

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

Th 9998

Abstract

Little research has been done on the members of the English nobility before the establishment of Parliament which began meeting regularly at the end of the thirteenth century. K. B. McFarlane's tables of extinction rates of families from 1300 to 1500 do not include the nobility before 1295. The first chapter of this thesis analyses the sources from which a list of 294 noble families between 1216 and 1300 can be drawn up. The reliability and usefulness of secondary works (primarily The Complete Peerage by Cokayne and I. J. Sanders' study of English Baronies) is discussed and the basis behind the choice of the 294 families is explained.

Chapter II discusses the origins of these noble families and divides the nobility into two groups. In the thirteenth century, noble families which had already become prominent in England before the twelfth century had generally attained a higher 'status' than the families which were recruited into the nobility after that time. Several noble families are used as examples. Chapter III examines the descent of these noble families and discusses their extinction or disappearance from the records. The ability of the early families (mostly of Norman origin) to outlive the newer families is commented on and the stratification of the nobility in the thirteenth century is analysed.

Appendix I contains a list of the 294 families with the name and date of the earliest known member of the family and the date of extinction or disappearance. Appendix II includes three tables (as a complement to McFarlane's tables) which illustrate the extinction rate of families. These tables show how the survival rate of the nobility

recruited after 1200 is much lower than that of the earlier and generally more prominent families.

Declarations

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed entirely and solely by me, based on research undertaken by me, and that it has not been accepted in any previous application for a higher degree. I was admitted as a candidate for the degree of M.Litt. at the University of St. Andrews in October 1982. Access to this thesis in the St. Andrews University Library shall be governed by any regulations approved by the Library Committee.

Robert J. Wells

As supervisor to the candidate, I hereby declare that the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations governing the award of the degree of M.Litt. have been fulfilled by Robert J. Wells.

C. J. Given-Wilson

Contents

	Page Number
Introduction	1
Chapter I The criteria for determining the members of thirteenth century nobility	10
Chapter II The origins of the thirteenth century English nobility	49
Chapter III The descent and eventual outcome of the thirteenth century nobility	79
Conclusion	96
Notes	101
Appendix I	111
Appendix II	127
Bibliography	131

Introduction

A study of the English nobility in the thirteenth century is long overdue. Historians have generally considered that before the regularisation of Parliament the concept of the nobility in England is too vague to define. Other than Earldoms there were no real inherited titles until the end of the thirteenth century. As a result, the study of families in this period which may be labelled as 'noble' has not progressed. No adequate criteria have been put forward in order to separate a group of individuals from those who could not be included among the nobility. Certainly, deciding exactly who should be included can be taken as a very subjective decision, but it is the aim of this thesis to define the concept of 'nobility' in the thirteenth century, and to analyse the background and origins of these men and their families. At the same time, it seems important to examine what ultimately happened to these families.

The fact that the origins of so many of these men are unknown further back than a century before they rose to prominence clearly illustrates the point that the nobility was a very unsettled group at this time. A man could easily join the ranks of the nobility by marrying an heiress or the coheiress of an important estate and thereby establish a new lineage to which he might (or might not) contribute his own name.

The fading into obscurity of families which had been prominent in the thirteenth century further illustrates the fleeting nature of the status of a noble at this time. A case in point is the family of Ap Adam which virtually disappeared after the first prominent member of the family died in 1311. Other families continued for centuries as a powerful and wealthy dynasty which succeeded in providing heirs and in

accumulating further wealth due to intermarriage with other noble families. Examples of this type of descent include the De La Warr family or the Beauchamps (Earls of Warwick) who first emerged in the thirteenth century. Possibly the most startling of the families which ascended into the higher nobility from relative obscurity is the family of Stafford. Their ancestry has been copiously studied and documented by several different works, undoubtedly due to their subsequent prominence. Hence their comparative lack of initial importance does not seem as marked because so much more is now known about the early generations of the Staffords than about many other families who did not flourish for so long.

This bias towards studying a powerful family in greater depth is inevitable. Possibly representatives of these families commissioned work to be done in order to investigate the sources of their family (such as the Earls of Warwick in the fifteenth century) but the likelihood is that prominent families have been studied in greater depth simply due to their very prominence. However, this does not mean to say that other noble lineages cannot be traced. There are many families for which a great deal more work remains to be done in order to gain further knowledge of the earlier generations and the reasons for their rise to greater prominence.

Original sources for this period in English history are plentiful. However, most of them are extremely limited in offering merely the essential records which were kept at the time for legal reasons. A lot may be gleaned from piecing together various sources of information but the overall picture of a family, its members, their land holdings and their way of life can seldom if ever be achieved.

Among the original sources available from the surviving records of the reign of Henry III and Edward I, the most valuable is probably the 'Inquisitions post mortem'. These documents are valuable because not only do they give details concerning the inheritance of property after the decease of a powerful or wealthy individual, but often list all his property and all his heirs - with their relationship to him clearly specified.

In addition to the inquisitions post mortem there are also a number of other valuable documents. These include assignments of dower, proofs of age, valuations of land and tenements, escheats, Sheriffs' and Coroners' Inquisitions and many others.¹

An inquisition post mortem was usually taken shortly after the person in question died. The information provided in these documents gives us the greatest part of the information on the families of the Lords that is available today.

Other published transactions include the Fine Rolls, Close Rolls, Patent Rolls and Charter Rolls, all of which contain information which can be used to piece together the activities and whereabouts of various Lords and their families and followers. The Fine Rolls are those which contain the payments made on writs, grants, licences, pardons and exemptions among other things. Charter Rolls included grants and confirmations of privileges - such as the inauguration of a new fair, market or warren, permission for new ventures of any kind, confirmations of dignities, offices and land. These were largely superseded by the Patent Rolls. The Patent Rolls and the Close Rolls include further Royal transactions as well as throwing light through confirmations, licenses, etc. on actions by members of the nobility and serve the purpose of mentioning

names and places which can often be used to piece together a fuller account of the doings of members of the nobility at the time.

It is difficult to overestimate the usefulness of this administrative material. What may seem to be a purely legal or administrative matter can easily turn out to be a complex case involving the inheritance of an estate and may provide unexpected and extremely valuable information on a family which would otherwise not be known.

Among secondary sources, the value of The Complete Peerage by Cokayne and others must be given the full acknowledgement it merits. The compilation of this work by a large group of historians with the utmost care toward every relevant detail has resulted in an invaluable aid for any historian working on the families who formed part of the peerage. Cokayne is not infallible, however. The earlier volumes start with the first member of a family who received a writ of summons in the thirteenth century, while the later volumes trace the earliest ancestor of the family. On the other hand, the earlier volumes include all men who were summoned in 1283 to Parliament while the later volumes do not. A case in point is Mauger de St. Albin, summoned to Parliament in 1283, and who received military summons from 1279 to 1283.² Nowhere are men who were summoned only in 1294 included. The reasons for this will be examined in the first section of this thesis.

There are several other peerage works which examine the importance of the nobility, but none (including Dugdale's pioneering but uneven work) come close to achieving the near-completeness of Cokayne's study. Burke's Dormant and Extinct Peerage is helpful but cannot offer the scholarly background information that Cokayne has. Because the publishers of The Complete Peerage were running low on funds by the end of

their work, no addenda or corrigenda were included, although it is mentioned that this was the original plan. Among the contributors to the mediaeval articles in this work were G. V. Watson, Ethel Stokes, M. W. Hughes and I. J. Sanders. Clearly a great deal of time was spent documenting each family title, and the effort of these historians has made The Complete Peerage an invaluable work of reference.

Further works of reference which help the historian in the compilation of pedigrees or descents of the nobility in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries include Sanders' excellent contribution on English baronies from 1086 to 1327.³ This work lists all the known baronies in England in this period with an additional group of probable baronies. His criteria for the selection of who is to be included hinges on the fact that barons had to pay baronial relief as holders of a barony. Magna Carta had specified that the relief for Earls and barons was £100 while for knights it was £5. If a barony was divided (as when it was inherited by coheireses) the relief was simply divided by the number of coheireses. A baron was required to pay a relief, but with divisions among baronies and acquisitions of fractions of baronies between various eventual heirs, the sums varied greatly. As Sanders points out in his preface, one tenant-in-chief could be the lord of several fractions of land. Even by owning a miniscule fraction of a barony a lord might be considered to be a baron. An example is the case of Asceline of Waterville who inherited one sixth of the barony of Bourn. She married Roger de Torpel and the Pipe Rolls show her son's payment of £16 13s. 4d. in payment for this fraction of the barony.⁴

However, a problem arises in that many of the men who were evidently large tenants-in-chief are not recorded as having paid baronial relief. The records ^{in question} (generally in the Pipe Rolls and the Fine Rolls) are

probably incomplete. Examples of estates which are not specifically mentioned as baronies because their lord did not pay a relief are those of the Mowbray family (Barnstaple) and the barony of Ros, eventually owned by the Kirkeby family. Naturally a decision must be taken as to which of the larger estates were baronies and which were not. Many were called baronies (such as the barony of Ros) and Sanders has included many of these in his work, while others, which he deems to be either smaller or misnamed, have been left out.

Sanders' book is divided into estates rather than families, unlike the present thesis which examines the families rather than the estates.

The English nobility has been well analysed in the period after 1300 by K. B. McFarlane who made a detailed study of 357 families from 1300 to 1500. He was able to investigate each of these families and draw up a statistical survey showing the speed with which these families became extinct, and how many creations from one century still survived at the end of the succeeding centuries. McFarlane's work is extremely thorough and exhaustive. He had very simple and straightforward criteria for his definition of extinction of a family, which are as follows:⁵

- (1) When the head of a family died leaving no heirs.
- (2) When the heir or heirs were female or traced their claim through a female.

However, McFarlane had subsequent limitations to his work. He felt that if a head of family died leaving a female heiress but whose name (and sometimes title) continued through a brother or cousin bearing the same family name, then that family should be considered as extinct.

However, if a man died leaving no heirs other than his brother or nephew or cousin then the line would continue. As examples, McFarlane gives the earldoms of Warwick and Arundel as having become extinct in 1369 and 1471 respectively, because the title of Earl was assumed by somebody who was not the heir male of the deceased Earl.⁶ In the case of these earldoms this shortens the length of time which a title can be held to have existed, because the actual family names continued until 1446 and 1580 respectively.

In the present thesis I will trace the continued existence of a family name through any branches (collateral included) for as long as the direct legitimate male-line descent of any member of the nobility continued. This does, of course, exclude any families which died out in the direct male descendants of the first noble but which continued through a collateral relative whose common ancestry with the last member of the family extended beyond the first member of the nobility.

As a result, the tables which are included with this thesis will not show a direct correlation with McFarlane's tables, simply because the criteria behind these tables is slightly (but significantly) modified.

It remains to be pointed out however, that in a great many cases, especially among the earlier families (where the concept of a hereditary nobility was not specifically followed) there is no possible way of tracing whether the family died out or not because the members of the family disappeared. This often happened with a family which had lost a lot of its property (and hence its prominence) and which thereby no longer received any summons of any kind. Because of this, I have added an 'untraced' specification to my tables, as this seems to be the only

honest way of including these families without giving the impression that they became extinct when they may actually have survived.

An example of this situation is the Russell family of North Cadbury, Somerset. They appear to have died out in 1340 but it is very likely from the records, that the Russells who subsequently became Dukes of Bedford descended from this family in some way which has been impossible to document, due mainly to the extensive nature of this family which had many branches from a very early stage.

There is a risk, however, in including the collateral relatives of a baron or an Earl in the statistical analysis. Although every attempt has been made to follow up the descendants in the male line of any barons or Earls, it is very possible (particularly with families which lasted into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries) that cadet lines which may have formed remain untraced. A cadet line might receive little importance, especially after several generations, and as a result would not be followed up in the same way that the main line of a family would. This is not a small risk, but it is unmeasurable, and it is beyond the scope of any survey to try and point out the possibility of this occurrence. Therefore, if no collateral male-line relatives of the last lord can be found, and if there is no indication that a cadet family existed, the family is considered to have become extinct.

The selection of men who are to be classified as belonging to the nobility is necessarily arbitrary. Before the 1290's, very few writs of summons to any Parliaments were drawn up. During this period there was no standard list employed for the purposes of summoning men to Parliaments. After 1295 summons to Parliament are available for every session of Parliament in the remainder of the century.

Therefore in the decision of which families to include and which ones to discard there were inevitably many subjective decisions which had to be taken. The process behind the selection of men whom I have chosen to term as members of the nobility will be outlined in the first section of this thesis. The second and third parts show where each of these families (as far as can be ascertained) originated and the direction eventually taken by this family respectively. At the end of the work is included a statistical survey, similar to McFarlane's tables in which the extinction rates of families are examined in greater detail.

It must be made clear that the 3,000 or so families from which members received military writs of summons and which McFarlane refers to as the 'undifferentiated' are not included in this survey, but could form the basis of a broader study which would, however, have to deal with many families about whom absolutely nothing (save the name of one representative) is known.

Finally, this study is limited to the nobility between 1216 and 1300. It is hoped that the work shall serve as a complement to McFarlane's work which began in 1295 but statistically only in 1300. I did not attempt to duplicate McFarlane's efforts, and considered that the transitional period of Henry III's reign and the reign of Edward I as far as 1300 would provide an adequate survey of this transitional period of the nobility.

Chapter I

The Criteria for Determining the Members of Thirteenth Century Nobility

A study of the thirteenth century nobility requires the use of several distinct sources : Parliamentary writs of summons from 1264, military summons and muster rolls, references in the Pipe Rolls, the Patent Rolls and other documents or rolls of the period. An analysis of the names mentioned in any of these sources provides the basis for a discussion of the nobility in this thesis.

The concept of 'nobility' at a time when there was not yet a Parliamentary peerage is difficult to define. It is only from an extensive search through the source material that it becomes apparent that certain families had a higher standing than the rest, and that for convenience it is useful to refer to these people as the nobility. The 'status' they had is to a great extent a subjective quality, but after a thorough analysis of the sources consulted there can be little doubt that a group of about 300 families made up the upper tier of the tenants-in-chief and the heads of these families can be referred to as the King's men. Status is an abstract, intangible concept, not susceptible to absolute rules, and only achievable by combining a number of factors in ways which sometimes have to be subjective. Therefore different types of evidence (from various sources) must be evaluated and their usefulness interpreted, and certain arbitrary limits have to be set. As an example, when a barony is divided among several heirs the point at which the owner of a fraction of the barony is no longer referred to as noble must be extremely subjective. By combining information from a variety of sources it is possible to come up with a

fairly clear picture of those families whose 'status' set them above the majority of the landholding class, whom we can therefore designate as the 'nobility' of thirteenth century England.

The first comprehensive list of the 'King's men' which is in existence is that of the twenty-eighth year of Henry III's reign - 1244. It is no more than a summons for men to fight against the Scots, but its construction - in that the Earls are listed first (eight of them) followed by 72 other names of men who are evidently those who would be considered the stronger barons - makes this a reliable source from which to draw up a list of the men who made up the nobility. The list of barons is followed by a list of Bishops and Abbots in a way similar to the subsequent summons to Parliament. As a result, and owing to the relatively early date of this summons it does not seem unreasonable to conclude that the men named on this summons, all of whom were tenants-in-chief, should be included under the heading of 'nobility'. No comparable list of the period includes men in this systematic way, and no other list is as complete.

This is not a summons to Parliament but as a military summons it falls into the category of those which listed the King's most important men, from which the Parliamentary lists of fifty years later would be derived. In the absence of any ^{summons} standardised parliamentary before 1264 military summons must be taken as their predecessors. They did not, of course, fulfill the same purpose, and cannot be taken as equivalent, but they are none the less extremely valuable as the only lists of men from this period which have survived.

It is important to bear in mind that from the early 1240's until 1265 when Simon de Montfort's death brought an end to the civil war,

England's nobility was in great disarray. As a result, few of the military writs can be taken to represent a true cross-section of the English nobility of this period. However, these military summons can be instructive and need to be discussed.

Whenever the King felt an urgent need to call on his feudal army, he issued military writs of summons. The usefulness of these cannot be overestimated, because they furnish us with a lot of our information on the members of families from whom the later 'true' nobility would evolve. After 1290 these are naturally of less importance, since the 'Parliamentary' peerage can now be charted. For the period from 1216 to 1290 their importance in providing a list of the men who were involved in the campaigns is fundamental.

Beginning with Henry III's accession, the first roll of forces which provides information on who was involved is in 1218 when the King summoned his men to Stamford. All of the men named in this list as tenants-in-chief are included in the present work. They were only a select few, and it is evident from the number of knights' fees they were providing that the King considered them to be the most valuable members of his feudal army. 500 knights were to be raised in 1218¹ and although it is impossible to calculate the actual number of knights present (as opposed to the number of knights' fees required) it is likely that a muster of 500 knights was achieved.

There exists a nearly complete muster roll for the year 1223 in which the tenants-in-chief are listed, together with the number of knights each provided. For the purposes of a study which aims at estimating the number of men involved in a campaign, this is extremely useful, but the number of tenants-in-chief listed is very low.

In 1224 a scutage roll names tenants-in-chief, and in 1225 there is a list of men who were summoned to fight in Gascony and Poitou, whether they actually served or not.

R. F. Walker has made a thorough study of several scutage rolls, in an attempt to calculate the number of knights who served in Wales. The first important one of these is the scutage roll of 1228 in which the feudal army was summoned to Shrewsbury. Despite the fact that they are referred to as tenants-in-chief, there are a great many men who were not particularly powerful, who did not have the 'status' of a nobleman, who were never summoned again, and about whose descendants little if anything is known. Among these, to cite a few examples, are Adam de Bendenges, Henry de Scaccario, William de Cyernton, William de Frise and Walter de Langton. It would make little sense to include such men among a group of men who are referred to as the 'nobility'. Not only did they not own any land of significance which can be traced, but their performance on one campaign does not merit their inclusion in a study which (aside from the Earls) mentions such important men as Hamo de Crevequer who was present at several important campaigns, whose estates (specifically Chatham in Kent) were sizeable, and whose family reflected the successes and failures of most nobles in the thirteenth century. Therefore these men are not included in this study.

In 1229 and 1230 Henry III organised an expedition to Brittany. Walker has calculated that over 548 knights were present, and

that in 1231 $463\frac{1}{2}$ knights could have participated in the army at Elfael in Wales.² This is speculative however, and as far as the present work is concerned, the list of tenants-in-chief at Elfael includes the names of men who do not reappear on any further summons

by the King and whose estates are not traceable. As a result many of these tenants-in-chief are not included. It is very likely that the King was simply interested in gathering as many men to fight as possible, and as long as they had sufficient money with which to purchase equipment for themselves and for their knights (if they had any), the King would presumably be willing to include them in his feudal army. It would, however, be technically a mistake to try to include every individual who was summoned on these campaigns.

After the army of Elfael in 1231 there is no adequate summons in existence until the year 1242 when a list of the tenants-in-chief involved in the campaign in Gascony is available. This scutage roll is useful in consolidating the group of names which can be used to decide who can be labelled as 'noble' simply by the fact that by being present on a campaign to Gascony the expenses incurred would inevitably have to be much greater than on an expedition in Wales.

In 1245 there was a further confrontation between the English forces and the Welsh in Deganwy. The muster roll for the contingents fighting at Deganwy together with the army summoned in South Wales in 1257 give us a further appreciation of the way in which the prominent members of the nobility (such as Ralph Basset of Weldon, Gilbert Pecche, Peter de Brus and Philip Columbers) were consistently present in these campaigns and generally contributed a greater number of knights than many of the other nobles.

On any of these campaigns it must be remembered that the King's household knights were also important, and were not listed in military summons or scutage rolls. However, there were many prominent men among the King's knights among whom John de Courtenay, Guy de Rocheford,

Philip Basset, Thomas de Gorges and Hubert Huse stand out due to the high fees they were receiving from the King for their service.³ Undoubtedly these and others among the more prominent of the King's knights formed part of the wealthier group of men (or the nobility) of the thirteenth century. However most of the King's knights were men who did not even form part of a family which owned estates or which was of sufficient stature to include members who formed part of the feudal army.

It is not easy to select a few men from the military summons in the early part of Henry III's reign without excluding others who may have merited some mention. However, it is sufficiently clear that there was one group of men which consistently and repeatedly ranked above the rest in these military summons. A man like Robert de Courtenay (together with his son John and grandson Hugh) received over ten writs of summons from 1230 to 1277. Robert de Saucey was summoned only once (in 1228). It would not reflect the great stratification which existed in the landholding class to describe both of these men as members of the nobility. In the early part of the reign of Henry III it is not as easy to find a clear line dividing the nobility from the other men who were summoned, who formed a much larger group themselves, but in spite of this difficulty, a distinction can be made when one compares those men who were present on most campaigns to those who were summoned only on one occasion.

In any of the summons sent out by the King, each man was required to provide a certain number of knights. Some of the muster rolls which still survive show the exact number of knights that were considered as appropriate. Among these are the muster rolls of 1223 of forces against

the Welsh and the roll of forces summoned to Stamford in 1218. In 1224 the scutage roll does not specify the number of knights that each man was supposed to provide. In fact it is clear that this number was not fixed but varied from year to year.⁴ This variance in the power and status of the tenants-in-chief demonstrates the temporary nature of a noble's standing. If he was no longer wealthy enough to provide three knights, he could provide two instead. His costs would decrease, but so would his status.

It is important to note that while many of those who were summoned were secular tenants-in-chief, there were in addition, ecclesiastical lords who (while they did not participate in military ventures) had to provide a number of knights as well. Summons are generally not considered to be complete unless they include Bishops and Abbots as well.

Another significant point is that the territorial possessions of secular tenants-in-chief increased or decreased depending on the deaths of tenants and on whether they left heirs or not. If a man's land had to be divided between several coheiresses, the property might soon be untraceable, and the knights' fees divided up accordingly. With church lands this splitting up of property did not occur, making the calculation of quotas and an estimation of wealth much easier.

By 1245, when there were scutage muster rolls for forces which went to Deganwy in Wales, the number of knights which each tenant-in-chief was to provide had changed. In fact most of the tenants-in-chief were providing far fewer men than they previously had. The tacit admission that a quota of the old service was due now led to a new service being fixed at the previous quota.⁵ There is clearly no obvious correlation between specified quotas and the number of knights' fees that any

tenants-in-chief held. Walker assumes that the King and his advisers calculated the wealth and power of the tenants-in-chief and settled their quotas in that way, rather than settling for an examination of knights' fees held.⁶

Knights' fees do not therefore play an exclusive roll in deciding who the members of the nobility were. By the thirteenth century they were one of the remnants of true feudalism which was gradually disappearing. As a result, it should not be felt that a mere examination of knights' fees will provide much more than an outdated estimate of what a family's wealth was. Quotas, on the other hand, reflect the true status of a family as knights' fees no longer did, and can be considered as more accurately reflecting one family's standing with respect to another. The variable nature of quotas yet again gives support to the theory that the upper ranks of the landowning class was very volatile, and that families could reach the ranks of the nobility for a few years and then descend again. The families of Brun, Erleye and de la Haye are examples of families whose standing varied substantially from one stage to the next.

Military writs of summons are only one of the sources from which a list of the nobility can be derived. From the 1240's on there were meetings to which the King summoned his men which were termed Parliaments. These meetings were not primarily intended as feudal musters but rather as sessions in which the King could assemble his men in order to ask for money, to hear their grievances and to receive advice from them.

The first charter in Henry III's reign was drawn up in November 1216 and names several men among his advisers. In this charter the term 'Majores Barones' is used, implying that this meeting (at Bristol)

was one at which the men who were felt to be the leading barons of the time were assembled in order to decide on the policies to be implemented. Many other documents and charters survive, and some of them can be used to decide whether a baron or tenant-in-chief formed part of the nobility or not.⁷

At the assembly in Oxford in 1258 the nobility was evidently an important force and all the barons who were involved in the Provisions of Oxford are included in the present study, and made up an important proportion of the nobility of that period.

The Lords Committee on the Dignity of a Peer attempts to discuss the validity and the constitution of legislative assemblies from the time of the meeting at Oxford until Parliament began meeting on a regular basis. A great deal of important information is provided by their thorough report. The report mentions that after small barons and tenants were permitted to be absent from meetings, they generally did not attend unless the King specifically required them to go.⁸ Therefore only the more important barons attended the summons at Oxford in 1258.

In 1260 several men received writs of summons to a Parliament, but it is not exactly clear what the purpose of the meeting was. The Lords' report suggests an appeasement with the discontented nobles on the part of King Henry. In 1262 with the growing discontent between King and nobles, Henry issued a proclamation saying he would no longer adhere to the Provisions of Oxford. What is significant in this proclamation is that the King refers to the people who had formed his Parliament at Oxford as 'barones'. The King's statement was consented to by twenty-seven important members of the nobility at which stage it is clear that the gulf between the factions of the nobility was becoming wider.

Legal historians do not consider that any meetings before 1296, apart from the one in 1264 and (occasionally) the one in 1283, are true sessions of Parliament capable of having created a peerage. This definition of Parliament is excessively strict for the purpose of this study which deals with social history rather than legal history, so little importance should (for the purpose of this study) be attached to this.

In 1264 another Parliament was held. At this time the King was a prisoner of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, and it can be assumed that the names on the Parliamentary Roll are those of nobles who sided with Montfort. Five Earls were summoned together with eighteen other nobles. If taken together with the names on the 1262 proclamation by the King which named the members of the King's faction, a composite picture of the higher nobility in the early 1260's begins to emerge. Inevitably not all the men one could call noble are included in these two lists, but it is a convenient set of writs from which to expand once the names of other nobles begin to emerge from other sources. Not only were the twenty-three members of the nobility summoned, but at the same time 122 Deans, Abbots and Priors were summoned by the King.

The two writs (1262 and 1264) are important in establishing which of the stronger nobles were on the side of the King and which were not, but it must be remembered that this period was one of great turbulence and conflict as far as the nobility was concerned, and the mere

choosing or rejecting of individuals as 'nobles' on the basis of whether their name is on one of these lists would not be accurate.

From the time of the battle of Evesham in 1265 the unrest in England declined steadily for the rest of the century. No military writs are available for ten years after this, at a time when reconstruction was perhaps more important than waging a war.

For the first five years of Edward I's reign, which began in 1272 there were no military summons, but in 1275 the King held a Parliament at Westminster at which the 'Statute of Westminster the first' was promulgated. However, at the end of 1276 Edward decided to attempt to get a final submission from the Welsh under Llewelyn. A large group of men were summoned to fight and to provide knights for the campaign. This list of nobles provides another important step in the determination of who was considered to have sufficient status to be summoned by the King.

Despite the magnanimity shown by Edward to Llewelyn, who was able to remain Prince of Wales and who received many favours from Edward, in 1282 Llewelyn rebelled against Edward and took many of Edward's castles. Due to this, Edward summoned a large group of nobles at Worcester and was eventually able to overcome and slay Llewelyn in December 1282.

In 1283 Edward summoned a Parliament at Shrewsbury which included not only the tenants-in-chief, but also two knights from each county as well as burgesses. The purpose was to try David, brother of Llewelyn, but this gathering is considered by some legal historians (specifically those in the Mowbray and Segrave case of 1877) as constituting the first Parliament by which a peerage was created.⁹

Subsequent military summons by Edward were mostly to gather the nobility together for campaigns in France or in Scotland (as in 1296). These military summons serve to bring our attention to further members of the nobility, but it is at this stage that military summons become excessively long for a complete list of tenants-in-chief to have any relevance to a documentation of the higher English nobility. It would not be wrong to conclude that over 2,500 men received summons in the campaigns in France and Scotland.¹⁰ A thorough examination of these military summons, as provided by Palgrave shows that a great many knights were directly summoned by the King in a way that could not have occurred before. The top nobles were summoned as well, but it is not possible to deduce from the summons who was considered to be a baron rather than merely a knight, because no reference to their rank (Dominus or Miles) is included.

However, by this time the summoning of men to a council, which eventually became known as Parliament was becoming a necessity. The King needed to ask for magnates for advice, and more importantly for support - both in terms of supplying men and funds.

The peerage came to be defined as consisting of the group of men who were summoned to Parliament once, and then subsequently for the rest of their lives, to be succeeded by their heirs male. This concept of peerage took a long time to become fully established, and many of the men who were summoned between 1295 and 1320 were only sporadically summoned. In addition there are several cases in which a prominent man was summoned, but his heirs never were. John Ap Adam was summoned from 1297, but his heir Thomas, who was still alive in 1330, had alienated most of his lands and as a result had evidently lost his earlier prominence.¹¹ It is clear, then, that a hereditary peerage was not totally in existence at this stage. In the interest of completeness, however, every family from which a man was summoned to Parliament from 1294 to 1300 has been included in this work. These number over 150. It must be stressed however, that although hereditary peerages were not in existence before 1296 and certainly not before 1264, there had been hereditary Earldoms since before 1066. All the English Earls are included in the study of the nobility, together with six Scottish Earls (Angus, Atholl, Buchan, Carrick, Dunbar and Stratherne^a) all of whom either received writs of summons or owned substantial lands in England.

At this point it is important to mention the accuracy of the surviving writs, whether they be Parliamentary or military summons, or scutage or muster rolls. While in most cases an early copy survives, it cannot truthfully be said that 'the original copy' is still in existence. Evidently rolls were copied out in rough many times, and were added to and changed. Many rolls list names of men who were not alive when they were drawn up. They cannot, therefore, be taken to represent, in every detail, the people who were definitely summoned on a campaign or to a meeting, without accepting the haphazard way in which they must have been drawn up.

An example of a roll in which the scribe is evidently to blame for a mistake exists in a Parliamentary summons for Simon Mortimer in 1296. No Simon Mortimer is known to have existed, and Simon Montagu (Monte Acuto) was summoned before and after 1296 but not on that date. It must be assumed, therefore, that the Simon Mortimer referred to is none other than Simon Monte Acuto. Scribes were not infallible and were easily capable of making such mistakes.

Other problems abound. In 1299 John Fitz-Roger was summoned, and as a John Fitz-Reginald had been summoned in several successive years but not in 1299, it might be tempting to consider that this is one and the same man. However, a closer examination of the family of John Clavering whose name does not appear among those summoned in 1299 although he was summoned both earlier and later, reveals that the son of Robert Fitz-Roger who died in 1311 was named John Fitz-Roger until he took the name of Clavering after the lands he owned. Evidently, in spite of the fact that he was already known as John Clavering, he was listed by his earlier name in the rolls for 1299.

In the Parliaments from 1294 on, not only are the secular tenants-in-chief summoned, but so are the Bishops and Abbots who were the principal religious tenants in England. In addition on many of the writs are included the names of men who were the King's justices. These men were not summoned to Parliament as nobles, and as a result are not included in this thesis. However, some of them were summoned to Parliament with the nobles after 1300 and would thereby be included in McFarlane's tables. Because they were not part of the nobility until after 1300, however, they are not included here.

The Complete Peerage is an excellent reference work and lists most of the men who were summoned in 1264, 1283 and from 1294 on. However, there are several men, including John Hudleston (summoned in 1298), William de Rye (summoned in 1294) and Mauger de St. Albin (summoned in 1283) who are not included by the compilers, for no obvious reason, which inevitably makes a subsequent search for more information on these men necessary. In all three of these examples little can be gained from any of the Calendered rolls and it must be concluded that not much is known about them.

There are many other manuscript records which give us a clearer idea about who was actively campaigning at this time, and forming part of the King's feudal army, particularly in Scotland.

Among these original sources for information on prominent men during the later part of the thirteenth century are the Rolls of Arms. This is the name given to mediaeval manuscript records of armorial bearings.¹² Very few survive, but of those that do, the Parliamentary or Bannerets Roll of the early part of Edward II's reign is probably the most valuable, together with the Song of Caerlaverock of 1300.

Both of these rolls together with several other rolls of a comparable nature list the members of the King's cavalry (with their coat of arms) during one of his campaigns. Denholm-Young discusses the significance of the rolls and particularly the chronology of the Parliamentary Roll and those which were made up during the Scottish campaigns (Caerlaverock, Galloway and Falkirk).¹³

The earliest surviving roll is known as Glover's Roll. It includes over 200 names and arms of men dating from about 1255. However, as is common with the rolls there are names of men who died before this period as well as the names of men who only received their arms after 1255.¹⁴ This roll is significant because of the precedence it gives to Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. He is listed right after the King and the King's brother. Simon was married to the King's sister but had no reason to rank above any of the other Earls, his Earldom having been created in 1230. His prominent position on Glover's Roll is the first indication that he was becoming more influential than the other men on the roll.

Of the other early rolls none can be taken to be totally authoritative, an example being the Herald's Roll which contains the names and arms of many men who existed only in legends.¹⁵ The Dering Roll is a good example of an early roll which has survived relatively intact. Dating from about 1275¹⁶ it lists the names of barons and knights who performed castle-guard at Dover.¹⁷ Castle-guard need not be performed in person, but an annual fee had to be collected by the King. The roll is probably simply a record of these guards.

The Parliamentary Roll is not an heraldic list. It is basically a list of names, commencing with barons, though mentioned as bannerets.

These bannerets are divided into the bachelors (the King's knights) and other knights of the King's household. Other knights who were not bannerets are also listed, being known as commilitones.¹⁸

The question of whether a bachelor or others were entitled to banners is not entirely easy to determine. In the Song of Caerlaverock it is mentioned that bachelors had banners with a long tail. Without careful consideration and a lengthy analysis of each name it would be dangerous to assume that any of these rolls are complete.

The usefulness of these rolls (and specifically the Parliamentary Roll) is that they list the names of most of the tenants-in-chief in England of this period. However, the arbitrary nature of these rolls and the large number of men covered make it impractical to use the names to classify a man as a tenant-in-chief or not. Inclusion on any of these rolls cannot be seen as a reason for considering these men as forming part of the ^{higher} nobility.

The Heraldic Rolls can be used together with the other available sources to corroborate and analyse the merits of the inclusion of men among the ranks of the nobility. This study is not concerned with heraldry, but the lists of names serve to provide a continuing picture of who the nobility were and which campaigns they were active in.

Consulting the writs of summons to Parliament and military summons is only part of the study of the nobility in the thirteenth century. Because the hereditary peerage cannot be traced with certainty until the 1290's, it is extremely important to analyse the estates and properties of the wealthier landlords, in an attempt to decide whether an estate was a barony or not. The correlation between families which

owned estates in the 1200's and the families who became part of the Parliamentary peerage in the 1300's may not seem very high at first sight. However, it would be misleading to compare names without examining the properties mentioned as being held by the different families. A close look reveals that many of the nobles of the early 1300's were directly descended from earlier, wealthy families who were considered 'barons' either because they paid baronial relief or because their wealth, reputation and status gave them this position. Examples abound, one in particular being the family of Veteri Ponte (or Vipont).

Robert Veteri Ponte (whose ancestry has not been adequately determined) was granted the estate of Appleby (Westmorland) for the service of four knights' fees.¹⁹ When Robert died in 1228, after receiving several writs of summons from Henry III,²⁰ he was succeeded by his son John, who died in 1241 and subsequently by John's son Robert, who died leaving no male heirs in 1264.²¹ His land was then divided between the two daughters and coheiresses of Robert : Isabel and Idoine. Isabel married Roger de Clifford and passed half of the barony to her own heirs, the Cliffords. The Cliffords were a fairly wealthy family, their origins going back to Richard Fitz Ponce whose brother-in-law was listed as a landowner in Hertfordshire in the Domesday book.²² In any case, Roger Clifford who married Isabel was a King's knight from 1226 to 1230²³ and his marriage to a coheiress undoubtedly increased his wealth and status.

The second daughter, Idoine was twice married. Her first husband was Roger de Leyburn who was the descendant of Philip de Leyburn who held seven fees in Kent before 1180. The marriage of Roger and Idoine undoubtedly helped increase the status of the Leyburns, but Roger died in 1284 after which Idoine married John de Cromwell. He was the younger

son of Ralph de Cromwell who had gained his land through two successful marriages and had been summoned by the King to Shrewsbury in 1283. He had married Philip Marmion's coheir and then Roger de Somery's daughter, who brought one quarter of the barony of Arundel to the Cromwell family through her own mother, Nichola D'Aubigny.²⁴ John de Cromwell was not summoned to Parliament until 1305, but as he died without heirs, Idoine's share of the Appleby barony would have reverted to the Clifford family had she not granted her share to the Cliffords already.²⁵ John Cromwell's eldest brother Ralph continued the line of Cromwells which eventually disappeared in the mid fifteenth century.

This example of families gaining prominence through the acquisition of land illustrates the trend by which families which died out left their lands to the families their heirs had married into, and shows that status could be gained by a strategic marriage. This is only one example of which there are many. Estates were, as a result, ~~much more~~ important in starting off a new noble family than writs of summons were.

Much work remains to be done on the important estates of England which were considered baronies. Nonetheless, the contribution by I. J. Sanders in English Baronies : A study of their origin and descent 1086-1327 is excellent and totally indispensable. In his study Sanders mentions that none of the tenants-in-chief were totally certain of the origins of a man's claim to be a baron, and often the title simply rested on tradition. If he paid relief for a barony a man was entitled to be termed a baron.²⁶ Fine Rolls and Pipe Rolls list payments of relief, and Sanders has examined these rolls and has examined every estate for which relief was paid.

In Magna Carta it was specified that a baron should pay £100 relief for his barony, but up to this time it had varied, and Sanders has divided his work into two parts placing only the estates which were definitely baronies in the first part, and has placed other estates for which evidence is inconclusive in the second half. All the estates were called baronies, but Sanders has not found relief payment by the barons for these estates, although many of them must certainly have been technically baronies.

One of the most complicated problems with estates (and which can be more clearly illustrated by looking at baronies) was the division of land between coheiresses. When an estate was divided between three coheiresses, for example, each one would then have to pay the sum of £33 6s. 8d. This division did not stop the estate from being a barony, regardless of whether the coheiresses' families had other lands of their own. In addition, the owner of one sixteenth of a barony could be considered to be called a baron since they were paying baronial relief.

The question arises as to how far one can take the divisions of an estate when evidently the land owned by one heir might be much smaller than other land owned by men who were not called barons.

One example from Sanders' research which will serve to illustrate this problem is the estate of Long Crendon in Buckinghamshire. Originally owned by the Giffard family, during the reign of Richard I it was divided between Richard de Clare, Earl of Hertford and William Marshal, later Earl of Pembroke. Marshal's half was eventually divided between five coheiresses who each owned one tenth of the barony. Sibyl, one of these coheiresses married William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby and died in 1238 leaving seven daughters, each of which now owned one seventieth of

the barony.²⁷ Obviously it is totally futile to attempt to trace the descendants of every coheiress, particularly when only a small fraction of land is involved.

As a general rule, therefore, this thesis will trace the families of the coheiresses of a barony after its first division, but no further. This rule is necessary due to tiny areas of land being subdivided over and over again. However, inevitably some minor coheiress could marry into a powerful family, and when this occurred it is evident that the family will be in the study. On the other hand one coheiress in the first division of an estate might marry into a very obscure family whose descent is untraced, and whose contribution to the feudal army was negligible or nil. In these cases, a family will not be included in this survey.

Payment of baronial relief combined with writs of summons determines, insofar as this work is concerned, the inclusion of a family in the category of 'nobility'. Evidently, as can be appreciated, there are many families which fall short of this, possibly because of lack of information on them, but a definite division does exist separating the upper strata of the tenants-in-chief from the rest, and it is this division which is used to examine the few families who were 'noble'.

It is essential to understand the difference between a barony and a fief. According to F. M. Stenton any fief which was held for the service of five knights or more was considered a barony in the early Norman period.²⁸ However, by the end of the twelfth century a fief was only referred to as a barony if it was held in chief from the crown. Major vassals of palatine lords might be included as well due to their comparable wealth.²⁹

Miss R. R. Reid points out that there were two other requirements for baronies. The first was that the relief for a barony was set at £100 by Magna Carta regardless of the number of knights' fees involved. In addition, it was necessary for a barony to have a head or caput from which the barony was run, and which could not be alienated or divided without losing the barony.³⁰

Sidney Painter describes a barony as giving a man 'a mass of varied rights over lands and men ... in return for the rights granted him by the crown he owed various feudal services'.³¹

Domesday book gives us the first opportunity to trace the value of any of the baronies. Walter Gifford had granted out £226 of his £375 barony, Ernulf de Hesding only £45 of £268.³² Other barons ranged from keeping most of their land to granting out large areas to mesne tenants. The tendency was generally however for the powerful barons to have several mesne tenants and thereby increase their entourage and affinities.

By the beginning of the 1200's the large fiefs were beginning to split into smaller areas. The reason for this was simply that once a man died leaving only coheireses, these daughters or sisters would divide the lands up, each claiming a share. At the same time new baronies were forming from remnants of others, chiefly as new creations by the King. From time to time baronies were forfeited and the King would then decide to whom to grant them. In other cases a barony might be alienated. So, by the year 1200 few baronies dating from 1066 still continued unchanged from the way they had been in the last 130 years.

Barons reacted differently to their 'servitium debitum'. Some men (such as the Darcies) produced 100 per cent of the quota they owed from

less than 70 per cent of their resources, while the Mandevilles could fill their quota by granting out only 29 per cent of their barony.³³ Unquestionably, after 1230 it was possible for tenants-in-chief to perform a reduced service, while scutage remained in force. After this period few but the wealthiest of barons had to provide more than two or three knights.

The earliest information available on baronies is from Domesday book in 1086. Until 1166 when there was an inquest of knights' fees, there is no further source of information on who the wealthier tenants-in-chief were. From then on, the information increases, until at the time of Magna Carta in 1215 the information on the barons becomes much more complete, and allows us to evaluate their progress in the intervening and subsequent years.

In the latter part of King John's reign, the Book of Fees of 1212 is helpful in determining who the important nobles of that time were, and The Red Book of the Exchequer³⁴ (which includes the Testa de Neville) is essential concerning matters dealing with tenure of land, and especially scutages. This work would be invaluable for a study of all tenants-in-chief of Henry III's reign, since many more than simply the nobles are mentioned in great detail. The same can be said for other works such as A. C. Chibnall's Early Taxation Returns and W. Farrer's Honors and Knights' Fees. The latter is extremely helpful in dealing with many of the transactions involving the barons' and knights' estates, but the information it provides as far as this work is concerned is limited.

It is important to keep in mind that according to Magna Carta tenure by barony had very little if anything to do with attending the

great council. All tenants by barony were naturally tenants-in-chief of the King. Certainly there is no justification in claiming that the barons named in Magna Carta were the greatest magnates in the realm. Some of them were very powerful, but others had no more knights' fees than other barons who were not numbered among the twenty-five.³⁵

Painter argues that tenure by barony had lost its original meaning by the time of Magna Carta, and it must be said in his favour that from 1216 on, the number of knights provided by the tenants-in-chief could not separate a baron from a mesne tenant, merely by a comparison of their proportion to total wealth as shown in the Inquisitions Post Mortem. From the time of Henry III the definition of a 'barony by tenure' continued to change and this resulted in a gradual but marked difference in the definition of a baron by the end of the thirteenth century.

Of the twenty-five Magna Carta barons, William de Lanvallei died in 1215 when his family became extinct, and William Malet died in 1216 leaving no male heirs. These men and their families are therefore not included in this survey, but the other twenty-three men either survived long enough or left male heirs which entitles them to be included as members of the nobility in the reign of Henry III.

In the thirteenth century the concept of knighthood was undergoing a period of change. Originally a knight was a person who had been enfeoffed by a baron or by a tenant-in-chief. The King would make a contract with the tenants-in-chief that they would supply a certain number of knights in battle or whenever they were required. By the thirteenth century it was common, however, for a tax (or scutage) to be paid by the tenants-in-chief in lieu of providing the services of a knight. Therefore, as is pointed out by Denholm-Young,³⁶ it becomes difficult to

calculate the true number of knights in this period. The traditional view that there were about 12,000 knights at this time³⁷ is convincingly dispelled by Denholm-Young, and it is clear that of the 6,000 people calculated by Moor in his exhaustive listing of Edward I's knights³⁸ to have been potential knights from 1266 to 1322 there may have been only about 1,250 who were actually knights. However, no more than about 400 names of specifically fighting knights have been traced, and if we account for omissions, it is safe to assume that there were probably no more than 500 active knights at any given moment during the thirteenth century.³⁹

It must be pointed out, however, that in the course of the thirteenth century knighthood was becoming less a functional epithet (which involved active fighting) and more of a title of honour. As a result administrative burdens discouraged some men from assuming the role of a knight.

This was not the only reason for the significant drop in the number of knights between the late eleventh century and the thirteenth century. The amount of equipment needed by a knight had increased dramatically in this period. Tenants-in-chief could not afford to produce the service they were supposed to, and despite the King's increasing demand for men for his military campaigns in France and Wales, it was difficult to gather the number of men he required. ~~Heavy armour was the main expense, but chainmail (which became common after 1240) for both the knight and the horse was an added expense which had come to be indispensable.~~ Despite the advent of distraint of knighthood (from 1234 on), there was a lack of willingness by tenants-in-chief to supply ~~this~~ expensive equipment for the King. Distraint levels varied, but in the writ of

1285 all landowners with annual incomes of £100 or more were to become knights. In 1292 the level was lowered to £40 because the demand for men had increased.⁴⁰ The King needed all the men he could get in times of war, and in 1306 Edward I created 267 knights in one day in order to wage war against the Scots.

Knights did not generally form part of the higher nobility, but a few of them belonged to the families of the most powerful tenants-in-chief in England. Whatever their number, they must be considered as making up a significant proportion of the English gentry.

The King's household included knights who did not form part of the feudal army. They were not called on by the King, but were permanently at his disposal, ready to fight whenever the occasion arose, unlike the feudal army which was only summoned in times of great need. Walker has calculated that the average number of household knights between 1217 and 1267 was 32 at any given year, but varied from three in 1217 to seventy in 1259.⁴¹ From the Exchequer Liberate Rolls and 'Liberate' entries in the Close Rolls before 1226 Walker has calculated the fees of 117 household knights ranging from twelve knights who received an annual fee of £5 to Hubert Huse who was paid an annual fee of £100 for six years from 1225 to 1230.⁴² This range serves to illustrate the tremendous differences among men who were employed by the King for the same basic purpose.

Of the knights who made up this group of retainers, those who received an annual fee of £25 or more were generally members of prominent families at the time. Occasionally they were younger sons of powerful members of the nobility (for example Stephen Longespee, third son of William Longespee so-called Earl of Salisbury) or men like Thomas

Corbet who was a tenant-in-chief of the barony of Cause in Shropshire. Others were the younger brothers of the Earl of Gloucester and of the Earl of Lincoln. As a result, many of the knights who were among those receiving an annual fee of £20 or above are included in the present work because of their family connections, while very few of those with an annual fee of under £20 are mentioned.

It is not altogether clear whether there were families which derived their prominence and status from the fact that the 'founder' of their family was a member of the King's household. Those who received higher fees were generally members of already established families while those who were paid less seem to have faded into obscurity. Many knights were of French origin, and especially at the time that Henry III's half brothers were in England there were a large number of Poitevin knights. Guy de Rocheford (who was eventually exiled) was one of these, and it would not be unfair to say that the King's household troops often contained a high percentage of foreigners.⁴³ The origins of many knightly families are obscure because they had worked their way up from low social backgrounds and only reached prominence as knights. Knights were not (as such) members of the nobility. However, several of them - particularly the wealthiest - eventually came to be numbered among the King's men. Therefore, while this thesis does include several men who were knights during Henry III's reign, they are not included simply because they were knights, but because their subsequent prominence or their family connections leaves little doubt that they should be considered to form part of the nobility.

Nevertheless it is still extremely worthwhile to study the lists of knights in order to understand who they were and how several of the

subsequent nobles originated as knights and gradually worked their way into the ranks of the nobility.

To summarise, therefore, the list of 294 families presented in Appendix I has been compiled on the following basis. Apart from the English and Anglo-Scottish Earls, who obviously had to be included, three principal criteria have been employed : military summonses, parliamentary summonses, and tenure by barony. Military summonses were clearly in many ways the predecessors of regular parliamentary summonses, being issued in much the same way (individually to the great, and indirectly, through the sheriffs, to the not so great) and, as is well known, late thirteenth-century parliamentary summonses were often based on lists of men summoned to perform military service. As a general rule, men or families who received five or more military summonses have been included among the 294 by virtue of this fact. Secondly, all those who received individual summonses to any of the parliaments held between 1294 and 1300 have been included. These men number over 150, and inevitably this has resulted in a slight bias in numbers towards the end of the century. It is important to note, however, that a substantial majority of those 150 would have been included among the 294 in any case; less than fifty of them are included solely by virtue of a parliamentary summons between 1294 and 1300, while the remainder were also either tenants by barony or receivers of regular military summons, so this late thirteenth-century bias is not excessive. Thirdly, all those tenants-in-chief who paid baronial reliefs in the thirteenth century have been included, provided that the barony for which each tenant paid had not been divided between co-heiresses more than once.

Obviously, the list of 294 families thus achieved cannot be regarded as a definitive list of those in thirteenth-century England who were considered to form the upper stratum of the nobility, but it is important to note that the considerable overlap between the lists of names provided from each source does suggest a high degree of homogeneity within this group. In other words, the three main criteria employed do not provide us with three separate lists pulled together to reach the figure of 294, but, in effect, one main list, the names on which usually derive from two, and sometimes three, of the different types of sources used, with a few additional names drawn from only one type of record. This strongly reinforces the view that there was in reality an upper stratum to the landholding class in thirteenth-century England, numbering in the region of 300 families, who may not have been marked off from the lesser nobility by clearly definable ranks or legal privileges, but who nevertheless did enjoy higher status, and usually greater wealth, than their fellows. The English nobility in 1300, it may be suggested, was not quite as 'undifferentiated' as McFarlane thought.^{43A} Moreover, it can be argued that the criteria used here to compile this list of families would not have accorded ill with contemporary views on the nature of nobility. It was commonplace in mediaeval thinking that the principal duty of those who aspired to nobility was to fight, rather than to work or to pray; hence it is not unreasonable to regard military summonses as a vital basis for selection. Equally, a man would hardly have been considered a noble had he not been a landholder, and again it seems reasonable (in general) to suppose that the upper stratum of the nobility comprised those with the greatest holdings. Finally, although not differentiated by rank or legal privilege, the 'greater' baronage

was talked about on occasions in thirteenth-century England, as for instance when King John referred to his majores barones in clause fourteen of Magna Carta.⁴⁴ Contemporaries, presumably, had some idea of who these majores barones were. The evidence suggests that they can more or less be equated with the 294 families listed in Appendix I.

It is worth comparing studies of the nobility by other researchers in an attempt to select a practical and useful way of showing the information acquired on the nobility and how this can best be interpreted. K. B. McFarlane's attempts to classify and categorise the nobility from 1295 to 1500 in a statistical way have proved invaluable to the researcher who is interested in the fourteenth and fifteenth-century nobility and in illuminating the trends concerning the creation and extinction of titles.^{44A}

Among other contributors to our knowledge of the nobility in this later period are T. B. Pugh in his article 'The Magnates, Knights and Gentry' and P. Contamine's 'The French Nobility and the War', which deals exclusively with the French nobles, but which serves to illustrate a different approach to describing their ascendancy and their demise.

When analysing McFarlane's essay and comparing it to Pugh's, one is immediately given the impression that McFarlane has examined more families and has explored a wider body of material than Pugh has.

McFarlane is examining the whole spectrum of the nobility - he apologises for not having the time to deal with the 3,000 members of the gentry - and has taken pains to examine every one of the 357 families which were summoned to Parliament from 1295 to 1500. McFarlane begins by defining the group he is studying and points out that in 1300 the nobility included the gentry while by 1450 unless a man ^{to Parliament} ~~was summoned~~ [^] he could not be considered to be a noble. McFarlane notes the high turnover among the nobility, but claims that this was widespread, and that the reason for most extinctions was not because of wars or plague but because of the natural rate of extinction among families. As he points out, while the extinction rate generally did not depend on outside influences, the recruitment into the nobility was dependent on the King himself. During the reigns of Kings such as Edward I or Henry IV few new titles were created. However, among others, Richard II and Edward IV created a large number of new peers, thus influencing the balance between the nobility and the gentry.

Other important points brought up by McFarlane include the problems resulting from heiresses who either transferred the family's wealth to another family or divided the property. Windfalls of this kind could often prove to be the 'making' of a new family, as for example the Howards (who received part of the Mowbray inheritance). Tail male and problems resulting from this arrangement is another question McFarlane discusses.

On the subject of why the King created nobles if it was not in his best interest to do so, McFarlane says that Kings created titles for two major reasons : kinship and service. A noble was expected to serve his King in battle and if a King managed to have a large retinue he was much

stronger. Due to John of Gaunt's tremendous affinities the Lancastrian Kings were often more powerful than the Yorkists as McFarlane mentions. He feels, however, that the Yorkist Kings had a greater affinity than is generally believed.

Pugh is more interested in examining trends among the nobility. This is a less scientific and more humanistic approach. He also begins by analysing the magnates and other members of the nobility, and points out that by 1465 no one lower than a baron was a magnate or had the right to be considered a member of Parliament.^{44B}

Pugh examines financial considerations and the influence of certain individuals (such as Warwick or the Wydeville family) simply due to their position or their strength. Again he goes into the attitude of certain Kings who had a high propensity to create new titles but points out that the percentage of nobles to the general population seldom changed.^{44C}

Like McFarlane, Pugh feels that the gentry fell from the nobility instead of the nobility having risen. From 1422 barons were peers, and the gentry were not. Defining the gentry is difficult and Pugh resorts to H. L. Gray's division of these individuals into groups depending on their income. Pugh feels that the first 183 men on Gray's list must be considered to form the 'higher gentry' since many earned as much as the nobles themselves. However, Pugh points out that it is not accurate to solely consider a person's income as a way of categorising him because taxes and affinities might change the true degree of his prominence. Regardless, it is a guide to the approximate standing of one member of the gentry to another. Gray, in particular, mentions ten wealthy commoners, but Pugh considers that this is not as straightforward as it might initially appear.^{44D}

Yet again, Pugh stresses that it was essential for the King to get the support of his magnates. For a noble, a retinue was equally important. Generally ten per cent of a noble's income went toward this purpose. As a tax deduction it helped the nobles while at the same time it extended their sphere of influence.^{44E}

P. Contamine has a different topic to discuss. The French nobility differed from the English nobility in several ways, but France as a country was structured differently. Thus the fourteenth-century writer Philippe de Mezieres divided people into a range of categories depending on their position in society. Evidently this system was too simplified because in many cases one person might fit into different categories. In any case, classifying people in this way could never be useful in any practical sense.^{44F}

In France to be a noble one had first to be a gentleman. Unlike England where a family like the de la Poles could emerge from total obscurity to become a member of the higher nobility in four generations, in France the concept of the 'gentilhomme' prevented this from occurring. Despite this situation, Contamine considers that there may have been up to 50,000 noble families in France in 1328. The subsequent drop in their number only reflected a similar drop in the population of France; their proportion of about one per cent of the population remained unchanged.^{44G}

Probably the most thorough work on the French nobility is Perroy's analysis of the nobility in the county of Forez. This monumental work serves to show that an analysis of this kind would need to be conducted in England on the 3,000 or so gentry families mentioned by McFarlane. Perroy's work shows that there was a rapid rate of extinction among noble families in Forez, and that derogation, or loss of status due to the incompatibility of one's title with a job was widespread.

In England there never was as strong a concept of the 'noblesse' but, nonetheless, a nobleman was unlikely to demean himself by lowering his status in the eyes of his fellow nobles.^{44H}

Clearly McFarlane's work is similar in scope and in detail to Perroy's work on Forez. Interestingly, their observations are very nearly the same. With respect to extinctions, it seems clear that wars and plagues were not unduly responsible for the extinction of families. However, unquestionably there was a high turnover, and fears by nobles of their family dying out and their property being dispersed by coheiresses made the need for an heir even greater. In spite of the large families, few titles or families survived for long.

In terms of recruitments, evidently an analysis of any real thoroughness meets with great problems. It is obviously impossible to trace all the English armigerous families which might be called the gentry. Often they faded into obscurity, and even when a man was summoned, thereby making him noble if one takes McFarlane's definition, often his family and descent cannot be traced. After 1350 creations were limited, and before that date they are difficult to label as such.

McFarlane's approach to his subject is the more thorough, and the one which seems the more conclusive in the end. Pugh has given us an excellent rounding up of the subject, and arrives at almost the same conclusions that McFarlane does. The evidence for his statements is well documented from a variety of different sources,

far more than McFarlane quotes, and he includes some extremely useful insights (such as the fact that incomes may be very misleading in judging the prominence of a person). Both articles serve their purpose, and while there is almost no disagreement between them (Pugh believes that the Yorkists had a greater retinue than McFarlane does) each article contributes valuable and worthwhile points to our knowledge of the nobility in this period. It is, however, McFarlane's work which is the more useful, due in part to its total originality. While Pugh's survey of the subject highlights the main points, McFarlane actually investigates every family he can in order to construct his own set of statistics with which to draw his conclusions. A work of such thoroughness is bound to make any others fade into the background. Nonetheless, the present examination of the nobility of the thirteenth century is an attempt to extend McFarlane's work and to complement it.

In a separate article, McFarlane points out that between 1154 when there were twenty-three Earldoms in existence in England, and 1307, very few new Earls were created. This implies that the reason that there were so few Earls in 1307 was not only that the families had become extinct (or left coheiresses) or that the titles had been forfeited but that a deliberate policy was being pursued. McFarlane describes the Ferrers family as having been unfairly cheated of the Earldom of Derby. Edward I vindictively prevented the Ferrers heirs from regaining their Earldom.⁴⁵

At the death of Aveline de Forz, Countess of Aumale in 1274, McFarlane claims that Edward prevented her lawful heirs from inheriting their lands which were eventually alienated to another family by the King. McFarlane continues with several other examples, and points to

the very favourable dowries that his daughters received after their marriages, at the expense of the families of his daughters' husbands.⁴⁶

By 1307 many of Edward's close relatives held the largest Earldoms. While this strengthened the power and influence of the King, it evidently diminished the possibility that a group of Earls or barons might unite against him as they had with his father. Edward I undoubtedly had a policy, but whether his interest in reducing the number of potential enemies was shortsighted is hard to decide. Certainly because of his policies, the Kingdom regained the stability it had lost, but at the same time, the nobility was undergoing a very extensive change.

Edward cannot be solely held responsible for this. True feudalism was breaking down by the end of the thirteenth century, and with the advent of Parliament, the concept of 'nobility' became less haphazard and much more rigidly defined.

Once the names of all men who were considered tenants-in-chief, who paid baronial relief, whose family owned substantial estates and who were generally men of high 'status' are assembled, the list gradually dwindles down to a group of approximately 300 different families.

The definition of a family becomes extremely important at this stage, because unless the placing of men into a family is consistent, any statistical survey on this group of individuals is likely to be inaccurate.

As a general rule, therefore, I have decided to define a family (insofar as this thesis is concerned) as members of a group who descend from the same individual in the male line as far back as can be traced.

This definition is not, however, without difficulties. The family of the Mandeville Earls of Essex share the same patrilineal ancestor as the family of Fitz John. The earliest known member of this family was Peter de Lutegarshale. However, it would be extremely misleading if these two families were grouped together as one, simply due to their common ancestor. As a result, they are not grouped together and are listed as separate families.

There are two families of Marshall listed separately in this thesis. It is possible, however, that the family of John Marshall and of William Marshall who died in 1265 was descended from an illegitimate son of a brother of William Marshall (the guardian of Henry III from 1216 to 1219 and Earl of Pembroke). The family of the Earls of Pembroke is listed separately in this thesis because the connection between the two families is not fully substantiated.

The family of Fitz William offers another problem. When Joan, daughter of Thomas Fitz William married William Fitz Ralph, their son became known as Ralph Fitz William (not necessarily due to the adoption of his mother's patronymic since his father was William) and this resulted in two different Fitz William families. Due to the custom that families at the time had of adopting their father's name when this was preceded by Fitz (from the Latin filius) it was easy for the following situation to arise:

Peter Fitz Herbert (a counsellor King John) had a son named Reginald Fitz Peter who died in 1285, whose son was John Fitz Reginald whose own son was Herbert Fitz John. This line continued changing their practice and it becomes difficult at times to determine who was who within the family, much less to try and give the family a 'name' as

such. In this case I have opted for Fitz Herbert after the more important members of this family.

The adoption by a man of his mother's family name can also play havoc with any attempts to organise families in an orderly manner. Alan de Multon married Alice daughter of Richard de Lucy who had died leaving no male issue in 1213. Since Alan was only a younger son and an unimportant member of a fairly obscure family, his son and heir Thomas took the name of Lucy which then continued with his descendants. As a result, this family which was known by the name of Lucy was in reality merely a cadet branch of the Multon family. Other examples abound, and it may be appreciated from this that a simple classification of men into one distinctive family is not as easy as it might seem to be.

There are many cases in which families having the same name are not related to each other, or a relationship between the families, while possible, is unknown. The D'Aubigny or De Albaniaco family is one example of this type of situation. The D'Aubigny family from which William D'Aubigny (one of the twenty-five barons associated with Magna Carta) descends originates with Niel a cousin of Rollo, ancestor of William the Conqueror.⁴⁷ A second family (which produced the Earls of Arundel until 1243 when the line came to an end) descends from William D'Aubigny who migrated to England during Henry I's reign.⁴⁸ Another family by the name of D'Aubigny descends from Nigel who was a tenant-in-chief at the time of the Domesday book.⁴⁹ It is of course very possible that these three families were related to each other, but since there is no proof of this connection, I have decided to list them as three different families.

However, when there are two families which descend from one person in the male line but have been separate for many generations it would be wrong to label them as being two different families. They belong to the same family due to the very fact that they generally have the same patronymic and because often estates were divided between two brothers who founded different lines of the same family. An example of this situation is the Fitz Alan family. The family of the Earls of Arundel (from 1291) descended from Alan Fitz Flaad, County of Brittany and Earl of Richmond who died in 1146. His elder son William (who died before 1160) was the ancestor of these Fitz Alans, while his younger son Brian became the ancestor of the Fitz Alans of Bedale whose line became extinct in 1306.⁵⁰ In this case as in many others I have grouped them in one family but have divided the family into two separate sections or branches.

Finally, this selection of 294 families can be considered as representing, broadly, the higher nobility from 1216 to 1300. A broader definition of 'nobility' would have permitted the inclusion of such families as Achard, Cygoyne, Fleming, Hansard, Samford and Upsale, as well as the family of Lusignan (half brothers of Henry III), but for the purpose of this work, I have decided to limit the families to those discussed in the next two sections of this thesis. These 294 families form the core of the nobility in this period, and a study of their origins and descent provides an accurate description and chronology of the continued rise and fall of the nobility.

Chapter II

The Origins of the Thirteenth Century English Nobility

When studying the origins of a family it is important to bear in mind that in the middle ages a family which could demonstrate that its members descended from Royalty or that its earlier forebears were illustrious or famous were considered to belong to a higher rank of the nobility. In a study of the nobility in the thirteenth century there come to light many claims for families which are supposed to have 'accompanied the Conqueror in his invasion of England in 1066'.

It is likely that many of the men who accompanied William in 1066 remained in England, but the descendants of few of these can be determined with absolute certainty.¹ What is clear is that once William had established himself in England many of his Norman countrymen were either summoned to England or came of their own accord. By 1086, as Domesday book shows, a high percentage of the English nobility was of Norman origin. Even when their origins cannot be traced to Normandy, their names leave little doubt that they were of French origin. It cannot be proved, however, that more than a select few accompanied William in 1066.

It is uncertain just what proportion of the ancestry of the nobility was Norman (or French). This is because many of the wives of ancestors of thirteenth century nobles are unknown, or their background is uncertain. It is likely that many of the women were Norman themselves (sisters or daughters of other prominent Lords), but some of them must have been of English origin, thereby adding a fraction of English blood to the blood of their descendants. In this study of family origins,

however, I am limiting the definition of ancestry to refer specifically to the male line ancestors of the nobles concerned. This is the most reasonable approach when dealing with many families whose members married women of obscure and untraced backgrounds.

The aim of this chapter is to trace the ancestry of the individuals who made up the English nobility from 1216 to 1300. This chapter will not attempt to discuss all 294 families included in this study, but will consider some examples of families as representative of the nobility as a whole. Details on the origins of every family will, however, be supplied in the appendix. The task of tracing family origins is complicated by poor documentation and by conflicting information, particularly with early families. Forged pedigrees are not uncommon, and often an error will be repeated by successive researchers. Sources for information on early families are the Patent Rolls, Close Rolls, Pipe Rolls, Domesday book, the Cartae of 1166 and scutage records. There are a great many other original sources which may contribute fragmentary information on certain families as well.

Reliable secondary sources are essential in a study of this kind, and several very dedicated historians have spent years piecing together details from original sources to draw up a more complete picture of these families as a whole.

Undoubtedly one of the most useful and better-researched works on the origins of mediaeval nobility is L. C. Loyd's The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families which lists the ancestry of 315 families - many of which had lost their prominence or had died out before 1216 - with details concerning the place of origin of these families in Normandy. This work makes a tremendous contribution to our present knowledge of

these families especially when concerned with the localities in Normandy from which these families came. A great many French sources and manuscripts have been consulted, and the work may generally be deemed to be accurate.

The Complete Peerage is also of great assistance in the search for family origins because several articles relating to baronial families of the thirteenth century trace the ancestry of the family as far as the earliest known member of that family. The Complete Peerage is not completely thorough, and should be used with caution, as there are several omissions. When tracing individual families it is useful to evaluate some of the contributions by historians to our knowledge of these families. J. H. Round is one of the historians who has contributed greatly with such articles as 'The Families of St. John and of Port',² 'Family of De Clare',³ and 'Family Origins and Other Studies'.⁴ His dedication and thoroughness to detail is exceptional, and most researchers who have subsequently traced early families have agreed with and corroborated his findings. Other works and articles on family origins abound, and inevitably a thorough and comprehensive study of any family provides the basis from which any general study can be derived.

Of the 294 families which made up the nobility of the period from 1216 to 1300, forty-seven can trace their origins with certainty to before Domesday book was commissioned. Corbett believes that there were about 170 fiefs held in chief in 1066 which were large enough to call baronies.⁵ It is evidently the case, however, that many of the families owning these baronies did not survive into the thirteenth century and that others took their place. These forty-seven families were extremely varied, but the majority were of French origin, including nineteen families which originated in Normandy.

Normandy had been settled by the Vikings in the early tenth century and as a result many of the members of the landed class in Normandy were of Scandinavian descent. While this is an undeniable historical fact, it is beyond the possibility of documentary history to allow the claim of the de la Haye family (as an example) that they descend from Sveide, an ancient Norse King, in the direct male line.⁶ L. C. Loyd proves that the de la Haye family took their name from La Haye-du-Puits, near Coutances in North-West Normandy,⁷ and that the first mention of the family in England was in a charter issued by Robert de Haia in 1123.⁸ The de la Haye family was not particularly wealthy, but in 1223 Ralph provided two knights in battle,⁹ and received a military summons in 1243. Ralph died in 1254 and John, his heir, in 1273.¹⁰

A second Norman family was that of Blundeville, Earls of Chester. Their ancestry goes as far back as 890, but the first contact with England was the marriage of Ralph vicomte de Bayeux with Margaret, sister of the Palatine Earl of Chester.¹¹ It was the marriage of their son Ralph le Meschin (who died about 1129) to Lucy (heiress of Bolingbroke and other estates at the time of Domesday book)¹² which provided them with the estates and the status that would make them important members of the twelfth century nobility before the last male member of the family died in 1232.¹³

The Clare family also traces its ancestry back to a Norse King,¹⁴ this time, however, by means of a better-documented line, since the Clares descended from Godfrey de Clare who died about 996 and who was the son of Richard I of Normandy.¹⁵ Godfrey's grandson Richard Fitz Gilbert of Tunbridge (Kent) was the first member of the family to settle

in England, and his grandson became the first Earl of Hertford. In the thirteenth century the Clare family was included among the higher members of the nobility, but being a branch of the family of the Dukes of Normandy they had received a greater patrimony than other families.

The Mortimer family took its name from Mortemer-sur-Eaulne in Normandy,¹⁶ and the first representative of this family in England was Roger de Mortimer, a leader of Norman forces. In general, many of the most powerful families in the thirteenth century had origins dating back to the time of the conquest and were already well established by the time of Domesday book,

There are three unusual examples of families whose ancestry extends beyond the conquest, but which differ from other families in that they did not derive their name from their male line ancestors, but from the family of an heiress who married into their family. The three families in point are the families of Percy, Neville and Stafford.

The Percy family derived its name from Percy-en-Auge in Normandy,¹⁷ and the first member of the family to come to England was William de Percy who was a tenant-in-chief in Domesday book. William's line became extinct in 1175 with the death of his grandson, but the name was continued by Agnes, a daughter and coheiress of this grandson. Agnes was married to Jocelin de Louvain, whose ancestry went back to Giselbert in the ninth century, and their descendants bore the name Percy by right of their ancestors through Agnes' father. In the thirteenth century the Percy family was powerful and had multiplied so that there were several family members. William de Percy and his son Henry were the two senior members of the family in the thirteenth century and were the Lords of Topcliffe, Yorkshire until they received Alnwick in 1309.¹⁸

William and Henry received military summons from the King consistently and can clearly be said to have numbered among the most important members of the nobility.

Consolidation of landed holdings and marriages to wealthy heiresses were two of the most important ways in which a family could make its way up to rank with the nobility and to gain status. The Neville family originated in Normandy and took their name from the town of Neville.¹⁹ Their ancestry can be traced (though very dubiously) to Gilbert the German about 1000.²⁰ However, Gilbert de Neville (named in Domesday book) was the first member of the family in England, and his direct male line included Hugh de Neville of Essex who married Joan, coheiress of the barony of Stogursey. This family became extinct in 1358, but the Neville family from which the Nevilles of Raby and the Earls of Westmorland descended, derived from Isabel de Neville who married Robert Fitz Maldred of Raby. Isabel was the heiress of a senior branch of the Neville family, and as a result her son Geoffrey took his mother's patronymic. The grandsons of Isabel included Robert, who received military summons throughout the 1250's and 1260's,²¹ and who became the ancestor of the Earls of Westmorland, and Geoffrey Neville of Hornby who was the King's knight and was subsequently summoned to the Shrewsbury Parliament in 1283.²² The Fitz Maldred ancestry is interesting. Robert's patrilineal ancestors were the Scottish Earls of Dunbar, themselves an offshoot of the Royal House of Scotland,²³ from whom most of the higher Scottish nobility of the thirteenth century descended.

The Stafford family presents an interesting contrast. The origins of the 'true' Staffords can be traced to Roger de Toeni (who was an

ancestor of the English family of Tony), and from there to the ancient and oft-claimed ancestor Sveide, the Norse King.²⁴ However, in the late 1100's Millicent de Stafford (the heiress of the family) was married to Harvey Bagot (of thus far untraced ancestry) and their descendants took the name of Stafford.²⁵ Hence, the line of Staffords which later became so prominent, descend from a fairly obscure background, and even in the thirteenth century received few military summons, and were not by any means as important as the Percies or the Nevilles.

The Ferrers family descends from Walcheline de Ferrieres, of Ferrieres, Normandy.²⁶ This family reached a higher level of recognition before most of the other noble families of the thirteenth century. Walcheline's grandson Robert was created Earl of Derby by King Stephen²⁷ and their descendants were able to consolidate their estates through successful marriages (such as the thirteenth century marriage of William, 7th Earl of Derby to Margaret de Quincy, heiress of Groby). Since they were Earls during the thirteenth century (although the title was forfeited in 1266) their importance and social 'status' was higher than that of ordinary barons, and although Earls are not always listed in military writs of summons, they were generally the most powerful men in the land. They could provide the King with a sizeable number of knights, or (as in Ferrers' case) could oppose him with a substantial number of followers.

The Bohun family (originally Bohon) has been well researched by Le Melletier²⁸ and his findings show that Raul, the first sire of Mary about the year 920 was the patrilineal ancestor of the family. Claims that the ancestry goes on to the early vicomtes de Beaumont in Maine,²⁹ while likely, are not fully substantiated. There were two important lines of the family in the thirteenth century. The senior line, the

Bohuns of Midhurst, was represented by Frank Bohun who married Sibyl de Ferrars, daughter of the Earl of Derby, and coheirress of one tenth of the barony of Long Crendon.³⁰ Francis received military summons five times from 1256 to 1263 and was an important, if not major, figure of his day.

The junior branch of the Bohun family is better known, and as a result more researched. Henry de Bohun, who was one of the twenty-five Magna Carta barons married Maud Fitz Piers, the heiress of the Mandeville Earldom of Essex which she brought to her son.³¹ Subsequent successful marriages by other members of the family resulted in an extremely powerful family which eventually became one of the wealthiest in England.

The family of Aubigny also originated in Normandy, named after the town of St. Martin d'Aubigny.³² However, it must be stressed that there were three different families of Aubigny (or De Albaniaco) and even though Loyd and others argue convincingly for a close relationship between the Domesday book family of Nigel Aubigny of Cainhoe, Bedford, and the Aubignys of Arundel,³³ the connection is not certain. The Aubigny family which later produced the Earls of Arundel traces its ancestry to William, who migrated to England during the reign of Henry I and whose son William (who died in 1176) married Adeliza, the widow of King Henry I.³⁴ As a result the second William was created Earl of Arundel, from where the line of Earls started. The third family of Aubigny which is possibly the best known, is the family which was established in Belvoir by the time of Domesday book,³⁵ and which produced William D'Aubigny one of the twenty-five Magna Carta barons. The progenitors of this family were the Dukes of Normandy, specifically Niel, a cousin of Rollo of Normandy who lived about the year 900.³⁶

Other families which made up the nobility of thirteenth century England and which originated in Normandy before the time of Domesday book were the families of Bosco (or Bois), Brus, Chaworth, Gurney, Harecourt, Lovel of Titchmarsh, Redvers (subsequently Earls of Devon), Port (subsequently St. John), Stuteville, Tony and Warenne.

There were thirteen other noble families from the thirteenth century which seem to have originated in France but outside of Normandy. These are generally families which have not been as well documented, and in several cases their exact provenance is unknown, but there are certain indications that they did originate in or around France, not the least of which are their names.

The Dukes of Brittany were from the eleventh century also designated Earls of Richmond. This was an honorary title since Brittany was often allied with England in this period, but because the Dukes of Brittany had territorial possessions they classify as members of the English nobility even though they were usually thought of as foreigners. Their ancestry extended to the early Counts of Savoy,³⁷ which gave them the same ancestry as Peter of Savoy who was an important landholder and a member of the English nobility in the 1250's and 1260's.

The family of Dynant or Dinan was also from Brittany and originated with Ammon de Dinan about the year 1000. In the thirteenth century Geoffrey de Dynant, Lord of Hartland in Devon and his son Oliver were members of the nobility, both being summoned to fight on several occasions,³⁸ with Oliver becoming a member of the Parliamentary peerage before his death in 1299.³⁹

Originating from another part of France was the family of Forz which descended from the marriage of Eudes, Count of Champagne with

Adelaide of Aumale, the sister of William the Conqueror.⁴⁰ The first Earl of Aumale and Lord of Holderness was Stephen, their son, who died in 1130. The 'true' male ancestry of the Forz family stemmed from the marriage of Hawise of Aumale with William de Forz at the end of the twelfth century.⁴¹ In the 1250's, William Count of Aumale received several military summons as one of the King's men.

The Grandison family (sometimes named Graunzon in thirteenth century manuscripts) only became prominent in the latter part of the thirteenth century. Otto de Grandison began receiving military summons in 1275⁴² and his brother William (who acquired the honour of Ashperton in Herefordshire) was summoned to Parliament from 1298. Despite the fact that their arrival in England was not until the 1250s,

they came from a well-established noble background, being the sons of Pierre, Seigneur de Granson, on the lake of Neufchatel, whose ancestry remounted to Hirschibert, who lived in the late tenth century in the same area.⁴³

The Montague (or Monte Acuto) family was French and possibly originated in Blois or Normandy. They descended from Drogo who was listed in Domesday book, and whose descendants William (who died in 1270) and Simon his son (who died in 1316) were prominent members of the nobility in the reigns of Henry III and Edward I. Both William and Simon received several military summons and Simon was a member of the Parliamentary peerage being consistently summoned after 1296. The Montagues became more prominent in the fourteenth century, especially after they received the title of Earl of Salisbury.

The Sudeley family is interesting because it descends from Count Dreux who was married to Goda, sister of Edward the Confessor.⁴⁴

Dreux's ancestry goes back to Valerin de Vexin, about the year 920, but this pedigree is not reliable.⁴⁵ Dreux's marriage to Goda was probably responsible for the creation of his son Ralph as Earl of Hereford, and possibly for the fact that he held Sudeley from which the family derived its name. Sudeley was held by Ralph before the Norman Conquest.⁴⁶ In the thirteenth century the Sudeleys did not stand out particularly among the nobility, but Bartholomew (who died in 1280) and his son John received military and Parliamentary writs of summons respectively,⁴⁷ and continued to hold the honour of Sudeley throughout the century. The family is a good example of one which survived for over three centuries without producing heirs who married into any other particularly important families, but which generally remained fairly stable and devoid of brilliance.

The family of Veteri Ponte (or Vipont) descended from William de Vieuxpont⁴⁸ who lived about the middle of the eleventh century. In 1203 Robert de Vipont was granted custody of the barony of Appleby in Westmorland, together with the position of sheriff of Westmorland for the service of four knights' fees.⁴⁹ The Veteri Ponte family did not survive long, becoming extinct in the year 1264 with the death of Robert (grandson of the grantee).⁵⁰ He left two daughters who took their share of the barony to the families they had married into (the Cliffords and the Cromwells) thereby giving them the 'status' which they had not quite achieved until then. Members of the Veteri Ponte family received military summons consistently from 1220 to 1262⁵¹ and are an example of a short-lived but highly noticeable family whose founding member (Robert) was evidently rewarded for service to the King and whose great-granddaughters were to become wealthy heiresses.

There were two Berkeley families of Gloucestershire, which may have been, but cannot be proved to be, connected. The better-known family which produced the powerful nobles of the later middle ages originated with Eadnoth who was killed in 1068.⁵³ His great-grandson Maurice Fitz Robert married Alice of Berkeley from where the family derived its name. Several marriages by members of the family to the daughters of wealthy Lords (such as the marriage of Thomas (who died in 1243) to Joan de Somery the daughter of the heiress of William Marshal, Earl of Pembroke) helped establish the family.⁵⁴ This Thomas provided three knights' fees in 1223,⁵⁵ and his own son Maurice (who married an illegitimate grand-daughter of King John), was one of the King's household knights and subsequently received several military writs of summons until his death in 1281.⁵⁶

The second family of Berkeley, of Dursley, Gloucestershire was already established by the time of Domesday book. Roger already held extensive lands of the King.⁵⁷ This family was not particularly conspicuous in the thirteenth century and there is no evidence of members of the family being summoned to any of the King's campaigns.

Another well-established family which became part of the English nobility were the Bryans. Guy de Bryan who married Eve, daughter and heiress of Henry de Tracy (a powerful noble of the early thirteenth century and included in this survey) became the 'governor' of Cardigan and Cernmerdyn, two of the King's castles in Wales and his own son Guy became the 'governor' of the castle at Haverford.⁵⁸ The Bryans, whose ancestry remounts to before the Norman Conquest, are a clear example of a family which owed its noble status to the service it gave the King. Guy de Bryan (the younger) was one of the King's household knights and

was in the King's service from 1276 to 1301,⁵⁹ and was as a result one of the King's longest-serving officials.

The Windsor family of Eton, Buckinghamshire descended from Walter Fitz Other who was a Lord in Domesday book. The family adopted the name of Windsor about the year 1160,⁶⁰ but other than supplying one knight's fee in the 1231 campaign⁶¹ there is no evidence to suggest that the Windsor family was represented by knights in battle.

France was not the only region from which noble families originated. Among the thirteenth-century nobility of England there were several families of Welsh and Scottish origin, although it must be understood that only the nobles who owned substantial lands in England or who were summoned by the King of England are included in this discussion.

The Scottish nobles were of an entirely different background. The Earls of Dunbar of Beanley, Northumberland were prominent in the thirteenth century with a succession of four Earls by the name of Patrick as owners of the barony in the thirteenth century.⁶² The descent of this family was from the ancient Kings of Scotland with Gospatric, Earl of Northumbria (who died in 1075) being the grandson of Crinan of Scotland.⁶³ The fourth Patrick was only summoned once, in 1298, but the wealth of his family's holdings were substantial, and he can be considered to be not only an important Scottish noble, but one of the English King's men.

From 1233 to 1237 the county palatine of Chester was held by John the Scot, who was the son of Maud de Blundeville, coheiress of

the county.⁶⁴ Maud had married David of Scotland, hence the descent of their son John from the ancient line of Scottish Kings. Although John's tenure was for only four years the importance of the title he held makes it essential to include him among the nobility.

David Strathbogie, Earl of Atholl was a significant landholder in the middle of the thirteenth century. His father was descended through the ancient Earls of Fife from King Malcolm Canmore of Scotland, and his mother was Ada de Hastings, daughter of the previous Earl of Atholl.⁶⁵ His marriage to Isabel de Dover of Chilham⁶⁶ helped to consolidate the family's position in England.

There are several other families who were already prominent enough by the time of Domesday book that sufficient documentation remains to permit their inclusion within the group of nobles, but whose origins are undetermined insofar as locality is concerned.

It is not clear where the Vescy family came from, but Ralph the Moneyer who died in 1061 was their progenitor. Ralph's grandson Eustace Fitz John married Beatrice de Vescy (of Norman origins)⁶⁷ and the family descended from this marriage. The family remained prominent, with Eustace de Vescy (one of the most persistent opponents of King John) being included among the twenty-five barons *associated with* Magna Carta. John and William de Vescy were in the King's service at the end of the thirteenth century.⁶⁸ Although it might not be the case (should further research be undertaken) it is probable that the thirteenth century Vescy family descended in the male line from English *landholders* before the Norman Conquest.

One of the two Fitz William families which were prominent in the thirteenth century was the one from which Thomas Fitz William descended.

He received military writs of summons in the 1240's,⁶⁹ and left a line which did not actually produce Parliamentary peers until the reign of Edward III,⁷⁰ though their prominence was evident. Thomas Fitz William traced his ancestry back to William Fitz William, who was said to be a cousin of King Edward the Confessor,⁷¹ although this assertion is not proven. In any case, the ancestry of the Fitz William family goes back to before the time of the Norman Conquest, and here too is a family which maintained its noble status from before 1066 to beyond the thirteenth century.

The two families of Despenser (which may be connected if they share a common ancestor living in or before the eleventh century) are of unknown origin.

There is no certainty as to the provenance of Thurstan le Despenser (whose son received Worthy and Stanley from Henry II)⁷³ or Thomas le Despenser (father of Hugh who was sheriff of Stafford and Salop), the earliest known ancestors of the two families. In the thirteenth century Thurstan le Despenser joined the King in the campaigns of 1228 and 1230 and provided one knight's fee for each.⁷⁴ In 1241 and 1243⁷⁵ he received military writs of summons, but other than these instances, and the actions of his son Adam who joined the barons against the King, this family of Despenser was not particularly prominent. The second family of Despenser which would subsequently provide the famous Hugh the elder and Hugh the younger in the reign of Edward II was not particularly illustrious either until the end of the thirteenth century. Hugh le Despenser the elder was the great-grandson of Thomas le Despenser, whom Cokayne suggests may have taken his name from the office of dispenser to the Earls of Chester.⁷⁶ The Despenser family is one of the families to which most erroneous information has

been added, and as a result it has been difficult for historians to deduce the true circumstances of the original family. J. H. Round⁷⁷ attempted to examine the evidence for both families and his report remains the definitive answer to any claims concerning the family's origins beyond the point at which the Despensers emerge as an important and prominent family.

The number of families which were established in England before 1066 whose ancestry can be reliably traced is limited, and few other than the very powerful nobles are included in this group. Domesday book provides us with the first mention of a large number of the families which are examined in this thesis, and it is these families which had benefitted most (by being given lands and vassals) from King William's conquest. Since most of these families were of Norman origin, and because their origins in Normandy cannot be traced with any precision, it is not easy to determine whether they formed part of the higher nobility before reaching England.

In Domesday book, Walter d'Aincourt, Lord of Blankney, is listed as a substantial landowner. Although the family is probably from Aincourt in Normandy, there is no evidence that Walter originated there, though he probably arrived in England at the time of the Norman Conquest or shortly afterwards.⁷⁸ In the thirteenth century the family was not of great consequence, but they continued to hold Blankney and other estates in Lincolnshire and were marrying within the circle of the nobility. Oliver de Aincourt provided the King with three knights' fees in 1218 and with five in 1223, but this decreased to two in 1230 and in 1245.⁷⁹ The family maintained its level of 'status' enough so that in the 1290's Edmund de Aincourt was summoned to Parliament.⁸⁰

Another prominent family in the thirteenth century which is first mentioned at the time of Domesday book but whose ancestry prior to that remains dubious, is the Mauduit family. Loyd has established that the family name derived from Saint-Martin-du-Boisc,⁸¹ and Pipe Rolls concur with his decision.⁸² Domesday book names a William Mauduit, but it was not until William Mauduit became chamberlain to King Henry I⁸³ that the family began to gain ground. In the thirteenth century another William Mauduit married Alice de Beaumont, a half sister of Henry, fifth Earl of Warwick,⁸⁴ and due to the subsequent extinction of the Beaumont family, William's son inherited the Earldom of Warwick in 1263. Not many families rose to such heights as fast as this, but the Mauduit family provides an outstanding example of a fast-rising family which stemmed from fairly obscure origins. The Earldom only remained in the Mauduit family until 1268 when it went to the Beauchamps.

The family of St. Quintin is another, if less prominent, family which is first mentioned at the time of Domesday book. Richard de St. Quintin helped fight against the Welsh in 1090,⁸⁵ and Loyd considers that the family was from St. Quentin des Iles in Normandy. Though the family does not appear to have achieved the prominence which other families surviving from Domesday book to the thirteenth century had, several members of the family were active in the middle of the century⁸⁶ and in 1294 Herbert de St. Quintin received a summons to Parliament. A family such as the St. Quintins clearly falls into a lower category than the Aincourt or Mauduit families. The sheer survival of the family which held no estates of importance and the fact that members of the family were occasionally but not consistently summoned to military ventures goes against the trend which most families seem to have followed. Those families which survived longest were generally the more powerful ones,

and they became more powerful the longer they lasted in the group of 'nobles'. If they lost the 'status' acquired by holding estates, receiving military summons or marrying into other wealthy families these families would begin to decline - gradually if their loss of 'status' was minimal, but very quickly if they could not manage to prevent one damaging event from occurring after another. The family of St. Quintin does not ^{however,} fit this pattern,

The Blund family derived from Robert Blund who was already Lord of Ashfield by 1080.⁸⁷ The family controlled the barony for five successive generations until its extinction in 1264. The barony was substantial, the two coheiresses married into the families of Criketot and Valoynes and in both cases dragged these families from virtual obscurity into becoming significant if not prominent members of the thirteenth century nobility.⁸⁸ There is no record as to the origins of Robert Blund however, and as his name does not appear to be of French origin it is possible that he was a member of a family which had controlled a barony before the Conquest and was able to maintain his hold on the barony. This family, then, demonstrates a case of survival for several generations. In the 1250's and 1260's William Blund was evidently an important figure, he was receiving repeated writs of summons⁸⁹ and his death at Lewes in 1264 when he held his barony of Ashfield for the service of five knights' fees⁹⁰ demonstrates the fact that consolidation rather than expansion was the way in which the Blund family retained its importance.

The Clifford family will serve as a final example of the families which originated at about the time of Domesday book. Although the progenitor of the Clifford family (Ponce) is listed in Domesday book, his

origins are unknown. In the middle of the thirteenth century the members of the Clifford family made several extremely favourable marriages which helped establish their status. Roger de Clifford was a King's knight from 1226 to 1230, his fee being £30,⁹¹ among the highest. He married Sibyl, the widow of Robert Tregoz, another of the King's household knights, and their son Roger married Isabel de Veteri Ponte, coheiress of Robert of Appleby.⁹² By this time the Cliffords had become a powerful noble family whose knights' fees were well in excess of the two that Walter de Clifford (the father of the first Roger) had paid in 1218.⁹³ In the 1290's Robert de Clifford, the senior representative of the Cliffords married Maud de Clare which gave the family added 'status' and inevitably increased its prospects.

The Clifford family suffered one setback in the thirteenth century, however. Walter de Clifford, eldest brother of Roger de Clifford (senior) died in 1263 leaving a single daughter, Maud, who married William Longespee, so-called Earl of Salisbury.⁹⁴ The Clifford estates in Herefordshire passed to Maud's descendants, and eventually to the Lestrangle family. The way in which families could and often did lose estates through leaving daughters is thus illustrated. The younger branch of the Clifford family was fortunate to maintain their level of wealth due to successive profitable marriages and owing to their original wealth which was enough to minimise the serious upset caused by the death of Walter whose estates did not pass on to his younger brother.

In summary, of the 294 families which made up the nobility in the thirteenth century, 119 can claim a direct male ancestor who lived before 1100, and about whom something more than a name is known. The remaining 175 families which made up the thirteenth century nobility included many men who were the first members of their families to be

in the King's service or who had gained their high position due to a marriage (either their own or one of their immediate ancestors) which had added to or started off their family estates.

While these families all form part of the nobility it is clear that few form part of the higher nobility. The reasons for this occurrence are not difficult to explain. A family needed a certain amount of time before it became properly established, and unless the family was very fortunate it usually took several generations of good marriages and careful expansion before a family's status increased.

It is clear that the conquest of England in 1066 saw the fall of many of the families which had reached a prominent position and replaced these families with Norman ones. The eleventh century was the time when new noble dynasties could be started without excessive and lengthy preparation, after the first wave of new families had become established there were less opportunities for other families to reach their level. The Kingdom after 1066 was able to accommodate a large influx of new nobles because the previous 'nobles' had been forced into submission. However, once these new men were established they did not allow for a further penetration of new nobles - the nobility of England had, for the time being, reached its satiation point.

This does not mean to say, however, that the men who became part of the nobility after 1100 were necessarily less powerful. The Huse family provides an example of a family which became powerful in the thirteenth century, even though its origins before 1169 are obscure. In that year Henry Huse founded the abbey of Dureford in Sussex and later died in the Holy Land.⁹⁵ His descendant Hubert Huse became the highest ranking of the King's household knights in the thirteenth

century, receiving a fee of £100 annually from 1225 to 1230.⁹⁶ In 1283 Henry Huse was summoned to Parliament at Shrewsbury and his son was summoned to several sessions of Parliament from the 1290's on.⁹⁷ It is interesting to note here that the Huse family disappeared as abruptly as it emerged. After 1478 they remain untraced.⁹⁸

Among the more prominent families of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries were the Audleys. This family originated with Luilf who lived in the middle part of the 1100's, but their prominence only started in the early part of the thirteenth century when Henry de Alditheley bought up a lot of land.⁹⁹ It is not clear how Henry had the means to do this, but he was able to provide for his son James who married Ela, daughter of William Longespee, so-called Earl of Salisbury, thereby increasing the status of the family.¹⁰⁰ The Alditheley family (subsequently Audley) thus provide one of the few examples of a family whose origins cannot be traced beyond the mid-twelfth century, but who went from near-obscurity to the upper ranks of the nobility in less than 150 years.

For the most part, however, the noble families of the thirteenth century which originated in the twelfth century are among the lesser-known of the families. The Plugenet family originated with Hugh de Plugenet who received the manor of Headington from Queen Matilda.¹⁰¹ Although the exact descent of the family is not clear, Alan de Plugenet who was a nephew of Robert Walerand of the barony of Pulverbatch¹⁰² married Alice de Rocheford and their son Alan was summoned to Parliament several times beginning in 1283.¹⁰³ Perhaps the Plugenets were not a particularly important family, but they possessed a manor and a barony (at different times) and their lands (when divided between coheiresses)

were a substantial benefit to the families which inherited them.

The Morley family is first mentioned in a feet of fines for Norfolk in the reign of Richard I.¹⁰⁴ The Robert de Morley mentioned in that document was the father of Matthew, a justice in Norfolk who died after 1250¹⁰⁵ and whose grandson William was summoned to Parliament on two occasions before 1301, and received military summons from 1295 on. Little else is known about the Morley family, and it is unlikely that much more will be found, since a family which did not become particularly prominent would not have left much documentation.

The Scoteny family was probably of Norman origins. Loyd suggests that the name derived from Etocquigny in Normandy,¹⁰⁶ but until Walter de Scotiniis issued charters for Robertsbridge abbey about the year 1180¹⁰⁷ little can be unearthed. It is clear, however, that Walter's father, named Hugh, married Bertha de Criol, heiress of the barony of Stainton le Vale in Lincolnshire.¹⁰⁸ The Scoteny family again offers an example of a son taking his mother's patronymic, in this case two cousins. When Lambert de Scoteny died in 1202 his heirs were the descendants of two nieces¹⁰⁹ whose sons each took on the name of Scoteny. As a result the name of Scoteny which should have become extinct in 1202 continued beyond the end of the thirteenth century.

Although the Segrave family would eventually become a well-known and important noble family, in the thirteenth century the Segraves were not very powerful. The family originated with Hereward of Segrave who was probably born in the middle of the twelfth century. His origins are uncertain, but he may have been of Saxon descent. The family derived its name from the settlement of Seagrave in Lincolnshire and Gilbert, his son, held a quarter of a knight's fee in 1166.¹¹⁰ The

prominence of the family derived from Gilbert's son Stephen who was an important figure in the early part of Henry III's reign, and was partly responsible for the fall of Hubert de Burgh.¹¹¹ The Segrave family, which was subsequently a significant force among the nobility owed its status to the service provided by Stephen to the King. Subsequent family marriages helped the family's progress, but the Segraves owed their status not to inheritances but to the service provided by Stephen de Segrave and his descendants.

The Fitz Osberts were a very minor noble family in the thirteenth century, their earliest recorded ancestor being Osbert Fitz William who held four knights' fees of the Bigod family in 1166;¹¹² his son Roger was the warden of Yarmouth fair in the 1230's. However, Roger's grandson, another Roger, was summoned to Parliament in 1294,¹¹³ and though his noble status rests on this, the mere fact that Edward I sent him a writ of summons suggests that the Fitz Osberts had become an important family. At the time of his death in 1306, Roger had accumulated the manors of Somerleyton, Wade, Uggeshall, Ilketshall, Hadestone and Whitlingham, all in Norfolk and Suffolk,¹¹⁴ acquired from different sources, and made two important marriages which brought him further income.

The preceding examples of thirteenth century noble families which originated in the twelfth century serve to illustrate the fact that most of the families which had only been prominent in the last one hundred years had not yet achieved the higher standing that more established families had. It is clear that accumulation of wealth over several generations was required (for the most part) before families could expect to become more prominent members of the nobility.

There remains a substantial group of thirteenth century nobles whose ancestry is untraced beyond the year 1200. It is, of course, likely that in some cases further work and research into the earliest known member of the family will shed some light on their provenance. However, in most cases the 'founder' of the family was an individual who emerged, as it were, out of the blue, and whose origins can never be adequately established.

There can be no more remarkable case than that of Ralph de Monthermer (alternatively known as de Mahermer) who was married to Joan, daughter of Edward I and widow of Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester and Hertford. Widows were prone to marrying men of lower ranks, but Monthermer is referred to as a 'member of the Earl's household',¹¹⁵ and it would seem that his attraction was less material than physical.¹¹⁶ The King forced the imprisonment of Monthermer after the marriage, but Monthermer was eventually pardoned,¹¹⁷ and he and Joan had two sons. In right of his wife, Monthermer was styled Earl of Gloucester and Hertford (*jure uxori*), and as such was summoned to Parliament on several occasions. Once his wife had died, however, he ceased to be an Earl and was summoned as a baron.¹¹⁸ The Earldom then passed to Joan's elder son by her first husband, while Monthermer's sons, who were, it must be remembered, the King's grandchildren, were never summoned to Parliament.

What is extraordinary about this case is that Monthermer's rise was instantaneous. His family had not had to gradually rise to the ranks of the nobility for several generations, but instead with a marriage to the widow of one of the most powerful men in the realm, and actually the daughter of the King, Monthermer rose far faster than

could ever have been expected. However, it is apparent that a sudden rise (as with the Huse family) in family fortunes often resulted in a sudden fall once the important figure in the family had died and his influence had disappeared. The Monthermers were in the limelight for only a few years, and once Monthermer's wife was dead they returned to the obscurity they had emerged from.

Most of the noble families which originated in the thirteenth century were less noticeable. Robert Aguilon was the second husband of Joan de Ferrars (one of seven coheiresses of William, Earl of Derby who had died in 1254).¹¹⁹ Aguilon's parentage is unknown, although his name would suggest French origins. He received several military writs of summons but died leaving a sole heiress whose inheritance consisted primarily of her mother's share of the great Marshall inheritance.

Another case in point is that of Elias de Rabayne, who was French¹²⁰ and whose marriage to Maud de Bayeux of Thoresway gave him a large inheritance. Elias was an important man in Henry III's army, receiving summons from 1251 to 1282,¹²¹ and providing the King with the service of one and a half knights' fees,¹²² but at his death in 1285 his two sons, who were minors, did not receive their mother's land. Here then is a case where a successful marriage by one man did not result in any benefits to his heirs because of his untimely death and because of his wife's inability to maintain her lands and to keep her son's interests in mind.

An example of a rise to the ranks of the nobility in the thirteenth century due to service rather than to a profitable marriage is the case of Hugh de St. Philibert. Hugh was in the King's service from 1206 to 1240, and although he joined the barons against King John, he became an

important figure in Henry III's reign and was in charge of shipping troops to France in 1230.¹²³ The service of this man (whose ancestry is undetermined) provided for his descendants who were significant if uninspiring members of the nobility for several generations.

The family of Gousle or Gousehill descended from Giles de Goushill of Goxhill, Lincolnshire who was sheriff of Lincoln in 1267.¹²⁴ His son, Peter, who died in 1286 was summoned to Parliament in 1277 and 1283 and was an established member of the nobility. Giles's ancestry is, however, unknown and it seems to be the case that despite his non-noble origins Giles managed to provide his descendants with estates simply due to his service to the King.

Thomas de Gorges was of the King's household knights in 1233 and 1234 at which time he received 100 marks.¹²⁵ His descendants were not prominent, however, and it can be assumed that despite his service to the King, and despite Ralph de Gorges's marriage to a coheiress, the Gorges family was unable to maintain the status required of a noble for very long.

There are many interesting cases of other families which acquired the status of a 'noble' in a great variety of ways. It is clear however that when considering the origins of families which made up the nobility in the thirteenth century two distinct groups emerge.

The first group concerns the members of the nobility whose families had been prominent before the year 1100. In most cases the families which still survived in the thirteenth century were the most prominent and made up the highest tier of the nobles. Included in this group is a very small selection of families which were already established in

England before the Norman Conquest. Evidently most of the important families from these early times were removed by the invading Normans, and their names and families are unknown.

The 'new men' who almost totally replaced the existing nobles in the late eleventh century consisted of families which originated in and around Normandy, together with a few other French families, which subsequently became part of the English nobility. Some of the men who settled in England already belonged to noble or near-noble families. However, this is not the case with all the families, and evidently some men achieved a high status in England because they were associated with the King, or with other nobles (either before or after arriving in England).

The second group of nobles were those who established themselves in England after 1100. In the thirteenth century there are many prominent examples of men arriving due to connections with the King. Elias de Rabayne was from Poitou, as were several others who arrived at the same time. Peter of Savoy became an important landowner in England, and Henry III's Lusignan half-siblings were important nobles who did not however (with the exception of William de Valence and Alice who married John de Warenne, Earl of Surrey) remain in England.¹²⁶

Many in this group derived their noble status through marriage. A non-noble could join the nobility if he married an heiress or coheiress and was able to establish himself, depending on whether his wife owned large estates or had close affinities to other members of the nobility. Marriage to an heiress was an easy way of gaining a foothold into the nobility, but it might not be until the second generation that this new family could be considered to form part of the nobility as such.

Service to the King was another effective method of gaining admission to the nobility. This method was more subjective and depended on the King. Henry III had to wage a civil war against some of his wealthy and powerful barons, ^{and} McFarlane believes that Edward I's attitude hardly betrayed enthusiasm to increase the number of his natural companions, as a means of keeping the nobility under control.¹²⁷ In any case, there are several examples of families which became noble as a result of their connections with the King, and evidently faithful service over a period of years was often well rewarded. Generally speaking, the men who became nobles by service to the King came from the knightly or esquire classes, so it may have taken a generation before they became fully integrated into the nobility.

Thus, among the men who joined the ranks of the nobility after 1100 there were clearly different routes to attaining this position of which service to the King and marriage to a noble heiress were clearly the most important.

Generally speaking, families which trace their origins to the time of Domesday book, and which survived until the thirteenth century, were by that time, among the most powerful families. At the same time, thirteenth century families whose earliest known member lived after 1100 were generally noble families of slightly lower status. As this was only a trend, there are naturally many exceptions. However, the longer a family continued to retain its noble status, the more prominent it tended to become.

One argument against this trend is that the higher nobility's ancestors are better documented simply because subsequent research has tended to explore these families at the expense of the lesser known

nobles. There may be some truth in this theory; moreover, it cannot be denied that the obscure ancestors of the Bigod family have been minutely examined, and the Corbet family of Cause have received greater scrutiny than other families, simply because Henry I's mistress and the mother of several of his illegitimate children belonged to this family. On the other hand, the Erleye or the Kilpeck families, because of their lack of notoriety, have received scant attention, and further research could prove fruitful. In spite of this, in the majority of cases, information on prominent thirteenth century families is more easily available in earlier centuries due to the simple fact that most were already established families. Prominent thirteenth century noble families were, on the whole, well-established families which had been 'noble' for at least a century, and which had not derived their wealth from other families, but had been granted lands by the Conqueror. It is this essential difference which separates the two groups. The 'magnates' of the thirteenth century were the descendants of men who had not had to work their way up to join the nobility, but had, instead, been handed the lands and men which had belonged to the earlier nobility. The second group of nobles did not have the same origins, and could only rise to join the older nobility under special circumstances. While the older families survived there was very little chance of advancement by those who ranked below them. However, old families were constantly becoming extinct. The Blundeville, Quincy and Marshal families, among others, all became extinct in the thirteenth century, and the Bigod and Clare families became extinct in the first part of the fourteenth century.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw the emergence of a large number of lesser noble families, included in this survey, but not until

after the end of the century did any of these 'newer' families actually replace the families which had existed from the time of Domesday book. This does not mean that the families at the time of the conquest were all extraordinarily successful in avoiding extinction, but rather that enough had survived as late as the thirteenth century to maintain their hold over the higher ranks of the nobility.

Evidently two significant divisions existed within the ranks of the thirteenth century nobility. The first separated the forty or fifty 'magnates' or higher nobility from the less wealthy men who did nonetheless own large estates and who were important members of the feudal army. Most Earls and a few nobles such as Robert de Gurney belonged in the 'magnate' category. The second level of stratification contained the remaining nobles, and these men numbered about 250. After this division, it may be claimed that the 'undifferentiated' (to use McFarlane's label) completed the rest of the knightly class. Studying the origins of families provides us with this information, and although it is only half the picture, it gives us an idea of how families were recruited into the nobility, and how their diverse origins resulted in an effective and cohesive group which influenced events in thirteenth century England significantly.

Chapter III

The Descent and Eventual Outcome of the Thirteenth Century Nobility

Tracing the descent of a thirteenth century noble family is often as difficult as trying to find its origins. Although many noble families left heirs whose descendants are easily traced, there are a substantial number of families whose descendants simply disappeared from all written records.

The Parliamentary Peerage formalised the concept of a hereditary nobility, and after 1300 few of the men who were summoned to Parliament left descendants who were not summoned after the death of the first peer. However, before the peerage was established, there were many prominent nobles who for some reason lost their 'status' and as a result their sons and descendants did not pay scutage, hold large estates, or receive military summons.

Families became extinct at an alarmingly fast rate, and although this might provide another family with new estates, it did not, in the thirteenth century, result in a consolidation of estates, because very often the heiresses had married men whose families did not belong to the nobility. An example of this situation is the family of Gurney. When John, the last member of the family died in 1291 his daughter and heiress was married to John Ap Adam who came from a modest knightly family.¹ In this case, the extinction of one family was the reason by which the other family entered the ranks of the nobility, but it can be seen that in the thirteenth century the extinction of one family did not always result in a consolidation of estates by the rest of the nobles.

Consolidation refers to the accumulation of estates by the wealthier nobles, but not necessarily in one particular region. The situation appears to have changed in the following century.

The majority of families became extinct within a century of their recruitment into the nobility. This is particularly the case with families which became noble between 1100 and 1300. Although earlier families seem to have lasted longer, the explanation for this event lies in the fact that there were a great many other families which became extinct before 1216, and that those remaining after that year were merely the survivors.

The definition of 'extinction' when applied to a family should be explained in detail because the following discussion will depend on the understanding and the acceptance of the specific definition used for the purpose of this work.

When the last male line descendant of a man who was a member of the thirteenth century nobility died, this family is held to have become extinct. A male line descendant does not necessarily have to be the heir of the original noble because he may be descended from a junior branch of the family. An example of this is the family of Aubigny. The family which was established in Belvoir at the time of Domesday book continued through the family of the Lords Daubeny up to the year 1548. The death of Henry, the last member of this family, who had been created Earl of Bridgwater, caused the extinction of this branch of the family.² However, the family survived with a collateral relative who was still descended in the male line from the original Aubigny family, to the extent that the family survives today.³

The fact that this family survives today does, of course, make it an exception, since of the 294 families studied, only nine are known to survive to this day, according to my definition. McFarlane defined extinction as occurring when the senior line of the family became extinct, regardless of whether junior branches survived. I have chosen not to follow this definition because in the thirteenth and early fourteenth century when fee simple was the usual form of inheritance rather than entails, a junior branch of a family could inherit property before the daughters of a noble did. In any case, I consider that a family was not extinct until every known male line descendant had died, while McFarlane's definition limits this situation considerably.

It must be made clear that when a title passed through a daughter, this signified an extinction of the family if no male line heir of the first noble survived. A family whose title continued through an heiress is not held to be the same family, but a new one regardless of whether the new family adopted the titles and names of the earlier family from which they descended in the female line. Equally important is the fact that an illegitimate descendant of a family cannot be considered to be a male line descendant of the nobles (even though genetically he was) simply because he did not receive the titles and estates of his father. When he did, he would have had to be legitimised in which case his descendants would be included in this study.

Finally, in many cases a family faded into obscurity and disappeared, and while it is possible and even probable that the descendants of these families survived for many years, because they are untraced, efforts to examine their families must be abandoned. The Complete Peerage, when discussing the Huse family (of which no members were summoned to

Parliament after 1349), completes its discussion of the Huse descendants by stating (in reference to the attempts by Thomas Huse in the fifteenth century to claim several estates and the hereditary barony of 1295) that 'having carried the presumable descent of the peerage down to this point, the Editors do not feel justified in pursuing it further'.⁴ Statements such as these are typical when a once-prominent family has faded into such obscurity that any attempts to trace the eventual descent of the family would necessarily include an extensive amount of research into relatively unknown and unimportant families.

The descent of a family is frequently complicated by changes of names and by examples in which the estates or the titles which should have continued to the descendants of the nobles were forfeited or lost for some other reason. One prominent example is mentioned by McFarlane and concerns the descendants of Robert Ferrers, Earl of Derby who 'was in 1269 persuaded under duress to make over his great and ancient patrimony and with it his earldom to Henry III's younger son Edmund'.⁵ Regardless of the reasons behind the deprivation of this earldom, it is certainly very irregular that Robert's descendants did not inherit their birthright, but the example cannot be taken as an exception, since there are several other (less well documented) cases in which economic troubles resulted in the loss of family estates. The Brun family, first became prominent due to the marriage of Richard le Brun to Albreda, daughter of Walter de Cormeilles of Tarrington.⁶ Tarrington had been divided in four after 1176 and Albreda's descendants inherited only her share. Despite this, the Bruns gained a sizeable estate and sufficient 'status' to be considered noble. However, they never achieved much prominence and in 1315 the Brun's share of Tarrington was alienated.⁷ The reasons for this alienation are unknown but it is possible that the family had

lost its revenue and could no longer maintain the estates they had inherited. In any case, the Bruns had evidently lost a great deal of standing by the end of the thirteenth century since there is no record of any military summons for members of the family.

A similar case concerns the Ballon (or Baalon) family. This family was well represented in Henry III's military ventures by John de Ballon (of Much Marche, Herefordshire) and by John's three sons who succeeded him in turn. Evidently after 1290 Reginald de Ballon, the youngest son, was facing serious economic problems and alienated lands in Much Marche together with other lands.⁸ Reginald's elder brother Walter had already been forced to lease Much Marche to Edmund Mortimer in 1285, and although Reginald possibly had a son, nothing is known of him once the family estates were lost.

Among the men who were summoned to Parliament from 1290 on, two apparently held no lands in chief.⁹ These were John de Whittington and Richard de Draycote. Why they are included in the summons to Parliament is speculative, but since little is known about them (in Whittington's case nothing but his name) it is evident that they were not members of the nobility until they received these summons. Attempting to trace the descent of such individuals is futile, and any attempts to include them in a statistical analysis of extinction rates of families would be meaningless. The tables at the end of this thesis include all families which became extinct as a result of the death of the last male member of a family. If a family merely disappeared, or when there is doubt as to whether an heir survived, these families will be separately analysed.

Out of the 294 families studied, less than 70 disappeared in such a way that nothing is known of subsequent descendants. This may be

considered a substantial number, but it must be taken into account that almost without exception these were (very understandably) the families which had sunk to the bottom of the nobility by the end of the thirteenth century. In some cases (such as the ones mentioned above) the families never managed to establish themselves much beyond the bottom tier of the nobility. In other cases (such as the family of Vautort whose estates were included in Domesday book but which had disappeared by 1270)¹⁰ a family which had substantial estates and high 'status' totally disappears once these advantages had been lost. Regardless of the reasons behind a family's final fall from the ranks of the nobility, in most cases it seems to have happened gradually, during successive generations until the last member of the family was forced to alienate the lands he had inherited. A point of interest is that when a noble alienated his lands in the thirteenth century (and this trend continued during the next century) it was usually powerful, well-established families which took these lands over rather than new, upcoming families. McFarlane makes the point that the higher nobility hardly ever sold land; and to sell to persons of lower status was unheard of. When Nigel Amundeville alienated his share of Southoe in Huntingdonshire in 1259, Richard de Clare, Earl of Gloucester received it.¹¹ There are many other examples which support this tendency towards consolidation, but it seems to be the case that 'new' noble families in the thirteenth century did not benefit from the loss of lands of the families of the already-established nobility. New families emerged primarily through marriage into other families or by being rewarded by the King for services rendered. Alienation by a noble family, therefore, generally benefitted the existing nobility who could consolidate their estates through the acquisition of alienated estates.

The extinction of most of the nobility of the thirteenth century is, however, well documented. Inevitably a high percentage of this nobility actually became extinct in the thirteenth century. The Birkin family was not of great importance, having originated with the marriage of Adam Fitz Peter, Lord of Birkin in Yorkshire to Maud de Cauz, a wealthy heiress.¹² Their son John took the name of Birkin, but the family survived for only two subsequent generations, until the death of Thomas Birkin in 1230. His heir was his sister Isabel who married Robert de Everingham, and was the progenitor of the Everinghams of Shelford,¹³ a family which achieved noble status with the participation of Robert de Everingham (grandson of the previous Robert) in the Parliament at Shrewsbury in 1283.¹⁴ In this example we can see how the extinction of a first family (of Cauz) resulted in the recruitment of the Birkin family into the nobility whose own extinction gave the Everingham family the 'status' it needed to be considered as part of the nobility. The Everingham family survived until 1388¹⁵ at which time the enormous wealth they had accumulated was divided between two coheiresses which gave these new families an important boost in terms of wealth and influence. The Complete Peerage has investigated the descent of the Everingham coheiresses, and a thorough and very well-researched account appears in the article on the Everingham family.¹⁶ It is interesting to see how the Cauz family were responsible for the wealth of the Everinghams and their descendants and how this 'status' was transmitted from one family to another for several generations.

The Birkins were a short-lived noble family. The Gurney family is an example of a well-established, older family which became extinct in the thirteenth century. They originated from Normandy and were already an important family in England by 1100. The death of John de Gurney in

1291 with no surviving sons brought an end to this family,¹⁷ but as with the previous example, raised another family into the ranks of the nobility. John's daughter Elizabeth married John Ap Adam who was summoned to Parliament several times in the 1290's, evidently due to the estates (particularly Beverstone in Gloucestershire) that his wife had inherited which contributed to the rise of this new family.¹⁸ The Ap Adam family did not survive for long, however, because in 1330 the castle and manor of Beverstone were alienated¹⁹ and the family became extinct towards the end of the fourteenth century when the heiress of the family (Elizabeth married to Thomlyn Huntley) is last mentioned.²⁰

A great many other thirteenth century noble families became extinct in the course of that century. The Dunstanville family had originated about the year 1100 with the marriage of Reginald de Dunstanville (who should not be confused with Reginald de Dunstanville, illegitimate son of King Henry I) with Adelize de L'Isle (or de Insula) of Castle Combe, Wiltshire.²¹ The family survived and progressed steadily (Walter de Dunstanville in 1218 provided two knights' fees to the King, in 1230 four),²² and from the 1250's on, Walter's son was constantly receiving military summons.²³ In 1270 the last male member of the family died leaving only a daughter, Pernel who, as an important heiress, carried a significant position for a husband to inherit. She was twice married, and her descendants continued to belong to the nobility, due to the wealth handed down by the Dunstanvilles.

Most of the noble families which became extinct in the thirteenth century were families which had attained their noble status within the last century. Since these families generally had not had time to accumulate great wealth, the families which inherited their estates need

not have immediately emerged as new nobles, particularly when the estates had been divided. The Biset, Forz, Crevequer, Aubigny (Earls of Sussex and Arundel), Blundeville (Earls of Chester), Longespee and Mauduit families were among the more powerful families which became extinct within the century and whose extinction allowed for new families to emerge and take their place among the thirteenth century nobility.

Of families which survived into the fourteenth century, a very high percentage became extinct within the next one hundred years. The Kime (or Kyme) family traced its origins to a tenant in Domesday book, and subsequent members of the family became prominent and married into other important noble families. Philip, Lord of Sotby in Lincolnshire was one of the powerful members of the family, and paid £100 relief as a baron.²⁴ Participating in the Parliament of 1283 and in several in the 1290's,²⁵ Philip was evidently a high ranking noble by the end of the century. He married Joan le Bigod, the niece of Roger, Earl of Norfolk,²⁶ but his son William died unmarried in 1338 at which time the family became extinct. William's heir was his sister Lucy who was married to Robert de Umfraville, Earl of Angus,²⁷ whose descendants received the entire barony of Sotby.

The Peche family was another significant noble family which died out in the fourteenth century. The family had been prominent for over a century when Gilbert Peche was chosen to be one of the hostages given by Edward I in 1288 to Alfonso of Aragon.²⁸ Gilbert's grandson Roger, who died in 1360 was the last male member of the family, at which time the estates of the Peche family were divided between the descendants of Roger's sister Katharine.²⁹

By the year 1400 most of the thirteenth-century noble families had become extinct. However, a few survived, one of which was the Bardolf family. The Bardolfs had achieved an important position among the thirteenth century nobility owing to their successful marriages to heiresses in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Hugh Bardolf (whose father had married Julian de Gurney) married the daughter and heiress of Robert Aguillon in the latter part of the thirteenth century,³⁰ and subsequent generations benefitted from the consolidation and accumulation of estates. Shelford, Wormegay, Long Crendon and other important estates were partly owned by the Bardolfs and at the extinction of the family in 1408 with the execution of Thomas Bardolf,³¹ the family was extremely wealthy and had achieved a high standing among the nobles.

The family of the Earls of Warwick, one of the branches of the Beauchamp family, became extinct in 1446.³² This family had worked its way into the nobility in the thirteenth century from a relatively modest background. Several important acquisitions and marriages helped to secure their position and their Earldom. The family of Thomas, the third Earl (who died in 1401) was extensive, he having had sixteen children.³³ However, within two generations the family had become extinct and the heiress (Anne, wife of the 'Kingmaker' who eventually assumed the Earldom) inherited the vast estates of the Earls of Warwick. A second branch of this family of Beauchamp (those of Alcester and Powick) survived until the year 1503.

The Courtenay family originated in England with Reginald de Courtenay of Sutton, in Berkshire about 1160,³⁴ who descended from an illustrious French family whose descent from Garnier, Count of Sens who lived at the beginning of the tenth century, is well documented.³⁵

Reginald lost all his French possessions however, and his son (also Reginald) married Hawise de Curci, heiress of Okehampton in Devon.³⁶ In the thirteenth century John de Courtenay (grandson of the younger Reginald) was a knight of the King's household who received 50 marks for his service from 1255 to 1263.³⁷ The family suffered a setback due to the deprivation of their lands on the Isle of Wight and in Devon during the reign of Edward I³⁸ but in 1335 Hugh de Courtenay, grandson of the preceding John, was created Earl of Devon. The family survived until 1471 when the last Earl of Devon died unmarried.

Only 28 of the 294 families which belonged to the English nobility in the thirteenth century survived as far as the year 1500. Many of the families which survived that far were prominent families which had accumulated great wealth and whose members were numerous, belonging to several branches. When one branch became extinct another branch could then inherit the title and lands of the senior branch thereby ensuring that the family continued. Some of the families which survived this far were the de Veres, Earls of Oxford (extinct in 1703), the Percies, Earls of Northumberland (extinct in 1670), the Clintons (extinct in 1692) and the Hastings, Earls of Pembroke (extinct in 1542). It is worth mentioning that a second branch of the Hastings family, which descended from Thomas, a younger brother of William Hastings (who lived in the early part of the thirteenth century) and from which the Earls of Huntingdon descended, continues to the present day.³⁹

No clear reason for the survival of one family, as opposed to the extinction of another, can be determined with any certainty. One of the reasons for a family's survival can be put down to its branching out into separate families which do, however, stem from one original

family. This ensures that if one of the branches died out the other branch would continue. This situation is, however, less common than might be thought. There are many families in which an uncle succeeded his nephew (in fact there were few in which this did not happen at least once), but for two distantly-related families to survive for many years was relatively uncommon. However, the increasing preference for tail male (or entail) rather than fee simple in the fourteenth century put collateral heirs in a less favourable position. Of the 294 families studied, 35 were, in the thirteenth century, divided into two or more families. One example of this type of division was the Ros family. The family originated from Ros in Holderness, but the first known ancestor was Peter de Ros, who was dead by 1130.⁴⁰ Peter de Ros acquired the barony of Helmsley in Yorkshire by his marriage to Adeline, the heiress of Walter Espec.⁴¹ His descendants kept Helmsley for subsequent generations, and the descent from one son to the next continued untroubled until the death of Robert de Ros (one of the Magna Carta barons) in 1226.⁴² At his death he left two sons, William and Robert. William (the elder) inherited the larger barony of Helmsley, while Robert received the honour of Wark in Northumberland.⁴³ This Robert died in 1274 and left his lands to his descendants. William, however, left three sons, Robert, Peter and William, of whom Robert received Helmsley (and subsequently acquired the barony of Belvoir through his marriage to Isabel d'Aubigny the sole heiress of that family),⁴⁴ Peter does not seem to have received any estates and William received the honour of Ingmanthorpe.⁴⁵ As can be seen, three distinct branches of the Ros family had now developed, and these branches continued for a considerable period of time. The Ros family of Wark became extinct in 1296 when the lands were forfeited due to the support given by Robert de Ros of Wark to the Scots.⁴⁶ The Ros family of Ingmanthorpe survived

until after 1350, but none of the members of the family were summoned to Parliament after 1294⁴⁷ and although the family seems to have survived for several generations,⁴⁸ it has not been thoroughly investigated. The senior line of the Ros family survived until 1508, at which time the Manners family, later Earls and eventually Dukes of Rutland were their heirs.⁴⁹

Other examples abound, but few families developed branches in this way, and of the thirteenth century nobles, only one (the Grey family) produced four different branches at the same time. Of the families which produced three branches (the Bassets, the L'Isles, the Mortimers, and the Ros family) it is interesting to see how generally one branch managed to survive for a much longer time than the others, thereby consolidating the power of the family. It is worth mentioning, however, that if one branch became extinct at the death of a Lord, his heir would not be the representative of the junior branch of the family but rather his own daughters or sisters (assuming he had any).

The Mortimer family is the best known of these families. In the thirteenth century three branches of the family were in existence. The senior branch, of which Ralph (died in 1246) and Roger (died in 1282) were the most important figures of this period, eventually resulted in the famous Earls of March.⁵⁰ The family became extinct in 1424, at which time the heiress (Anne) was the heir general to the English throne, through her descent from the daughter of Lionel (Duke of Clarence), second son of King Edward III. The other two branches of the Mortimer family were less prominent. The Mortimer family of Richard's Castle descended from a younger brother of Hugh Mortimer (who died about 1149) and became extinct in 1304,⁵¹ while the third branch (the Mortimers of

Attilburgh or Kingston) survived until 1387.⁵² However, all three branches produced men who received military summons in the thirteenth century and also received summons to attend Parliament in the 1290's.⁵³

Summing up, the facts concerning the descent and the eventual extinction of families show that many families which were never summoned to the formalised Parliaments of the 1290's often left descendants who are untraced. Their lack of prominence forces us to conclude that they had lost the quality which had given their ancestors the right to be termed 'noble', and as a result had slipped from the ranks of this group. The families which maintained their status of 'nobles' and whose progeny survived, generally became part of the higher nobility, once they had been able to establish their family's 'status'. However, very few families survived beyond the year 1500, and the proportion of families which became extinct within the first century after they joined the nobility is high.

Heiresses were extremely important in ensuring the continuity of estates, because even when the family became extinct in the male line, a single daughter could allow for the estates to continue to belong to the descendants of the original nobles, even when they descended through a female. The original family is, of course, deemed to have become extinct. Evidently in many cases there was more than one heiress, which led to a break-up of the estates, but when the family name could not be continued due to the extinction of the family it could be the case that a daughter's heirs would adopt their mother's name (which happened several times in the period before the fourteenth century, an example being the Percy family), or that the daughter or daughters became the founders of new noble families by transmitting their family's estates to their descendants.

McFarlane's conclusions regarding the extinction of noble families from 1300 to 1500 are in agreement with the extinction of the families which made up the English nobility in the thirteenth century. Families tended to die out very rapidly; when they survived it was usually because a family had produced several male members, occasionally separate branches, at the same time, and when a family did become extinct, the female heiresses of the last member of the family could become wealthy and powerful founders of a new noble family. What McFarlane did not have to deal with, when studying the later nobility was the large proportion of families which simply disappeared. The formalisation of the Parliamentary Peerage meant that most families remained better documented, and that the son of one peer would be summoned after the death of his father. Before this formalisation, however, unless the son of a Lord was as powerful as his father and had sufficient 'status', he might not be deemed eligible to be included in a military summons, and if the quota of knights' fees his family was supposed to pay had decreased, his family might not rank as a member of the nobility.

The Parliamentary Peerage made the concept of 'nobility' much less flexible. Either a man belonged to the nobility and was summoned to Parliament, or he was not a noble. This raised a much more sharply defined barrier between the lower nobility and the upper gentry (who did not become noble) than had previously existed.

Much work remains to be done on the descendants of the men who made up the thirteenth century nobility. It would be interesting to know what correlation there was between a thirteenth century family and their descendants, in terms of 'status' and position. My initial findings would suggest that consolidation among the higher nobility

contributed to a narrowing of the nobility after 1300. In addition to this consolidation (which was due in part to heiresses marrying into other noble families and economic conditions forcing the poorer nobles to alienate their lands) the fact that the 'nobility' had become defined as the Parliamentary peers meant that a very clear line could now be drawn to separate the nobles from the non-nobles. Many families which had previously been part of the nobility were not included in this narrower definition, and as a result gradually faded into obscurity. The Bellew (or Bella Aqua) family was undoubtedly one of these families. John de Bellew had started a 'new' noble family by marrying Laderina de Brus, the coheiress of Peter de Brus who had died in 1272.⁵⁴ She was granted the barony of Skeldon, but none of the Bellew descendants were ever able to maintain the 'status' of a noble and soon disappeared from this group. The Astley family survived longer, but the last member of this family, William Astley, was never summoned to Parliament,⁵⁵ and clearly this family, too, had not managed to maintain its noble status.

The older, more established nobility which had survived into the thirteenth century from the time of the Norman Conquest, was still powerful, despite their decreasing numbers. By the end of the thirteenth century this group numbered about forty families. The group just below them constituted the families which either ended up joining and occasionally replacing the older nobility, or falling below the ranks of the nobility and not being included in the Parliamentary Peerage. For this group of about 250 families the late thirteenth century and particularly the fourteenth century became a period of transition in which the stronger families survived while the weaker ones did not.

Economic problems may have affected some families, and changes of policies by different Kings undoubtedly had a strong influence, but it seems clear that by the middle of the fourteenth century, when the concept of 'nobility' had become more clearly defined, nearly a quarter of the families which had previously been part of the nobility had not managed to maintain their noble 'status' and were therefore not included in the Parliamentary Peerage.

Conclusion

The nobility of England in the thirteenth century ranged from very powerful families like the Marshals, the Bigods and the Clares to families about whom very little is known, such as the families of Whittington, St. Albin or Regny. What these families had in common was that they ranked above the remaining large number of families which made up what McFarlane has termed the 'undifferentiated' nobility. *

The 'undifferentiated' nobility of the thirteenth century may have consisted of about 3,000 families. This figure can be arrived at by estimating the number of men who received military writs of summons from the King in this period. Many of the men in this category would not have been tenants-in-chief, and are labelled as knights by Moor and others. This figure of 3,000 families is corroborated by Denholm-Young who estimates that in the thirteenth century there were approximately 1,500 knights and a further 1,500 men of similar wealth and status who were 'esquires'.¹

Ranking above this group of men in the thirteenth century were the 294 or so families which made up the nobility. The great range in power and wealth among these families leaves little doubt that this group can, itself, be further divided into the upper nobility (the magnates) and those of less standing. A precise division is not easy to define, but approximately forty families could be called 'the magnates' while the remaining 250 formed the 'lower nobility' which did not possess the intangible quality of status with which to be included among the magnates.

In an attempt to analyse the origins of the 294 noble families, the present work has traced the ancestry of each noble family back to the point at which it first emerged in England. The results of the analysis (which have been condensed in table form in Appendix II) show that more than a third of the families which made up the thirteenth century nobility had originated before the year 1100. Not surprisingly, these families, which were mostly the survivors of the families which had been listed in Domesday book, include nearly all of the families which made up the higher nobility in the thirteenth century. As a result, we can see a distinct trend emerging : the longer a family survived the more powerful it was likely to become.

When this statement is applied to the group of families which survived from the eleventh century to the thirteenth century we can see that it holds true. Most of these families were of Norman origin, and with the conquest of England in 1066 and the dispersal of most of the existing Saxon nobility by William, this group did not have to work its way up to join the ranks of the nobility in England. Instead, entering a new territory there would seem to have been a nearly limitless supply of land available for nobles to control. Once this group had taken control of most of the large estates in the Kingdom, there was no longer room for other families to join them unless they were replaced. As a result, this long-surviving group did not have to make their way up into the nobility once they were in England, but had the good fortune to be given land because the previous group of tenants had been displaced.

The analysis in the present work would suggest that families became powerful due to their sheer survival, by continuing the family line and by maintaining their 'status'. Survival depended on both

factors, and hence was not limited to the most powerful families. Generally the longer a family survived the more wealth it accumulated, and might eventually take the place of higher families which had become extinct. This would suggest that in most cases a family which rose to the nobility would continue to rise the longer it survived, and when it became extinct another family would take its relative position (though not necessarily its lands). Some noble families fell from the ranks of the nobility not because of extinction but because they were dispossessed or exiled. Although this occurred very rarely, the Montfort family is an example of this situation. When ~~they~~ ^{of their lands} were dispossessed, other nobles benefitted from this opportunity to gain new lands.

This hypothesis seems to hold true with most of the families which had joined the nobility before 1100. But after that date families which joined the nobility were forced to make their way up by their own merits or resourcefulness, since the Norman settlers had saturated the lands made available after 1066. It was usually the case that when one family became extinct or lost its status others could move in to take its place. A new man could join the nobility because he had married an heiress or coheiress, or because his service to the King had been generously rewarded.

Alienation by established families (when it occurred - which was rare) was in virtually every case to another family of equal rank. Established families did not stoop to help a 'new' family emerge when they could not maintain their estates. They seem to have preferred to alienate to their peers - in this case the nobility.

Families which joined the nobility after the middle of the thirteenth century did not always fit the pattern as easily. Powell and Wallis refer to the selection of men in the Parliamentary Peerage after 1295 as 'haphazard'.² Several of the men summoned are not known to have been tenants-in-chief at all, and their ancestry often cannot be traced beyond the first generation. Evidently the Parliamentary Peerage was not planned (at first) to be limited to the 'nobility' of thirteenth century England. However, ^{the Peerage} eventually became an hereditary right, and as a result the Parliamentary Peers came to be equated with the nobility.

Few of the 'new' families of the thirteenth century survived for long. By the end of the fourteenth century only eleven survived, while fifty-eight families which had already been prominent before the thirteenth century were still in existence (if not always included among the Parliamentary Peerage). The longevity of the more established families is all the more remarkable when one considers that they managed to survive this transitional period at the end of the thirteenth century in which the 'nobility' became defined as the 'peerage'.

Evidently some early families did not make it. Some had already become extinct by 1300, but of pre-twelfth century families, twenty 'disappeared' between 1250 and 1400. In each case it is clear that the family had lost its status and could not continue as part of the nobility because it did not merit summons and did not own estates. These families are very much the exception and account for less than one-fifth of the pre-twelfth century families.

Families which attained their prominence in the thirteenth century were not as successful. Thirty families disappeared between 1250 and

1375, accounting for over one-third of all of these 'new' men.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw the survival of the established nobility at the expense of many of the newer families which had been recruited into the nobility in the thirteenth century but which had not had time to become properly absorbed into that nobility. Some new families did survive, the Freschevilles and the Greys being good examples, but the general trend shows that on the whole the thirteenth century did not witness the extinction of the oldest families (as would be assumed if we consider the high turnover described by McFarlane),³ but rather the inability of the newer families to survive.

The transition from one type of 'nobility' in the early part of the century to a formalised peerage excluded many families, but the Parliamentary Peerage took many years before it became established as a rigid hereditary privilege of the nobility. In the intervening years many families either joined or fell from the ranks of this nobility. In the long run, though, the indications are that the older and more established nobility survived the transition while the newer nobility did not.

Notes

Introduction

1. Robert, Charles (ed.), Calendarium Genealogicum, Vol. I, London, 1865.
2. Palgrave, Sir Francis, The Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, London, 1827, Vol. I, p.816.
3. Sanders, Ivor J., English Baronies : A study of their origin and descent : 1086-1327, London, 1960.
4. Pipe Rolls, 7 Henry II, p.45.
5. McFarlane, K. B., The Nobility of Later Medieval England, Oxford, 1973, p.173.
6. Ibid., p.173.

Chapter I

1. Walker, R. F., The Anglo-Welsh Wars, 1217-1267; with special reference to English Military Developments, Oxford University thesis, 1954.
2. Ibid., p.295m-295w.
3. Ibid., p.70-78.
4. Ibid., p. 70-78.
5. Ibid., p.50.
6. Ibid., p.55.
7. Redesdale (ed.), Report from the Lords Committees on the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm, London, 1826, Vol. I, p.86-87.
8. Ibid., Vol. I, p.126-127.
9. Cokayne, G. E., The Complete Peerage, Vol. I, p.xiii.
10. Palgrave, Vol. I.
11. Cokayne, p.179-180.
12. Wagner, A. R., A Catalogue of English Mediaeval Rolls of Arms, Oxford, 1950.

13. Denholm-Young, N., 'The Song of Carlaverock and the Parliamentary Roll of Arms' in Collected Papers, Cardiff, 1969.
14. Denholm-Young, N., History and Heraldry 1254 to 1310, Oxford, 1965, p.42.
15. Ibid., p.46.
16. Wagner, p.14.
17. Denholm-Young, History and Heraldry 1254-1310, p.66.
18. Denholm-Young, 'The Song of Carlaverock ...', p.130.
19. Nicholson, J. and Burn, R., History and Antiquities of Westmorland and Cumberland, Vol. i, p.267-268, (London, 1777).
20. Redesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166.
21. Sanders, p.103-104.
22. Sanders, p.35-36.
23. Walker, p.77.
24. Sanders, p.2.
25. Ibid., p.2.
26. Ibid., p.V.
27. Ibid., p.62-64.
28. Stenton, F. M., The First Century of English Feudalism 1066-1166, Oxford, 1932, p.95.
29. Painter, Sidney, Studies in the History of the English Feudal Barony, Baltimore, 1943, p.15.
30. Reid, Miss R. R., 'Barony and Thanage' in English Historical Review (1920), Vol. No. XXXV, p.162.
31. Painter, Sidney, p.18.
32. Ibid., p.19.
33. Ibid., p.28.
34. Hall, Hubert (ed.), The Red Book of the Exchequer, London, 1896.
35. Painter, p.50-55.
36. Denholm-Young, N., 'Feudal Society in the Thirteenth Century : The Knights' in Collected Papers, Cardiff, 1969, p.87.
37. Blaauw, William H., The Barons' War including the Battles of Lewes and Evesham, London, 1844, p.373.
38. Moor, Charles, Knights of Edward I, Harleian Society, Vol. LXXX, 1929.
39. Denholm-Young, Collected Papers, p.87.

40. Palgrave, Parliamentary Writs, Vol. I, p.214.
41. Walker, p.71.
42. Walker, p.72-78.
43. Walker, p.71.
- 43A. McFarlane, p.268.
44. Holt, J. C., Magna Carta, Cambridge, 1965, p.320.
- 44A. McFarlane, p.142-176.
- 44B. Pugh, p.86.
- 44C. Ibid., p.93-96.
- 44D. Ibid., p.97-101.
- 44E. Ibid., p.101.
- 44F. Contamine, p.135-136.
- 44G. Ibid., p.138-139.
- 44H. Ibid., p.137-138.
45. McFarlane, p.254-256.
46. Ibid., p.256-264.
47. Burke's Landed Gentry (18th ed.), 1969, p.138.
48. Ibid., p.138.
49. Sanders, p.26.
50. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.393-396.

Chapter II

1. Cokayne, G. E., The Complete Peerage, Vol. XII, Part 1, Appendix L, p.47-48.
2. Round, J. H., 'The families of St. John and of Port', Genealogist, xvi, 1900.
3. Round, J. H., Family of De Clare, Dictionary of National Biography, X, 1887.
4. Round, J. H., Family Origins and other studies, London, 1930.
5. Corbett, Cambridge Medieval History, V, p.508.
6. Turton, W. H., The Plantagenet Ancestry, London, 1928, p.127.
7. Loyd, Lewis C., The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, Leeds, 1951, p.51.
8. Ibid., p.51.
9. Walker, p.295t.

10. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem. vol I p 79, 312
11. Cokayne, Vol. III, p.164-169.
12. Sanders, I. J., English Baronies, Oxford, 1960, p.17.
13. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem. vol I p.2
14. Cokayne, Vol. III, p.242.
15. Cokayne, Vol. III, p.242.
16. Loyd, p.70.
17. Loyd, p.72.
18. Sanders, p.103.
19. Loyd, p.72-73.
20. Flanché, J. R., The Conqueror and His Companions, 1876.
21. Medesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166.
22. Palgrave, Sir Francis, The Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, Vol. I, London, 1827, p.757.
23. Paul, Sir James Balfour (ed.), The Scots Peerage, Vol. III, Edinburgh, 1906, p.239-265.
24. Cokayne, Vol. XII, Part 1, p.168.
25. Sanders, p.81.
26. Loyd, p.42.
27. Cokayne, Vol. IV, p.191.
28. Le Melletier, Jean, Les Seigneurs de Bohon, Coutances, 1978. p.9
29. Loyd, p.16.
30. Sanders, p.63.
31. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.134.
32. Loyd, p.7.
33. Loyd, p.7.
34. Cokayne, Vol. IX, p.366-367.
35. Sanders, p.12.
36. Cokayne, Vol. IV, p.93-96.
37. Ysenburg, Wilhelm Karl Prinz von, Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten, Marburg, 1965. vol II table 29

38. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.571.
39. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem. vol II p 404
40. Cokayne, Vol. I, p.351.
41. Sanders, p.142.
42. Redesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166.
43. Charriere, L. de, Les Dynasties de Grandson, 1866.
44. Cokayne, Vol. XII, Part 1, p.411.
45. Turton, p.133.
46. Sanders, p.85.
47. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.852.
48. Turton, p.142.
49. Sanders, p.103.
50. Sanders, p.104.
51. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.887.
52. ~~Turton, p.120.~~
53. Cokayne, Vol. II, p.124.
54. Cokayne, Vol. II, p.126-127.
55. Walker, p.63.
56. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.465.
57. Sanders, p.114.
58. Cokayne, Vol. II, p.361-362.
59. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.498.
60. Sanders, p.116.
61. Walker, p.295s.
62. Sanders, p.106.
63. Turton, p.21.
64. Sanders, p.32.
65. Paul, Sir James Balfour (ed.), The Scots Peerage. vol I p.424
66. Sanders, p.111.

67. Sanders, p.103.
68. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.886.
69. Redesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166.
70. Cokayne, p.513.
71. Cokayne, p.518-519.
- ~~72. Cokayne, Vol. IV, p.287.~~
73. Cokayne, Vol. IV, p.287.
74. Walker, p.64.
75. Redesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166.
76. Cokayne, Vol. IV, p.259-260.
77. Round, J. H., Peerage and Family History, p.279-329.
78. Loyd, p.2.
79. Walker, p.64.
80. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.565-566.
81. Loyd, p.62.
82. Pipe Rolls, 5, Richard I, p.99.
83. Eyton, 'Pedigree of the Baronial Houses of Mauduit' in Heraldry and Genealogy, Vol. vii, p.385-394.
84. Sanders, p.94.
85. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.368.
86. Redesdale, p.99-166.
87. Sanders, p.3; Red Book of the Exchequer, p.408-409.
88. Sanders, p.3-4.
89. Redesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166.
90. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Vol. I, p.585.
91. Walker, p.77.
92. Sanders, p.103-104.
93. Walker, p.63.
94. Sanders, p.35-36.

95. Cokayne, Vol. VII, p.9-10.
96. Walker, p.78.
97. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.678.
98. Cokayne, Vol. VII, p.9.
99. Cokayne, Vol. I, p.337.
100. Sanders, p.112.
101. Cokayne, Vol. X, p.552.
102. Sanders, p.73.
103. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.736-737.
104. Feet of Fines, Norfolk, Richard I, p.262.
105. Cokayne, Vol. IX, p.209.
106. Loyd, p.96.
107. Red Book of the Exchequer, p.623.
108. Sanders, p.82.
109. Pipe Rolls, 4, John, p.239.
110. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.596-597.
111. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.597-601.
112. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.445.
113. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.605-606.
114. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.445-447.
115. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.709.
116. Nicolas, Siege of Carlaverock, p.48.
117. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.710.
118. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.711-712.
119. Sanders, p.63.
120. Walker. p. 43-71
121. Redesdale, Vol. I, p.99-166; Palgrave, Vol. I, p.797.
122. Sanders, p.89.
123. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.364-365.

124. Cokayne, Vol. VI, p.42.
125. Walker, p.78.
126. Snellgrove, Harold S., The Lusignans in England, Albuquerque, 1950, p.24-25.
127. McFarlane, 'Had Edward I a 'Policy' towards the Earls?', History, 50, 1965, p.145-159.

Chapter III

1. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage, Vol. I, p.179-180.
2. Cokayne, Vol. II, p.311.
3. Burke's Landed Gentry, 18th ed., Vol. II, p.138-139.
4. Cokayne, Vol. VII, p.9.
5. McFarlane, K. B., The Nobility of Later Medieval England, p.254.
6. Sanders, p.86-87.
7. Sanders, p.87.
8. Sanders, p.66.
9. Powell, E. and Wallis, K., The House of Lords in the Middle Ages, London, 1968, p.230.
10. Sanders, p.90-91.
11. Sanders, p.80-81.
12. Sanders, p.76-77.
13. Sanders, p.77.
14. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.588.
15. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.189-192.
16. Cokayne, Vol. V, p.193.
17. Sanders, p.14.
18. Sanders, p.15.
19. Sanders, p.16.
20. Cokayne, Vol. I, p.180-181.
21. Sanders, p.28.

22. Walker, p.64.
23. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.575.
24. Sanders, p.79-80.
25. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.687.
26. Cokayne, Vol. VII, p.354.
27. Cokayne, Vol. VII, p.356-357.
28. Cokayne, Vol. X, p.336.
29. Cokayne, Vol. X, p.337-339.
30. Cokayne, Vol. I, p.417.
31. Cokayne, Vol. I, p.419-420.
32. Cokayne, Vol. XII, Part 2, p.383-384.
33. Burke, Sir Bernard, Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire, London, 1883, p.31.
34. Cokayne, Vol. III, p.465.
35. Turton, p.59.
36. Sanders, p.69-70.
37. Walker, p.77.
38. McFarlane, p.257-260.
39. Burke's Peerage (105th ed.), London, 1970, p.1395-1397.
40. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.90.
41. Sanders, p.52-53.
42. Sanders, p.53.
43. Sanders, p.149.
44. Sanders, p.12.
45. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.117-118.
46. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.121-122.
47. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.808-810.
48. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.118-119.
49. Cokayne, Vol. XI, p.106-107.

50. Cokayne, Vol. IX, p.266.
51. Cokayne, Vol. IX, p.264-265.
52. Cokayne, Vol. IX, p.250.
53. Palgrave, Vol. I, p.748-751.
54. Sanders, p.77.
55. Cokayne, Vol. I, p.283-284.

Conclusion

1. Denholm-Young, Neil, Collected Papers, p.56-57.
2. Powell, E. and Wallis, K., The House of Lords in the Middle Ages, p.230-231.
3. McFarlane, K. B., The Nobility of Later Medieval England, p.172-176.

Appendix IThe Nobility of England in the Thirteenth Century

An alphabetical list of the 294 families which made up the nobility in the thirteenth century is now included. The name of the family is followed by the first known patrilineal ancestor of the family in England, together with his place of origin, when known. The last column shows the date of extinction, or the approximate date of disappearance of the family. When a family developed two or more branches (either before or during the course of the thirteenth century) the eventual descent of each branch is listed with their extinction or disappearance date, together with a label to distinguish each branch. Families of the same name which are not known to be related are shown as separate families.

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
1	Aguillon	Robert	c.1260 French
2	Aincourt	Walter	1080 Norman
3	Alditheley (Audley)	Luulf	c.1160
4	Amundeville	Goislan	1080 Norman
5	Ap Adam	Reynold	c.1250 Welsh
6	Argentein	Reginald	c.1100 French
7	Arsic	Manasser	c.1100
8	Astley	Philip	1165
9	Aubigny (Earls of Arundel)	William	c.1120 Norman
10	Aubigny (of Belvoir)	William	c.1080 Norman
11	Aubigny (of Cainhoe)	Nigel	1080 Norman
12	Audeham	Thomas	1250
13	Averanches	Rualon	1100 Norman
14	Ballon	Hamelin	1080 Norman
15	Balliol	Guy	1100 Norman
16	Bardolf	Thomas	c.1160
17	Basset	Ralph	c.1090 Norman
18	Bevent	Hubert	c.1070 Norman
19	Bayeux	Ralph	c.1140 Norman
			extinct 1280's
			extinct c.1458
			extinct 1391
			disappeared 1259
			extinct 1350
			extinct 1383
			extinct 1230
			extinct post 1400
			extinct 1242
			continues
			extinct 1233
			extinct 1327
			extinct 1258
			disappeared 1300
			(a) extinct 1368 (Scottish Kings)
			(b) disappeared 1368 (Cavers)
			extinct 1408
			(a) extinct 1400 (Weldon)
			(b) extinct 1390 (Drayton)
			(c) extinct 1378 (Sapcote)
			extinct 1374
			extinct 1250

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
20	Beauchamp	Walter	c.1100 (a) extinct 1446 (Earls of Warwick) (b) extinct 1503 (Alcester and Powick)
21	Beauchamp (of Hatch)	Robert	c.1092 extinct 1361
22	Beauchamp (of Eaton Socon)	Hugh	1080 extinct 1265
23	Bek	Walter	c.1200 French extinct 1304
24	Bellew (Bella Aqua)	John	c.1070 French extinct 1301
25	Berkeley	Eadnoth	killed 1068 continues
26	Berkeley	Roger	1080 disappeared 1349
27	Bertram (of Mitford)	Richard	1080 Norman extinct 1272
28	Bertram (of Bothal)	Richard	died 1176 Norman disappeared 1364
29	Bigod	Roger	c.1080 Norman extinct 1306
30	Birkin	Adam Fitz Peter	died 1185 extinct 1230
31	Biset	Manasser	c.1160 Norman extinct 1220
32	Blund	Robert	1080 extinct 1264
33	Blundeville	Ranulph de Meschines	1070 Norman extinct 1232
34	Bohun	Humphrey	1080 Norman (a) extinct 1373 (Earls of Hereford and Essex) (b) extinct c.1490 (Midhurst)
35	Bolebec	Hugh	1086 Norman extinct 1262
36	Boltby	Nicholas	died 1272 extinct 1281
37	Bosco (Bois)	Ernaldo	1080 Norman extinct 1313
38	Breousa	William	1080 Norman (a) extinct 1326 (Bramber) (b) extinct 1489 (Stinton)

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
39	Brittany	Peter, Duke of Brittany died 1268	Brittany
40	Briwerre	Drogo	1080
41	Brun	Richard	died 1226
42	Brus	Robert	1080 Norman
43	Bryan	Guy	1080
44	Burgh	Walter	c.1150
45	Butler (of West Dereham)	Hervey Walter	c.1150
46	Butler (of Wem)	Ralph	c.1140
47	Butler (of Warrington)	William of Warrington	died c.1280
48	Camcys	Ralph	died 1259
49	Camville	Gerard	c.1140 Norman
50	Cantilupe	William	died 1238 Norman
51	Ceriton	William	c.1180 French
52	Chancy	Amfrey	died c.1128
53	Chandos	Roger	1086 Norman
54	Chauvent	Peter	died 1303 French
55	Chaworth	Patrick	1080 Norman
56	Chilham	Richard	c.1230
57	Clare	Richard Fitz Gilbert	1080 Norman

	<u>Name</u>		<u>Origins</u>		<u>Descent</u>
58	Clavering	Eustace	1080	Norman	continues
59	Clifford	Ponce	1080		extinct 1643
60	Clinton	Geoffrey	c.1110		extinct 1692
61	Clyvedon	Raymond	c.1270		extinct c.1303
62	Cogan	Miles	died 1182	Welsh	extinct 1382
63	Colevill	Philip	c.1135	Norman	(a) extinct 1369 (Bytham) (b) extinct 1439 (Ingleby)
64	Columbers	Philip	died.1185	Norman	extinct 1342
65	Comyn	Robert	killed 1070		(a) extinct 1314 (Kilbride) (b) extinct 1308 (Earls of Buchan)
66	Corbet	Roger Fitz Corbet	died c.1121		extinct 1347
67	Cornwall	Reynold de Dunstanville illegitimate son of Henry I	died 1146		extinct 1222
68	Corzwall	Richard, son of King John	died 1272		extinct 1300
69	Courtenay	Reginald	1150	French	extinct 1471
70	Cressy	Hugh	c.1160	French	(a) extinct 1408 (Hodsock) (b) extinct 1263 (Blythborough)
71	Crevequer	Hamo	c.1100	Norman	extinct c.1299
72	Criquetot	William	c.1200	Norman	disappeared 1343
73	Crioll	John	died 1264	French	(a) disappeared c.1300 (Tirlingham) (b) disappeared c.1303 (Croxtan)
74	Cromwell	Ralph	c.1190		disappeared c.1417

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
75	Darcy	Norman	continues
76	Despenser	Robert	disappeared c.1300
77	Despenser	Thomas	extinct 1414
78	Devereux (Ebroicis)	Norman	disappeared 1388
79	Draycote	Philip	disappeared 1324
80	Dunbar	Gospatric	died 1095 extinct 1564
81	Dunstanville	Reginald	c.1100 Norman extinct 1270
82	Dynant	Geoffrey	c.1110 Brittany extinct 1501
83	Engaine	Richard	c.1100 French extinct 1367
84	Erleye	Henry	c.1250 disappeared c.1305
85	Esseley	Walter	c.1215 extinct 1245
86	Everingham	Robert	c.1240 extinct 1388
87	Eyville	Robert	c.1110 French extinct 1369
88	Fauconberge	Peter	c.1150 French extinct 1407
89	Ferrars	Walcheline	1080 Norman (a) extinct 1450 (Earls of Derby) (b) continues (Gorby)
90	Fiennes	Eustace	1080 French disappeared 1339
91	Fitz Alan	Flaad	c.1100 Brittany (a) extinct 1580 (Earls of Arundel) (b) extinct 1306 (Bedale)
92	Fitz Henry	Bardolph	1080 Norman extinct 1506
93	Fitz Herbert	Herbert	c.1080 (a) extinct 1356 (Stanford) (b) extinct 1309 (Stokenhame)
94	Fitz John	Peter de Lutegareshale	c.1140 extinct 1297

<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
95 Fitz Martin	Martin	extinct 1326
96 Fitz Nicholas	Nicholas Fitz Roger	disappeared c.1290
97 Fitz Osbert	Osbert Fitz William	extinct 1306
98 Fitz Payn	Pain Fitz John	extinct 1354
99 Fitz Philip	John	disappeared 1305
100 Fitz Walter	Richard Fitz Gilbert	(a) extinct 1431 (Little Dunmow) (b) extinct 1328 (Woodham)
101 Fitz Warine	Guarine De Meer	extinct 1431
102 Fitz William	William Fitz Ulf	extinct 1487
103 Fitz William	William	continues
104 Foliot	Richard	extinct 1325
105 Forz	William	extinct 1269
106 Fraser	Fressell	extinct 1306
107 Frescheville	Auker	extinct 1682
108 Friville	Baldwin	disappeared 1328
109 Furnivall	Gerard	extinct 1383
110 Gaugy	Ralph	extinct 1279
111 Gaunt	Gilbert	extinct 1298
112 Genville (Joinville)	Etienne	extinct 1314
113 Gernun	Richard	(a) extinct c.1280 (Burgh by Sands) (b) disappeared c.1320 (Theyden)
114 Ghent	Robert Fitz Harding	extinct 1230

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
115	Ghisnes	Baldwin	extinct 1396
116	Giffard	Osborne	(a) extinct 1322 (Brimpsfield) (b) disappear c.1350 (Winterborne)
117	Gorges	William	extinct c.1330
118	Gouiz	William	extinct 1299
119	Gousle (Goushill)	Giles	extinct 1294
120	Grandison	Peter	extinct 1375
121	Grelley	Albert	extinct 1311
122	Grendon	Robert	extinct 1365
123	Grey	Henry	(a) extinct 1496 (Codner) (b) extinct 1369 (Sandiacre) (c) continues (Ruthin) (d) extinct 1388 (Rotherfield)
124	Greystock	Lyulphe	extinct 1306
125	Gurney	Hugh	extinct 1291
126	Hache	Eustace	extinct 1306
127	Harecourt	Anchitel	extinct 1278
128	Hastings	Walter	(a) continues (Earls of Huntingdon) (b) extinct 1542 (Earls of Pembroke)
129	Havering	Richard	disappeared c.1320
130	Haye	Ralph	disappeared c.1300
131	Hilton	Alexander	extinct 1746
132	Hudleston	John	disappeared 1303

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
133	Huntercombe	William	extinct 1313
134	Huntingfield	William	extinct 1374
135	Huse	Henry	disappeared 1476
136	Ingham	John	extinct 1349
137	Kaines	Ralph	disappeared c.1320
138	Kilpeck	John	extinct 1244
139	Kime	William	extinct 1338
140	Kirkeby	Roger	(a) extinct 1302 (Kirby Bellars) (b) disappeared c.1300 (Barony of Ros)
141	Knoville	Bogo	extinct c.1350
142	Lacy (Earls of Lincoln)	Eustace	extinct 1311
143	Lacy	Gilbert	extinct 1230
144	Lancaster	Edmund, son of Henry III	extinct 1361
145	Lancaster	Gilbert Fitz Roger	extinct 1334
146	Lascelles	Thomas de Maunby	extinct 1300
147	Latimer	William	(a) extinct 1411 (Scrampton) (b) extinct 1381 (Corby)
148	Levington	Richard de Boivill	extinct 1253
149	Leyburn	Philip	extinct 1310
150	Lincoln	Alfred	extinct 1277
151	Lindsey	Walter	(a) extinct 1282 (Lamberton) (b) continues (Crawford)
152	L'Isle	Robert	(a) extinct 1428 (Rougemont) (b) extinct 1382 (Kingston) (c) extinct 1523 (Wodeton)

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
153	Longespee	William, illegitimate son of Henry II	extinct 1257
154	Lovel (Fitchmarsh)	Robert	extinct 1495
155	Lovel (Castle Cary)	Ralph	extinct 1351
156	Lovain	Geoffrey	extinct 1347
157	Lucy	Richard	extinct 1460
158	Luttrell	Geoffrey	extinct 1419
159	Mandeville	Robert	disappeared c.1313
160	Mandeville (Earls of Essex)	Peter de Lutegarshale	extinct 1227
161	Mare	Matthew	extinct 1313
162	Marmion	Robert	(a) extinct 1291 (Tamworth) (b) extinct 1360 (Quinton)
163	Marshall (Earls of Pembroke)	John Fitz Gilbert	extinct 1245
164	Marshall	John	extinct 1316
165	Martin	Martin	extinct 1326
166	Mauduit	William	(a) extinct 1268 (Earls of Warwick) (b) disappeared c.1250 (Castle Holgate)
167	Mauley (Malo Lacu)	Peter	extinct 1415
168	Maune	Peter	disappeared c.1280
169	Mautravers	Hugh	extinct 1364
170	Meinill	Robert	extinct 1349
171	Merlay	William	extinct 1265
172	Mohaut (Monte Alto)	Ralph Fitz Norman	extinct 1329

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
173	Mohun	William	extinct 1375
174	Molis	Nicholas	extinct 1337
175	Monmouth	Wethenoc	extinct 1257
176	Montague	Drogo	extinct 1428
177	Monte Begon	Roger	extinct c.1236
178	Montfort (Earls of Leicester)	Almaric	disappeared c.1290
179	Montfort (Preston)	Thurstan	extinct 1370
180	Montfort (Wellow)	Nicholas	extinct 1349
181	Monthermer	Ralph	extinct 1340
182	Morley	Robert	extinct 1442
183	Mortimer	Roger	(a) extinct 1424 (Earls of March) (b) extinct 1304 (Richard's Castle) (c) extinct 1387 (Attilburgh)
184	Mowbray	William D'Aubigny	extinct 1476
185	Multon	Lambert	(a) extinct 1334 (Egremond) (b) extinct 1314 (Gilsland)
186	Munchensy (Monte Canis)	Hubert	(a) extinct 1404 (Edwardstone) (b) extinct 1287 (Swanscombe)
187	Muncy	Walter	extinct 1308
188	Munfichet	William	extinct 1267
189	Musard	Hascuil	extinct 1300
190	Muscegras	Roger	extinct 1266

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
191	Nansladron	Serlo	c.1295 Cornish
192	Nerford	Geoffrey	c.1150
193	Neville	Gilbert	1080 Norman
194	Neville (Fitz Maldred)	Robert Fitz Maldred	1200 Scottish
195	Newburgh	Henry	1046 (a) extinct 1242 (Earls of Warwick) (b) extinct 1338 (Poorstock)
196	Newmarche	William de Waddon	c.1090
197	Northwood	Jordan	c.1160
198	Oddingseles	Hugh	died 1239 French
199	Oilly	Nigel	died c.1115 French
200	Pavilly	Roger	c.1200 Norman
201	Paynel	Ralph	1086 Norman
202	Peché	William	c.1100 Norman
203	Percy	Jocelin de Louvain	c.1170 French
204	Perot	Pirot	1080
205	Peverel	William	1080
206	Peyvre	Roger	c.1200
207	Pierrepoint	Godfrey	1086 Norman
208	Pinkeney	Chilo	1086 Norman
209	Pipard	Gilbert	c.1100
210	Flessetis (Playz)	Hugh	1080 (a) disappeared c.1291 (Hook Norton) (b) extinct 1389 (Barnham)
211	Flugenet	Hugh	c.1150

<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
212 Poinings	William	extinct 1446
213 Pomeray	Ralph	disappeared c.1327
214 Pyntz	Poinz	extinct 1376
215 Quincy	Saher	extinct 1264
216 Rabayn	Elias	disappeared c.1300
217 Regny	William	extinct 1275
218 Rither	Walter	extinct 1543
219 Rivers (Redvers)	Baldwin Fitz Gilbert	extinct 1262
220 Rivers (of Angre)	Richard	extinct c.1350
221 Roche	Godebert	extinct c.1370
222 Rocheford	Guy	extinct 1273
223 Ros	Peter	(a) extinct 1508 (Helmsley) (b) extinct c.1350 (Ingmanthorpe) (c) extinct 1296 (Wark)
224 Roscelyn	Thomas	disappeared c.1303
225 Russell	Ralph	disappeared 1340
226 Rye	William	disappeared 1294
227 Sackville	William	disappeared c.1280
228 St. Albin	Mauger	disappeared 1283
229 St. Amand	Amauri	extinct 1330
230 St. John	John	extinct 1355
231 St. John (Port)	Hugh de Port	extinct 1347
232 St. Philibert	Hugh	extinct 1361

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
233	St. Quentin	Richard	1090 Norman extinct 1347
234	St. Valery	Reginald	c.1140 Norman disappeared c.1300
235	Sampson	William	c.1290 disappeared c.1307
236	Sandwich	John	c.1240 extinct c.1288
237	Sanzaver	Hugh	c.1260 disappeared c.1306
238	Savoy	Peter (Earl of Richmond)	c.1240 Italy extinct 1268
239	Say	Picot	1080 Norman extinct 1382
240	Scales	Roger	died c.1198 extinct 1460
241	Scotland	David	c.1150 Scottish extinct 1237
242	Scoteny	Walter	c.1180 Norman disappeared c.1345
243	Segrave	Hereward	c.1150 extinct 1353
244	Setvans	Robert	died c.1207 disappeared c.1322
245	Siward	Richard	died c.1246 disappeared c.1305
246	Somery	John	c.1160 extinct 1322
247	Stafford	Hervey Bagot	c.1180 extinct 1640
248	Steingreve	Simon	c.1220 extinct 1295
249	Strange (Lestrangle)	Roald	died c.1158 extinct 1479
250	Strathbogie	John	c.1200 Scottish extinct 1369
251	Stratherne (Earls of)	Malise	c.1120 Scottish extinct c.1350
252	Strelley	Robert	c.1220 disappeared c.1290
253	Stuteville	Robert	c.1080 Norman (a) disappeared 1241 (Cottingham) (b) disappeared 1336 (Crick)
254	Sudeley	Ralph, Earl of Hereford	died c.1057 French extinct 1367

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>
255	Talbot	Geoffrey 1086 Norman	extinct 1418
256	Tateshal	Spirowic c.1100	extinct 1306
257	Teye	Walter c.1295	disappeared 1324
258	Thweng	Robert c.1170	extinct 1374
259	Tiptot	Henry died c.1250	extinct 1485
260	Ties	Henry died c.1240	extinct 1322
261	Tony	Roger c.1080 Norman	extinct 1309
262	Torrington	Robert c.1130	extinct 1227
263	Tracy	Henry c.1160 Norman	extinct 1274
264	Trailly	Geoffrey 1080 Norman	disappeared 1346
265	Tregoz (of Ewyas Harold)	William 1172 Norman	extinct 1300
266	Tregoz (of Goring)	Geoffrey c.1140 Norman	extinct 1404
267	Trussell	William c.1290	disappeared 1301
268	Tuchet	Nicholas c.1260	disappeared 1322
269	Umfraville	Robert 1080 Norman	extinct 1421
270	Urtiaco (Orty)	Henry died 1242	extinct 1411
271	Valencia	Henry (married King John's widow) 1220 French	extinct 1324
272	Valoynes	Robert c.1220	extinct 1282
273	Vautort (Valle Torta)	Reginald 1080	disappeared 1270
274	Vaux	Hubert c.1140	extinct 1288
275	Vavassour	William died c.1191	extinct 1826
276	Verdon	Ives 1080	extinct c.1370

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origins</u>	<u>Descent</u>	
277	Verdun	Hervey Walter	c.1150	extinct 1316
278	Vere	Alberic	died 1088	Norman extinct 1703
279	Vescy	Ranulph the Moneyer	died 1061	extinct 1297
280	Veteri Ponte (Vipont)	William	1080	French extinct 1264
281	Vivonne	Hugh	c.1220	disappeared c.1258
282	Wahull	Simon	died c.1150	Flemish extinct 1542
283	Wake	Geoffrey	died c.1142	extinct 1349
284	Walerand	William	died c.1273	extinct c.1308
285	Warde	Robert	c.1290	extinct 1307
286	Warre	John	died 1213	French extinct 1427
287	Warene	Rudolph	died c.1074	Norman extinct 1347
288	Wauton (Walton)	Waldeve	c.1157	disappeared 1283
289	Wells	Ravemar	1080	extinct 1499
290	Whittington	John	c.1290	disappeared 1298
291	Wigeton	Odard	c.1130	extinct 1315
292	Windsor	Walter Fitz Other	c.1080	Welsh disappeared c.1326
293	Wolverton (Fitz Hamo)	Manno le Breton	1080	disappeared c.1341
294	Zouche	Alan	died 1190	extinct 1625

Appendix IIThe Rate of Extinction of Noble Families

A statistical analysis of the recruitment and the extinction of the nobility reveals the precise figures behind the trends previously examined. It must be made clear that deciding precisely when a family was recruited is extremely difficult before the establishment of the hereditary peerage, and no attempt has been made to categorise families by date of recruitment beyond listing the century within which they first emerged.

As concerns the extinction or disappearance of a family, the two outcomes are treated separately, since a family which is untraced after a certain date need not have been (and was probably not) extinct. Regardless of the number of branches, a family is only listed once, with the last date of extinction being considered the final demise of the family. When one branch of a family became extinct and another disappeared, the family is listed as having disappeared at the later of the dates.

The information shows that the earlier nobility generally seems to have survived longer. Of the thirteenth century nobility which originated before the twelfth century (which numbers 108) all but twenty-four survived the thirteenth century. Of the nobility which originated in the twelfth century twenty-nine out of ninety-eight did not survive beyond 1300. Of the eighty-eight noble families which originated in the thirteenth century, twenty-four did not survive beyond that century, and what is remarkable is that only eleven survived the following century. Twenty-nine of the pre-twelfth century noble families survived beyond

the year 1400 and twenty-seven of the twelfth century nobles survived beyond the same year. It becomes clear, therefore, that the narrowing of the nobility which occurred in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries primarily affected the newer families. When examining the incidence of disappearances of families it is startling to see what a very high number disappeared between 1275 and 1350. In fact this seems to have been largely due to the implementation of the Parliamentary Peerage which gave new families the status of a noble while depriving other families (but not generally the more established families) of that status.

The old nobility (before the twelfth century) which survived into the thirteenth century can be seen to have lasted remarkably well, while the families which traced their origins to between 1100 and 1200 lasted relatively well, but not as well as the older families. With very few exceptions the nobles of the thirteenth century whose families had only been established in that century did not survive beyond the fourteenth century. The turnover among the more recent families was very high while that of older families was much lower, and it can be seen that many of the older families actually outlived the newer nobility.

I In 1216 there were 108 noble families which had originated before the year 1100.

		<u>extinct</u>	<u>disappeared</u>	
By	1225	0	0	leaving 108
By	1250	6	0	leaving 102
By	1275	9	3	leaving 90
By	1300	5	1	leaving 84
By	1325	13	5	leaving 66
By	1350	9	8	leaving 49
By	1375	13	2	leaving 34

	<u>extinct</u>	<u>disappeared</u>		
By 1400	4	1	leaving	29
By 1425	5	0	leaving	24
By 1450	4	0	leaving	20
By 1475	1	0	leaving	19
By 1500	7	0	leaving	12
By 1600	5	0	leaving	7
By 1700	1	0	leaving	6
By 1800	1	0	leaving	5
By 1900	0	0	leaving	5

of which 5 continue today

II In 1216 there were ninety-eight families which had originated between the years 1100 and 1200.

	<u>extinct</u>	<u>disappeared</u>		
By 1225	2	0	leaving	96
By 1250	10	1	leaving	85
By 1275	6	0	leaving	79
By 1300	5	5	leaving	69
By 1325	10	2	leaving	57
By 1350	8	3	leaving	46
By 1375	10	1	leaving	35
By 1400	5	1	leaving	29
By 1425	7	1	leaving	21
By 1450	2	0	leaving	19
By 1475	3	1	leaving	15
By 1500	1	0	leaving	14
By 1600	5	0	leaving	9
By 1700	4	0	leaving	5
By 1800	0	0	leaving	5
By 1900	1	0	leaving	4

of which 4 continue today

III From 1216 to 1300 there were eighty-eight noble families which had originated after the year 1200.

	<u>extinct</u>	<u>disappeared</u>	
By 1225	0	0	leaving 88
By 1250	2	0	leaving 86
By 1275	5	1	leaving 80
By 1300	9	7	leaving 64
By 1325	12	18	leaving 34
By 1350	12	4	leaving 18
By 1375	6	0	leaving 12
By 1400	1	0	leaving 11
By 1425	5	0	leaving 6
By 1450	1	0	leaving 5
By 1475	0	0	leaving 5
By 1500	2	0	leaving 3
By 1600	0	0	leaving 3
By 1700	1	0	leaving 2
By 1800	1	0	leaving 1
By 1900	0	0	leaving 1

of which 1 continues today

Bibliography

- Blaauw, William H., The Barons' War including the Battles of Lewes and Evesham (London, 1844).
- The Book of Fees, 3 vols. (Public Record Office, 1921-31).
- Burke, Sir Bernard, Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire (London, 1883).
- Burke's Landed Gentry, 18th Edition (London, 1966-1972).
- Burke's Peerage, 105th Edition (London, 1970).
- Calendar of Charter Rolls (ed. Public Record Office).
- Calendar of Close Rolls (ed. Public Record Office).
- Calendar of Fine Rolls (ed. Public Record Office).
- Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem (ed. Public Record Office).
- Calendar of Patent Rolls (ed. Public Record Office).
- Calendarium Genealogicum, ed. Charles Robert (London, 1865).
- Charriere, L. de, Les Dynasties de Granson (1866).
- Chibnall, A. C., Early Taxation Returns (Buckingham Record Society, XIV, 1966).
- Chronica Majora, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1872-83).
- Cokayne, G. E., The Complete Peerage (London, 1910-59).
- Corbett, Cambridge Medieval History.
- Coss, P. R., 'Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth-Century England' in Past and Present, No.68 (1975).
- Denholm-Young, Neil, Collected Papers (Cardiff, 1969).
- Denholm-Young, Neil, History and Heraldry 1254 to 1310 (Oxford, 1965).
- Douglas, David C., 'Companions of the Conqueror' in History, XXVIII, (1943).
- Dugdale, William, The Baronage of England, 2 vols. (London, 1675-76).
- Dugdale, William, Perfect Copy of All Summons of Nobility to Great Councils and Parliaments from 39 Henry III (1264) (London, 1685).
- Eyton, 'Pedigree of the Baronial House of Mauduit' in History and Genealogy, Vol. vii.

- Farrer, W., Honors and Knights' Fees, 3 vols. (London, 1923, 24, Manchester, 1925).
- Feudal Aids, 6 vols. (HMSO, 1899-1920).
- Giles, Rev. J. A. (ed.), Matthew Paris's English History from the year 1235 to 1273 (London, 1852).
- Gray, Howard Levi, The Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation : A Study of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (Cambridge, 1932).
- Handbook of British Chronology, ed. F. M. Powicke (London, 1939).
- Holt, J. C., Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1965).
- Jenkinson, C. H., 'The First Parliament of Edward I' in Economic History Review, XXV (1910).
- Le Mellétier, Jean, Les Seigneurs de Bohon (Coutances, 1978).
- Loyd, L. C., 'The origin of the family of Aubigny of Cainhoe' in Bedfordshire Historical Records Society, xix (1937).
- Loyd, L. C., The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families (Leeds, 1951).
- McFarlane, K. B., England in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1982).
- McFarlane, K. B., The Nobility of Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1973).
- Miller, Edward, 'England in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries : An Economic Contrast?' in The Economic History Review, XXIV, No.1 (1971).
- Miller, Edward and Hatcher, J., Medieval England : Rural Society and Economic Change 1086-1348 (1978).
- Moncreiffe, Sir Iain, 'Sir Hereward and the Wakes' in The Genealogists' Magazine, Vol.15, No.10.
- Moor, Charles, Knights of Edward I (Harleian Society, Vol. LXXX, 1929).
- Nicholson, J. and Burn, R., History and Antiquary of Westmorland and Cumberland.
- Nicolas, Sir Nicholas H., Siege of Carlaverock (1828).
- Painter, Sidney, Studies in the History of the English Feudal Barony (Baltimore, 1943).
- Painter, Sidney, William Marshal knight-errant, Baron and Regent of England (Baltimore, 1933).
- Palgrave, Sir Francis, Antient Kalendars and Inventories (London, 1836).
- Palgrave, Sir Francis, The Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, Vol. I (London, 1827).

Pipe Rolls (Pipe Rolls Series).

Flanche, J. R., The Conqueror and his Companions (1876).

Powell, E. and Wallis K., The House of Lords in the Middle Ages (London, 1968).

Powicke, F. M., King Henry III and the Lord Edward (Oxford, 1947).

Powicke, M. R., 'Distraint of Knighthood and Military Obligation under Henry III' in Speculum, XXV (1950).

Powicke, M. R., 'The Nature of Parliament in the Reign of Henry III' in Economic History Review, LXXIV (1959).

Frestwich, Michael, The Three Edwards : War and State in England, 1272-1377 (London, 1980).

Frestwich, Michael, War, Politics and Finance under Edward I (London, 1972).

Pugh, T. B., 'The Magnates, knights and gentry' in S. B. Chrimes, Fifteenth Century England 1399-1509 (1972).

The Red Book of the Exchequer, ed. Hubert Hall (London, 1896).

Reid, Miss R. R., 'Barony and Thanage' in English Historical Review (1920). vol. xxxv

Report from the Lords Committees on the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm, ed. Redesdale (London, 1826).

Round, J. Horace, 'The Families of St. John and Port' in The Genealogist, xvi (1900).

Round, J. Horace, 'Family of De Clare' in Dictionary of National Biography, Vol.X, (1887).

Round, J. Horace, Family Origins and Other Studies (London, 1930).

Round, J. Horace, Geoffrey de Mandeville (London, 1892).

Sanders, Ivor J., English Baronies. A Study of their Origin and Descent 1086-1327 (Oxford, 1960).

The Scots Peerage, ed. Sir James Balfour Paul (Edinburgh, 1906).

Snellgrove, Harold S., The Lusignans in England (Albuquerque, 1950).

Stenton, F. M., 'The Changing Feudalism of the Middle Ages' in History, xix (1934-1935).

Stenton, F. M., The First Century of English Feudalism 1066-1166 (Oxford, 1932).

Treharne, R. E. and Sanders, I. J., Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion 1258-1267 (Oxford, 1973).

Turton, William H., The Plantagenet Ancestry (London, 1928).

Victoria County History.

Wagner, A. R., A Catalogue of English Mediaeval Rolls of Arms (Oxford, 1950).

Walker, R. F., The Anglo-Welsh Wars 1217-1267; with special reference to English Military Developments (Oxford University Thesis, 1954).

Ysenburg, Wilhelm Karl Prinz von, Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten (Marburg, 1965).

Contamine, Philippe, 'The French Nobility and the War' in The Hundred Years War (ed. K. Fowler) (London, 1971)

Sayles, G.O., The King's Parliament of England (London, 1975)