

For King, Country, and Patron: The Despensers and Local Administration, 1321-1322

SCOTT L. WAUGH

As the royal government in England expanded from the twelfth century onward and touched more aspects of the economy and society, landlords tried to control the administration and to protect their interests by retaining royal officers as their private clients. Simultaneously, lords built their own administrations to manage their estates and households. As clients, administrators could move easily between the royal government and baronial administrations and serve two or more masters, thereby compromising their loyalty and impartiality. The problem of “double allegiance,” as it has been called, therefore worried moralists and became an important characteristic of English government and politics in the fourteenth century.¹

This is a case study of the process and consequences of the overlapping of public and private power. The phenomenon of retaining royal ministers is well known and has recently received attention in J.R. Maddicott's study of royal justices and in Nigel Saul's study of the Gloucestershire gentry. Yet, in the later years of the reign of Edward II, the two Despensers—father and son—greatly magnified this practice of “double allegiance” to create a network of influence that permeated the royal government.² The Despenser case is important because it can illuminate further the administration and politics of early fourteenth-century Eng-

¹N. Denholm-Young, *Seignorial administration in England* (Oxford, 1937); idem, *The country gentry in the fourteenth century* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 38-40; idem, “The authorship of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*,” *English Historical Review*, 71 (1956), 95-96 (hereafter cited as *EHR*); R.B. Pugh, “The king's government in the middle ages,” in *Victoria county history of Wiltshire*, vol. 5, eds. R.B. Pugh and E. Crittall (London, 1957), pp. 7-10, 15, 19; G. Lapsley, “Buzones,” *EHR*, 47 (1932), 193; P.D.A. Harvey, *A medieval Oxfordshire village: Cuxham, 1240 to 1400* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 104-12; F.R.H. DuBoulay, *The lordship of Canterbury* (London, 1966), pp. 264-76; E. Searle, *Lordship and community: Battle Abbey and its banlieu, 1066-1538* (Toronto, 1974), pp. 242-46. “It has been pointed out that through men of double allegiance . . . the baronage could indirectly influence the administration.” (Denholm-Young, “Authorship,” p. 202). J.C. Davies called this “divided allegiance,” (Davies, *Baronial opposition*, p. 315. Full citations for this and many other abbreviations of sources and works are listed in the notes to the tables, below, p.57) Davies also described the household system of government as “. . . a perfect machinery for a strong-minded and able favorite to work his will in the government of the time.” (p. 75).

²J.R. Maddicott, “Law and lordship: royal justices as retainers in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century England,” *Past and Present Supplement*, no. 4 (1978); Nigel Saul, *Knights and esquires: the Gloucestershire gentry in the fourteenth century* (Oxford, 1981), esp. chapters 2 and 3. For the Despensers' role in the administration, see: Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 71-72, 93, 96-99, 102-05; Tout, *Place*, pp. 136-56; Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 27-36, 83-84, 101, 103-04, 110-12.

land in two ways. First, it shows precisely how lords relied on clients to extend their influence in the administration and the roles that clients performed for their lords as royal officers. Their performance stands out with particular clarity in the arrangements made for the forfeiture and custody of the land of the Contrariants, those magnates and their followers, primarily from the Marches of Wales but also including Thomas of Lancaster, who rebelled against Edward II and the Despensers in the autumn of 1321. Secondly, the Despenser case reveals the political contradictions and consequences of this practice of “double allegiance.” Because they pushed this practice so far, the Despensers obtruded upon the interests of other lords. The barons voiced their resentment over this competition in 1321:

... in order to attain their evil and covetous wishes, for the disinheritation of the magnates and the destruction of the people, they removed the good and suitable ministers who were appointed by assent, and replaced them by other false and bad *ministers of their conspiracy*, who would not suffer right to be done, and appointed sheriffs, escheators, constables of castles, and others in the king's offices who were not suitable for the king or his people, and caused judges who were ignorant of the laws to hear and determine matters touching the magnates and the people. . . . [emphasis added]³

In the eyes of their contemporaries, therefore, the tyranny of the Despensers lay in their domination of the length and breadth of the royal government and the consequent partiality of royal officers. Yet, as pervasive as this network became, it failed to defend the Despensers from determined opposition and, in fact, contributed to their fall by hardening resentment against them. The Despenser regime, as brief as it was, provides an opportunity to analyze in detail both the practice and weaknesses of “double allegiance.”

The Despensers carried out their policies with the aid of a sprawling clientele of retainers, administrators, and servants. Tables I and II demonstrate the breadth and variety of the Despensers' clientage in the latter years of Edward II's reign, though they do not pretend to account for every Despenser associate or retainer.⁴ The first column shows the different

³CCR, 1318-23, pp. 492-5, quote at p. 493. The process is also printed in W. Stubbs, ed. *Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvan auctore canonico Bridlingtoniensi in Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series 76 (London, 1883), 2:66-7 (hereafter cited as Bridlington); A. Luders, et. al., eds., *Statutes of the Realm*, Record Commission (London, 1810-28), 1:182-3. For the background to the process, see: Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 45-49.

⁴The terms client, clientele, and clientage are preferred here because in the majority of the cases no formal indentures survive between the Despensers and their retainers, as can be seen in the tables. The tables provide the basic references to an individual's service, and those references are amplified in the notes to the text when necessary. All of the clients referred to in the text are listed in the tables.

types of association between the Despensers and individuals as well as the date of the earliest evidence for the association. The second column records the individual's royal service, and, in some cases, the earliest recorded date of that service. The third column shows any service performed by the client in 1321-22, and the last shows the date of the earliest indication of royal service after the fall of the Despensers in 1326.

The Despensers recruited these followers in numerous ways, and their clients served varying lengths of time with varying degrees of closeness. A handful of individuals thus formed the core of the Despensers' clientage and faithfully tended their lords' interests over a long period of time. Berenger, Dene, and Haudlo served Hugh senior for many years, while the younger Hugh relied particularly on the services of Inge, Baldock, and Ovedale. With the younger Hugh's rapid ascendancy after his appointment as chamberlain of the household in 1318, he and his father attracted a growing number of adherents within the royal administration. Their supremacy in the household would explain the high percentage of officers who attached themselves to the favorites.⁵ Others gravitated towards the Despensers after their triumph over the Contrarians. Roger Belers, for example, had been associated with Thomas of Lancaster prior to 1321, but seems opportunely to have changed his allegiance to the Despensers in that year.⁶ Edmund Pinkenny, Robert de Wateville, and Thomas Wyther actually fought against the king and the Despensers in the civil war and consequently forfeited their lands. Pinkenny and Wateville received pardons and recovered their property at the insistence of the younger Despenser, while Aymer de Valence intervened in favor of Wyther. Pinkenny entered into a bond of recognizance with Hugh junior for £10,000 and served him to the end of the reign. Wateville also entered Hugh's service, becoming his bachelor and acting on his behalf in Gascony.⁷ In addition to Contrarians, the Despensers also acquired the services and support of several retainers of Aymer de Valence after his death in 1324. Thomas of Castle Goodrich, John de Cromwell, William Lovel, Constantine Mortimer, and John de Olney sought out the lordship of the younger Despenser once their master died, though there is some evidence that the loyalty of Lovel and Cromwell, at least, had been divided

⁵For examples of how such contacts could be made, see below, n. 9 and 19.

⁶J.R. Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322* (Oxford, 1970), p. 229; Tout, *Place*, pp. 46, 144, 180-81, 281, 298, 304, 307.

⁷*Pinkenny: CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 406, 431; *1327-30*, p. 330; *CIPM*, 7:324-5 (no. 458); *CCR, 1318-23*, p. 402. *Wateville: CFR*, 3:80, 84, 167; *CCR, 1318-23*, p. 602; *CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 62, 210, 403; Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 339-40; *WSS*, pp. 152-54, 157, 232. Wateville remained loyal to his lord to the very end, for in the autumn of 1326, he was among those charged with the defense of England from Isabella and Mortimer. *Wyther: CFR*, 3:116, 155, 183; *CMR*, p. 67. Wyther had also been associated with Thomas of Lancaster and Aymer de Valence: Maddicott, *Lancaster*, pp. 54, 61, 274; J.R.S. Phillips, *Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, 1307-1324* (Oxford, 1972), p. 304. For the Despensers' use of recognizances as instruments of power, see: Davies, *Baronial opposition*, p. 36.

prior to that.⁸ Finally, some individuals had only fleeting contact with the Despensers, as far as can be determined from the sources. Aukeland, FitzWalter, Gorges, Langeley, Olney, and Peverel served with the Despensers on only one or two military campaigns, while the Despensers occasionally relied on attorneys such as Berners or Sancto Amando.⁹

These clients not only served the Despensers in a private capacity, but they also held a remarkable number of positions within the royal government. The extent to which the Despensers exploited "double allegiance" can be illustrated by comparing their clientele in royal service to those of Aymer de Valence and Thomas of Lancaster.¹⁰ As Lancaster's biographer

⁸Phillips, *Valence*, p. 257. Lovel received the younger Despenser's aid in contracting a marriage with the widow of Henry de Valence in 1322. Valence was also in the Earl of Pembroke's retinue, (*CPR*, 1321-4, p. 141; Phillips, *Valence*, pp. 116, 255, 258, 261, 302) Lovel acted as a mainpennor for Wateville in 1322: *CPR*, 3:167. Cromwell's association with the Despensers dated from at least 1322, when they entered into a series of land transactions that involved life grants to Cromwell with remainders to the Despenser family, (*CAD*, 4:420 (A9399); *CCR*, 1318-23, pp. 344, 346, 358-59, 368; *CPR*, 1321-4, p. 324). After that, Cromwell can be found witnessing Despenser charters, (*CAD*, 5:44 (A10,769); *CPR*, 1324-7, p. 52; *CCR*, 1323-7, p. 327). Such an association might have developed because Cromwell had long served in the household and royal administration as a bannaret, steward and constable of the Tower of London. As steward, Cromwell witnessed a royal grant with Hugh junior in 1315, and the two accompanied one another to Scotland in 1322 as royal familiares, (*Tout*, *Chapters*, 2:237, 302 n.2; 6:42; Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 142, 168, 174, 212, 226, 360, 427, 431; Phillips, *Valence*, pp. 44-45, 122, 125, 149, 305, 313; Fyrde, *Tyranny*, pp. 131, 167). Finally, Master John de Shorditch went to Gascony on the king's service in 1324 in the company of Valence and Constantine de Mortimer, (*CPR*, 1324-4, p. 427).

⁹Other men who served as attorneys only once, but who cannot otherwise be identified were Robert Graunsak, clerk, and Philip de Hertrugge, (*CAD*, 4:45, 528 (A6488 and A10,260). Some clients acted jointly as the Despensers' attorneys: Cliff and Camoys, or Cliff and Belers, (*CPR* 1317-21, p. 449; 1321-4, p. 189).

¹⁰Information for the retinues of Lancaster and Valence can be found in: Maddicott, *Lancaster*, pp. 40-66 and Phillips, *Valence*, pp. 253-68, 291-311. Maddicott concludes that Lancaster's retinue numbered about 50 to 55 knights in 1318-19, (p. 45) though this number does not include administrative clients or other servants. Similarly, Phillips calculates that Valence's *military* retinue fluctuated between about 40 and 100 (p.254). He lists a total of 128 men known to have been associated with Valence at some point in his lifetime, (pp. 295-305, excluding sub-retinues). From these, I have selected 76 (including some officials) active around 1321-22, to compare with the Despensers' clientage, (Abel, Addingsley, Bagot, J. Bassingburn, M. Bassingburn, Bayhouse, Baynard, N. Beche, W. Beche, Bendyn, Berkeley, Brickendon, Carew, Castle-Goodrich, Cleydon, Cressoner, Cromwell, J. Darcy, R. Darcy, H. Dene, J. Dene, H. Drayton, S. Drayton, Elys, Ergun, E. Gacelyn, J. Gacelyn, Glyn, Hashtorp, Hastings, Holewell, Huntingfield, Insula, Keu, Lavenham, Leaumes, Lodewyk, Loryng, Lovel, Mareschal, Mortimer, Merlyn, Milksop, Moriz, R. Munchensy, W. Munchensy, Olney, Oseville, J. Pabenham, J. Pabenham, J. Pabenham, J. Pabenham, Panton, Paveley, Paynel, Peyvre, Plaiz, Pollicott, Priour, Ryver, Sackville, Simeon, Simond, Stackpole, Stapleton, Twenge, Umfraville, Valence, Walkingham, FitzWalter, Waterville, West, Wollaston, Wyther, A Zouche, J. Zouche, W. Zouche). The most striking difference between the Despenser group and the others is the military quality of Lancaster's and Valence's retinues. The difference can perhaps be explained by the fact that different sources were used in compiling the lists, yet it is notable that the Despensers had very few military retainers.

points out, the earl's opportunities for placing men in royal offices were limited because he was outside of the inner circles of power during much of Edward's reign. Nevertheless, Lancaster cultivated his influence in the royal courts by retaining justices and legal experts.¹¹ Despenser clients also served as justices—a role that the barons specifically denounced in 1321.¹² Furthermore, six of Lancaster's clients, eight of Valence's and seven of the Despensers' served as sheriffs at some point in their careers, thought not necessarily while they were in private service. Only two of Lancaster's retainers served simultaneously in both capacities, while three Despenser men did so—Berenger, Inge, and Iwayn. Royal and baronial service equally attracted men from the ranks of the gentry, so that their careers would usually embrace both kinds of service.¹³ The high number of men in retinues who served as sheriffs does not, therefore, necessarily indicate a corruption of the office. Patterns of retaining in the higher echelons of the royal administration, however, probably do reflect varying degrees of political influence and opportunities for steering government in the direction of personal interest. Here a comparison of the retinues reveals a striking contrast, for the Despensers had many more clients within the household or central administration than either Valence or Lancaster. For instance, only six of the seventy-five Valence retainers active in 1321-22 served in any position close to the court.¹⁴ Yet, no less than twenty of the ninety-six Despenser clients did so. Furthermore, only about thirty-six percent of the Valence retinue served the crown at that time, while roughly sixty-nine percent of the Despensers' clientele occupied some administrative post. Though partly the result of distortions in the evidence, these discrepancies surely indicate deliberate choices of lords and particularly the Despensers' desire to consolidate authority at court by controlling administrative offices.¹⁵ Finally, from

¹¹Maddicott, *Lancaster*, pp. 48-51.

¹²The process against the Despensers singled out Basset, Camoys, and Inge as those whom the Despensers placed on judicial commissions. G.O. Sayles, however, concluded that "... so far as the king's bench is concerned, there is no evidence at all to support Tout's argument (*Place of Edward II*; p. 144) that Hugh Despenser had 'packed' the court with his dependents before he was driven into exile in 1321." (G.O. Sayles, ed., *Select cases in the court of king's bench under Edward II*, [Selden Society Publications, 74] (London, 1955), Introduction, p. xiii n. 13).

¹³Maddicott, *Lancaster*, p. 63: "These activities are only what might be expected of any of the country gentry and lesser barons at this period." Saul's study of the Gloucestershire gentry fully supports this conclusion, (Saul, *Knights*, pp. 106-67). Because of the form in which Phillips presents the evidence for Valence's retinue, the royal and private services of his retainers cannot be correlated.

¹⁴John Abel, baron of the exchequer, (Davis, *Baronial opposition*, p. 315; Tout, *Place*, pp. 300 n.3, 304, 306, 323). William de la Beche, valet and knight of the household, (Davies, pp. 146, 222). John de Cromwell, steward of the household, etc. Robert Darcy, served in the household, (Davies, p. 384). John de Dene, household knight, (Davies, p. 222). John de Paynel, chamberlain of Chester, (Tout, *Place*, p.348).

¹⁵It should be noted that the high percentage of Despenser clients in royal service can perhaps be misleading. The evidence is weighted in favor of that conclusion, for the information is largely taken from royal sources and therefore tends to single out those serving the king and to exclude any acting in a purely private capacity.

the evidence presented in the tables, Hugh junior appears to have been far more ambitious than his father in attracting adherents.

Ties between the Despensers and these administrative personnel seem to have been formed in various ways, though the information concerning retaining and the dates of entering service are fragmentary. The Despensers probably placed some clients in offices themselves, for chroniclers and opponents of their regime denounced them for this practice. Indeed, it is notable, for example, that at least three of the four controllers of the wardrobe between 1320 and 1327 were Despenser clients.¹⁶ The Despensers also established ties with officers who were already in royal service. Robert de Welles, for example, had a long career in the royal household before the earliest indication of his ties to Hugh junior in 1325.¹⁷ In other cases, a client's royal service likewise antedates evidence of his adherence to the Despensers. It is possible that once the Despensers consolidated their power at court, officials ingratiated themselves with the new favorites to ensure their tenure.

The Despensers' schemes to control the court have long been studied, yet it must be stressed that they tried, with equal vigor, to subordinate many local officers as well. The comprehensiveness of their intentions can be demonstrated by detailing the careers of a group of clients who filled relatively humble posts in the royal administration. William de Aylmer, a clerk, was Hugh senior's steward on the manor of Saham, Cambs., in 1315. His administration was evidently very harsh, for, in that year, the tenants seized William and other officials, forced them to hold a mock court in which they expunged unjust fines from the rolls, ordered the officials to return goods they had distrained, and then assaulted them. Aylmer moved on to become a bailiff on the younger Despenser's manor of Tewkesbury and was assaulted by Hugh's enemies in Wales in the summer of 1321, along with other Despenser agents such as Gorges, Iwayn, and Joce.¹⁸

¹⁶Tout, *Place*, pp. 130 and n. 2, 316; Murimuth, p. 33; *Chronica monasterii de Melsa*, ed. E. A. Bond, Rolls Series, 43 (London, 1866-8), 2:337-8; John Trokelowe, *Annales*, ed. T. Hearne, Rolls Series, 28 (London, 1866), p. 107. Controllers: Baldock (1320-3); Holden (1323-6); Huggate (1326-7). Also see below, p. 30 and n. 29.

¹⁷In 1311, Welles was described as a royal clerk, and was appointed as keeper of the bishopric of Durham and controller of the chamberlainship of Scotland. (*CFR*, 2:85; *CPR*, 1307-1313, p. 381). He served thenceforth in various positions, both in the central administration and on local commissions, (*CFR*, 2:213, 248; *CCR*, 1313-18, p. 234; *CPR*, 1313-17, p. 326). In 1316, he married the widow of Robert Clifford and then worked on behalf of his new stepson, (*CPR*, 1313-17, p. 551; 1317-21, p. 433). Nevertheless, in the years 1321-25, he worked assiduously in the central government and probably formed his ties with the Despensers during that period, (*CPR*, 1321-4, p. 425; 1324-7, p. 100; *CCR*, 1318-23, pp. 430, 438, 456; Public Record Office (hereafter cited as PRO), Exchequer various accounts, E.101/381/6, wardrobe account for 20 Edward II; Exchequer warrants for issues, E.404/1/8, 16 Edward II: "nostre cher bachelor. . .").

¹⁸*CPR*, 1313-17, p. 320; *Parliamentary writs and writs of military summons*, ed. F. Palgrave, 2 vols. in 4, Record Commission (London, 1827-34), 2:2:90 (Saham); PRO, Plea rolls of the king's bench, KB.27/271, m. 105 (Tewkesbury); *CPR*, 1321-4, pp. 153-54, 257, 368 (assault). Aside from Aylmer, Croyser, and Inge seem to have served both father and son at different points in their careers.

Ingelram de Berenger served as an attorney for the elder Despenser and witnessed several of his charters.¹⁹ John le Botiller of Llantulit acted as the younger Despenser's steward, witnessed his charters, and held lands of Despenser in Gloucestershire. At the same time, he was named as a royal yeoman.²⁰ John de Dunstaple, like Aylmer, was a clerk and was imprisoned in Wales in 1321.²¹ Richard de Foxcote was another Despenser steward, while Alan de Tesdale, also one of the king's yeomen, served Hugh junior as chamberlain and valet and witnessed his charters along with Botiller.²² Richard de Tyssbury, another clerk, was the younger Despenser's auditor and a treasurer at Bristol.²³ Finally, Ralph de Camoys, a knight singled out by the barons as one of those "ignorant in the laws" appointed as a justice by the Despensers, performed military service under Hugh senior in 1313 and 1322, and acted as an attorney for Hugh junior in 1320.²⁴ Several others can be found working with this clique such as the more notorious John Inge, the younger Despenser's sheriff in Glamorgan; Adam Brom, a prominent chancery official; John de Kingston; and John Bek.²⁵ Furthermore, Aylmer, Berenger, Botiller, and Camoys received pardons from the new regime in 1327 for having adhered to the younger Despenser, and the depth of attachment between a minis-

¹⁹Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 89-90, 89 n.10; *CCR, 1318-23*, p. 385; *Rot. parl.* 1:352a.

²⁰*Rot. parl.*, 2:385 (steward in Worcs., Gloucs., and Staff.); *CCR, 1323-7*, p. 532 and *CPR, 1324-7*, p. 206 (witness to charters); *CPR, 1324-7*, pp. 252, 318 (tenant of lands granted to abbot and convent of Tewkesbury in mortmain); *CChW*, p. 542 (yeoman). In 1312, Botiller paid £6. 13s. 4d. (or ten marks) to be respited from knighthood for two years, (*CFR, 2:157*). It should be noted that Despenser and, before him, the Clares had a close association with the abbey of Tewkesbury. See: W. Dugdale, *Monasticon anglicanum*, new ed., eds. J. Caley, H. Ellis, and B. Bandinel, 6 vols in 8 (London, 1817-30), 2:55.

²¹*CCR, 1318-23*, pp. 518, 541; *1323-7*, p. 142 (clerk); *CChW*, p. 450; *CFR, 3:71* (king's clerk).

²²PRO, Justices itinerant, Just.1/1037, m. 1d. (Foxcote: "senescallus domini Hugoni . . ."); *Rot. parl.*, 2:37 (Tesdale: valet), 431 (chamberlain); *CCR, 1323-7*, p. 532 (witness); *CFR, 3:74* (yeoman); *Rot. parl. ined.*, pp. 144, 191.

²³*CMR*, p. 250 (no. 1833, auditor); Fryde, "Deposits," p. 349.

²⁴*CPR, 1307-13*, p. 582 (1313); *1317-21*, p. 449 (1320); *1321-4*, p. 188 (1322).

²⁵Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 9, 48, 74 (Inge); Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 128, 176, 338, app. no. 94; Tout, *Chapters*, 2:144 n. 2 (Brom). The cohesion and inter-relationships of these Despenser servants are visible in the commissions on which they served together during the years of the younger Hugh's prominence. *Bek*: with Aylmer (1323), Botiller (1323), Aylmer and Botiller (1323), Botiller (1324), Aylmer and Botiller (1324), (*CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 263, 311, 443, 449; *1324-7*, p. 64). *Brom*: Inge and Aylmer (1321), (*CFR, 3:69-70*). *Kingston*: Dunstaple (1321), Dunstaple and Aylmer (1322), Inge (1322), Dunstaple (1322), Aylmer and Botiller (1325), (*CChW*, p. 526; *CFR, 3:79, 101, 114, 115; CPR, 1321-4*, p. 108; *CCR, 1323-7*, p. 408). *Cliff*: Basset, Foxcote, Dunstaple, Brom, and Belers, (*CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 189, 324, 343; *CFR, 3:193; CCR, 1318-23*, pp. 490, 518. *Ingham*: Inge and Swynburn, Travers and Leyburn, Croyser, Vaus, (*CCR, 1318-23*, p. 723; *CFR, 3:118, 172-3; CIM, 2:240* (no. 965)).

ter and his patron might be seen in Aylmer's participation in a rash scheme to free Edward II from Berkeley Castle in 1327.²⁶

These men also acted on a variety of royal commissions touching local government. Ralph de Camoys, for instance, was frequently a royal justice, while the king appointed Tesdale, Aylmer, and Botiller to judicial commissions. Richard de Foxcote was a subescheator in Oxfordshire.²⁷ Dunstaple was a purveyor for the royal household office of the buttery, while Aylmer gained practical experience as a keeper of some of the Clare lands in 1315/6, work which foreshadowed the role these men performed in 1321/2.²⁸ The king had appointed Ingelram Berenger sheriff of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire in April, 1320, probably at Despenser's behest, for he was removed promptly in August, 1321 when the barons forced the Despensers into exile. Nevertheless, he returned to power with his patron and received the same shrievalty in June, 1322.²⁹

While gathering this clientele, the Despensers also expanded their estates. Their family had not been particularly wealthy and both father and son significantly enlarged their holdings down to 1321 through a combination of favoritism, acquisition, and terror.³⁰ The core of the younger Despenser's estate lay in Glamorgan and Gloucestershire, after his wife, one of the Clare heiresses, received her share of the inheritance in 1317-20. His father's lands lay primarily in Buckinghamshire and the west midlands.³¹ He began to add to those holdings towards the end of the thirteenth century by purchasing lands in Gloucestershire and elsewhere.³² Yet both he and his son acquired additional property through coercion and harassment. The *Vita Edwardi Secundi* stated that "... the brutal and greedy father had in the past wronged many, and promoted the excommunication of many. As a justice of the Forest he had accused many of breaches of the royal rights of hunting, many he had vilely disinherited, some he forced into exile, extorted unjust ransoms from many, collected a thousand librates of land by means of threats. . . ."³³ This passage high-

²⁶For the pardons and accusations, see: *CPR, 1327-30*, pp. 20, 76, 80, 81, 100, 101, 285. For Aylmer and the effort to release Edward II, see: *CPR, 1327-30*, p. 156-7; *CCR, 1327-30*, p. 158; *Foedera, conventiones, litterae*, ed. Thomas Rymer, 3rd. ed., ed. George Holmes, (The Hague, 1745), 2:2:195; Fryde, *Tyranny*, p. 224; T.F. Tout, "The captivity and death of Edward of Carnarvon," in *idem, Collected Papers*, (Manchester, 1932-4), 3:157-63.

²⁷Camoys: *CPR, 1317-21*, pp. 170, 179, 300, 467, 542, 548, 602, 608 (etc.). Aylmer: *CPR, 1313-17*, p. 320; *1321-4*, pp. 64, 153-4, 254, 311, 380, 443, 449, 452. Botiller: *CPR, 1324-7*, pp. 191, 231. Foxcote: *CPR, 1317-21*, p. 541.

²⁸*CPR, 1313-17*, p. 349 (1315, Dunstaple); *Rot. parl.*, 1:354 (1315, Aylmer); *CFR*, 2:313 (Aylmer).

²⁹Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 141, 525; *List*, p. 1; *CFR*, 3:21, 67, 130, 202.

³⁰This discussion of the Despensers' holdings is taken from Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 27-36, 228-32.

³¹The distribution of the elder Despenser's lands can be seen, roughly, in his accusations against those who ravaged his property in 1321, (*CPR, 1321-4*, p. 168). The complaint thus shows that he had 17 manors in Wilts., 12 in Gloucs., 5 in Hants., 6 in Bed. and Bucks., and others scattered over several counties.

³²*CAD*, 1:108, 109, 111 (A 927, 931, 932, 934, 943, 946, 947, 948, 955).

³³*Vita*, p. 114.

lights the Despensers' reliance on official authority to augment their private wealth which became such an outstanding characteristic of their regime down to 1326. Natalie Fryde and others have described several of the younger Despenser's attempts to intimidate landholders into surrendering their property during those years.³⁴

The Despensers particularly relied on their clients and the official authority that they wielded as royal ministers to conduct this policy of territorial aggrandizement. The younger Despenser's efforts to enlarge his holdings in South Wales in 1320-21 illustrate their use of private clients for this purpose. His letters to his agent, John Inge, for example, reveal his nervousness over the situation there and his determination to protect his gains at whatever cost.³⁵ He instructed Inge, the royal sheriff of Glamorgan, to guard his lands, victual and fortify his castles, raise Welsh forces, handle some of Despenser's financial business, and even to take hostages if necessary. There is no clearer example of the confusion of private and public authority. And other Despenser clients acted in a similar fashion. John Iwayn worked for Despenser in his capacity as sheriff of Carmarthenshire in acquiring some of the Braose inheritance. Though Iwayn had originally grown wealthy in service to the Braose family, he deserted them in 1318 to join with Despenser.³⁶ Despenser may have hoped to undermine another rival in the region, Hugh Daudele junior, through similar tactics. In 1316, he retained the services of Peter de Ovedale whose family had been tenants of the Clare family. After the partition of the Clare estates, Overdale held some of his lands of Daudele and Damory, both Despenser rivals, during a period in which he was Despenser's retainer.³⁷ Finally, Despenser's steward, Richard de Foxcote was the subescheator in the Welsh Marches whom the king appointed in 1321 to seize Gower into royal custody, the action that precipitated the Contrariants' rebellion.³⁸

The Despensers thus built up large estates staffed by an extensive clientele. Furthermore, at crucial points, this private administration intersected with the royal government, so that Despensers' men performed several roles simultaneously. Precisely how well these clients served the Despensers and how thoroughly they dominated the royal government can best be seen in the arrangements made in 1321-22 for the confiscation and administration of the lands of the Despensers and Contrariants.

³⁴Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 106-18; Fryde, "Deposits," p. 348; Tout, *Place*, p. 138-39; Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 95, 97-98.

³⁵R.R. Davies, *Lordship and society in the March of Wales, 1282-1400* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 279-81, 285, 288; Edwards, *Anc. cor. Wales*, pp. 84, 219-20, 259-60; J.C. Davies, "The Despenser war in Glamorgan," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd ser., 9 (1915) 21-64, esp. pp. 25-49.

³⁶Davies, *Lordship and society*, pp. 100 and n. 41, 416; Griffiths, *Principality of Wales*, p. 258.

³⁷For the Ovedale lands, see: *CIPM*, 5:346 (no.538), tenants of the Earl of Gloucester; 6:178-9 (no. 310).

³⁸*CCR*, 1318-23, p. 223, 285; *CFR*, 3:41; *CPR*, 1321-4, p. 21; *CMR*, p. 150 (no. 959)

The Despensers' use of clients in official positions to expand their private wealth clearly interfered with the interests of the local baronage and gentry, so that the leaders of southern Wales and the Marches united in the early summer of 1321 to protect those interests. They began by devastating the younger Despenser's lands, killing his agent, Iwayne, and capturing and imprisoning others.³⁹ The agitation resulted in the process and parliament against the Despensers in August and their exile on August 14. Edward, humiliated and angered by the exile, turned his rage against the baronial allies. The fighting began with the siege of Leeds Castle, Kent, which capitulated on October 31. He then pressured an ecclesiastical convocation into revoking the exile of his favorites and carried the war into the heart of the opposition on the Welsh Marches. The fighting that began there in December ended with the defeat of the rebels at Boroughbridge on March 16.⁴⁰

Meanwhile, Edward had issued orders for the forfeiture and management of the rebels' property, beginning with the forfeiture of lands of the followers of Bartholomew de Badlesmere, who had resisted the king at Leeds. On December 27, the king ordered the confiscation of the lands of the Contrarians in Gloucestershire and neighboring counties. Through the early months of 1322 down to July, the king commissioned men to keep, survey, and account for the lands throughout England. He also made plans for the receipt and accounting of the issues in the central offices of the household and exchequer.⁴¹

The Despensers' clients, armed with royal commissions, participated in every phase and level of this administrative enterprise. They carried out royal orders, yet simultaneously watched over their lords' interests.

To begin with, once the Despensers had gone into exile, the king arranged for the custody of their lands. The barons perhaps intended that the lands be turned over to the escheators, for the king, acting on the advice of the council, ordered them to take custody. Edward, however, on his own initiative established a different administration for the lands. On August 16, he entrusted them to seven men, adding an eighth on September 6. All three men given custody of the lands of the elder Despenser—Inge, Aylmer, and Waledon—were either Despenser's clients or associates.⁴² The four men to whom the king initially granted custody of

³⁹CCR, 1318-23, pp. 541-46. Trokelowe (p. 108) notes that attackers plundered the lands of the Despensers and "... omnium eis aliquo foedere vel affinitate conjutorum."

⁴⁰Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 37-57. For a more comprehensive treatment of the events of 1321-22, see: Maddicott, *Lancaster*, pp. 259-317.

⁴¹Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 69-86; S.L. Waugh, "The Confiscated lands of the Contrarians in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire in 1322: an economic and social study" (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1975), pp. 118-22.

⁴²Fryde, *Tyranny*, p. 49; CFR, 3:68-70. The order for the escheators by king and council is listed under 20 August, while the commitment of the lands to individual custodians is dated 16 August.

the lands of the younger Despenser do not seem to have had any close ties to him, though one—Adam de Brom—often worked in association with Despenser's men. On September 6, however, the king assigned William de Beauchamp, Hugh junior's bachelor, to take custody of Hugh's manor of Tewkesbury. He likewise appointed John de Dunstaple custodian of Hugh junior's property in London, and Ralph de Camoys received a commission as surveyor and chief keeper of four of the younger Despenser's manors in October. Furthermore, the king appointed John de Dunstaple along with John de Cotesford and John de Kingston to survey the Despenser lands and later to audit the accounts of the bailiffs and keepers of the lands. Finally, although he had removed Ingelram de Berenger as sheriff in August by the action of the council, Edward entrusted him with the lands of his lord, the elder Despenser, sometime after October.⁴³ Thus, of the eighteen men appointed to administer the Despenser lands between August and November, eight definitely served as Despenser clients at one time or another. The remainder of the administrators were clerks or officials at the center of the government. Adam Brom, William Thunnyk, and Gilbert de York, to whom the king originally gave custody of Hugh junior's lands, were clerks in the household or chancery. The king similarly turned custody of the lands of both of the Despensers over to the household in November, 1321, by appointing Henry de Thrapston and Gilbert de Wigeton, an influential wardrobe clerk, as the chief surveyors and keepers of the lands, except those in the custody of Ralph de Camoys.⁴⁴ The measures that the king took to administer the Despensers' lands during their exile would have convinced the barons of Edward's insincerity, for he either kept close personal control over their lands or entrusted them to the Despensers' own officials.

During the civil war, Edward displayed further consideration for the Despensers' interests. The king ordered his ministers on February 7, 1322, to refrain from taking any goods or chattels from the tenants of the younger Despenser's manor of Tewkesbury, as long as the manor was in royal custody. The order came as royal officials scoured the local countryside for goods to supply the royal army and household, thereby exempting Despenser from royal exactions.⁴⁵ The king then assigned Richard de Foxcote to hold the manorial courts on the lands of his lord in four counties. Richard had not forgotten his master, for during the rebellion,

⁴³*CFR*, 3:67, 70, 71, 74, 75, 79; *CCR*, 1318-23, p. 442; *CChW*, p. 526, *CPR*, 1321-4, p. 108; Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 89-90.

⁴⁴For Brom, see above, n. 27. Thunnyk and York: *CMR*, pp. 67, 94, 122, 247 (nos. 474, 716, 870, 1814). Wigeton had at one time been controller of the wardrobe, (Tout, *Chapters*, 2:242, 245, 272, 297-8). The previous keepers—Dunstaple, Kingston, and Cotesford—were appointed to audit the accounts of the keepers and bailiffs of the Despensers' lands, on 14 November, (*CFR*, 3:79).

⁴⁵*CFR*, 3:94. For the king's efforts to purvey grain and other victuals in this region during the civil war, see: S.L. Waugh, "The profits of violence: the minority in the rebellion of 1321-1322 in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire," *Speculum*, 52 (1977), 851-53.

he seized twenty marks worth of wood in Worcestershire and turned it over to Hugh as a gift from the king.⁴⁶

The government erected an even more elaborate system to administer the Contrariants' lands, and the Despensers' men likewise staffed positions in each of the areas—military, managerial, and judicial—involved in the task. At least four of them—Walter de Beauchamp, Croyser, Lerededeake, and Swynburn—thus fought with the king against the Contrariants and again in Scotland later that year, while Peverel and Olney accompanied the elder Despenser on the latter campaign.

Despenser clients also managed the forfeited lands. In February, the king appointed Richard de Tyssbury to receive the issues of certain of the forfeited lands in Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire, Somerset, and Wiltshire.⁴⁷ In April, he gave Richard de Foxcote custody of twelve manors in Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire, and Worcestershire, regions with which he was familiar as both a royal and private official.⁴⁸ Then, on May 4, William de Aylmer and John de Dunstaple took custody of the "wainage" and stock on several manors, five of which (Thornbury, Shipton, Oxendon, Burford, and Severnstoke) the king had previously committed to Foxcote. The commission included the Despenser manors of Tewkesbury and Henley.⁴⁹ The king appointed John le Botiller keeper of the manor and honor of Cranebourne, Dorset, which had belonged to the Despenser's rival, Roger Damory. The king then named him keeper of all of Damory's lands in Dorset the following November. Botiller later had co-custody of a Contrariant's tenement in his native Gloucestershire and took oaths of loyalty from the tenants on manors seized illegally by the younger Despenser.⁵⁰ In the early months of 1322, Edward similarly entrusted the lands of several of the most important Contrariants—Lancaster, Holand, Mortimer of Wigmore, and others—to the custody of Despenser clients such as Inge, Ingham, Tesdale, Travers, and others.⁵¹

Despensers' clients could also be found at the center of the administration. The king appointed Morteyn and Bousser, for instance, to oversee the custody of the forfeited lands, while Robert de Silkeston, who had been an auditor for the younger Despenser, audited the accounts of the keepers of the forfeited lands.⁵² Finally, Aylmer, Botiller, Dunstaple,

⁴⁶*CFR*, 3:100 (baronial courts); *PRO*, Just.1/1037, m. 1d. (seizures). John de Dufford, knight, had also taken a horse, 3 oxen, a bull, and 8 quarters of wheat belonging to one of the rebels and turned them over to Despenser for the king's use. (Just.1/1037, m. 1: "... quae deliberavit Hugoni le Despenser ad opus regis. ...")

⁴⁷*CFR*, 3:97, 151; *PRO*, Exchequer memoranda rolls, (LTR), E.368/95, m. 119; Exchequer miscellaneous accounts, E.358/16, m. 17; Ministers' accounts, SC.6/1145/9.

⁴⁸*CMR*, p. 236 (no. 1731); *CFR*, 3:122.

⁴⁹*CFR*, 1321-4, pp. 112, 118.

⁵⁰*CFR*, 3:101, 119, 121; *CCR*, 1318-23, p. 603; 1323-7, pp. 220, 393; 1327-30, p. 64.

⁵¹Beauchamp: *CFR*, 3:70, 86, 100, 120. Inge: *CFR*, 3:143, 306; *PRO*, Rentals and surveys, SC.12/8/18. Ingham: *CFR*, 3:102-3. Tesdale: *CFR*, 3:397; *CMR*, pp. 258-59, 323 (nos. 1958, 2177(a)). Travers: *CFR*, 3:118, 126, 140, 148, 150, 173, 222, 223; *CFR*, 1321-4, p. 161; *CCR*, 1318-23, pp. 537, 539, 541, 571-73, 576.

⁵²*CFR*, 3:149, 225, 226; *CCR*, 1318-23, pp. 442, 454; E.358/14, m. 6.

Bek, Inge, and Kingston served together in varying combinations on commissions issued by the king to survey lands in Wales and to hear pleas of oyer and terminer arising out of the disturbances there.⁵³

The civil war thus multiplied the activities of the royal courts, and Despensers' men took a hand in many aspects of the judicial business. The king commissioned Foxcote, Olney, and Tesdale at different times to pursue and arrest rebels. Botiller sat on commissions of oyer and terminer. The king also assigned Hampton, Inge, and Marlebergh to deliver judgement on captured Contrarians.⁵⁴ The government relied most heavily on the assistance of the younger Despenser's client, Ralph de Camoys. During the rebellion he arrested Contrarians and afterwards passed judgement on at least one of them. In the later years of Edward's reign, he was a keeper of the peace, pursued disturbers of the peace, and helped to put down the brief rebellion of Robert L'Ewer.⁵⁵

The Despensers' clients were thus conspicuous as justices, administrators, and soldiers in 1321-22. Yet the extent of their service, and of the Despensers' control over the royal administration should not be overestimated. Between October, 1321 when the first orders went out for the forfeiture of Badlesmere's lands, and March 24, 1322 when the administration of the forfeited lands took its final shape, more than one hundred individuals participated in the administrative process. Fourteen were Despenser clients. Of the twenty-one keepers finally appointed to keep the Contrarians' lands after March 24, only two had direct ties to the Despensers: Belers and Travers. Despenser clients thus made up only a small percentage of the total number of ministers involved, though it was certainly greater than that of any other lord. Only five of Valence's retainers can be found to have participated in the administration of the lands.⁵⁶ It was impossible, even for the Despensers, with their extensive clientage in the royal government, to control an operation as massive and complex as the forfeiture and administration of the Contrarians' lands.

Within that administration, however, the Despensers could use their men effectively to safeguard their special interests. Because their agents acted in so many different governmental capacities, the Despensers could maintain their influence while their personal rule had been temporarily eclipsed. Furthermore, from the outset of the forfeitures, the government instituted a separate administration, made up of the Despensers' own servants and distinct from the regular administration of the Contrarians'

⁵³*CFR*, 3:101, 114, 115; *CCR*, 1323-7, p. 408; *CPR*, 1321-4, pp. 311, 443, 449, 452; 1324-7, p. 64.

⁵⁴*CPR*, 1321-4, pp. 102, 148, 149, 311, 380, 443, 449, 452; 1324-7, pp. 191, 231; *CCR*, 1323-7, p. 422; *Parl. writs*, 2:2:277.

⁵⁵*CPR*, 1321-4, pp. 77, 206, 254; 1324-7, pp. 229, 286; *CCR*, 1318-23, pp. 492-93, 673; 1323-7, pp. 203, 289. For L'Ewer's rebellion, see: Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 153-54.

⁵⁶Most of the commissions relating to the forfeiture and custody of the Contrarians' lands can be found on the fine rolls: *CFR*, 3:76-120. The one Valence retainer who assumed a prominent role in the administration was Nicholas de la Beche. He received a number of commissions to keep Contrarians' lands, (*CFR*, 3:76, 81, 84, 107, 427).

lands, to manage lands which the king had evidently earmarked for his favorites. Edward, for instance, granted Hugh junior four of the manors (Oxendon, Shipton, Burford, and Severnstoke) that Richard de Foxcote had managed.⁵⁷ In October, 1322, Hugh himself succeeded Foxcote as keeper of the six manors remaining in his custody and had to account for the issues of the manors in the exchequer.⁵⁸ Although Foxcote thus lost his official position, he may have continued to supervise the lands privately for Despenser, for in 1324, when the exchequer summoned Hugh to appear to render his account, Foxcote appeared in his place.⁵⁹ Furthermore, Aylmer, Tyssbury, Bek, and John de Standon held a special audit, distinct from those for the rest of the Contrariants' lands, of Foxcote's keepership, in March, 1322.⁶⁰ Foxcote had continuously received special treatment from the government. For example in October, 1322, when the exchequer ordered him to come before the treasurer and barons, the king countermanded the order, demanding instead that the exchequer respite his account as long as he was on royal business.⁶¹ Some of the lands surveyed by Aylmer and Botiller in Wales were similarly granted to Despenser.⁶² Earlier, the king had entrusted the lands of Hugh Daudele the younger in Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire to the elder Despenser's adherent, Berenger, while Berenger was sheriff. Eventually, some of those lands also came into Despenser's hands.⁶³

Aside from this administrative work, Despenser clients once again extorted property from local landholders. After the fall of the Despensers in 1326, local inhabitants accused three of these officials—Aylmer, Botiller, and Foxcote—of abetting the younger Despenser in his unjust seizure of land and of plundering the forfeited lands entrusted to their

⁵⁷*CPR, 1321-4*, p. 132; PRO, Chancery extract rolls, C.59/9, 10; KB.27/271, m. 105. William de Aylmer had illegally seized Oxendon in March, prior to turning it over to Foxcote.

⁵⁸*CPR*, 3:181; PRO, E. 358/15, m. 45. A place was marked for Despenser's accounts, but it was left blank. Edward granted him other forfeited lands and goods in Gloucs. as well, (*CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 128, 129, 132, 189; PRO, C.59/9, 10).

⁵⁹*CC_hW*, p. 152-53; PRO, E.368/94, m. 100: "Hugo le Despenser junior ponit loco suo Ricardum de Foxcote ad reddendum comptum pro eodem de exitibus maneriorum . . . de toto tempore quo idem Hugh habuit custodiam dictarum terrarum ac etiam ad comptum pro eodem de operibus castri Bristol in custodia eiusdem. . ."

⁶⁰*CPR, 1321-4*, p. 263. For the auditing process, see: PRO, E.368/93, m. 7.

⁶¹*Ibid*, m. 56.

⁶²*CPR, 1321-4*, p. 443; *1324-7*, p. 64.

⁶³*CFR*, 3:203; PRO, SC.6/1145/1; E.358/14, m. 51; E.368/96, mm. 112-112d.

care.⁶⁴ As can be seen in the tables, plaintiffs charged at least twelve Despenser clients with similar acts of violence or extortion, some more than once. Aside from these clients, the Despensers seem to have hired gangs of thugs whose only apparent connection with the Despensers was the intimidation of landholders during the rebellion.⁶⁵ The Despensers had grown so overbearing that the younger Hugh prevailed upon Master John Walewayn, a royal official with no other known ties to the family, to disseise the Abbey of Thorney of some land for him.⁶⁶

The Despensers' clients thus performed three general functions on behalf of their lords while they served as royal officials. In the first place, they supervised their interests and provided them with information about the actions of the government or of those in royal service. Such information could be vital to any lord, and clients placed within the royal government could easily inform their lords about activities that impinged upon their interests. Letters to and from the younger Despenser's clients,

⁶⁴Aylmer: PRO, KB.27/271, m. 105; *Rot. parl. ined.*, p. 158-59; *CPR, 1327-30*, pp. 80, 285. Botiller: *Rot. parl.*, 2:385-6. Foxcote: *CPR, 1327-30*, pp. 75-76, 80, 81, 285. (Saul, *Knights and esquires*, p. 182-83, mistakenly attributes Foxcote's actions to the year in which the commissions of oyer and terminer were issued. The fact that Foxcote had been one of the keepers of the lands in question and the fact that the "crimes" involved the removal of goods and livestock, probably indicated that Foxcote and others acted while they had custody of the lands. His accusers—John de Wilington and John de Acton—had to wait until 1327/8 to bring their actions, because they could not have hoped to attain redress while Despenser and his men were still in power. Moreover, the language of trespass and the commissions of oyer and terminer make it appear that Foxcote had acted maliciously, yet it is possible that Wilington, Acton and others brought such actions in order to obtain compensation for confiscations that royal officers made under royal authorization during the civil war.) Botiller was linked with a John Golafre, for whom Foxcote acted as a pledge in a fine of £20 owed to the crown in 1327, (PRO, Exchequer of pleas, E.13/54). Foxcote was also linked with Stephen Dunheved, (*CPR, 1327-30*, p. 80), with whom Aylmer was involved in the abortive attempt to rescue Edward II from Berkeley Castle, (above, n. 26).

⁶⁵After the fall of the Despensers, many individuals brought forth complaints against the former favorites, their adherents, and royal officials who had assisted them during the civil war. Some of those complaints can be found in the rolls of parliament (see preceding note for examples) and in the inquisitions miscellaneous, (*CFM*, 2:232, 237-41, 246, 248-49, 253-55, 259, 315, 363 (nos. 933, 955, 958, 965, 969, 989, 992, 1000, 1020, 1022, 1024, 1291, 1485)). The complaints mention many Despenser clients, such as Ingham, (no. 965), but also individuals for whom no other association to the Despensers can be established. Thus, John Bronyng (no. 988), John Haselegh (no. 1024), William Staunford (no. 1024), and Thomas Waukelyn (no. 965) were all implicated in the Despensers' depredations, though little else can be discovered about their private or public careers. For the Despensers' harassment of landholders in these years, see: Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 109-118 (esp. p. 116 for Oliver de Ingham); G.A. Holmes, "A protest against the Despensers, 1326," *Speculum*, 30 (1955), 210 n. 21.

⁶⁶For Cliff and Bousser, see: Holmes, "A protest," p. 211. Walewayn: "... per procuramentum et malivolenciam Hugonis . . . iunioris magister Johannes Wallweyn tunc escaetor citra Trentam ipsos disseisiuit," (*Rot. parl. ined.*, p. 147). For Walewayn's career, see: Denholm-Young, "Authorship, pp. 202-05; Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 355-56.

such as John Inge or Adam de Lymbergh, portray a lord concerned about his property and position and demanding information that could help him protect himself.⁶⁷ He also made use of his agents in a second capacity: that is, to corrupt or to divert the normal course of administration for private purposes. Because the Despensers had so closely intertwined their personal influence and official authority, this aspect of retaining royal officials stands out clearly during their regime. Time and again, the Despensers' clients exercised legitimate power to their lords' benefit: to care for their property, to harass opponents or victims, to enlarge their holdings, or to protect themselves. Finally, lords relied on clients in the royal administration to connect them more securely into the "... nexus of jobbery, influence, and patronage which was essential for the maintenance of territorial lordship."⁶⁸ Placing a client in a royal office represented an important reward, and, in so doing, the lord also opened the door to further appointments as well as to the possibility of tapping royal patronage for himself and his clients. From the standpoint of the lord, therefore, having a client in a royal office was important not only because of the potential influence that it brought the lord, but also because it relieved some of the burden of rewarding the client by putting royal patronage at his disposal.

Patronage was vital in retaining royal officials, for the successful maintenance of any clientele depended on the lord's ability to dispense the favors sought after by his clients. He had to share his wealth with his followers. Most of the Despensers' clients thus prospered from their patronage in the form of rewards made either directly by them or indirectly by the king. John de Haudlo, for instance, received life grants of lands and manors from the elder Despenser, while the younger Despenser made similar grants to his valet, Thomas de Wydeslade.⁶⁹ The Despensers rewarded some clients by helping them to marry. Hugh junior thus obtained the right to marry the widow of Henry de Valence for William Lovel in 1322 and seems to have extended similar assistance to Robert de

⁶⁷Ed).ds, *Anc. cor. Wales*, pp. 184, 219-21, 259-60; Davies, *Lordship and society*, p. 280 and n. 1; WSS, p. 233 (no. 201), Lymburgh to Despenser: "Et, sur ceste chose et autres que pur auscunes enchesons jeo lees de vous escrire, vous pleise doner foi et credence a Johan de Asphale, car, sur ma foi, jeo crei que vous lui trouveretz bon et loial et il vous seet overer ascuns secretz, sil soit bien examinez. Totefoitz, jeo meintenck' ceo que jeo vous avoi avant dit del bien et de la loialte et la bone amour que mons' Johan de Wisham porte a nostre seignur le roi et a vous. . . ." Because of his position, Despenser easily confused his business with that of the crown. Yet, taking this distortion into account, these letters show how a lord could use royal officers to acquire valuable information and establish further connections.

⁶⁸Maddicott, "Law and lordship," p. 40.

⁶⁹L.J. Sanders, *English baronies: a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327* (Oxford, 1960), p. 10; CAD, 2:165, 166 (A3202, 3204); 4:85-6 (A6814); 5:62-3 (A10910); CIM, 2:127 (no. 516). Wydeslade: CAD, 1:62 (A523).

Wateville a few years later.⁷⁰ The Despensers also offered Haudlo, Sancto Amando, and Ovedale wives from within their own family.⁷¹

Yet most of the rewards came in the form of royal patronage, though it is not always certain that the grants resulted from pressure or requests by the Despensers. Aylmer, Dunstaple, Silkeston, and Tyssbury were all royal clerks to whom the king gave benefices.⁷² The king, for example, named Tyssbury Dean of St. Martin-le-Grand, a royal free chapel in London, in 1325, most likely in recognition of his administrative service.⁷³ The younger Despenser's adherent within the household, William Cliff, also partook of royal generosity and received grants of three prebends in the year following the civil war, along with grants of wardships, marriages, and corn, hay, grass and other goods from forfeited lands.⁷⁴ Alan de Tesdale received the office of controller of customs in the port of London in 1321, after Hugh junior had ousted the incumbent, John Prynne.⁷⁵

In fact, after Edward II's victory in 1322, the Despensers' power was unchallenged for a time, so that they and their followers enjoyed unrestricted royal favor, especially regarding the spoils of their victory over the Contrarians. Ralph Basset of Drayton received two manors that had formerly belonged to Badlesmere; Simon of Reading received the lands of John Wyard; and Robert de Welles gained custody of some of the lands of

⁷⁰Lovel: *CPR, 1321-4*, p. 141. Both Lovel and Valence served as retainers of the Earl of Pembroke, (Phillips, *Aymer de Valence*, pp. 116, 255, 258, 267, 302). Wateville: *WSS*, p. 157 (no. 147): "Il vous membre bien qe autrefois voliez qe je eusse este delivres de femme, queu cas, sire, me est ja avenuz; si vous requier, sire, qil vous plesse recorder et sovenir de moi et de mon estat, si mariage nul chiete en court dont un povre bachiler come je sui em pusse estre eide, car surement, sire, coment que disverses paroles se volent, je masseure souverainement de vostre bone seigneurie et daver recoverir parmi vous, come vous lavez commence."

⁷¹Hugh senior assisted Haudlo in a marriage agreement with Maud Lovel, Hugh's daughter-in-law, and more directly offered Sancto Amando the hand of his daughter Margaret. Hugh junior promised to assist his retainer Ovedale in marrying Hugh's sister Isabel, but she married Ralph de Monthermer instead, (*CAD*, 4:85-6 (A6814), 252 (A8019), 525 (A10237); Sanders, *English baronies*, p. 8 and n. 4, 29 and n. 1; *CPR, 1321-4*, p. 203; *CFR*, 3:357). Hugh junior evidently also aided Edmund Bacon (who called himself Hugh's bachelor) in a disputed wardship, (*PRO*, Ancient correspondence, SC.1/49/112).

⁷²*CChW*, pp. 450, 537; *CPR, 1317-21*, p. 37; *CFR*, 3:71. The patronage that the Despensers' men received has been compared with that received by Pembroke's retainers: ". . . the overall impression is that the patronage obtained by Pembroke's men and the lands he himself received at intervals from the crown were no more than might be expected in the case of a prominent and loyal magnate of Pembroke's standing. There is no evidence that he ever deliberately exploited his position in the way followed by favorites such as Gaveston or the Younger Despenser." (Phillips, *Aymer de Valence*, p. 259). For a similar conclusion, see: Maddicott, *Lancaster*, pp. 47, 178.

⁷³*CCR, 1323-7*, p. 308. He was appointed in 1325, but removed the next year. The king customarily awarded the deanship of St. Martin's to trusted servants, (*Vic-toria county history of London*, vol. 1, ed. William Page (London, 1909), p. 559).

⁷⁴*CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 135, 181, 198, 239, 301, 416.

⁷⁵*CFR*, 3:74; *CMR*, pp. 17, 38 (nos. 69, 221, 227); *Rot. parl.*, 2:431; *Rot. parl. ined.*, pp. 114, 191.

Roger de Clifford, his inlaw.⁷⁶ Furthermore, the elder Hugh's clerk, Robert Harewedon, obtained the life custody of several manors and lands that Hugh had extorted from various individuals during the rebellion, as did Oliver de Ingham.⁷⁷ Yet it is the career of Ralph de Camoys that shows most clearly the benefits that could be derived from royal service. Throughout his career, he enjoyed a steady stream of small grants, such as rights to markets and warrens. After the civil war, however, the king augmented this stream with grants of wardships, marriages, and confiscated lands.⁷⁸

Clientage also offered men the protection of a powerful lord both inside and outside the government. The younger Despenser sometimes shielded his clients from the harsher demands of royal service. Richard de Tyssbury's experience in these years illustrates how such immunity could work. As a receiver of the issues of the Contrarians' lands, Richard had to account to the exchequer, but that office had difficulty getting him to appear. The barons ordered the Bishop of Salisbury in 1323 to distrain Richard to render his account, since he was the parson of the church of Tisbury in the bishop's diocese. The bishop reported that he had distrained Richard, but the barons again postponed his audit because he was engaged in work for Hugh junior.⁷⁹ When the exchequer finally held the audit in 1324, it found that Richard still owed about £80 and therefore ordered Richard to pay the money to the sheriff of Gloucestershire.⁸⁰ The exchequer entrusted the writs directing this procedure to John Molyns, then a valet of the younger Despenser.⁸¹ John le Botiller may have also benefitted from Hugh's support. He paid a fine in 1312 for a two-year respite from taking up the duties of knighthood, and in 1322, the king ordered the sheriff of Gloucestershire not to molest Botiller for military service because he was on royal business.⁸² On two other occasions, Despenser wrote to the government, requesting that his companion and valet be acquitted of their military obligations because they were with

⁷⁶Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 106-09; *CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 127 (Welles), 134 (Basset), 275 (Reading).

⁷⁷*CIM*, 2:240, 244, 246 (nos. 966, 982, 989); Fryde, *Tyranny*, p. 116.

⁷⁸*CCR, 1323-7*, pp. 203, 289; *1327-30*, p. 71; *CPR, 1321-4*, pp. 206, 254; *Calendar of the charter rolls, 1226-1516*, 6 vols., HMSO (London, 1903-27), 3:469.

⁷⁹*CFR*, 3:97; *The registers of Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury, 1315-1330*, eds. K. Edwards, C.R. Elrington, and S. Reynolds [Canterbury and York Society] (London, 1959-71), 3:62, 113, 114, 128, 135 (nos. 210, 400, 403, 455, 482); PRO, Exchequer memoranda rolls, (KR), E.159/97, mm. 23, 24; /99, m. 19, "... predictus Ricardus est in servicio Hugonis. . . ."

⁸⁰PRO, E. 368/95, m. 119; E. 358/16, m. 17; *Registers of Martival*, 3:149 (no. 516).

⁸¹PRO, E.368/95, m. 119: "Et memoranda quod illa dua brevia liberantur eodem die Johanni de Molyns, valette Hugonis le Despenser junioris, ad deferendum ipsis quibus diriguntur per preceptum baronum. . . ."; Fryde, *Tyranny*, pp. 149-50; G.R. Elvey, "The first fall of Sir John Molyns," *Records of Buckinghamshire*, 19 (1972), 194-98; N. Fryde, "A medieval robber baron, Sir John Molyns of Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire," in *Medieval legal records edited in memory of C.A.F. Meekings*, eds. R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post, HMSO (London, 1978), pp. 198-99.

⁸²*CFR*, 2:157 (£6. 13s. 4d.); *CCR, 1318-23*, p. 424.

Hugh in his service.⁸³ It is thus not at all improbable that Despenser may have intervened to release Botiller from his military obligations.

Through such an exchange of rewards and loyalty, the Despensers gained the adherence of a large number of officials positioned throughout the royal administration and thereby strengthened their grip on the machinery of government. For a time, their position seemed impregnable. Yet, they could not quell opposition, and their opponents ultimately overthrew their regime. As the Despensers found, therefore, far from guaranteeing political authority, the system of “double allegiance” contained serious defects which could limit its usefulness to an ambitious lord.

To begin with, the practice of suborning royal ministers conflicted with the prevailing moral principle of the impartiality of public officials, which virtually everyone who wrote about law or government in England since the twelfth century had stressed.⁸⁴ These writers recognized that the exchange of gifts was a common social practice, but they denounced the practice when it corrupted the official. The author of the *Vita* summed up these sentiments when he wrote that “. . . what is freely offered may properly be received, but in due measure, for to receive from no one is scarcely human, but to do so indiscriminately is most disgraceful.”⁸⁵ In this passage, he paraphrases Bracton’s statement that “. . . to accept presents from all indiscriminately is most contemptible and avaricious, to accept them from no one is almost inhuman, as where friend accepts from friend moved solely by friendship and affection.”⁸⁶ Repeated denunciations of maintenance and bribery, along with accusations and trials of corrupt officials in the years between these two writers show that the

⁸³PRO. SC.1/36/124, 127.

⁸⁴*The treatise on the laws and customs of the realm of England commonly called Glanvill*, ed. and trans., G.D.G. Hall (London, 1965), pp. 1-2; H. Bracton, *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliae*, ed. G.E. Woodbine, revised and trans., Samuel E. Thorne, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.; 1968), pp. 307, 309, and the notes on p. 307 for other references; *Annales monasterii de Burton*, ed. H.R. Luard in *Annales monastici*, ed. idem, vol. 1, Rolls Series, 36 (London, 1864), pp. 463-64 (letter from the nuncio to the Pope in 1258 explaining the reform movement and the ideals of justice espoused by the reformers); *Documents of the baronial movement of reform and rebellion 1258-1267*, ed. I.J. Sanders and R.F. Treharne (Oxford, 1973), pp. 134-35 (the ordinances of the magnates, 1259); *The song of Lewes*, ed. and trans. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1890), *passim*; *Rot. parl.*, 1:183b (*ordinatio de conspiratoribus*, 1305: “Et ceux qui receivent gentz de pais a lour robes ou a lour feez pur meintenir lour mauveis enprises et pur verite esteindre auxibien les pernours come les donours. Et Seneschaux et Baillifs de grantz seigneurs qui per seigneurie, office, ou poeir, enpernent a meintenir ou sustenir pleez ou baretz pur parties, autres que celes que touchet l'estat lour Seigneurs ou eux mesmes. . .”).

⁸⁵*Vita*, p. 91: “Verum tamen quod offertur ex gratia licenter recipi potest, set cum mensura, quia a nemine accipere est ualde inhumanum, set *passim* et indifferenter, turpissimum.”

⁸⁶Bracton, 2:303-4 (f. 106b): “Ab omni tamen munere non est abstinendum, quia licet ab omnibus et *passim* avarissimum sit accipere et villissimum, a nemine tamen accipere erit inhumanum, ut si amicus recipiat ab amico solo intuitu amicitiae et amoris.”

principle may have been widespread but that it had little direct impact. With the example of the Despensers before him, the author of the *Vita* had excellent evidence of the failure of the ideal to reform official behavior. Nevertheless, people did appeal to the principle in seeking redress of grievances. For example, in 1322, after Lancaster had been defeated at Boroughbridge, the “poor of the realm” petitioned Edward II in Parliament that none of Lancaster’s former counsellors, stewards, bailiffs, or other ministers be reconciled with the crown and put back into office, because they had abused their powers, usurped the authority of the crown, and trampled the poor beneath them.⁸⁷

If this ideology lacked direct influence, it could be useful indirectly to legitimize baronial attacks against royal favorites. Politics, therefore, also limited the effectiveness of “double allegiance.” The retaining of royal officials became an explicit political issue between the crown and nobility from 1308 to 1330 because a series of royal favorites exploited the weaknesses of Edward II and his son to impose themselves on the royal government and spread their influence by retaining officials. Local landholders voiced concern over what they considered unfair competition from the center for the control of the administration. And they couched their complaints in terms of the ideal of impartiality.

The Ordainers, for instance, denounced Piers Gaveston in 1311 in terms that foreshadowed those used against the Despensers a decade later. They accused Gaveston of “. . . despising their counsels, not allowing good officers to carry out the law of the land; . . . removing good officers, appointing those of his own gang, as well aliens as others, who at his will and command offend against right and the law of the land.”⁸⁸ The statute of sheriffs in 1316 echoed these sentiments in declaring that the stewards of magnates could not become sheriffs.⁸⁹ In the events leading up to the exile of the Despensers, in 1321, the barons denounced the Despensers’ alliances and retaining (*alliaunce e retenaunce*) which aimed at unjustly extending their power.⁹⁰ The process against the Despensers that summer recapitulated and elaborated these complaints, as shown at the beginning of this paper. Even after they had defeated the Despensers in 1326, the barons denounced their confederacies. The Commons, for instance, petitioned the crown to appoint only worthwhile counsellors to the king, who would not abuse their power by interfering with the common law and unjustly maintaining others.⁹¹ Finally, the judgement against Roger de Mortimer in 1330 recalled these concerns when it declared that: “Roger de

⁸⁷*Rot. parl.*, 1:394; Maddicott, *Lancaster*, p. 20. For legislation against maintenance and corruption, see: B. Wilkinson, *Constitutional history of medieval England, 1216-1399*, vol. 3 (London, 1958), pp. 204-05.

⁸⁸*English historical documents*, 3:532, cap. 20.

⁸⁹*Statutes of the realm*, 1:174-5; Saul, *Knights and esquires*, pp. 108-09, 164; Maddicott, *Lancaster*, pp. 180-82; Davies, *Baronial opposition*, pp. 408-24, 524-27.

⁹⁰G.L. Haskins, “The Doncaster petition, 1321,” *EHR*, 53 (1938), 484.

⁹¹*Rot. Parl.*, 1:10b, 12, 166b; G.A. Holmes, “Judgement on the younger Despenser, 1326,” *EHR*, 70 (1955), 288, for similar arguments.

Mortimer usurped to himself the royal power and the government of the realm over the estate of the king, and dismissed and caused to be dismissed, officials in the king's household and elsewhere throughout the realm and others set in their place at his will.⁹²

While interested parties thus occasionally rallied sufficient strength under the banner of impartiality to break up or, at the very least, to circumscribe clientage within the royal administration, the loyalty of the clients themselves posed a more intractable problem to lords intent on expanding their influence by retaining royal officials. Clients served their lords primarily out of self-interest: in hopes, that is, of the patronage that a lord, especially favorites like Gaveston, the Despensers, or Mortimer, could bestow. Yet though self-interest propelled men to lords, it could likewise drive them to desert a lord whose actions or politics jeopardized their interests. Inducements secured only limited obedience, as Piers Gaveston found to his loss. The author of the *Vita* portrays him lamenting, just as he has learned that he is to die: "Oh! Where are the presents that bought me so many intimate friends, and with which I had thought to have sufficient power? Where are my friends, in whom was my trust, the protection of my body, and my whole hope of safety. . . . They had promised to stand by me in war, to suffer imprisonment, and not to shun death."⁹³ Much later, Machiavelli likewise disparaged the strength of bonds based on inducements, though he used the observation to contrast the cupidity and faithlessness of such relations with those based on the virtues of true friendship:

For it is a good general rule about men, that they are ungrateful, liars and deceivers, fearful of danger and greedy for gain. While you serve their welfare, they are all yours, offering their blood, their belongings, their lives, and their children's lives . . . so long as the danger is remote. But when the danger is close at hand,

⁹²*Rot. parl.*, 2:52; translation, *English historical documents*, vol. 4: 1327-1485, ed. A.R. Myers (London, 1969), p. 53. One Mortimer client who can be identified followed a career remarkably similar to those of the Despensers' clients. Richard de Haukeslowe served the king in Worcestershire in various capacities. (PRO, Exchequer receipt rolls, E.401/251; *CPR*, 1321-4, p. 224; *CCR*, 1330-4, p. 127; *CFR*, 4:114). Yet he also acted as Mortimer's steward and benefitted from his lord's rise to power after 1327. The king appointed him chirographer of the bench for life in 1327, while dismissing the incumbent, and then named him sheriff of Worcs., (*CPR*, 1327-30, pp. 2, 229; *CFR*, 4:15). On Mortimer's fall in 1330, however, Haukeslowe lost both offices and was the object of a parliamentary petition by villagers in Worcs. who complained of his corrupt activities on behalf of Mortimer during his tenure as sheriff, (*CPR*, 1330-4, pp. 36, 281, 308; *Rot. parl. ined.*, pp. 204, 284).

⁹³*Vita*, p. 26. The author also points out that Piers had been responsible for raising the status of many men while he was in power: "For many owed much to him, and some he had promoted from the stable to the chamber, of whom some go about as knights who never thought to have been knighted. . . ." (p.29).

they turn against you. . . . [For] friendships bought at a price, and not with the greatness and nobility of the soul, may be paid for, but they are not acquired. . . ."⁹⁴

Whatever the moral failings of patronage and inducements, they formed the basis of social relations in England in the early fourteenth century, and the experiences of lords confirm these writers' misgivings about the political reliability of clients whose loyalty had been purchased with gifts or fees.

Ironically, the reputed author of the *Vita*, John Walewayn, abandoned his long-standing lord, the Earl of Hereford, when the earl and other Marchers took arms against the king in 1321.⁹⁵ Roger Belers similarly deserted Thomas of Lancaster to side with the Despensers. In their turn, the Despensers too discovered that loyalty could be ephemeral. John de Cromwell, for instance, jumped to Mortimer's camp after he accompanied the queen to France in 1325 and he refused to return to England even after the king threatened him with disinheritance.⁹⁶ Henry Turplington and Oliver Ingham also deserted the Despensers for Mortimer and Isabel when they invaded the country in the autumn of 1326. Ingham and Cromwell became advisors to Mortimer once he had assumed power.⁹⁷ The Despensers paid for the loyalty of these men, but they did not own it. In a moment of crisis, when they needed that loyalty the most, they found that it had shifted decisively away from them.

Furthermore, the practice of serving several lords simultaneously diluted the loyalty of clients. It has already been pointed out that several of Despenser's men also served the Earl of Pembroke. John le Botiller had been a Berkeley retainer, and John de Hampton had received a fee and robes from the prior of Bath. Two years after becoming the younger Despenser's retainer, Peter de Ovedale entered into an indentured agreement with the Earl of Hereford. Prior to coming into the Despensers' service, Robert de Wateville had been Bartholomew de Badlesmere's

⁹⁴N. Machiavelli, *The prince*, ed. and trans., R.M. Adams (New York, 1977), pp. 47-48; passage cited in D.H. Wrong, *Power: its forms, bases and uses* (Oxford, 1979), p. 81.

⁹⁵Denholm-Young, "Authorship," pp. 202-05.

⁹⁶For Belers, see above, n. 7; WSS, p. 243 (no. 213); *CPR, 1324-7*, pp. 102, 131, 180; *CCR, 1323-7*, pp. 463-64; *CFR*, 3:392, 393, 395, 398, 403, 407, 414; *Annales Paulini* in Stubbs, *Chronicles*, 1:314; H. Knighton, *Chronicon*, ed. J.R. Lumby, Rolls Series, 92 (London, 1889-95), 1:431-2.

⁹⁷Fryde, "Deposits," p. 352 n. 1; R.M. Haines, *The church and politics in fourteenth-century England: the career of Adam de Orleton* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 177 n. 88, 180 n. 105, 182 n. 12; m. McKisack, *The fourteenth century* (Oxford, 1959), pp. 96, 102, 115, 152. In 1327, Edward III granted Simon Croyser a ship in consideration of his service to Edward's mother and late father, (*CPR, 1327-30*, p. 187). Ralph Basset was also associated with Mortimer in a commission of array in 1330, and John de Fresyngfeld acted as Mortimer's attorney in Ireland beginning in 1329, (*CPR, 1327-30*, pp. 367, 395, 564).

indentured retainer.⁹⁸ Lords, in other words, could not retain the exclusive loyalty of their clients, particularly in periods of political turmoil. These men hedged their bets, formed ties to several lords—including the king—and slid easily from one to the other as circumstances dictated.

Enduring loyalty was exceptional. Baldock and Reading stood by the Despensers and died for their pains. As noted earlier, William de Aylmer tried to free Edward II from Berkeley Castle the following year, along with another Despenser client, Peter de la Rokele. Ingelram de Berenger and William Cliff, though pardoned by Edward III, may have nursed grievances against the new regime, for they were implicated in the revolt by Edmund, the Earl of Kent.⁹⁹

Therefore, only a few of the Despensers' associates suffered along with their masters. Most accommodated themselves to the regime and continued to serve in the royal government. W. A. Morris has shown that between 1326 and 1330, the new rulers systematically excluded the Despensers' adherents, particularly the ministers involved in the events of 1322, from the shrievalties.¹⁰⁰ On the whole, however, the vulnerability of officials to political change can be easily overestimated. Political adherence did not necessarily damage an individual's career. The careers of many of the Despensers' clients after 1326 confirm Tout's claim that a remarkable continuity of bureaucratic personnel underlay the royal ad-

⁹⁸See above, n. 9; Saul, *Knights and esquires*, pp. 70, 89, 91, 94; Jones, "An indenture," p. 392; British Library, Egerton roll, 8724 (inventory of Badlesmere's muniments). Foxcote went on to serve the Hospitallers for an annual pension of £30, (Saul, pp. 86, 149).

⁹⁹Murimuth, pp. 254-57.

¹⁰⁰W.A. Morris, "The sheriff," in the *The English government at work, 1327-1336*, vol. 2: "Fiscal administration," eds. W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (Cambridge, Mass.: 1947), p. 49.

ministration.¹⁰¹ The heads of offices changed frequently, but most subordinates weathered political crises and carried on the work of the government, whatever their political affiliations. This professional class was indispensable to the successful operation of the government, and Edward III could not afford to squander such a resource. He and his favorite, Mortimer, thus pardoned at least fifteen Despenser men, including such long-standing clients as Inge, Berenger, Camoys, and Botiller. Aside from these, many who had worked in the royal administration under the Despensers picked up where they left off and resumed their service, as indicated in the tables.

The Despensers' attempts to acquire the exclusive control of the royal administration by making officers their private clients failed dramatically in 1326. It failed for a number of reasons, but in part, at least, because they based their regime on a narrow social group of gentry administrators. They did not include many of the baronial rank. They placed too much faith in the strength of the royal bureaucracy. Their influence spread far through the ranks of royal officials, but not through landholding society. They failed to realize that true power lay not with royal agents in the counties, but with the landed elites of those counties. Those elites, whether in south Wales or elsewhere, distrusted the attempts by royal favorites to insinuate their power into the landowners' domain by manipulating the local administration.

Clients, however, did not make the same miscalculation. For the most part, they adjusted their attitudes to the realities of political power and attached themselves to whomever seemed to offer security at the moment. Loyalty did not run deep.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

¹⁰¹Tout, *Chapters*, 2:217-8.

TABLE 1:
Clients of the Elder Dispenser in Personal and Royal Service

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321/2	Service After 1326	Sources:
1. William de Aylmer	O,P 1315	Cst 1315	Jst,Aud, Cst/D,C, VE	—	<i>CPR</i> 1313-17, 320; 1324-7, 112, 118; 1327-30, 100; <i>CFR</i> , 2:313; 3:69-70, 101.
2. Ingelram de Berenger	O,P 1316	Sh 1314	Cst/D.C	—	Davies, 89-90; <i>List</i> , 1, 257; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 208-9; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 1, 14; <i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 385.
3. Richard de Berners	At 1322	—	—	—	<i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 189.
4. Ralph Bolle	Cook 1325	—	—	—	<i>CAD</i> , 3:108 (A4812).
5. John Chyverton	A 1326	—	—	1327	<i>CMR</i> , 277(no 2030); <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 215, 258; <i>CFR</i> , 4:32, 68, 74-5, 80; <i>Tout</i> , <i>Chap-</i> <i>ters</i> , 6:62, 64.
6. Edmund Cornhill	O 1326	—	—	—	<i>Lit. Cant.</i> , 1:174-5 (no 175).
7. Simon Croyser	A 1321	Ksj, Com	Mil,VE	1327	<i>CIM</i> , 2:240(no 956); <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 65, 67, 185, 262, 423; 1327- 30, 152.
8. William de Dene	O,R 1313	Jst	Jst	d. 1327	Saul, 79, 277; <i>Rot.</i> <i>Parl.</i> , 2:406; Davies, 281, 301; <i>CCR</i> 1318- 23, 434; <i>CFR</i> , 4:63.
9. John de Denton	O	Kcl	Cst/C	—	SC.1/63/175; <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 72, 340; <i>CFR</i> , 3:242.
10. Robert de Harewedon	Cl 1297	—	VE	—	<i>CIM</i> , 2:244 (no 982); <i>CAD</i> , 4:137 (A7238).
11. John de Haudlo	A 1305	Com	—	—	Davies, 210; <i>CAD</i> , 2:165, 166 (nos A3202, 4); 4:85- 6(A6814); 5:62-3 (A10910); <i>CIM</i> , 2:127(no 516).
12. Robert de Haudlo	At 1322	—	—	—	<i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 189.
13. Thomas Lercedeake	P 1326	Com, Gas	—	1327	<i>CCR</i> 1323-7, 626; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 14, 156; <i>WSS</i> , 271; <i>CCR</i> 1318- 23, 410, 548, 560.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321-2	Service After 1326	Sources:
14. John de Sancto Amando	At 1314	—	—	1329	<i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 189; <i>CAD</i> , 4:525(A10237); <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 430.
15. John de Vaus	O	Jst	Mil	—	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 188; <i>CAD</i> , 3:84(A4592); <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 58, 66, 96, 158; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 442, 614.
16. Humphrey de Waledon	A 1308	Kcl,Ch Hkt,Ex	Cst/D,C Jst	1330	Davies, 88, no.6, 222, 232, 538; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 2:230, 346-7; <i>CFR</i> , 3:20, 29, 40, 43, 69, 104, 139, 149, 242, 244, 259; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 37, 58, 172, 256, 375, 429; <i>1327-30</i> , 558.
17. Geoffrey de Weston	At 1318	—	Cst/D	—	<i>CAD</i> , 5:237(A12062); <i>CFR</i> , 3:72.
18. John Wokyng	O 1326	—	—	—	<i>CCR 1323-7</i> , 624.

TABLE 2:
Clients of the Younger Despenser in Personal and Royal Service

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321/2	Service After 1326	Sources:
1. John de Aukeland	Mil 1322	—	—	—	<i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 188.
2. Robert Baldock	O,A	Wa,H	—	d. 1326	Tout, <i>Place</i> , 18, 20, 121, 123, 135, 144-5, 147, 150-1, 164, 294-5; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 140; <i>CMR</i> , 75-6 (no 552).
3. Ralph Basset of Drayton	A 1321	Com, Gas	Cst/C	1329	Davies, 339; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 48, 141-2, 183, 250; <i>CFR</i> , 3:42, 48, 54, 106, 107, 118; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 422, 435.
4. Walter de Beauchamp	R 1321	H,Sh 1316	Mil	1327	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 362; Griffiths, 245-6; <i>List</i> , 145; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 67, 73; <i>1327-30</i> , 152.
5. William de Beauchamp	B 1321	H,Sh 1316	Cst/D,C	1329	WSS, 229 (no 194); Davies, 141, 222; <i>List</i> , 157; <i>CFR</i> , 3:70, 86; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 424-5, 537.
6. John Bek	A 1326	Jst	Jst	1328	<i>CMR</i> , 76 (no 553); Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 141; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 263, 311, 433, 449; <i>1327-30</i> , 281, 288.
7. Roger Belers	A,At 1322	H,Ex 1322	Cst/C, VE	d. 1326	Tout, <i>Place</i> , 46, 141, 180-1, 281, 298, 304, 307; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 189; <i>CFR</i> , 3:114, 139-40, 220, 375, 378; <i>Rot. Parl. Ined.</i> , 158-9.
8. William le Blund	O 1325	—	—	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 349, 360.
9. John le Botiler of Llantulit	O,P 1321	Jst	Cst/C, Jst,VE	1328	Saul, 65, 80, 94, 120, 123; <i>CFR</i> , 3:101; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 603; <i>1323-7</i> , 393, 592; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 153-4; <i>1324-7</i> , 206, 318; <i>1327-30</i> , 64, 100, 303; <i>Rot. Parl.</i> , 2:385-6.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321/2	Service After 1326	Sources:
10. John Bousser	A 1321	Jst, Com	Sur	1327	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 110, 112; <i>CFR</i> , 3:32, 42, 202, 225-6, 391; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 58, 212.
11. Ralph Camoys	Mil,At P 1313	Jst, Mil 1303	Cst/D, Mil,Jst	1329	Saul, 9; <i>CPR</i> 1307-13, 582; 1317-21, 96, 170, 300, 449; 1321-4, 77, 188; 1324-7, 296, 315; 1327-30, 20, 422, 429; <i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 150, 221, 492-3, 584, 673; <i>CFR</i> , 3:75.
12. Thomas of Castle Goodrich	O 1325	—	—	1327	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 361; Griffiths, 174.
13. William de Cliff	At,P 1321	Kcl,H, Ksj 1316	Cst/C, VE	1327	Tout, <i>Place</i> , 123 & n.2; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 2:301 n.6; Davies, 128; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 110, 115, 153; <i>CPR</i> 1317-21, 449; 1321-4, 189; 1327-30, 25, 107; <i>Rot.Parl.Ined.</i> , 174, 177; <i>CFR</i> , 3:11, 111, 143.
14. Hugh de Colewyk	At 1326	—	—	1327	<i>CMR</i> , 170, 236, 240 (nos 1085, 1730, 1745).
15. John de Cromwell	A,Mil 1312	H,Hkt	Mil	1327	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 131, 167; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> 2:302 n.2; <i>CAD</i> , 4:420(A9399); 5:44 (A10769); <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 66, 189, 212, 324; 1324-7, 52; <i>CCR</i> 1323-7, 327; Davies, 142, 174, 212-3, 220, 226, 360, 427, 431
16. William de Cusance	O 1319	Kcl,Wa 1320	—	1336	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 348-9, 360; Tout, <i>Place</i> , 123; <i>Chapters</i> , 2:301 n. 6; 6:23, 27, 88-9; Davies, 159, 173, 340; <i>Anc.Cor.Wales</i> , 219-20, 259-60.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321/2	Service After 1326	Sources:
17. Robert de Digby	Mil,P 1322	—	Jst	1330	<i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 186, 205; <i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 628; <i>CFR</i> , 4:211; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 116.
18. John de Dunstaple	O 1321	Com,H 1314	Cst/D, Aud	—	<i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 54; <i>CPR</i> 1313-17, 145, 349; 1321-4, 108, 118; <i>CFR</i> , 3:71, 79, 101, 114-5.
19. Thomas de Dunstaple	P	—	—	—	<i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 60.
20. William de Dunstaple	A 1321	—	—	1336	<i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 541; <i>CFR</i> , 4:497(?).
21. John de Ellerker	O 1325	H 1318	—	1327	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 362; <i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 106, 305; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 3:109 n.3, 109-10; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 98, 174, 547.
22. John de Felton	B,P 1321	Hkt, Gas 1317	Cst/C	—	<i>WSS</i> , 106-7, 151-2 (nos 93, 141); Davies, 221; <i>CFR</i> , 3:89; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 10, 12, 13, 37; <i>CFR</i> , 4:12.
23. Richard de Foxcote	O 1321	Com 1321	Cst/C, Jst,VE	1328	<i>Just.</i> 1/1037, m.1d; <i>CChW</i> , 1:552-3; <i>CPR</i> 1317-21, 547; 1321-4, 21, 102, 263; 1327-30, 76, 80-1, 285, 452, 559; <i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 225, 582; <i>CFR</i> , 3:41-2, 100, 122 4:328.
24. John de Fresyngfeld	A 1321	Jst	—	—	<i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 541; Davies, 301.
25. John de Gode	O 1325	H 1322	—	1328	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 361; <i>CMR</i> , 297, 367, 375, 379 (nos 2133, 2264, 2270, 2271).
26. John Golafre	A 1322	—	—	1328	<i>Rot.Parl.</i> , 2:385; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 222.
27. Matthew de Gorges	A	—	—	—	<i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 541.
28. Ralph de Gorges	A 1321	Com	Mil, Cst/C	d. 1323	<i>CCR</i> 1318-23, 541; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 44; <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 73, 76, 82, 188, 340.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321-2	Service After 1326	Sources:
29. Thomas de Gorges	Mil 1322	—	—	—	<i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 188.
30. Rees ap Gruffyd	A 1321	Jst	Mil	1327	Griffiths, 99-101; <i>CAD</i> , 3:110(A4878).
31. John de Hampton	A 1326	Sh 1318	Cst/C	1327	Saul, 80, 86, 112; <i>CFR</i> , 4:11.
32. Robert Holden	P 1326	Cst, Wa 1323	—	d. 1328	<i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 97, 102, 336; Tout, <i>Place</i> , 316; Davies, 225, 235, 241; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 609; <i>CFR</i> , 3:176, 185, 357; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 2:273, 277, 308, 344-8.
33. Nicholas Hugate	Cl 1321	Kcl.H, Wa	—	1327	WSS, 59-60(no 45); Tout, <i>Place</i> , 65-6, 316; Davies, 54; <i>CFR</i> , 3:6, 258; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 2, 430; <i>1327-30</i> , 96, 234.
34. John Inge	A.P 1321	Sh	Cst/D	1327	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 9, 42, 44, 48, 74, 209; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 32, 88, 141, 205, 220; Davies, 142.
35. Oliver de Ingham	R 1321	H,Hkt, Wa 1317	Cst/C VE	1327	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 116; Tout, <i>Place</i> , 337; Davies, 168-9, 221, 223, 292, 339; <i>CFR</i> , 3:61, 102, 109, 118; <i>CIM</i> , 2:240 (no 965); <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 6, 242, 244, 364, 423.
36. John Iwayn	A 1318	Sh 1319	—	d.	Griffiths, 258; <i>List</i> , 245; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 541.
37. Philip Joce	A 1321	—	Mil	—	<i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 541; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 68, 74, 97; <i>CFR</i> , 3:154, 161, 420.
38. John de Kingston	A 1321	—	Aud	1328	<i>CChW</i> , 1:526; <i>CCR 1323-7</i> , 408; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 302, 323, 429.
39. John de Langeley	Mil 1317	Var	Cst/C	d. 1326	Coss, 'Langeley family,' 6.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321-2	Service After 1326	Sources:
40. Robert de Leyburn	B 1321	Gas, Hkt,Sh 1316	Cst/C	d. 1327	WSS, 133-4(no 202); Davies, 221, 386; <i>List</i> , 72; <i>CFR</i> , 3:105, 118, 431.
41. William Lovel	B 1325	—	—	1332	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 361; <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 141; <i>List</i> , 92 (1332).
42. Adam de Lymbergh	C1 1321	Kcl,Ex, Gas 1311	—	1327	WSS, 233(no 201); Tout, <i>Place</i> , 310-11; Davies, 172, 262, 280, 302 n.5, 409, 470-1, 520; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 212.
43. Thomas de Marlebergh	P 1327	Sh 1319	Jst,Mil	1333	<i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 69, 148, 374; 1327-30, 55; <i>List</i> , 123; <i>CFR</i> , 4:354.
44. Albert Mège	Cl	—	—	—	WSS, 54-5, 84, 117(nos 39,67,106).
45. Robert de Micheldever	A 1321	Kym 1322	Cst/C,	d. 1327	<i>CIPM</i> , 4:154(no 204); <i>CFR</i> , 3:176, 260, 355, 420; <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 104, 197; <i>CFR</i> , 4:8.
46. Arnaud de Molière	Cl	—	—	—	WSS, 83-4, 101-2(nos 66, 85-6).
47. John Molyns	O 1324	—	—	1327	E.368/95, m. 119; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 149- 50; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 3:52, 89, 98, 112, 114, 123.
48. Simon de Montbreton	R,B 1325	Gas 1325	—	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 351, 361; WSS, 162, 219- 21(nos 152, 182, 184).
49. John de Morteyn	P 1327	Com, Jst	Jst,Mil	1327	<i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 42, 185, 213, 225, 235, 268, 311, 448-9; 1327-30, 81, 144, 277; <i>CFR</i> , 3:124, 225-6, 316, 329.
50. Constantine de Mortimer	R 1326	Com	—	1327	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 351, 353 n.2, 360-2; <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 89, 157, 208, 214, 227.
51. Richard de Nateby	Cl 1326	Wa 1322	—	1327	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 361; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 2:301 n.4; <i>CMR</i> , 374, 378(nos 2270-1); <i>CPR</i> 1327-30, 95.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321-2	Service After 1326	Sources:
52. Robert de Northwode	A	—	—	—	SC.1/36/127 (<i>compaignon</i>).
53. John de Olneye	Mil 1322	Sh 1319	Cst/C, Jst	d. 1325	<i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 81, 88; <i>List</i> , 145; <i>CFR</i> , 3: 105, 235, 362; <i>Rot. Parl.</i> , 1:389-90.
54. Peter de Ovedale	R 1316	Gas	—	1327	Davies, 36; Jones, 'Indenture,' 392; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 184; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 427; <i>1327-30</i> , 144, 213.
55. John Peverel	Mil 1322	—	Mil	1327	<i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 123, 188, 213, 167; <i>1327-30</i> , 172, 429, 567.
56. Edmund de Pinkenny	A 1322	—	—	d. 1332	<i>CIPM</i> , 7:324-5(no 458); <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 406, 431; <i>1327-30</i> , 330; <i>CFR</i> , 4:307.
57. Simon de Reading	R 1321	—	—	d. 1326	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 191; Murimuth, 49-50; <i>CFR</i> , 4:19, 21.
58. Peter de la Rokele	P 1327	—	Jst	—	<i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 168, 372, 378; <i>1327-30</i> , 100, 156.
59. Geoffrey de Rudham	Cl 1325	Hcl	—	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 362; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 241.
60. Simon de Shepeye	O 1326	—	—	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 362.
61. John de Shoreditch	P 1327	H,Jst 1321	—	1327	<i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 6, 10, 213, 440, 446, 482; <i>1321-4</i> , 347, 427; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 303; Davies, 151 n.10, 157, 227, 280.
62. Robert de Silkeston	O 1326	Kcl 1322	Aud	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 346; <i>CMR</i> , 223 (no 1632); <i>CFR</i> , 3:149; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 442; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 85, 144; <i>1324-7</i> , 315.
63. John de Smale	O 1325	—	—	1330	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 362; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 191; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 502, 512.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321-2	Service After 1326	Sources:
64. Nicholas de Sodington	A 1324	—	VE	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 360-1; <i>CIM</i> , 2:254 (no 1024).
65. Robert de Swynburn	B 1325	—	Mil	d. 1326	WSS, 226, 237(nos 189, 206); <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 723; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 67, 198, 201, 220; <i>CFR</i> , 3:376.
66. Alan de Tesdale	O,Mil 1321	Jst 1313	Jst,VE	—	<i>Rot.Parl.</i> , 2:37, 431; <i>Rot.Parl.Ined.</i> , 144, 191; <i>CFR</i> , 3:74; <i>CPR 1317-21</i> , 575; <i>1321-4</i> , 188; <i>1324-7</i> , 191; <i>CCR 1313-18</i> , 70.
67. John Travers	Cl 1324	Ex,Gas Jst 1323	Cst/C	1328	WSS, 49-52, 82(nos 35, 64); Tout, <i>Place 310-11</i> ; Davies, 124; <i>CFR</i> , 3:118, 126; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 160-1, 224, 240, 264; <i>1327-30</i> , 319, 377.
68. Henry de Turplington	B 1325	—	—	1330	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 362; <i>CPR 1327-30</i> , 573; <i>CFR</i> , 4:189; Tout, <i>Chapters</i> , 6:43.
69. Richrd de Tyssbury	O 1321	—	Aud	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 349; <i>CMR</i> , 250 (no 1833); <i>CFR</i> , 3:97, 151.
70. Robert Wauwayn	A 1322	—	VE	—	<i>Rot.Parl.Ined.</i> , 174.
71. Robert FitzWalter	Mil 1317	—	—	—	Jones, 'Indenture,' 394; Davies, 69 n.5.
72. Robert de Wateville	B 1322	Gas 1324	—	1327	WSS, 152-4, 232 (nos 143, 198); Fryde, 'Deposits,' 353 n.2, 362; Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 83, 185-6; Davies, 339-40; <i>CCR 1318-23</i> , 602; <i>CPR 1321-4</i> , 210, 403-4; <i>1324-7</i> , 315, 327; <i>1327-30</i> , 114.

Name of Client:	Personal Service	Royal Service	Service 1321-2	Service After 1326	Sources:
73. Robert de Welles	B 1325	H,Kcl, Com, Mil 1311	—	1327	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 361; <i>CChW</i> , 1:378; <i>CPR</i> 1307-13, 381; 1321-4, 423; 1324-7, 141, 161, 220; 1327-30, 18, 176, 226; <i>CFR</i> , 2:85, 213, 248; <i>CCR</i> 1313-18, 239; 1313-23, 430, 438, 456; 1323-7, 4, 152; E.101/381/6. <i>CAD</i> , 1:62(A523).
74. Thomas de Wydeslade	O 1308	—	—	—	
75. John de Wymondeswold	O 1324	—	—	—	Fryde, 'Deposits,' 361; <i>CCR</i> 1323-7, 621; <i>CPR</i> 1324-7, 340.
76. Thomas Wyther	A 1322	Gas 1324	—	d. 1329	Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i> , 191; <i>CPR</i> 1321-4, 428.
77. John de Yeddminister	O	—	—	—	SC.1/36/124.

TABLE ABBREVIATIONS:

1. *For Service:*

A	Adherent of the Despensers—relation unspecified	Jst	Justice—Bench, Gaol Delivery, Oyer and Terminer, Peace Commission, etc.
At	Attorney	Kel	King's Clerk
Aud	Auditor	Ksj	King's Serjeant
B	Bachelor	Kym	King's Yeoman
Ch	Royal Chamber	Mil	Military—in service with Despenser, commission of array, royal service, etc.
Cl	Clerk	O	Official—valet, servant, etc
Com	Comission—non-judicial	P	Recipient of royal pardon for supporting Despensers, 1327
Cst	Custodian of lands	R	Retainer or recipient of fee
Cst/C	Custodian of Contrariants' lands, 1321-2	Sh	Sheriff
Cst/D	Custodian of Despensers' lands	Sur	Surveyor
Ex	Exchequer	Var	Various commissions or offices
Gas	Gascon administration	Wa	Royal Wardrobe
H	Royal Household		
Hkt	Knight of the Household		

2. *Sources:*

(note: these abbreviations are used throughout the paper)

<i>Anc. Cor. Wales</i>	<i>Calendar of ancient correspondence concerning Wales</i> , ed. J.G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1935).
Coss, "Langeley,"	P.R. Coss, "The Langeley family and its cartulary," <i>Dugdale society occasional papers</i> , 22 (1974).
CAD	<i>Catalogue of ancient deeds in the Public Record Office</i> , HMSO (London, 1890-1915).
CCR	<i>Calendar of the close rolls, Edward II and Edward III</i> , HMSO (London, 1892-1913).
CChW	<i>Calendar of chancery warrants, 1244-1326</i> , HMSO (London, 1927).
CFR	<i>Calendar of the fine rolls</i> , HMSO (London, 1911-62).
CIM	<i>Calendar of inquisitions miscellaneous</i> , HMSO (London, 1916-1968).
CIPM	<i>Calendar of inquisitions post mortem</i> , HMSO (London, 1904-1970).
CMR	<i>Calendar of the memoranda rolls (exchequer), 1326-1327</i> , HMSO (London, 1968).
CPR	<i>Calendar of the patent rolls, Edward II and Edward III</i> , HMSO (London, 1894-1916).
Davies	J.C. Davies, <i>The baronial opposition to Edward II: its character and policy</i> (Cambridge, 1918).
Fryde, "Deposits"	E.B. Fryde, "The deposits of the Hugh Despenser the younger with Italian bankers," <i>Economic History Review</i> , 2nd. ser., 3(1951), 344-62.
Fryde, <i>Tyranny</i>	N. Fryde, <i>The tyranny and fall of Edward II, 1321-1326</i> (Cambridge, 1979).
Griffiths	R.A. Griffiths, <i>The principality of Wales in the later middle ages. The structure and personnel of government: South Wales, 1277-1536</i> (Cardiff, 1972).

- Jones, "Indenture" Micheal Jones, "An indenture between Robert, lord Mohaut, and Sir John de Bracebridge for life service in peace and war, 1310," *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 4 (1972), 384-94.
- List *List of sheriffs for England and Wales, to 1831, Lists and Indexes*, 9, HMSO (London, 1892+).
- Murimuth Adam Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum*, ed. E.M. Thompson, Rolls Series, 93 (London, 1889).
- Rot. Parl.* *Rotuli parliamentorum*, Record Commission (London, 1832).
- Rot. Parl. Ined.* *Rotuli parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti. 1279-1373*, ed. H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, Camden Society Publications, 3rd. ser., 51 (1932).
- Tout, *Chapters* T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the administrative history of medieval England*, (Manchester, 1920-33).
- Tout, *Place* T.F. Tout, *The place of the reign of Edward II in English history*, 2nd. ed. by Hilda Johnstone (Manchester, 1936).
- Vita* *Vita Edwardi secundi*, ed. and trans. N. Denholm-Young (London, 1957).
- WSS Pierre Chaplais (ed.) *The war of Saint-Sardos (1323-1325): Gascon correspondence and diplomatic documents*, Camden Society Publications, 3rd. ser., 87 (1954).