

Social Advancement through Seignorial Service? The case of Simon Pakeman

by G. G. Astill

The vagaries of documentary survival have ensured that our view of the gentry as a group within later medieval society will always be weighted in favour of their administrative activities. Thus, while we must acknowledge that a characterisation of the gentry as county officials is to a certain extent inevitable, there are dangers that an overemphasis on this aspect could lead to a distorted impression of the gentry as a social group in two major ways. First there is the problem of isolating this class historically: a definition which relies on a simplistic equation between office holding and gentry status is at the same time both too broad and too narrow. It is too broad because studies of particular offices show that, for example, JPs and tax collectors were drawn from a variety of social and economic groups; and too narrow because not every member of the gentry chose to participate in local government.¹

Secondly, and this is especially important in the present context, an 'official' definition of the gentry tends to detract from an appreciation of an internal dynamic within the class, and makes it difficult in particular to identify and explain the rise and fall of families. An illustration of the different viewpoint which can be obtained from official documentation as compared with that from other types can be seen in the thirteenth century. At this time it is possible to see the growth of the gentry as a politically articulate body in the localities, gaining in confidence and power as the local government structure itself grew.² Yet in the same period the relatively abundant evidence for the land market suggests that many, if not the majority, of the knights were unable to maintain their economic status, and mortgaged or sold land. Although the major beneficiaries in this redistribution of land appear to have been monastic houses, some gentry were also able to take advantage of their fellows' predicament and thus to increase the relative position of their families within their localities.³

However, within this group of gentry which benefited from the economic situation of the mid to late thirteenth century, there were those who also achieved additional advancement from administrative service. It is the possibility of an individual creating the family's fortune from such employment that indirectly adds a dynamic element to the 'administrative model' of the gentry which concerns us here. The work of Denholm Young and others has emphasised both this potential for advancement and that service in a noble household was a frequent 'stepping stone' to similar posts in

the higher echelons of national government, because of the similarity between seignorial and governmental administrative systems. The men who thus became administrators were of proven 'professional' ability and have been characterised as of knightly or near-knightly status, owning one or two manors and having a legal experience which was largely gained from controlling their own manorial courts. While this depiction of the 'rising' official gives few insights into recruitment to the gentry class because these officials were firmly within the gentry before they started their civil careers, it clearly emphasises the advantages of noble service for aspiring government officials.⁴

Yet the examples given of the graduation to public administration through noble patronage, in the fourteenth century at least, may have overemphasised the importance of seignorial service at a time when the localities were supposed to be increasingly both conscious of their corporate identity and resentful of outside interference, be it from magnate or king.⁵ The necessity of an apprenticeship in a magnate household at least for local government office may also be questioned considering the similarity between the attributes needed for selection to noble service and county office.

In view of these possible qualifications of the customary portrayal of the rising official, it is appropriate to offer a case study of a fourteenth-century Leicestershire steward, Simon Pakeman, and his family, in an attempt to estimate the importance of a magnate household as a potential source of administrative patronage. Such an exercise is particularly apposite for fourteenth-century Leicestershire where few of the gentry families who were involved in county administration were prepared, or were given the opportunity, to follow similar service in a magnate household.⁶ The Pakemans' experience of noble service with the Duchy of Lancaster must be set against that of other gentry families in Leicestershire, in an attempt to see how much service could affect the Pakeman family's position in county society.

The Pakemans' home village was Kirby Muxloe, a settlement on the western edge of Leicester forest, four miles west of Leicester. Both village and forest came within the administrative purview of the Lancastrian Honor of Leicester.⁷ The family is first documented in the early thirteenth century and lasted in the male line until 1391.⁸ The member of the family who took Lancastrian service, and who will concern us later, Simon Pakeman III, was born in c. 1306 and died in 1376, and his career marked a watershed in the family's history.⁹ For prior to Simon III it would be difficult to describe the family as being firmly among the gentry. An attempt has been made recently to characterise and define the fourteenth-century Leicestershire gentry from a number of standpoints. It is noticeable for instance that when first documented in the twelfth century the gentry families were in a similarly powerful position as they were two centuries later; this is also reflected in their repeated appearances in the records of the central courts. In addition these families often held a manor court where they resided, and this means of controlling their immediate locality was often extended over a wide area by acting as JPs, sheriffs and MPs. The gentry's lands were typically grouped

round one or perhaps two residential manors within a radius of 10–15 miles; this limited geographical distribution also tended to determine the extent of their social relationships. The majority however also held lands in neighbouring, usually east midland, counties but these were mostly leased out.¹⁰

These gentry characteristics inevitably are typical of the well-established knightly and near-knightly families, and like a purely governmental criterion of the gentry cannot chart families' arrival into, or departure from, the social group. On this basis, however, the Pakemans show an incipient gentry status. While not being documented until the early thirteenth century, it is clear from the family's appearance in the records of the central courts from the 1240s to the end of the fourteenth century that the Pakemans, in common with the gentry, had a sufficiently high status and sufficient means continually to prosecute writs at Westminster.¹¹

However there were important ways in which the Pakemans differed from gentry. Firstly they did not hold a dominant position in their residential village. That, to judge from inquisitions *post mortem* and the 1327 and 1332 lay subsidies, was the privilege of the knighted Herle family, who were absentee lords.¹² Secondly there is a difference in estate structure. The surviving inquisitions *post mortem* for the Pakemans in 1272, 1303 and 1313 show their holdings to have consisted of a demesne varying between 30 and 75 acres, a small amount of meadow and woodland, with some free tenants holding a total of 4½ virgates, and (in 1313) eight villein tenants owing relatively light labour services.¹³ This type of estate structure is similar to that of knights and 'well-to-do freeholders' which Kosminsky noted in the east midlands from his analysis of the 1279 Hundred Rolls.¹⁴ It is also a type which was typical of woodland areas where there had been recent colonization and which gave 'little opportunity to practise the traditional oppressions of manorial lords' which bolstered the position of gentry in other areas of the county.¹⁵

Another uncharacteristic feature of the Pakeman estate was that the landed interests of the first three documented generations of the family were entirely in Kirby Muxloe, yet even so were not very stable. The first member, Simon I, granted the majority of his holding to Garendon Abbey in 1234 comprising a wood, an assart, some meadow and 3 virgates of demesne land; while this could suggest that Pakeman was in financial difficulties, it may have been a gift to the monastery in which he was to spend the last years of his life.¹⁶ Yet the first extant inquisition, of Robert II, could indicate that the family was indeed in serious debt in the thirteenth century. Robert II held 2½ virgates in demesne at Kirby and 2 virgates at Odstone, 8 miles west of Kirby; there was an additional 7 virgates in Kirby held by tenants for nominal money rents which may suggest this land was sold either by Robert II himself or his father or grandfather.¹⁷ Family fortunes thereafter appear to have recovered largely through prudent management. Between 1272 and 1303 Robert III bought small amounts of land in the Kirby fields, amounting in all to over 80 acres, and he acquired some land in Barton, near Odstone, through his marriage to Beatrice: none of this property appears in his inquisition *post mortem* of

1303.¹⁸ When ten years later Robert III's son, Simon II, died, his inquisition showed that the size of the family demesne had almost tripled, to 75 acres. Simon II also acquired a life interest in some land in Coventry, including some shops, from his marriage to a widow, Agnes. His third marriage brought some land in Worthington.¹⁹

By the early fourteenth century, then, the Pakemans had built up an estate which was of a similar character to those of well-to-do freeholders in other woodland areas. The fleeting glimpses of the estate structure which are obtained from inquisitions show that this type of landholding was different from the larger and more stable estates belonging to knightly families in the area such as the Herles.²⁰ However it is evident that the Pakemans' estate was sufficiently important to the Herles for them to buy the custody of the lands held in chief and Simon III's marriage soon after Simon II's death in 1313.²¹ This emphasises the difference between the status of the Herles and the Pakemans: despite their acquisitions the Pakemans still appear to have a closer affinity with other free tenants living in Kirby, and this is confirmed to a certain extent by what is known of the family's social relationships. The 1327 and 1332 lay subsidies provide a useful starting point; these show William Herle's preeminent position in the village. He is followed by a group, all assessed at approximately the same amount, which included Simon Pakeman III and representatives of the Levere and Mayel families.²² Both these families had long associations with the Pakemans. With the first mention of the Pakemans, in the early thirteenth century, we already see the Leveres cooperating with them: acting as witnesses—a function they performed throughout the century—buying and selling land, and belonging to the same gangs which attacked the property of local monasteries.²³ Indeed the two families seem to have undergone a parallel development for their assessments in 1327 and 1332 were similar, and they both became involved in local government at about the same time.²⁴

The Mayel family had a similar relationship with the Pakemans.²⁵ It could be said that evidence for this type of interaction may relate more to economic necessity than to social relationships. All three families held the bulk of their lands in Kirby, and it made sense to call upon the most influential residents of the village to act as witnesses in order to gain their support and to avoid potential challenges from the most likely quarter. However, other evidence shows that the ties among these families accurately reflect their social relationships. An eloquent example is the gathering which took place to take the proof of age of Simon Pakeman III in 1328.²⁶ William Levere testified to Simon's age by remembering his baptism at which Simon's godparents were present, one of whom was Simon Mayel. Richard and Mathew Mayel also testified, along with John de Weston and Simon Wareyn, both of whom to judge from the lay subsidies were Kirby residents and on a par with the Pakemans, Mayels and Leveres.²⁷ The le Hunte family were also probably friends of the Pakemans. Like the Mayels they witnessed Pakeman charters in the 1270s, and Philip le Hunte acted as attorney for Simon II's sister Margaret in 1318. He also vouched for Simon III's coming of age in 1328. Indeed the two families may have been related for in 1321 Simon Pakeman II became heir to a Robert le Hunte of Kirby and is referred to as a kinsman.²⁸

The impression of the Pakemans' social relationships gained from this admittedly meagre evidence is that they were closely oriented to other families of a similar status in the immediate area. Indeed Pakeman and his friends formed a small knot of families who had sufficient economic resources in the early fourteenth century to lead village society in Kirby, where there was no resident lord. In short they were what in the fifteenth century Fortescue would have described as 'franklins'.²⁹

The marriages of the Pakemans provide another index to the family's social aspirations. Little can be said about the marriages of the early members because maiden names are not recorded. Robert Pakeman III married Beatrice, a widow, who had first married into the Friday family. It appears from a grant in 1304 to her son of all her lands in Kirby, probably her original jointure, that Beatrice was a native of Kirby, which emphasises the local nature of the Pakemans' 'marriage policy'.³⁰ This is also apparent from Simon Pakeman II's marriages, the arrangements of which are quite well documented. Simon II married Alice, a daughter of Silvester of Kent, a free tenant of Simon's grandfather Robert in Kirby for whom he also witnessed charters.³¹ Silvester of Kent was apparently a tenant of limited resources. In order to provide his daughter, a widow, with a second jointure he bought land from his son-in-law's heir and brother, William Pipaunt. This he granted to Simon Pakeman, with his capital messuage, on Simon's marriage to his daughter Alice. It seems as though Silvester had granted to Simon not only land he had bought but also everything he possessed, for the gift did not come into force until Silvester had died.³²

Simon Pakeman's second marriage was also to another widow, Agnes, who had a son, Elias of Lyn, by her first marriage. Through this Simon acquired a life interest in some shops and land in Coventry, which were granted to Elias in 1334.³³ This episode in Simon II's life is the most interesting and unfortunately the least documented; there is no information about how Simon II was able to break his parochial bounds. It is however clear that this phase was relatively short lived, for by 1305 Simon II had married again, this time Christina the daughter and coheir of Richard de Whitsand of Worthington, a village 12 miles north-west of Kirby. While this marriage emphasises the small circle in which the family moved at this time, it also shows that such an attitude could be advantageous, for Simon gained over a carucate of land in Worthington which passed to his younger son on Simon and Christina's deaths.³⁴

Simon II died in 1313 leaving a son Simon III who was seven. Simon III was taken into the king's wardship and custody was given to Hugh le Despencer as a part payment of the crown's debt to him. Despencer in turn sold it to William Herle; Herle then was responsible for Simon III's marriage and the choice of bride might be expected to give an indication of how the lord of Kirby regarded the Pakemans in terms of social status.³⁵ However, little is known about Simon's wife Agnes, although as she brought lands in the Leicester forest area to the Pakemans she was probably from a local family.³⁶ The younger Pakemans also followed this local marriage pattern; Simon I's sister Margaret for example married a William Marshall who was a leading free tenant in Stapleton, a village 5 miles south-west of Kirby.³⁷

If it is possible to characterise the position of the Pakemans from such meagre evidence, it appears that by the beginning of the fourteenth century they belonged to a close-knit group of families who were on the verge of gentry status. Although not possessing a means of social control in the manor court these families held a dominant position in the locality; this to a certain extent was recognised when Simon III's contemporaries were appointed to minor government offices for the first time in the 1340s.³⁸ This dynamic element is important in looking at the history of the Pakeman family. There is a danger in regarding Simon Pakeman III's service in the Lancastrian household as laying the foundation of the family fortune, which would be to disregard the achievements of Simon III's grandfather and father. From the late thirteenth century the family's estate was clearly expanding through piecemeal acquisition and marriage, although within an extremely narrow geographical area, which was also reflected in their social relationships. This then is the family background against which we must set the career of its best-known member, Simon Pakeman III.

Simon Pakeman III's early activities, like those of his ancestors, are poorly documented for the seven years after his coming of age in 1327. It is therefore all the more surprising to see this obscurity dispelled by Simon III's election as MP in 1334. This was Pakeman's first local government position and his last for seven years. The Commons regularly demanded that MPs be the *plus convenable* of the county, and the election of someone not in the county's own tradition of knightly MPs (in terms of economic and social status and administrative experience) is interesting.³⁹ However, Pakeman's election was not completely exceptional in the mid-fourteenth century. In the early 1350s men of a similar status to Pakeman were elected, who had only been employed in the relatively lowly positions of coroners and tax collectors; one such was John Levere, the friend of Simon Pakeman III.⁴⁰ Whereas Levere served a kind of 'apprenticeship' for MP in those minor positions, Pakeman's may have consisted of a legal training. By 1337 Simon was appearing as an attorney at the Court of Common Pleas for local landlords like Sir Nicholas Charnels and the Abbot of St. Evroult (1338) as well as for his brother William.⁴¹ It is difficult to envisage Pakeman's graduation from his family's limited field of experience to the wider horizon of a legal career as the result of his own efforts. It is possible that the man who secured Simon's wardship and marriage continued to show an interest in him after he had come of age. This was Sir William Herle, who had distinguished himself at the Court of Common Pleas and was Chief Justice there in 1327, a position he held intermittently until 1337, when he became a member of the king's Council.⁴²

Perhaps introduced and helped by Herle, Pakeman fast established himself as a popular lawyer. In 1340 Henry earl of Lancaster appointed him steward of Leicester Honor, a position he held until 1346. After a break under Henry Grosmont, John of Gaunt reappointed him steward in 1362; this was later extended for his life in 1372, although Pakeman resigned in 1375 because of old age. He nevertheless continued as a member of Gaunt's council, a position to which he was first appointed in 1369.⁴³

Pakeman's appointment as Leicester steward in 1340 dramatically divides his career into two: his activities before then can be described as local when his legal clientele was drawn from the immediate area around Kirby; his one entry into the political arena as MP was not followed by reelection or periods spent in other administrative positions. Once steward, the political weight behind, and the prestige of, the office assured Pakeman of a career as a legal adviser and local administrator. It is significant that the year after his appointment, Pakeman started to be appointed to commissions, the first of which was to hear and determine a plea that one of Lancaster's yeomen, Richard of Kenilworth, was attacked at Prestwold.⁴⁴ Although Pakeman mainly represented Lancaster's interests in Leicestershire, seignorial service took him far beyond his own normal sphere of activities: between 1342 and 1344 for example he sat on commissions of inquiry and oyer and terminer in Lancashire.⁴⁵

With the death of Henry Lancaster and the accession of Grosmont, Pakeman left the stewardship for fifteen years until Gaunt reappointed him in 1362. During this period, although his activities elsewhere ceased, Pakeman maintained his position in the political society of Leicestershire. He was appointed to every peace commission and sat on eight commissions of oyer and terminer and of inquiry.⁴⁶ He was also elected MP in 1346 and 1348. Although Pakeman was no longer in such a powerful position, it would be wrong to assume he had parted company with Grosmont, for Grosmont probably used his influence to keep a trusted supporter in important local positions.⁴⁷

Between 1346 and 1362 Pakeman continued to act as legal adviser to his local clients, and also maintained his links with the Herle family. In 1353 Robert Herle gained Pakeman an exemption from jury service, perhaps in order to spend more time on their joint enterprise, for Herle was keeper of the Priory of Monks Kirby and Pakeman the debt collector.⁴⁸ Yet Simon III was not so heavily committed that he could not find new, and more influential clients; it is at this time that his relationship with Thomas Beauchamp comes into focus. During his first period as Leicester steward Pakeman had acted for parties other than Lancaster, one of whom was Beauchamp. In 1341 he was Beauchamp's attorney, and may have acted as bailiff for his Leicestershire manor at Kibworth Beauchamp. Pakeman witnessed charters at Kibworth for Beauchamp in 1344, and he was also steward for the neighbouring manor of Kibworth Harcourt owned by Merton College.⁴⁹ As with Lancaster, Pakeman found himself representing Beauchamp's interests outside his customary field of activity. In 1347 he was appointed to a Warwickshire commission of oyer and terminer to hear a complaint brought by Beauchamp.⁵⁰ It is difficult to be certain about the character of Pakeman's relationship with Beauchamp, although there is a possibility that he was a member of the earl's household. In 1355 Beauchamp granted his beloved 'valet' lands in Nottinghamshire for recovering the lordship of Gower. Henry of Lancaster also called Pakeman his 'valet' in 1345 when he was still steward.⁵¹ If Pakeman were part of the Beauchamp household the connection was fairly short lived for he stopped acting for the family in the 1350s.

Pakeman's sphere of activity was again broadened following his appointment as Gaunt's Leicester steward in 1362. We see him on commissions in other midland counties where there were lands attached to Leicester Honor—Northamptonshire, Rutland, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, as well as in Cambridgeshire.⁵² He also spent much time in London, appearing at the central courts to represent his habitual clients as well as attending Gaunt's council and working at the Savoy, making inventories of the Duchy records.⁵³

However Pakeman's chief importance to Gaunt lay in the Honor itself. Detailed analysis of Gaunt's influence in the county shows that he secured a few nominees to the important local offices, but not in such numbers as to arouse local opposition. It is also significant that few of Gaunt's supporters were nominated if they could not qualify on the basis of their own experience or social and economic status.⁵⁴ Pakeman may have been an exception in this respect, as the importance of the office of steward was recognised as sufficient qualification in itself for local government office. He clearly figured as a lynch pin in Gaunt's designs. He was a JP until his retirement; indeed he may have been the *custos rotulorum*.⁵⁵ On the occasions he was elected as MP in 1365 and 1368 his colleagues were men who were later retained by Gaunt.⁵⁶ Yet Pakeman's role in the web of Gaunt's retinue should not be allowed to obscure his more regular and local career as a lawyer. It is strange that, considering Pakeman's extension of his public career through seignorial service, he did not take advantage of the situation to extend his own personal clientele. Some of the men he represented during his time as Gaunt's steward were members of the Lancastrian retinue, but they also resided in the Charnwood/Leicester forest area and Pakeman acted for them before he was Gaunt's steward. For example the Ferrers of Groby were a peerage family whose main residence, at Groby, was 2 miles from Kirby Muxloe. The family had supported Thomas and Henry of Lancaster, and Henry Ferrers was the highest paid of Grosmont's retainers.⁵⁷ Henry's son William continued the family's Lancastrian association and served Gaunt and called upon Pakeman's services.⁵⁸ In the late 1350s Pakeman was a witness, in 1359 feoffee, along with two of Gaunt's retainers. Pakeman also acted as attorney for Ferrers' wife and was again a feoffee for William Ferrers in 1371. In addition Simon III maintained contact with his old associates: in 1365 for example he acted as a feoffee for Robert Herle.⁵⁹ Pakeman's adherence to his locality, despite his periods of employment in one of the most powerful of lordly households and the concomitant opportunities for advancement, marks him out from the more frequently documented type of professional administrator-cum-lawyer who advanced into more lucrative and influential positions.

This is not to say Pakeman did not benefit economically from his periods of service; the estate he left to his son was clearly much larger and more widespread, and was assuming more of a 'gentry-type' structure than that which he himself inherited.⁶⁰ Yet the breadth of his social relationships remained much the same as before he first took service with the Lancastrians. Pakeman's standing at the end of his career can be judged in several ways. In

1374 Pakeman put much of his land in trust; the feoffees chosen were Richard of Leicester, Stephen Peak and Alan of Kirby, all vicars of parishes in his locality.⁶¹ When Pakeman died in 1376, leaving a son who was under age, Simon IV, the guardians who had been appointed were Agnes, Simon III's wife, Alan of Kirby and Alan of Sutton, two local incumbents, and one of the old family friends, Simon Mayel.⁶² This once again reflects the limited social horizons of a man whose career, if typical of this professional group, would have led one to expect he could recruit a more influential group of guardians and feoffees.

When Simon Pakeman IV died while still a minor in 1391, the estate was divided between Simon III's daughters, both of whom were already married.⁶³ The daughters' marriages indicate that Simon III had built up an estate which was sufficiently large to attract gentry sons. Katherine married Robert Digby, the heir of a gentry family documented since the twelfth century with an estate centred on Tilton in the east of the county. As well as possessing the social and economic status appropriate to a member of the gentry Robert was also involved in local political society, being an MP in 1373 and a tax assessor in 1380.⁶⁴ Simon III's other daughter, Joan, married Richard Vylers, a family which had been centred at Brokesby since the thirteenth century. In the 1377 poll tax Vylers was described as an 'esquire'.⁶⁵ Although Simon Pakeman III reflected the limited social horizons of his family when he was not employed in seignorial business, it is clear that his daughters' husbands were of a higher status than Pakeman and indicates the extent to which he had expanded the family's estate.

Yet the Pakemans' arrival into the gentry suggested by these marriages and to a lesser extent the estate, ironically at a time when the family failed in the male line, indicates that Simon III's long seignorial service had not necessarily conferred an immediate increase in family status. Indeed Pakeman may have even shunned the more lucrative perquisites of office, for as a family the Pakemans appear to have gained little from Simon III's employment which could not have been obtained without service in a magnate household, judging from his ancestors' energetic activities.

Simon Pakeman III thus appears to have had an exceptional ability—recognised by influential magnates—which ensured that he became more than a local legal adviser, the most likely position for a son of a family with a background such as the Pakemans'. Yet because Simon's rise was so rapid, he may not have been able to take full advantage of his position in a way that an official from a well-established gentry family would have found natural.

Pakeman's career provides a variant of the more familiar model of the rising gentry official, and indirectly helps us to appreciate some of the processes of recruitment into the medieval gentry class.

Notes

1. E.g. R. F. Hunnisett, *The Medieval Coroner* (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 169–89; G. G. Astill 'The Medieval Gentry: A Study in Leicestershire Society, 1350–1399' (Birmingham University Ph.D. thesis 1977) (hereafter Astill), pp. 17–18, 182–6
2. E.g. R. F. Treharne, 'The Knights in the Period of Reform and Rebellion, 1258–67', *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, xxi (1946), pp. 1–12

3. M. M. Postan, *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, i, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 590–5, and his *The Medieval Economy and Society* (London, 1972), pp. 161–5; R. H. Hilton, *A Medieval Society: The West Midlands at the End of the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1966), pp. 49–55; P. R. Coss, 'Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, no. 68 (Aug. 1975); J. E. Newman, 'Greater and Lesser Landowners and Parochial Patronage: Yorkshire in the Thirteenth Century', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xcii (1977)
4. N. Denholm Young, *Seignorial Administration in England* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 2–5, 66–85, 163–4; L. Fox, *The Administration of the Honor of Leicester in the Fourteenth Century* (Leicester, 1940), pp. 28–36
5. E.g. J. R. Maddicott, 'The County Community and the Making of Public Opinion in Fourteenth-Century England', *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., xxviii (1978), pp. 27–43; R. Virgoe, 'The Crown and Local Government: East Anglia under Richard II', in F. R. H. Du Boulay and C. M. Barron (eds.), *The Reign of Richard II* (London, 1971), pp. 218–41
6. Astill, pp. 223–9
7. L. Fox, *The Administration of the Honor of Leicester in the Fourteenth Century* (Leicester, 1940), pp. 20–1, 74–6
8. Hist. Manuscripts Commission, *Hastings Manuscripts*, 4 vols. (London 1928–47), i, pp. 11–12. A pedigree of the Pakeman family is printed in G. F. Farnham, *Leicestershire Medieval Pedigrees* (Leicester, 1925), p. 43
9. *Cal. Inquisitions Post Mortem* (hereafter *Cal.I.P.M.*), VII, 94; *Cal.I.P.M.*, XIV, 275
10. Astill, pp. 1–26
11. G. F. Farnham, *Leicestershire Medieval Village Notes* (Leicester, 1929–33), 6 vols., (hereafter *L.M.V.N.*), III, pp. 131–8
12. *Cal.I.P.M.*, IX, 39; *Cal.I.P.M.*, XI, 589; *L.M.V.N.*, III, pp. 136–7
13. *Cal.I.P.M.*, I, 797 (Robert Pakeman, 1272); *Cal.I.P.M.*, IV, 140 (Robert Pakeman, 1303); *Cal.I.P.M.*, V, p. 251 (Simon Pakeman, 1313)
14. E. A. Kosminsky, *Studies in the Agrarian History of England in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1956), pp. 256–78
15. E.g. in Feckenham Forest, Worcestershire: J. W. Willis Bund (ed.), *The inquisitions post mortem for the county of Worcester*, Worcester Historical Soc., 2 vols., (1894, 1909), I, pp. 5–7; R. H. Hilton, *A Medieval Society*, pp. 140–1. However most of the demesnes in Leicestershire seem to have been smaller; most lay tenants-in-chief's demesnes were under 150 acres; R. H. Hilton, *The Economic Development of some Leicestershire Estates* (Oxford, 1947), pp. 9–11
16. *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1226–1257*, p. 194
17. *Cal.I.P.M.*, I, 797
18. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, pp. 13–16; *L.M.V.N.*, III, pp. 134–5
19. *Cal.I.P.M.*, V, p. 251; *Warwickshire Feet of Fines*, II, ed. E. Stokes and L. Drucker (Dugdale Soc., XV, 1939), pp. 70, 114; *Cal. Ancient Deeds*, III, A6058; *L.M.V.N.*, II, p. 31
20. *Cal.I.P.M.*, IX, 39; *Cal.I.P.M.*, XI, 589
21. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 16
22. *L.M.V.N.*, III, pp. 136–7. The range was from 19d. to 2s. in 1327 and 18d. and 3s. in 1332
23. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, pp. 13–4, 64; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1327–30*, p. 275
24. E.g. *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1350–54*, pp. 449, 568; both on commissions of oyer and terminer in 1345
25. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 14
26. *Cal.I.P.M.*, VII, 94
27. *L.M.V.N.*, III, pp. 136–7
28. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, pp. 13–14, 43; *Cal.I.P.M.*, VII, 94; *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1319–27*, p. 43, *Cal.I.P.M.*, VI, 304

29. J. Fortescue, *De Laudibus Legum Anglie*, ed. S. B. Chrimes (London, 1942), Chap. XXIV, and R. H. Hilton *The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 25–7 on the status of franklins
30. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 16. The Fridays may have been the same family who were tenants of Leicester Abbey in Stoughton: R. H. Hilton, *Economic Development*, p. 101
31. Silvester held 2½ virgates of Robert: *Cal.I.P.M.*, I, 797; *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 13
32. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, pp. 13–14
33. *Cal. Ancient Deeds*, II, A4277 and IV, A6477–79, A7656
34. *L.M.V.N.*, II, p. 31
35. *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 16
36. *Cal.I.P.M.*, XV, 132
37. Farnham, *Leicestershire Medieval Pedigrees*, p. 43; P.R.O., E 179/133/1
38. See note 24; and e.g. tax collector, *Cal. Fine Rolls*, 1340–50, p. 268
39. Fox, *Administration of the Honor of Leicester*, p. 35; Astill, pp. 147–8
40. Astill, pp. 148–9
41. Farnham, *Leicestershire Medieval Pedigrees*, p. 94; G. F. Farnham, ‘The Manors of Allexton, Appleby and Ashby Foleville’, *Trans. Leicestershire Arch. Soc.*, 11 (1913–20), p. 375; *L.M.V.N.*, III, p. 136
42. E. Foss, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Judges of England* (London, 1870), p. 344; L. Stephen and S. Lee (eds.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, XXVI (1891), p. 248
43. R. Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster*, i (1953), pp. 356, 362, 375; *John of Gaunt’s Register 1372–76*, ed. S. Armitage-Smith (Camden Soc., 3rd ser., xx, xxi, 1911), 255, 218, 1811, 730
44. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1340–43, p. 120
45. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1340–43, pp. 542, 550, 586, 587; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1343–45, pp. 87, 90
46. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1350–54, p. 89; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1354–58, pp. 59, 61, 62, 68, 123, 124, 395; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1361–64, p. 66; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1345–48, p. 499; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1350–54, pp. 288, 455; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1354–58, pp. 58, 124; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1358–61, pp. 280, 421
47. Fox, *Administration of the Honor of Leicester*, p. 35. Grosmont’s influence may have led to some opposition, for in 1352 Pakeman was removed from a commission, only to be reinstated later in the year, his ‘diligence and fidelity testified’; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1349–54, pp. 330, 412
48. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1350–54, pp. 400, 165; *Cal. Fine Rolls*, 1347–56, pp. 403, 429
49. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1343–45, p. 240; P.R.O., E 315/58 (Beauchamp Cartulary), fol. 50r; C. Howell, ‘Peasant Inheritance in the Midlands, 1280–1700’, in J. Goody, J. Thirsk, E. Thompson (eds.), *Family and Inheritance, Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200–1800* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 130
50. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1345–48, p. 367
51. *Cal. Ancient Deeds*, IV, A7203; *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 24
52. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1361–63, pp. 447, 448, 526; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1364–67, pp. 71, 74, 360, 366, 449
53. *L.M.V.N.*, III, pp. 131–8; Somerville, *Duchy of Lancaster*, i, pp. 62–3, 117; P.R.O., DL 41/1/33, 41/3/27
54. Astill, pp. 164–7
55. Astill, p. 165. It is clear from the way Pakeman was entertained by Leicester borough that he was regarded as an extremely influential person in the town as well as the county: M. Bateson (ed.), *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, ii, (London, 1901), pp. 47, 52, 65, 144
56. *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1365–68, pp. 168, 273, 480; Sir Ralph Hastings (1365) and Sir John Talbot (1368), Astill, pp. 152, 342
57. *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1318–21, p. 69; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1327–30, p. 528; P.R.O., DL 41/9/3/27
58. P.R.O., DL 28/1/2; British Library, Harley MS 265, fol. 25v

59. *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1354–60, p. 508; *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1354–60, p. 56; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1365–68, p. 271; *Cal. I.P.M.*, XIII, 87; the other retainers were John Buckingham and Ralph Basset of Sapcote; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1372–77, p. 350; *Cal. Fine Rolls*, 1369–77, p. 142; *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 149
60. *Cal. I.P.M.*, XIV, 275; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389–92, p. 405. His service with the duchy also brought life interests in large blocks of land near Kirby: *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 24
61. P.R.O., CP 25(1)/125/66, No. 298
62. *Rotulorum Originalium in Curia Scaccarii Abbrevatio*, ii, (London, 1810), p. 344. Pakeman tried to maintain their loyalty by granting them life interests in some of his woodland: *Hastings Manuscripts*, i, p. 18
63. *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389–92, p. 405
64. Farnham, *Leicestershire Medieval Pedigrees*, pp. 129–131; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1369–74, p. 612; *Cal. Fine Rolls*, 1377–83, p. 187. Robert Digby is described as an esquire in the 1377 poll tax: P.R.O., E 179/133/26
65. P.R.O., E 179/133/26