, for the most part in the southern Saintonge lying just below the river Charente, had passed to Louis IX's younger brother, Alphonse of Poitiers. After Alphonse's death in 1271, and in accordance with the Treaty of 1259, these were restored by Louis's heir, Philip III, to the English King Edward I (?).⁵⁶ In these new circumstances, with the King of France and his *parlement* now the ultimate court of appeal for

⁵⁰ For efforts to preserve such documentation, including the issue of confidentiality, see Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice*, 72-4.

⁵¹ Above n.XYZ.

⁵² J. Beverley Smith, 'The Treaty of Lambeth, 1217', *English Historical Review*, 94 (1979), 562-79.

⁵³ N. Vincent, 'A Forgotten War: England and Navarre 1243-4', *Thirteenth Century England XI*, ed. B.K. Weiler (Woodbridge 2007), 109-46.

⁵⁴ D. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258* (New Haven/London, 2020), 587, 636; Pélissié du Rausas, 'De guerre, de trêve, de paix', 389.

⁵⁵ N. Vincent, 'Henry III, Frederick II and the Council of Lyons (1245)' (forthcoming), and cf. *Treaty Rolls I: 1234-1325*, ed. P. Chaplais (London, 1955).

⁵⁶ *Foedera*, 2, p. 571 (Amiens, 1279), and 672 (Paris, 1286). M. Prestwich, *Edward I* (Yale, 1997), 316-323.

Edward's Gascon subjects, there was a need to ensure ease of access to whatever documents might be employed to defend the rights of the kings of England in Gascony. Hence the making of several documentary compilations, of which 'Liber A' is one of the more significant.

As we would expect, the section of 'Liber A' in which the truce of 1222 survives was specifically concerned with the defense of English rights over the county of La Marche, here in an *inspeximus* issued in January 1291, copied from the sealed original by the King's chancellor Robert Burnell, bishop of Bath and Wells, and William of Louth bishop of Ely, both of these men leading royal administrators, both active in diplomacy with France.⁵⁷ Burnell is last recorded in Gascony in June 1289, so that the English bishops were making their transcript in England from evidences in English royal custody, rather than from whatever was preserved in the Lusignan family archive in Poitou.⁵⁸ Apart from the 1222 truce, this same section of 'Liber A' preserves an *inspeximus* by Bishop Burnell here acting together with William bishop of Norwich, dated 1 August 1287 at 'Oloron in Béarn' (i.e. Oloron-Sainte-Marie, Pyrénées-Atlantiques), copied from a *vidimus* by Philip the Fair issued a year earlier, reciting six instruments dated between 1242 and 1269, all concerning the rights of Alphonse of Poitiers including the so-called 'Peace of Pons' by which Hugh de Lusignan and Isabella had made their peace with Louis IX and Alphonse in August 1242.⁵⁹ In the margin to 'Liber A', the 1222 truce is supplied with a misleading rubric describing it as 'letters of *inspeximus* by the bishops of Bath and Wells and of W. bishop of Norwich (*sic*), about how Hugh de Lusignan, count of La Marche and Angoulême, and Isabella the Queen of England, submitted to the wish of the bishop of Norwich to the King of France for the pacification of their wars with the same King', here misidentifying both the bishop of Ely and Henry III of England, described as King of France, apparently by confusion with the subsequent *inspeximus* of 1287.

To understand why these *inspeximus*es were made we must look to the second copy of the 1222 truce, preserved amongst the chancery miscellanea as TNA C 47/29/2/14. This is a single parchment membrane, today damp-damaged and partially illegible, where the 1222 truce is copied in a rapid cursive hand typical of the English chancery, followed immediately by a copy in the same hand of the agreement made in 1177 by which count Audebert of La Marche had first transferred his comital rights to the English King Henry II.⁶⁰ The 1222 truce was not copied here from Burnell's *inspeximus* of 1291 but from the original, as can be established from points of detail where neither text is entirely accurate but both preserve

⁵⁷ Prestwich, *Edward I*, 310, 311, 355. For Burnell and Louth, see *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁵⁸ Burnell's itinerary is supplied by Richard Huscroft, 'The Political Career and Personal Life of Robert Burnell, Chancellor of Edward I', Unpublished PhD thesis (King's College University of London, 2000), 241-5, noting that after visits to Paris followed by prolonged residence in Gascony June 1286-June 1289, he was never again to cross the Channel.

⁵⁹ TNA E 36/274 fos.117r-119v, where the bishops recite Philip IV (Paris, August 1285) reciting: (1) Hugh de Lusignan and Isabella homage and peace with Louis IX and Alphonse of Poitiers, the camp before Pons August 1242 (*Layettes*, ii, 476-7 no.2980); (2) Geoffrey de Lusignan homage to Alphonse, April 1243 (*Layettes*, ii, 508 no.3084); (3) Peter bishop of Saintes settlement of disputes with Alphonse, March 1245/6 (*Layettes*, ii, 607 no.3474); (4) Hugh l'Archêvêque lord of Parthenay homage to Alphonse, September 1248 (*Layettes*, iii, 47-8 no.3715); (5) Pons Astoaudi and Master Odo de Mautoneria clerk of Alphonse on disputes over the castle of Bomount (i.e. Beaumont-sur-l'Osse, Gers, cant. Armagnac-Ténarèze) in the diocese of Agen, 22 November 1266 (*Layettes*, iv, 196-7 no.5225, and cf. J. Gardelles, *Les Châteaux du Moyen-Age dans la France du sud-ouest* (Paris 1972), 94); (6) P(eter) bishop of Agen on a pension owing from the late count R(aymond) of Toulouse for the bastide of *Grandicastro* (i.e. Puymirol, Lot-et-Garonne) now forgiven Alphonse, 13 June 1269 (*Layettes*, iv, 366-7 no.5546).

⁶⁰ Cf. above n.XYZ.

better versions of passages miscopied in the other. On the back of the membrane, two shorter entries relating to the Lusignans have been copied, in a different hand. The first records the defeat of Taillebourg, and how ‘Hugh quitclaimed his lands in Poitou to Louis IX’. The second, even briefer, states that in 1241, King Henry made a promise to the count of La Marche.⁶¹ As preserved today, C 47/29/2/14 follows in sequence immediately after two other parchment rolls, documenting a suit heard in 1289 before the parlement de Paris between the count of La Marche and the king of England, chiefly over the lordships of Merpins, Cognac and Archiac claimed against Edward I by Hugh XIII of Lusignan, great-grandson of Hugh X.⁶² Following a clash of arms on the Charente, this quarrel had been carried to Paris where, in the *parlement* of 11 November 1289, each party presented its defense.

The speeches delivered on this occasion appear in the relevant edition of the acts of the Parlement de Paris not from any Parisian original, but from an 18th-century copy made by a French antiquary from the two rolls now in London.⁶³ Here, having listed the damages he claimed had been incurred after Taillebourg, and having unashamedly referred to the promises of Henry III to offer compensation for lands lost in his service by a great-grandfather, Hugh X, whose defection had led directly to English defeat, Hugh XIII went on to claim what he claimed was his ancestor’s hereditary quarter part of the Île-d’Oléron, and the castle of Cognac.⁶⁴ But Edward I and his ministers also knew their history. Hence their sharp reminder to Hugh XIII that Cognac and Merpins had passed first to the late count Alphonse, then after Alphonse’s death in 1271 to King Philip III who had in turn transferred them to Edward in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1259).⁶⁵ That Oléron, Cognac and Merpins loomed large in 1289 must surely explain why English officials went to the trouble, first under Burnell in 1287 to copy out the documents now in ‘Liber A’, and then in due course to recopy both the 1222 truce and the sale of La Marche from 1177, now preserved in the Chancery Miscellanea, in this latter case with a series of endorsements drawing attention to the significance of 1242 and of Hugh X’s surrender to Louis IX.

From the standpoint of Lusignans, and as suggested by Clément de Vasselot, the suit of 1289 may also explain why the late thirteenth-century cartulary of the counts of La Marche, compiled for Hugh XIII, destroyed in 1737 in the fire at the French Chambre des Comptes, but today preserved in two antiquary copies, opens with a series of letters issued by Henry III

⁶¹ TNA C 47/29/1/14 dorse. At the top: ‘Anno domini m.cc.xlii. mense Augusto Hugo de Lezin’ comes Marc<hie et Isabella regina> Angl(ie) eius uxor et eorum filii, videlicet Hugo Brunus, Guido et Gaufridus inposuerant se et terram suam voluntati domini Ludouici regis Francie et quitauerant eidem <omnes> conquestus <quos> fecerat super ipsos in guerra que fuerat inter ipsum regem et comitem Pictaue ex una parte et dictos com<item etc> ex altera’. At the bottom (in the same hand): ‘Anno ~~domini~~ regni xxvi°. viii die decembr(is) fecit rex Henricus promissionem comiti Marchie. Anno d(omini) m°.cc°.xlii°. mense Augusto erat annus H(enrici) regis Anglie xxvi. Anno domini m°.cc°.lxxii°. mense Nouembri obiit dominus Henr(icus) illustris rex Angl(ie) anno vero regni sui lvii°. incepto, in festo apostolorum Symonis et Iude proximo precedente. Anno domini m°.cc°.lxxii°. mense Nouembri in festo beati Edmundi inceptit regnare Eduuardus illustris rex Angl(ie) post sepulchrum patris sui’.

⁶² TNA C 47/29/2/11-12, these two rolls in turn copied as C 47/29/2/13.

⁶³ *Actes du Parlement de Paris: première série, de l’an 1254 à l’an 1299*, ed. E. Boutaric (Paris, 1863), 426-8 no.723, from a copy by Bréquigny, now Paris, Bibliothèque nationale ms. Moreau 690 fo.49v.

⁶⁴ *Actes du Parlement*, 426-7 no.723A: ‘Item dicit et proponit idem comes Marchie contra dictum regem Anglie, ducem Aquitanie, quod dictus dominus Henricus promisit sufficienter dicto domino Hugoni de Lezignano quod, si ipse amitteret aliquid terre vel redditus propter guerram predictam, idem dominus Henricus emendam legitimam sibi faceret de amissis <et> dedit et concessit et quitavit dicto domino Hugoni de Lesignano et domine Ysabelli, uxori sue, regine quondam Anglie, et liberis suis quicquid ad eos et suos homines pertinebat in insula Oleronis, videlicet quartam partem ipsius insule, quam jure comitatus seu domini Engolismensis habebat, <necnon> quicquid dominus de Compniaco habere solebat in insula supradicta’.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 427-8 no.723B.

in 1241, documenting the claims by Hugh X and Isabella, following their brief return to Plantagenet allegiance, itself to be undone following Henry III's humiliation at Taillebourg a year later.⁶⁶ After the 1280s, nothing further is heard of the original of the 1222 truce, or indeed of the 1177 sale to Henry II, both of which seem to have vanished thereafter into the unfathomable depths of either the chancery or the Exchequer. By contrast, both 'Liber A' and the single-sheet chancery copy were more carefully preserved, in the case of the latter still reported in 1322 when an array was made of Gascon documents in the English royal archives, and our copy can be identified as a 'transcript of documents concerning the count of La Marche, year of grace 1221', stored together with copies of Henry III's letters from 1241-2 and the pleadings of 1289, themselves renewed in 1296-7.⁶⁷

In this way, the 1222 truce, at the time of its making the first step on the slope towards ignominious surrender by the English crown, could be re-branded sixty or more years later not as a symbol of weakness but as proof of English strength. Seven centuries before George Orwell's *1984*, those who tended medieval archives were familiar with a thoroughly Orwellian concept: 'Who controls the past, controls the future'.

⁶⁶ De Vasselot, *Le Parentat Lusignan*, i, 599, and cf. *Cartulaire des comtes de la Marche et d'Angoulême*, ed. G. Thomas (Angoulême, 1934), esp. pp.19-23.

⁶⁷ *Gascon Calendar of 1322*, ed. Cuttino, 114 no.1292 ('Transcriptum instrumentorum tangencium comitem Marchie anno gracie 1221'), where the editor has identified the treaty of 8 January 1222, as in TNA C 47/29/2/14, but erroneously attached this reference to the succeeding document, a copy of a charter of 1241/2. The calendar's description matches that in a hand, probably also of 1322, on the dorse of C 47/29/2/14: 'Transcriptum instrumentorum tangencium comitem March(ie)'.

APPENDIX:

Composition made between Henry III King of England and Hugh de Lusignan count of La Marche and Angoulême. Vouillé near Niort, 8 January 1222

B = TNA E 36/274 (Exchequer Liber A) fos.116r-17r (77r-78r), in an inspeximus by Robert Burnel, bishop of Bath and Wells, and William bishop of Ely, 12 January 1290/1, from an original still sealed by Hugh de Lusignan, Isabella his wife and many others, copied s.xiii ex. C = TNA C 47/29/2 no.14 = copies said to be dated 11 November 1289 (although no such date appears), s.xiii ex.

Letters in <> legible in B, illegible in C. Letters in () represent editorial expansions.

<Notum sit omnibus tam presentibus quam fu>turis presens scriptum inspecturis quod cum inter dominum Henr(icum)^a illustrem regem Anglie et nobilem virum Hugonem de Lizgn' <com(item) Marchie et Engolisme^b discordia suborta fuisset super hiis que receperat cum sorore domini reg(is) et de dotal<icio> ux(or)is sue, matris domini reg(is), mediantibus domino P(andulfo) Norwycen' electo, domini pape camerario, et Xancton', Pictauen', Lemouicen' et Vasaten' episcopis et aliis ecclesiarum prelatiis, a pluribus nobilibus viris inter eos composicio^c in hunc modum interuenit. Scilicet quod dominus comes iurauit fidelitatem domino regi Anglie^d in presencia predictorum secundum quod predecessores sui regibus Angl(ie) facere consueuerunt, et cartam de prestita fidelitate domino regi fecit. Ipse vero Norwycen' electus prefatum com(item) et ux(orem) suam ac suos secundum formam ecclesie a sententia lata in ipsos auctoritate apostolica pro domino rege absoluit et interdictum terrarum suarum relaxauit. Si vero dicta discordia usque ad festum beati Andree proximo venturum inter eos sopita non fuerit, extunc in antea dominus comes faciet iu<sticiam> domino regi in cur(ia) sua^e regia coram eo cui rex <commi>serit vices suas, <vid>elicet de ciuitate Xancton' et pertin(entiis) suis, etiam^f dominus rex dicit prefatum com(item) cum sorore sua recepisse de cast(r)o Merpisii et Cogniaco^g et eorum pertin(entiis) quibus ut rex dicit comes et ux(or) sua spoliauerunt fideles suos, et predicta remanent usque ad predictum festum ipsi com(iti) pacifice possidenda. Si vero com(es) et ux(or) sua iusticiam regi ut dictum in cur(ia) sua non fecerint nec super premissis iustum iudicium cur(ie) sue subire voluerint ad usus et consuetudines Pictaue, extunc reducentur in statum in quo erant tempore huius compositionis prolocute^h, scilicet in sententiam excommunicationis in personas et interdicti in terras per eos qui auctoritate apostolica tulerunt sententiam excommunicationis et interdicti cum super hiis eis constiterit et fuerint requisiti ex parte reg(is), et ad hoc faciendum durabit eorum iur(is)dictio de consensu parcium quousque dominus rex ad adultam peruenerit etatem. Dominus vero rex iusticiam faciet com(iti) et ux(ori) eius^j de Oleron^k, de stagnaria et de Elleberes que com(es) dicit sibi ratione dotalicii ux(or)is sue pertinere. Et si forte, quod absit, rex non fecerit super hiis com(iti) et ux(ori) sue iusticiam exhiberi in Pictauia de hiis que sunt in Angl(ia) secundum consuetudines Angl(ie) et de hiis que sunt in Pictauia secundum consuetudinem^l Pictaue, extunc absque malicia com(es) erit absolutus a fidelitate regi prestita. Interim t(ame)n insula Oleron^m remanebit domino regi, eo excepto quod pertinet ad dominum com(item) ratione comitatus Engolismeⁿ et domini de Cogniaco^p, et stagnaria^q et manerium de Elleberes. Pro Niorto quod domina regina dicit sibi^r ratione dotalicii pertinere, fiet ei escambium^s in loco competenti et certo ad valorem prouentuum quos tunc temporis I(ohannes) bone memorie rex Anglie^d habebat in predicto castro quando dotauit de castro dominam reginam, et hoc ad arbitrium domini predicti electi et proborum virorum quos ad hoc viderit vocandos. Item com(es) restituetur ad dotem domine regine quam h(abui)t in Angl(ia) cum fructibus inde perceptis post spoliacionem. Burgenses de Rochella, de Niorto et de Sancto Iohanne erunt absoluti ab exactionibus et censariis pro quibus certam summam pecunie com(iti) reddere iurauerant^t quamdiu com(iti) dominus rex iusticiam non denegauerit. Faidini^v

sunt in treugis sine restitutione terrarum suarum ab utraque parte, et si qui eorum in treugis esse noluerint, a neutra parcium recipiantur. Et si com(es) aliquas fidelitates vel homagia vel aliqua dom<ania> spectancia ad dominum regem habuerit que non pertineant ad tenencias suas, domania restituet et fidelitates absoluet et obsides si quos tenet, et quamdiu dominus rex non denegabit com(iti) iusticiam exhibere, com(es) contra regem non debet aliquid in regium^w preiudicium attemptare nec ipse rex contra ipsum quamdiu dictus com(es) in sua cur(ia) rationabiliter voluerit respondere. Item com(es) bona fide et sine fraude et sine malo ingenio villis et uniuersis hominibus et fidelibus domini reg(is) tam clericis quam laycis pacem seruabit, et specialiter vic(ecomiti) de Thoarcio et Hug(oni) de Thoacio^x et filiis dicti vic(ecomitis), domino Sauarico et toti terre sue, H(ugoni)^y de Viueona et militibus suis et genti sue, dominis A. et R. de Rancon' et dominis R. de Ponte seniori et iuniori, G. de Ponte, vicecomitis de Franciaco^z, vic(ecomiti) de Castellione, Sauaric(o) de Rupeforti^{aa}, G. Rudelli et Hel(ie) Rudelli, R. de Muntant^{bb}, com(iti) Petragorice^{bb}, R. de Talamundo^{cc}, B. de Maritannia^{cc}, G. Martelli, Arn(ulfo) Airaudi et Radulpho de Amaio^{ff}. Et similiter ex parte fidelium domini reg(is) et omnium suorum hominibus et inprisis^{gg} com(itis) et terre sue pax obseruetur, specialiter domino Will(elm)o Archiepiscopi, domino G. de Rancon', Will(elm)o Maingoti^{hh}, domino G. de Lezign'^{jj}, Americo de Lezign'^{kk}, P. Episcopi, Chalon(i) de Rupeforti^{ll} et filiis suis. Mercatoribus et uniuersis transeuntibus^{mm} per totum posse domini reg(is) et suorum per Pictauiam et Vasconiamⁿⁿ et per totam terram com(itis) March' et Engolisme^{pp} securus pateat transitus. Si vero dominus com(es) vel aliquis de fidelibus suis versus aliquem vel aliquos domini reg(is) fideles de feodis vel aliis querelam habuerit, per senescallum domini reg(is) qui pro tempore fuerit iusticiam recipiet. Neutra pars malefactores alterius durante pace recipiet nec permittet guerram alteri pro posse suo moueri, et qui hoc facere presumpserit^{qq}, nisi monitus resipuerit, per senescallum domini reg(is) conpescatur, et com(es) ad hoc faciendum cum requisitus fuerit a domino reg(e) vel a senescallo suo consilium et auxilium prestabit tanquam fidelis domini reg(is), et vice versa faciet com(iti) senescallus domini regis. Et ut hec omnia predicta firmiter et fideliter obseruentur, dominus Sauaricus^{rr} ex parte reg(is) iurauit et dominus com(es) cum ux(ore) sua similiter pro parte sua et suorum iurauit, et ne de predictis debeat^{ss} aliquatenus dubitari, presens scriptum de consensu parcium est confectum et sigillis domini Norwycen' electi et Pictauen', Xancton' et Lemouicen' episcoporum et domini com(itis) et ux(or)is sue et domini Sauarici de Malo Leone est roboratum. Actum apud Folliet^{tt} prope Niortum, secunda die post Ep(ip)h(an)iam, anno gratie^{vv} millesimo ducentesimo xxi.^{ww}. Et notandum quod si contingat super predictis causam tractari, ex parte reg(is) coram mandato suo littere de rathabicatione exhibeantur, et similiter ex parte com(itis) et ux(or)is sue nisi forte principales persone presentes fuerint.

^a Henricum C ^b March' et Engol' C ^c C repeats inter eos ^d Angl(ie) C ^e sua not in B, supplied from C
^f etiam C, not in B where dominus is written over an erasure ^g Merpispn' et Congniaco C ^h proloquite C
^j eius B, sue C ^k Olerone C ^l consuetudines C ^m Oleronis C ⁿ Engol' C ^p Congniaco C
^q stagnaria C ^r B inserts et underdotted for omission, not in C ^s exchambium C ^t iurauerat B,
iurauerant supplied from C ^v fadini C ^w regium B, reg(is) C ^x Thoarcio C ^y Hug(oni) C
^z Front' C ^{aa} Sauaricum de Rupeforti B, Sauac' de Rupefort' C ^{bb} Montaut C ^{cc} Petragor' C
^{dd} Calamundo B, Talamundo supplied from C ^{ee} Mauritanica C ^{ff} Aunaio C ^{gg} imprisis C ^{hh} Mangoti
C ^{jj} C. de Lezign' C ^{kk} Aymerico de Lezign' C ^{ll} Rupefort' C ^{mm} transeuntibus C ⁿⁿ Vascon(iam)
C ^{pp} Engol' C ^{qq} presumpserit C ^{rr} Sauarius C ^{ss} debeatur C ^{tt} Vollicc C ^{vv} domini cancelled
gratie C ^{ww} m^o.cc^o.xx^o.primo C

TRANSLATION : Be it known to all present and future inspecting this writing that, when dispute arose between the lord Henry, illustrious King of England, and the noble man Hugh de Lusignan, count of La Marche and Angoulême, over what he received with the lord King's

sister and over the dower of his wife, the lord King's mother, a composition was arranged between them in this form by various noble men, through the mediation of the lord Pandulph bishop-elect of Norwich, chamberlain of the lord Pope, and through the bishops of Saintes, Poitiers, Limoges and Bazas. Namely that, in the presence of the aforesaid, the lord count swore fealty to the lord King of England just as his predecessors were accustomed to do to the kings of England, and made a charter of this fealty sworn to the lord King. The bishop-elect of Norwich, acting according to the forms of the Church, absolved the aforesaid count and his wife and followers from the sentence imposed against them by apostolic authority on behalf of the lord King, and relaxed the interdict placed upon their lands. Should the said dispute between them not be settled by the coming feast of St Andrew, thenceforth, as before, the lord count will do justice to the lord King in his royal court before whoever the King appoints in his place, namely concerning the city of Saintes and its appurtenances. Moreover, the lord King stated that the aforesaid count had received with his sister such things from the castle of Merpins and from Cognac and their appurtenances that, as the King states, the count and his wife had thereby despoiled the King's faithful men, and such things should remain in peaceful possession to the count until the aforesaid term (the feast of St Andrew). Should the count and his wife not do justice to the King in his court, nor wish to submit in these to just judgement of his court according to the uses and customs of Poitou, then affairs will be restored to the state in which they were at the time when this composition was pronounced, namely to the sentence of excommunication of persons and interdict of lands imposed by those who, by apostolic authority, shall impose sentence of excommunication and interdict as required on the King's behalf. And to ensure this, the jurisdiction of those who impose such sentence is to last, by consent of the parties, until the King attains adulthood. The lord King will do justice to the count and his wife over the Île d'Oléron, over the stannaries, and over Aylesbury that the count states belong to him by reason of his wife's dower. And if by unwanted chance the King should not do justice over these things in Poitou to the count and his wife, over the things in England according to the customs of England, and over things in Poitou according to the custom of Poitou, from then onwards and without malice the count shall be absolved from the fealty sworn to the King. Meanwhile, however, the Île d'Oléron is to remain to the lord King, save for what pertains to the lord count by reason of the county of Angoulême and the lordship of Cognac, and the stannaries and the manor of Aylesbury. As for Niort, that the lady Queen states pertains to her by reason of dower, she shall have an exchange in an appropriate and certain place to the same value of receipts that John, of good memory King of England, had in that castle at the time that he dowered the Queen with the castle, and this by arbitration of the aforesaid lord bishop-elect and trustworthy men that he may choose to summon to this business. Moreover, the count is to be restored to the lady Queen's dower that he had in England together with the profits received from there since the time of their spoliation. The townsmen of La Rochelle, Niort and Saint-Jean-d'Angély are absolved from exactions and rents for which they had sworn to pay a certain sum of money to the count, for so long as the lord King does not deny justice to the count. Disputants are to be received within the truce by both sides, without restoration of their lands, and should any persons not wish to be within the truce, they are to be received by neither party. If the count shall have any fealties, homages or other lordships pertaining to the lord King and not pertaining to the count's own holdings, he shall restore such lordships and annul such fealties, together with whatever hostages he may hold, and for so long as the lord King does not refuse to do justice to the count, the count should not undertake anything against the King to the King's prejudice, nor should the King himself do likewise, for so long as the said count wishes reasonably to answer in the King's court. Moreover, the count will ensure peace to the towns and to all men and subjects of the lord King, both clergy and laity, in good faith and without fraud or evil intent, and in particular to the vicomte of Thouars and to Hugh de Thouars and to the said vicomte's sons, and to the

lord Savaric (de Mauléon) and his whole land, and to Hugh de Vivonne and knights and people, and to the lords A. and R. de Rançon, and the lords R. de Pons, elder and younger, and to G. de Pons, and to the vicomtesse of Fronsac, and the vicomte of Castillon, and to Savaric de Rochefort, G. Ridel and Elie Ridel, and to R. de Montaut, to the count of Périgueux, to R. de Talmont, B. de Maurienne, G. Martel, Arnulf Airaud and to Ralph de Amaio. In the same way, on behalf of the King's subjects and all his men, peace will be extended to the men and adherents of the count and his land, and in particular to the lord William L'Archevêque, to the lord G. de Rançon, to William Maengot, to the lord G. de Lusignan, to Aimery de Lusignan, to P. L'Evêque, and to Chalo de Rochefort and his sons. Let there be safe passage for all merchants and travellers, throughout the power of the lord King and his followers through Poitou and Gascony, and throughout the land of count of La Marche and Angoulême. Should the lord count or anyone of his subjects raise a complaint over fees or other matters against any subject or subjects of the King, they shall receive justice from whoever is at that time the lord King's seneschal. During the peace, neither party will receive malefactors from the other side, nor permit war to be waged against the other, and whoever presumes to do such things, unless they desist when warned, shall be compelled by the lord King's seneschal. And whenever requested by the lord King or his seneschal, the count shall supply counsel and aid like a faithful subject of the lord King, and in the same way shall the lord King's seneschal supply counsel and aid to the count. And so that all these aforesaid things may be firmly and faithfully observed, the lord Savaric (de Mauléon) swore on behalf of the King, and the count together with his wife similarly swore on behalf of themselves and their followers, and so that there may be no doubt over any of these aforesaid things, the present writing has been made with the consent of the parties and has been affirmed with the seals of the lord bishop-elect of Norwich, of the bishops of Poitiers, Saintes and Limoges, of the lord count and his wife, and of the lord Savaric de Mauléon. Enacted at Vouillé near Niort, on the second day after the feast of the Epiphany, in the year of grace 1221 (i.e. 8 January 1222). And be it noted that should any dispute arise over the aforesaid matters it shall be heard on receipt of mandatory letters of right on behalf of the King, and similarly on behalf of the count and his wife, unless it should happen that the principals themselves attend in person.