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PREFACE

This short study is the outcome of an interest in the history of medieval Leicestershire, any history of which must be largely concerned with the earldom and honor of Leicester. Leicestershire's historians, from Burton onwards, have all described the careers of the respective earls of Leicester, a treatment rendered necessary by the fact that the earls were the lords of Leicester borough. They have also offered descriptions and descents of the Leicestershire vills within the honor, but since the county or borough and not the honor has been their subject, such questions as the full territorial extent and the administrative system of the honor have not been hitherto treated. My attempt to investigate these neglected aspects has naturally led me far outside Leicestershire, for the honor was a large complex of lands transcending county boundaries; it has also led me into the fascinating subject of the institutional and administrative side of private property. It is one thing to conceive of a manor or honor as a bundle of proprietary rights handed down from father to son or passing from family to family; it is quite another to comprehend the economic and administrative structure of which it formed a part and to understand its inside management.

What is here offered is essentially in the nature of an interim report on the initial stage of the investigation of a far bigger subject. It is hoped to continue the administrative history of the Leicester honor throughout the medieval period down to later times; it should then be easier to attempt the far bigger task of dealing with the system of administration within the whole of the Lancastrian lands. In the meantime, it is thought that a preliminary sketch of the Lancastrian administrative system within the honor of Leicester during the fourteenth century will be of value and interest for purposes of comparison and contrast with other monographs on kindred topics.
I should like to record my indebtedness to all who have helped me by their interest and advice. To Professor F. M. Powicke, who originally inspired me to take up this line of enquiry, I am most grateful for writing for me an introductory note which, like everything he does, is very clear and to the point. I owe much to the friendly criticism of Professor E. F. Jacob, who supervised the thesis upon one section of which the following pages have been partly based. Mr. S. H. Skillington and other Leicestershire friends have encouraged me by their constant interest and advice on local matters, and Mr. Albert Herbert has kindly drawn for me the map I include. Finally, I extend my thanks to the Leicestershire Archaeological Society, which has so generously made publication possible.

L. F.
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INTRODUCTORY NOTE

If the reader is to understand the nature and scope of Mr. Fox’s study of the administration of the Leicester honor in the Middle Ages, he must have firmly fixed in his mind the difference between the old division of England into shires—a division which has persisted, without any loss of vigorous life, until to-day—and the later division of the greater part of England into baronies and honors.¹ The shire was, except here and there, compact, the honor was distributed. The shire was fixed, the honor was the result of grants, marriage alliances, and good fortune. The shire was an area of royal administration and, with the exception of the counties of Chester, Durham and later, Lancaster, was ruled by a royal official, the sheriff; the honor was a feudal entity and was administered, widespread and scattered though it was, as an object of private jurisdiction. One of the most interesting facts in our early history is that these systems continued so long side by side, and that the later system did not edge the former aside, but was adjusted to it, and ultimately gave way to it.

Hence the honor of Leicester is quite different from the county of Leicester. It did not by any means cover the whole of the shire, and, after it was divided in the reign of king John, it included much less land in Leicestershire than it had included before; for the share of the younger co-heiress contained land in Leicestershire which through her was separated for ever from the honor of Leicester. On the other hand, the honor contained lands or fees in many other shires, in Kent, Hampshire, Dorset, Wiltshire, Norfolk and Suffolk, as well as in the neighbouring midland shires of Northampton, Warwick, Nottingham and Rutland. Mr. Fox has confined his study to the lands of the honor in these midland shires, but it should always be remembered that the lands in Leicestershire formed only part of this group of fees and manors, and that, when he speaks of Leicester as the centre of the administration, he is referring to the earl’s property and courts in Leicester as the centre of a private jurisdiction, not to Leicester as the county town of Leicestershire.

¹There was no legal distinction between these terms. The name “honor” was generally used for the “largest complexes” of land, to use F. W. Maitland’s phrase.
In recent years we have been told a great deal more than we knew before about honors and their administration. The administration was very careful, the honor being divided into groups of manors called bailiwicks; and a hierarchy of officials was responsible at every stage, from the manor to the central offices, for the conduct of its affairs, economic, judicial, financial, executive. The reader can get a good idea of this recent learning from Mr. Denholm-Young's *Seignorial Administration in England* (Oxford, 1937). Mr. Fox has applied this learning and experience to the honor of Leicester, whose administration has never been explained before.

Mr. Fox has been very fortunate in his selection of the honor of Leicester, for it so happens that few medieval honors have left such rich records of their administration. This brings me to another very interesting feature of the history of the honor. The honor of Leicester, since the later part of the thirteenth century, has been part of the great honor or, as it became rather later, the duchy of Lancaster. After the famous Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, was killed at the battle of Evesham in 1265, his honor was taken over by the crown, for Simon was regarded as a traitor. It was given to the youngest son of Henry III, Edmund, who also received, in a different way, the similar honors of Lancaster and Lincoln, each of them, like the honor of Leicester, widespread over various parts of England.¹ Now this vast collection of lands was never held by anybody who was not closely related to the royal house, and since the days of the first Lancastrian king, Henry IV, it has been associated with or annexed to the crown. The duchy of Lancaster, of which the honor of Leicester is a part, is still the most important territorial dignity held by the king in England. Its relation to the crown was defined by important statutes in the reigns of Edward IV and Henry VII. When other hereditary revenues of the crown were surrendered in the nineteenth century, the revenues of the duchy of Lancaster were kept apart and have remained at the disposal of the sovereign. The duchy has its own office and its own minister, the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, responsible to Parliament. The significance of all this, from Mr. Fox's point of view, is that the records of the duchy have been pre-

¹For the earlier history of the honor of Lancaster and its relation to the county, see J. Tait, *Medieval Manchester and the beginnings of Lancashire* (Manchester, 1904).
served, and with them, as part of them, the records of the honor of Leicester. The surviving records of the medieval administration of other honors are few and casual; an enormous mass of material has disappeared, and most of what survives is due to the fact that, for some reason or other, the honor or barony concerned was, for a time, in the hands of the crown. The records of an honor which was continuously annexed to the crown had an exceptionally good survival value. This is why Mr. Fox is so happy in the choice of a subject. The first fruits of his labours on these invaluable records are to be found in the following essay. If I may say so, I think that he has done his work exceedingly well.

F. M. POWICKE.
INTRODUCTION

The territorial entity or congeries of fees known as the honor of Leicester in the fourteenth century came into being by a process of territorial addition and partition.\(^1\) Originating as a combination of the Domesday lands of Hugh de Grentemaisnil with those of Robert, count of Meulan, the extensive possessions of the Beaumont earls of Leicester passed from father to son during the twelfth century, but on the death of the last Beaumont earl, Robert FitzParnel, without issue in 1204, they were divided between his two sisters, Amicia and Margaret, the wives respectively of Simon de Montfort and Saer de Quincy. Of the two moieties created by this partition, one was the grouping of estates recognized as the honor of Leicester in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; the other was the honor of Winton, which remained separate from the Leicester honor and suffered partition between three co-heirs on the death of Roger de Quincey, earl of Winchester, in 1264. By a gradual and complicated process extending over some twenty-five years or more the honor of Leicester, together with the earldom, passed to Simon de Montfort, only to become forfeit to the crown after Evesham in 1265.

On 26 October, 1265, Edmund, styled Crouchback, fourth and youngest, but second surviving son of Henry III by Eleanor, received a charter granting to him and his heirs the honor of Leicester and all the lands held by Simon de Montfort, late earl of Leicester;\(^2\) and forthwith he received, as earl of Leicester, a grant of all the privileges and liberties appertaining to the honor.\(^3\)

The significance of this transference of the earldom, town and honor of Leicester to the king's son can only be appreciated in relation to the numerous other grants of lands and titles which he received. Without even attempting a summary enumeration of these, it is sufficient to note that he was earl of Lancaster and Derby as well as earl of Leicester.\(^4\) Perhaps the greatest seat of

\(^1\) For a full treatment of this subject see my article, "The Honor and Earldom of Leicester: Origin and Descent, 1066-1399", English Historical Review, liv, 385-402.


\(^3\) Cal. Chart. Rolls, ii, 67.

his power was in the northern and central midlands, but he had large estates also in the north and in the southern marches of Wales, besides lands in the eastern and southern counties of England. The honor of Leicester, therefore, formed but one of several similar congeries of fees which composed Edmund's vast territorial possessions. It was no longer an isolated unit, but fitted into a larger system. It had, in fact, become parcel of the great grouping of honors and possessions which descended during the fourteenth century in the earls and dukes of Lancaster,¹ and which on the accession of Henry of "Lancaster" to the English throne as Henry IV in 1399 became an appanage annexed to the crown, under a distinct and independent administration, which from that time to the present has been known as the duchy of Lancaster.

The bulk of the possessions of the honor of Leicester in the fourteenth century lay in the five midland counties of Leicester, Northampton, Nottingham, Rutland and Warwick. Besides these, the full extent of the honor comprised scattered lands or fees in many other shires: in Bedford, Berkshire, Buckingham, Cambridge, Dorset, Essex, Hampshire, Kent, Middlesex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Sussex and Wiltshire.² No detailed treatment of the outlying fees is attempted in this study, an omission explained by a feature of the administration of the honor in general. The lands outside the five midland counties, although grouped into bailiwicks of the honor, stood apart from the rest of the honor. There were bailiffs or keepers of the fees of the honor in the counties of Bedford and Buckingham, Dorset and Wilts, Norfolk and Suffolk, and Kent; but they were not supervised by, nor answerable to, the central officials of the honor. Some of these lands were administered as distinct independent units, but others of them were managed for administrative convenience along with other adjacent Lancastrian possessions which formed no part of the honor. Thus, for instance, the lands of the honor in Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire were under the distinct administration of an official, variously described as keeper, feodary and steward, who was answerable for the collection of rents, the perquisites of courts and jurisdictional dues direct to the central administration of the honor.¹

¹See Appendix I.
²For a list of the component fees of the honor in the early fourteenth century see English Historical Review, liv, 400-2.
departments of the Lancastrian administration;\(^1\) and the same applied to the fees of the honor in Sussex and Surrey.\(^2\) On the other hand, the lands of the honor in Norfolk and Suffolk and elsewhere, though their separate identity was maintained, were linked up for administrative purposes with other Lancastrian possessions, a circumstance which doubtless explains the absence of separate records of their administration.

The midland lands of the honor were accordingly that part of the honor which in the fourteenth century was organized and worked as a territorial and administrative grouping, and for which administrative records have survived as a whole. These lands in themselves were extensive. Their management created problems necessitating the use of certain administrative offices and practices. It is to indicate the more important features of the organization and administration of these midland possessions of the honor, within the wider Lancastrian administrative system, that this short study has been attempted.

\(^1\)D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 26; 725/11818-11822.  
I
SOURCES

The chief source of evidence is in the category of the Public Records known as Ministers' Accounts. Of all existing manorial records, these documents are at once "the most closely in touch with facts and the least influenced by extraneous circumstances". They originated as private, business documents concerning estate management, and as such, probably more than any other type of record, are least affected by prejudice and personal bias. Apart from their essential economic value, as the work of Miss Levett and Miss Page has shown, they are valuable for illustrating a great variety of aspects of social life in medieval England; while in addition they give some real glimpses of corporate organizations and communities and of administrative officers and practices.

Under this category fall three types of account, which represent three stages in the administrative system of the Lancastrian lands as far as the honor of Leicester is concerned. First, there are the accounts rendered by the local officials of the honor: bailiffs, reeves, park-keepers, the forest receiver and so on. These accounts are the result of a definite process of manufacture from certain materials that can be traced. The basis of such an account would be a bundle of tallies, writs, receipts and schedules produced by the local official as evidence of payments or delivery of goods to the earl's household, to the receiver at Leicester, or to other authorized persons. A rental or valor would provide material from which the rents, services and other charges and allowances could be made up, and court rolls would give particulars of fines and perquisites. From these various sources and the verbal instructions of the local official, whose unfailing memory in itself constituted a record, the professional clerk compiled the account, setting out in an ordered financial statement the arrears of the accountant, all that he had received and paid out, and a balance. In the case of manorial accounts the endorse-

1A. E. Levett, "The Financial Organization of the Manor", Economic History Review, i, 66; reprinted in the same author's Studies in Manorial History, 43.
2H. S. Bennett's Life on the English Manor is a good example.
3D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 16-17; 198/3111; 198/3112; Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9.
4The earliest court rolls touching Leicester honor are for 5 and 6 Edward IV.
ment usually consists of a stock and grain account, and occasionally a statement of works owed by the villeins. Every animal that was born or died, that came into or left the manor during the year had to be accounted for; full particulars were given of all grain sown, reaped, sold, consumed or given away on each manor; and a stock-taking had to be duly made and reported of all the goods and implements on the premises.\(^1\) The chief forester had to answer for every tree chopped down with its crops and bark, and for every buck and doe which left the forest. The bailiff of the fees in each bailiwick was answerable for all feudal perquisites which may have become due since his last account, and for all profits arising from the liberties and franchises of the honor.

Secondly, there are the accounts of the central officials of the honor. One class of these is the accounts of the castle of Leicester presented by the porter or janitor on behalf of the keeper or steward.\(^2\) They supplement in many important ways what the borough records have to say about the topography of Leicester, the actual buildings of the castle, and the property, perquisites and powers of the earls in the borough. Considerations of space unfortunately will not allow of the development and illustration of these points in the following pages. More important from the administrative point of view are the accounts of the receiver of Leicester,\(^3\) which embody the income from the various local units of the honor, together with all the expenditure authorized for the payment of officials, for pensions and gifts, and for all sorts of administrative duties.

Thirdly, the final stage in the system of account is represented by the accounts of the earl's household and of his receiver-general, where the receiver of Leicester's payments appear alongside those of the receivers of other honors and estates.\(^4\) There are in addition various other records which are essential to an understanding of the wider Lancastrian system. The two valors of the lands of Henry, earl of Leicester and Lancaster, for the fifth and sixth years of Edward III, contained in a book of feodaries, are worthy of much closer attention than they have received hitherto.\(^5\) The rental of the lands of the same earl in 1349 con-

\(^1\)E.g. Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 1, 3, 3d.
\(^2\)D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20; 198/3112, m. 1; Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 1, 3d.
\(^3\)Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1147/20; D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.; 212/3246-3248.
\(^4\)D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20; D.L. Acc. Var. 3/1; 3/2; 32/21.
\(^5\)D.L. Knights' Fees 1/11, fos. 43-55.
tains a section on Leicester, which gives under each administrative
division of the honor a full statement of all sources of income and
of all recognized working allowances and charges. Similar
information for the later part of the century is contained in the
valors of the Lancastrian lands drawn up for the use of the
auditors.

More useful for throwing light on administrative detail and
local personnel throughout the greater part of the century are the
various smaller documents subsidiary to the main accounts. They
are mostly warrants from the earls ordering the reeves of demesne
manors or the receiver of Leicester to give a named person a
certain allowance of money or food, or instructing them to under­
take a specified duty; letters from the earls to their auditors
authorizing them to make certain allowances when auditing the
accounts of particular officials of the honor; and receipts produced
either by the reeves or the receiver as proof that various sums
have been duly paid.

The register of John of Gaunt contains valuable material for
the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Here, for instance,
is found the single record of the appointment of a steward of the
honor, together with various writs issued to the officials of the
honor. Further information concerning these officials and their
respective functions is found in the fine series of mayors’ accounts
which survive among the Leicester borough records. As far as it
has been possible to ascertain, the borough records form the only
local source, but in many important respects they form a valuable
counterpart to the wider duchy of Lancaster records.

Finally, there is much material forthcoming from the patent
and close rolls of the chancery and the fine rolls of the exchequer.Various miscellaneous grants and returns of interest are to be
found among the Additional and Harleian charters in the British
Museum, while special mention must be made of the collection of
grants concerning the property and privileges of the honor con­
tained in the duchy of Lancaster category of Ancient Deeds and
the second volume of the Great Cowcher.
II

TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION

Using these documents as the basis of our evidence it is possible to speak in general terms of the organization of the midland block of the honor. For apart from the break which followed the execution of earl Thomas of Lancaster in 1322, when the honor became forfeit to the crown and was administered by royal officials for two years,¹ there were no important changes in territorial grouping from the middle of the thirteenth to the end of the fourteenth centuries. The number of demesne manors and the composition of the bailiwick remained unchanged. Moreover, while administrative ideas and practices developed during this period and the tendency towards centralization increased, on this side also there is no evidence to suggest any fundamental change.

Like all other great feudatories the earls of Leicester had at an early period surrounded themselves with a retinue of knights, most of whom they enfeoffed with lands in return for knight's service,² themselves reserving for their own exploitation and sustenance a number of manors in demesne. By the end of the thirteenth century, when the earl of Leicester was also earl of Lancaster and Derby, there were only four desmesne manors within the midland possessions of the Leicester honor, the rest of the lands of the honor being held of the earl by tenants rendering varying amounts of knight's service and rents.³

¹The accounts of the officers in charge of the honor during the period of forfeiture have survived: Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9; 1147/20. See my description and text of same in Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc. xix, 199-274; xx, 77-158.
²A list of knights holding of the honor of the earl of Leicester, with the respective amounts of their knight's service, appears in the Red Book of the Exchequer (Rolls Series) ii, 552 (A.D. 1210-12).
³A survey of 1279 gives useful information concerning tenants and their holdings in Leicestershire. This is known only by a copy in Burton's Collections (Bodley, Rawlinson Ms. B. 350, fos. 11-57) printed in Nichols, History of the Antiquities of the County of Leicester, I, i, cx-cxv. This inquisition was in connection with the commission of 12 March, 1279 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1272-81, p. 342). Kirkby's Quest, 1284-5, also enumerates the Leicestershire fees of the earl (Feudal Aids, iii, 97 seqq.) while details of the earl's tenants and their services within the five midland counties are to be found in the return for the feudal aid of 1330 (ibid. vi, 560 seqq.) and the feodary of 1344 ((D.L. Knights' Fees, 1/7).
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(i) LEICESTER CASTLE AND MANOR

The chief demesne manor was at Leicester, where the earl exercised the lordship of the borough. Here stood the castle, the centre of the honor, at which met the honorial court from three weeks to three weeks, and at which the audit of accounts was held. It had its own prison to which malefactors were committed, and was the scene of executions on the earl's gallows. From time to time it served as the residence of the earls, their relatives and friends, and was occasionally visited by royalty. While no attempt can be made here to deal in detail with the fabric and layout of the castle, a few of the buildings may be indicated which have been noted from items in the receiver's and porter's accounts throughout the century. Chief among them were the hall, with the great chamber at the end, the long chamber, the flat chamber, the wardrobe chamber, the dancing chamber, the chapel and the hall of pleas. There were numerous other apartments sometimes referred to by the names of the persons occupying them and sometimes described by their positions. The chief domestic buildings were the kitchen, bakehouse, pantry, larder, buttery, scullery, spicery, saucery and cellar. Within the castle enclosure were also stables, miscellaneous outhouses and several houses or apartments occupied by officers and servants.

The chief importance of the castle from the point of view of this study, however, lies in the fact that it served as the head-

---

1Leics. Bar. Rec. i, xvii.
2Billson, Medieval Leicester, 41.
3Plac. de Quo War. 659.
4For some picturesque details see William Kelly, Royal Progresses and Visits to Leicester (1844) and James Thompson, An Account of Leicester Castle (1859).
5I have collected material for this subject, which I hope to publish in a future paper. The principal surviving building of the castle is the great hall, which measures 84 feet in length and 58 in breadth, and has walls 4½ feet thick. It has six bays, aisled, with arcades of timber, and is of twelfth-century date, though many of its original features have been removed or obscured.
6The word camera, here translated chamber, is frequently applied to a set of rooms; it may also mean a small house.
7Respectively: aula; magna camera ad finem aule; longa camera; plata camera; camera gardrobe; le daunsynchambre; capella castri; aula placitorum.
8E.g. a list is found in D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3247, m. 4.
9E.g. camera iuxta stabulum; camera ultra prisonam; camera ultra portam castri.
10Respectively: coquina; pistrinum; panetria; lardaria; boteleria; squillerye; ipycery; salsaria; celarium.
quarters of the administration of the midland part of the honor, both as the offices, as it were, of certain important officials, and as a local depository for money and a muniment room for charters, deeds, court-rolls and accounts.

The manor of Leicester, as surveyed in 1297 after the death of earl Edmund, consisted of 320 acres of land in demesne, 44 acres of meadow and a hide of pasture, altogether worth £12 1s. 8d. per annum. There were free tenants there rendering rents totalling £34 4s. 4½d. a year and free tenants outside the town rendering £1 19s. 6d. Two watermills, two windmills and six ovens were farmed out for £16 a year. Further sources of profit were the tolls of the market worth £8 6s. 8d. a year, the fishery in the river Soar worth 6s. 8d., the pleas and perquisites of the court of Leicester worth £10 a year, and the pleas and perquisites of the great foreign court held there worth £20 a year. The inquisitions taken in 1327 and 1361 add little to these details beyond the mention of income from the tolls of the annual fair, the tonnage of wool and perquisites from the views of frankpledge held at Easter and Michaelmas.

(ii) OTHER DEMESNE MANORS

The other three demesne manors were all in Leicestershire. In 1297 the jurors returned that the late earl Edmund had a manor at Hinckley, the chief messuage of which with the croft and garden were worth 10s. a year. There were there 90 acres of land in demesne worth £2 5s. 0d. a year, and 16 virgates of land in villeinage held by villeins rendering yearly £4 16s. 0d. Free tenants there paid £2 16s. 6½d. rent a year and certain cottars 10s. A park or pasture called "Scydleye" was valued at £1 per annum.

1 Occasionally an item records the cost of transporting money from Leicester to another depository. E.g. 1313-14, Et vs. vjd. in lxx libris argenti cariandis vsque Kenilworth per ij parcellas hoc anno cum j equo conductivo ad idem (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.)

2 For a list of charters and muniments found in the castles of Kenilworth, Leicester, Tutbury, etc., see D.L. Misc. Bks. 11, fo. 17 seqq. Cf. D.L. Acc. Var. 4/2, fo. 15, for details of the cost of removing records from Leicester to London in 1402 for making the Great Cowcher. There were still records kept here in 1650 (D.L. Parliamentary Surveys, 38, fo. 2).

3 "Magne curie Leyc' de forinces". This "foreign" court is to be identified with the honorial court.

4 Chancery Inquisition post mortem, Edw. I, file 81. The chancery copy is defective, but the missing words can be supplied from D.L. Misc. Bks. 12, fo. 21v.

5 Chancery Inquisitions post mortem, Edw. III, files 6 and 160.
Other sources of revenue were an oven worth £2 13s. 4d. a year, pannage worth 4s., tolls worth £6 13s. 4d., and the pleas and perquisites of the court worth 13s. 4d. These estimated valuations, which are naturally different in the returns of 1327 and 1361, are chiefly useful as showing the relative importance of the various sources of income within the manor.

The manor of Desford, as extended in 1297, comprised a chief messuage with a garden worth 4s. a year, 222 acres of land in demesne worth £4 11s. 6d. a year, and 20 acres of meadow worth £1 6s. 8d. Villeins there held 16 bovates of land in villeinage worth £5 8s. 0d. a year, and 103 acres of waste worth £3 0d. 6d. Certain cottars rendered an annual rent of £1 5s. 6d. There were in addition 50 hens rendered each year worth 4s. 2d., pannage worth 10s., a sore sparrow hawk or 2s. from Theobald de Verdon, and an assized rent of 14d. of Seman de Wilthire. A watermill brought in £2 6s. 8d. a year and the pasture of the park £1. The perquisites of the halmote, not mentioned in this return, were estimated as worth 2s. in 1327 and 3s. in 1361.

The remaining demesne manor was at Earl Shilton, the chief messuage and garden of which were said to be worth 3s. in all issues in 1297. There were in demesne 240 acres by the greater hundred worth £7 a year, 16 acres of meadow worth £1 1s. 4d. and 34 acres of land in villeinage for which the villeins rendered £5 4s. 5d. The villeins also held 74 acres of new assarts for £1 12s. 1d. a year, another 5 bovates and 8 acres of land in villeinage for £2 9s. 8d., and 27 acres and 1 ¹/₂ roods of waste for £1 7s. 4½d. Rents from free tenants and cottars amounted to 7s. 9d. and £1 7s. 7½d. respectively, and the cottars and villeins also rendered 80 hens worth 6s. 8d. and 300 eggs worth 9d.

Other sources of revenue were the windmill and watermill worth £2 14s. 3d. a year, a certain pasture worth £1, and pannage worth 10s. The perquisites of the halmote, not mentioned in the 1297 return, were said to be worth 3s. 4d. in 1327 and 1361. Attached to this manor was the park of Tooley, which formed a popular grazing ground for the earls' animals throughout the century.

1See R. Lennard, "What is a Manorial Extent?", English Historical Review, xliv, 256-63.
(iii) BAILIWICKS

In dealing with the other lands of the honor, so far as the earl was concerned the unit of administration was not the manor but the bailiwick containing a number of vills in which his vassals held manors or lands from him either by knight's service, suit of court or rent. Excluding Leicester the lands of the honor in Leicestershire, Warwickshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland were divided up and grouped into eight bailiwicks: Carlton Curlieu, Desford, Earl Shilton, Glenfield, Hinckley and Sileby (occasionally called Belgrave bailiwick), together with those of Warwick and Northampton. These bailiwicks varied greatly in composition and size.1 There lay within Carlton Curlieu bailiwick as many as twenty-five vills in which the earls had lands as of the honor; in the Warwick bailiwick there were twenty-six, in the Northampton bailiwick forty-one, whilst in Desford there were only ten, in Hinckley nine, in Sileby thirty-one, in Earl Shilton twelve, and in Glenfield two. The boundaries of the bailiwicks corresponded neither with those of counties nor of hundreds within the counties. For example, all the Nottinghamshire fees were included in Sileby (Leicestershire) bailiwick, whilst Wilnecote in Warwickshire did not belong to the Warwick bailiwick of the honor but to Hinckley (Leicestershire) bailiwick. It seems that the geographical location of the different vills was the deciding factor as to the composition of the various territorial groups, for it was obviously to the advantage of the bailiffs and of all other officials for a number of vills lying within a given area to be regarded as a bailiwick for administrative purposes irrespective of the shire or hundred divisions.

(iv) LEICESTER FOREST

Apart from these bailiwicks of fees and demesne manors, the forest or chase of Leicester2 formed another unit or bailiwick of the honor which was separately administered. Occasionally the forest bailiwick appears under the name of Heathley, which seems to have been a lodge within the forest, where the woodmote was held, and where probably the forest receiver had his office.3 The

---

1See Appendix II and accompanying map.
2Not to be confused with Charnwood forest in Leicestershire.
3I have not been able to identify Heathley (Hethelgh), and it is probable that as a separate place it has now disappeared.
extent of the unenclosed forest area can be fairly accurately established from places within its boundaries contained in the forest accounts and in certain ancient deeds. It began hard by Bromkinsthorpe in the west field of Leicester township and roughly included the area enclosed by a line joining up Braunstone, Enderby, Thurlaston, Earl Shilton, Peckleton, Desford, Botcheston, Kirby Muxloe, Glenfield, Ansty, Birstall and Leicester Abbey. The forest area included a certain amount of both woodland and pasture, certified by definite metes and bounds. The chief parts were the wooded stretch to the north of Leicester called the Frith, the Berneparte or Barne park, lying south of Kirby Muxloe, the wood called the Twaite3 near to Thurlaston and Enderby, and Tooley park attached to Earl Shilton manor. Besides these, there were numerous closes and spinneys identifiable by names which frequently occur in the accounts. Over all this area the rights of hunting and warren were reserved exclusively to the earls of Leicester, who employed foresters and keepers to look after their vert and venison. Vert was especially valuable at a time when nearly all houses were built wholly or partly of timber, and when wood was required not merely as fuel, but for fencing, instruments of husbandry and many other necessaries. Venison supplied the earls and their friends with the sports of the chase and their larders with food.

III
MINISTERS
To manage these lands, in common with other great lords, the earls of Leicester and Lancaster evolved a system of administration entrusted to, and run by, servants or ministers in their employment. The bishops of Winchester,4 the earls of Cornwall, the

1 Some examples are D.L. Anc. Deeds, 961, 1792, 1794, 2280.
2 Cf. Leland’s description in the first half of the sixteenth century: “The foreste of Leycester yoining hard to the toune: it is a y miles lengthe, but of no greate breede: and is replenished with deer”. Leicester forest was enclosed in 1627-8.
3 There are various spellings: Twaite, Twyt, Thwaytes.
Clares,¹ and less important families like the Turvilles or Bassets in Leicestershire would all be confronted with the same problems of general estate management to a greater or lesser degree.² They all had to make provision for the farming of their demesne manors, for the collection of rents and jurisdictional profits from time to time, and for the punctual and efficient rendering of the various services and dues of their vassals. A large part, if not the whole, of their livelihood came from these sources, and it was of vital consequence to them to arrange for their efficient exploitation.

It is now proposed, therefore, to deal in turn with the various officials or ministers who were in charge of the territorial units which have been outlined. The duties of each will be described and details of the careers of certain officials will be given.

(A) LOCAL OFFICIALS

(i) BAILIFFS

The most numerous class of local officials were the bailiffs of the honor. It is well known that the term "bailiff" covered many different grades in the official world in medieval times. A bailiff of a lord, for example, may be an official supervising the reeve's activities in a single manor; he may himself be equivalent to a reeve, or he may have the oversight of a number of manors; whilst on the other hand he may have only to do with fees, and not with estate management at all. The office may be of great or small importance according to the duties involved.

As far as the bailiffs of the Leicester honor are concerned, they seem to have nothing whatever to do with the supervision of the earl's demesne manors, which were accounted for solely by reeves. Their sphere of activity was essentially the bailiwick

¹See an unpublished thesis by Miss C. A. Musgrave, "Household Administration in the fourteenth century with special reference to the household of Elizabeth de Burgh, Lady of Clare" (University of London, 1923).
²Most useful for the whole subject are H. S. Bennett's Life of the English Manor and N. Denholm-Young's Seignorial Administration in England. The original draft of this study had been written before either of these books was published (1937), and although account of them has been taken in the final text and their authority cited for comparative purposes on general aspects of the subject, the present writer had previously reached independently any conclusions which may be offered.
groupings of the various possessions of the honor held by the earl’s tenants as outlined above. Each bailiwick was normally in the hands of a separate bailiff, who collected the rents and farms from the various lands and tenements let within his bailiwick, together with any farms of mills or other property. On him fell the onus of collecting scutage, revenue from wardships, reliefs, and other regular feudal incidents. He was responsible both for taking lands into the earl’s hand on the death of a tenant, and for delivering seizin of lands as occasion arose. He was, in fact, an escheator on a small scale. Moreover, as the representative of the earl another of his primary functions was the safe-guarding of the earl’s interests within his bailiwick. In common with other great feudatories, the earl of Leicester held certain liberties and franchises within his honor, and in so far as they had a local bearing the bailiff was responsible for their exercise and protection. For instance, since the earl claimed “the return of all the king’s writs” within his honor, his bailiffs, and not the sheriff (the king’s bailiff), were responsible for their execution. Thus the bailiff had both to summon, attach or distrain residents within his bailiwick, and to seize lands or goods when occasion arose. In a similar way the earl exercised the view of frankpledge in most of the vills within the various bailiwicks, and so the bailiff is found accounting for the perquisites and fixed views of frankpledge, which he would have to hold on the earl’s behalf. He was responsible also for the chattels of felons and fugitives within his area, for taking in charge stray

1 Examples of these and the following items are to be found in any of the ministers’ accounts already cited.
2 E.g. In the account of 1313–14 William de Temesford, late bailiff of Northampton, owes £15 2s. 5d., arrears of scutage of two Scottish armies (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 17d.).
3 In the pleadings of a suit (1263) Juliana states that William died, as is evident “quia bailivi comitis Leic’ seisiverunt terrain quam Willelmus tenuit de feodo ipsius comitis in manum comitis” (Curia Regis Rolls, ii, 276).
4 E.g. Add. Chart. 21912—Richard Brehulle, bailiff of the honor of Leicester in co. Northampton, has delivered seizin in Holdenby and Ravens-thorpe in accordance with the king’s order (1229). Cart. Harl. 86. C. 45 is a mandate from B. de Kyrkeby, sheriff of Northampton, to the bailiff of the honor of Leicester to give seizin in Helmdon, etc. (1278).
5 See below, Chapter V.
6 E.g. in Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1391-6, p. 507.
7 E.g. in Ibid. 1338-40, p. 75.
8 E.g. D.L. Min. Acc. 1/8, m. 17, 17d.; 198/3111, m. 1, 1d., 2d.
cattle,\(^1\) and for the collection of amercements,\(^2\) fines for relaxation of suit of the honor court, and the small perquisites of the honor court of Leicester within his bailiwick.

Some of these duties were such as could be delegated, as is shown by the fact that some bailiffs rendered their accounts before the auditors through their sub-bailiffs; while there are instances of a bailiff holding two or more bailiwicks at once, though this was contrary to the general practice. Certainly the bailiff would need a number of men to assist him in some of his tasks: the attachment of accused persons and the levying of distresses were not to be undertaken single-handed, and occasionally were fraught with real danger.\(^3\) As far as can be gathered the bailiff was usually a man of substance though much humbler in rank than either the steward or receiver, generally, but not always, holding lands in the bailiwick which he administered. While the lord himself was usually responsible for the appointment of his bailiffs,\(^4\) in some bailiwicks the office was hereditary. Sileby bailiwick, for example, was held in fee by the family of Belgrave. Nicholas de Belegrave held it in 1313-14\(^5\) and was still holding it in 1322-23.\(^6\) Roger de Belegrave was bailiff here in 1355-56,\(^7\) but by 1361-62\(^8\) had been succeeded by his son and heir Thomas de Belegrave, who was still bailiff in 1377-78,\(^9\) and who was succeeded by William Belegrave.\(^10\) In the case of the Northampton and Warwick bailiwicks it appears that the office

\(^{1}\)E.g. *D.L. Min. Acc.* 198/3111, m. 1d.
\(^{2}\)E.g. *Ibid.* 1/3, m. 17.
\(^{3}\)In 1388 William Rybles of Wardon, bailiff of the honor in co. Northampton, pursuant to his office would have replevied some cattle of Nicholas son of Roger de Flore, which William de Kaynes of Dodford and others unjustly detained within the liberty, by return of a writ of the king directed to him therein, and would also have attached the said William and others to answer the said Nicholas therein, but the said William de Kaynes and a crowd of other people at Dodford rescued the cattle and would not permit him to attach the said William and others, and assaulted him and other of the earl’s men and servants. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1338-40, p. 75.)
\(^{4}\)E.g. On 3 November, 1379, duke John appointed Oliver de Kneshale bailiff of the honor of Leicester in co. Northampton (*Gaunt’s Reg.* 1379-85, ii, 391-2).
\(^{5}\)D.L. *Min. Acc.* 1/3, m. 17d.
\(^{6}\)Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 2, 4d.
\(^{7}\)D.L. *Min. Acc.* 198/3111, m. 1.
\(^{8}\)Ibid. 198/3112, m. 1.
\(^{9}\)Ibid. 212/3247, m. 1.
\(^{10}\)Ibid. 212/3248, m. 1; 198/3113, m. 2d.
was farmed out for a fixed yearly sum which appears in the accounts of their respective bailiffs alongside the other receipts.¹

(ii) REEVES

Each of the demesne manors had a reeve, who was ultimately responsible for the management of the manor. He represented, it may be presumed, the interests of the villeins, and by his detailed and intimate knowledge of the manorial population, lands and customs influenced the working of the manor more effectively than did the steward of the honor who acted as his supervisor. It has already been remarked that the reeves of the manors under consideration alone appear to be accountable, a fact which together with the detailed returns of every item on the manor which they make on their own authority, confirms Mr. Bennett's doubts as to whether the reeve was relatively so insignificant as we have been taught to believe,² and supports his claim that the reeve is “the pivot-man of the manorial administrative system”.³

The material extant for this period affords little or no evidence as to the methods of appointing the reeve on the demesne manors of the Leicester honor. It may have been either autocratic selection by the lord, preliminary selection by the peasants and final selection by the lord, or democratic selection by the peasants. The period of office was usually from Michaelmas to Michaelmas for one year, but there are examples of a reeve holding office for several years. Concerning the duties of the reeve the books of estate management which were written in the late thirteenth century, such as Fleta, Walter of Henley and others, have much to say, but since they are apt to be misleading it is best to supplement their evidence with that from other documents.⁴ The illustrations which follow have accordingly all been taken from items which appear in the ministers' accounts cited above.

Every item of manorial economy fell within the sphere of the reeve. He arranges and supervises the agricultural operations on the manor, and minor undertakings such as the cultivation of vines and the planting of trees and hedges. He is responsible

¹Usually 26s. 8d. p.a.
²Bennett, Life on the English Manor, 167.
⁴Ibid. 358-9.
for acquiring and disposing of stock and grain, and has to answer for the performance or the sale of the works of the unfree tenants and for the collection of the rents of the freemen, cottars and villeins, whether in money or kind. He sells wood, farms out the mills, and collects passage dues from carts going through the manor. He answers for the income from the pannage of pigs, for the sale of nuts, and the agistment of cattle; also for money collected for licences to build within the manor, heriots, merchett, the perquisites of the manor court and fines for entry. It is also his duty to issue the various food allowances to the servants (famuli) at certain intervals and to pay the accustomed tithes as well as fees, pensions and other sums of money to authorized persons. He is expected to hail before the manor court all those who fail in their service. The proper upkeep of the manor house, the mills and the farm buildings, as well as the repair and replacement of the agricultural implements are his concern. There is, in short, no end to the variety and extent of his labours, and before he can relinquish office he has to render account, not only for the above items, but also for all the stock, whether living or dead, which he took over from his predecessor and any additions he has acquired during his term of office. The actual compilation of the written account at the end of the manorial year, according to the accepted formula, was the work of trained scribes who made the round of the manors for this purpose.

Although the earl had the right to require his unfree men to serve as reeves, he was not so harsh as to demand this service gratis. There were emoluments and allowances which compensated in part for the heavy burdens of this office. At Hinckley, Earl Shilton and Desford manors the reeves received a direct money payment of 3s. for the year for which allowance was made in their accounts,¹ and occasionally an allowance of rent was also granted.² More important would be the grazing privileges which formed "one of the most highly esteemed perquisites of the reeve's office" and which do not appear in the accounts, and the partial or total relaxation of his customary works. Moreover, the reeve was assisted in his work by other officers such as the hayward or messor, and beadle, and by a select band of paid or

² E.g. In the account for 1361-2 a sum of 13d. rent is allowed to the reeve of Earl Shilton (_D.L. Min. Acc._ 198/3112, m. 1d.)
customary workers, such as ploughmen, carters, fencers, shepherds and others, to whom reference is often made in the accounts.

(iii) FOREST OFFICIALS

The other local officials were for the most part connected with the forest or chase of Leicester. Here a master forester, a receiver and a number of other foresters, keepers and fencers contrived to preserve the rights of vert and venison and the privilege of the chase for the earl and his friends. All gifts of deer had to be accounted for, together with wood sold or given away, whether trunks, crops, barks or underwood. The herbage of glades and lands within the forest area had either to be grazed or sold; and a continual round of fencing had to be kept up. Enclosure of land within the forest was allowed only by special grant of the earl and according to the assize of the forest. Trespassers to vert and venison had to be arrested and tried before the woodmote or swanimote of Heathley, but the graver offences were reserved for the royal justices.

1The chief officers in the second half of the century were the master forester, two foresters of the Frith, the park-keeper of Berneparte, two keepers of the chase, the forester of the Twaite and the park-keeper of Tooley park. The park-keeper of Hinckley is also included with these forest officers.

2A good example is the account in D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 17d. which records a lengthy list of persons who have received gifts of deer.

3Sometimes separate accounts are rendered by "sellers of wood"; e.g. Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 1d.; D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3111, m. 2d. The earliest letter of allowance touching Leicester honor relates to sellers of wood (1318); printed in Letes. Bor. Rec. i, 318 (see Appendix V).

4John of Gaunt's Register contains a number of writs authorizing the keeper of the forest to supply timber to named persons; thus in September 1380 the duke ordered wood to be supplied for fuel to Rande de Tynneslowe, "ussher de nostre sale", and in October 1382 six oaks suitable for timber to be delivered for the repair of the manor of Kirkby (Gaunt's Reg. 1379-83, i, 125-6; ii, 244.)


6In 1322 it was found by inquisition that in the time of earl Edmund, the foresters of Frith used not to make attachments in the town of Leicester or to interfere there for any trespasses about dry-wood; in the time of earl Thomas by extortion and force they made attachments as well upon those who bought at their doors from poor women carrying dry branches upon their heads as upon others, and caused the purchasers to be amerced at the court of Heathley (Hethilegh) (Cal. Inq. Lists, Misc. ii, no. 548).

7In 1303, for example, commissioners of oyer and terminer were appointed to deal with certain persons who had entered earl Thomas's free chase at Leicester and parks at Leicester and Desford (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, p. 270). Similar commissions can be found throughout the century.
The master forester or chief keeper was generally an important person holding other offices at the same time. Sir Robert Swillington, for instance, who was the master forester during the years covered by the printed volumes of John of Gaunt’s register, was also steward of Pontefract and head keeper of forests in Yorkshire.¹ The master forester was the official directly responsible to the lord for the administration of the chase and as such received all communications relating to it, but the receiver, foresters and parkers did the actual work. Like the manorial officials the forest officials received money wages,² with fixed allowances of food,³ together with shoe-money or shoes⁴ at certain times.

(B) CENTRAL OFFICIALS

(i) STEWARD

By far the most important of the central officials of the honor was the steward or seneschal (senescallus). In early times the whole administration of an honor turned upon the steward or dapifer, for apart from whatever duties he may have had in his lord’s household, he was also his lord’s chief executive officer within the honor at large and the president of courts held in the lord’s name.⁵ By the early fourteenth century, however, his powers as an administrative officer, although still very large, had declined. With the advent of a complicated system of accounts a share of his functions passed to the auditors. As finance became more complex the receiver or treasurer came to the fore and household officials became more numerous as the organization became more involved.⁶ And as private courts declined before an increasingly powerful and popular royal justice, so did the steward recede into the background, simply because his primary duties had been judicial.

During the period under consideration a good part of the steward’s time would still be taken up with courts. In the only

¹He had a house near Leicester castle (D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3247, m. 4d.)
²The master forester received £5 p.a. throughout the period, a forester 2d. a day or 66s. 8d. p.a., a parker 1½ a day or 48s. 6d. p.a.
³The normal allowance throughout the century for each forester and fencer was one quarter of grain every twelve weeks.
⁴“calcitura”.
⁶Cf. Denholm-Young, Seignorial Administration, 68-9.
surviving record of the formal appointment of a steward for the honor of Leicester during this period, Simon Pakeman, the appointed steward (1372), is given "plein poar a tenir noz courtes et toutes autres choses faire que a l'office de seneschalcie celles partie partienent". The steward presided over the honor court at Leicester which met every three weeks. Not only was he held responsible there for amercing barons for any recognized default, but was also accountable for the chattels of criminals executed in this court. There is also evidence for his occasional presence at the courts both of merchant gild and of borough at Leicester. For important conveyances it might be well to have the record of both the earl's court held at the castle and merchant gild and portmanmoot. Thus in 1314 the earl's steward summoned a gild meeting to hear three charters and in his presence they were set on record; while several scattered references on the gild rolls point to the presence of the steward in the morning-speech. He would, moreover, be responsible for holding the courts at the demesne manors in the place of his lord, though it is likely that he frequently delegated this function to the bailiffs. In any case, he would himself inquire periodically into the due performance of services and payment of rents; he would hear any complaints against the reeve or other officers, and if need be he would deal severely with them. Only the most grave and difficult cases would be reserved for the consideration of the lord and his council. Finally, the steward would no doubt often appear in person at the views of frankpledge which were held twice yearly at one or more central points in each bailiwick.

The administrative aspects of the steward's office were manifold and of considerable importance. Since he was placed in general command of the honor, as it were, upon him fell the special duty of supervising the bailiffs and other officials of the

1Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 96.
2See below, p. 351.
3E.g. the steward was ordered to amerce the barons in the earl's court for their default in not assisting in the construction of a mill-dam at Leicester which by right (de jure) they ought to have done (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.)
4E.g. John de Holt, steward in 1298, is to answer for 5 marks and a horse worth 10s. which belonged to William le Norreys, cattle-thief, who has been hanged in the earl's court (Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 360).
5Ibid. i, 287.
6Ibid. i, xxxix.
local territorial units, a task which involved a good deal of travelling from place to place within the five counties deputed to his charge. To him was entrusted the oversight of wardships, the assignment of dowers, and in general all the feudal business which it fell to the local bailiffs to execute. More directly he himself had to do with the lands of the honor, for another of his duties centred round the holding of inquisitions. Whenever any doubt arose concerning the tenancy, service, value or obligations of any parcel of lands or manor within the honor, the steward would assemble a body of sworn men, conduct an inquiry, and embody the evidence in a return to which he attached his seal. A number of documents recording these inquisitions have survived. In 1280 Thomas de Bray, steward of the honor, held an inquisition by order of earl Edmund to find out whether the convent of Biddlesdon should pay scutage for their lands in the vill of Syresham, co. Northampton. An inquisition in 1309 held by Ellis de Stapleton, steward, concerning the lands held by the abbot of Creake in Illston on the Hill, Leicestershire, returned that he held all the lands and tenements late of John de Joy by enfeoffment of the king, for the service of half a knight's fee. In 1336 Hugh de Haverbergh, steward, held an inquisition concerning the lands held by Henry de Dyve in Brampton Parva, Northamptonshire. John, duke of Lancaster, gave licence to William Spencer and William Mercer in 1392 to hold divers messuages and property in the north suburb of Leicester after William Bispham, deputy of Thomas Walsh, steward, had reported the findings of an inquisition concerning the property in question. Occasionally, the origin of these inquisitions can be found in the ministers' accounts. For example, an item in the account of 1355-56 records that the steward, John de Knygh-

1The record of Simon Pakeman's appointment in 1372 states that he must "surveur sur toutz noz baillifs de franchises realx en les ditz counteez".
2E.g. Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 81.
3E.g. Ibid., ii, 97.
4Cart. Harl. 84. C. 13.
5Add. Chart. 26960.
6Ibid. 21630.
7This William Bispham appears as feodary in co. Leicester in the account of 1292-3 (D.L. Acc. Var. 3/2, fo. 16). He was also bailiff of the borough of Leicester from 1392 to 1403 and represented the borough in the Parliament of 6 October, 1399 (Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 450, 461).
8Add. Chart. 8125.
ton, is ordered to hold an inquisition concerning the annual value of the lands held by John son and heir of Paul de Brome in Lapworth, Warwickshire, and to report about Easter. A similar kind of duty, though not necessarily involving the holding of an inquest, was when the steward was called upon to certify the limits of the earl's liberty or to inquire into the grievances of tenants.

On occasion the steward might act as the attorney of his lord in some special transaction, as did Robert de Ernesby, who was appointed along with others in 1361 to deliver seizin in his lord's name of the manor of Wrangle, co. Lincoln, to the mayor and community of Leicester. He might appear in law-suits for the earl, advise him on any particular topic of administration or law, or work behind the scenes to further his interests in any particular case. The newly elected mayors of Leicester were received in the earl's court at the castle by the steward and took their oath before him, the occasion being celebrated by a feast, and the mayors seem regularly to have sought his counsel and aid, rewarding him either with money or presents. It follows that since the steward held so important a "public" position he was often sought, and appeared, as a witness not only for charters and grants relating to his lord, but also for transactions between outside parties.

Much other miscellaneous business fell to this busy official. He would invariably have to be present at the audit of accounts, but there is no evidence that he ever exercised the dual capacity of steward and auditor. At any time he might find himself

1 D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3111, m. 1d.
2 Ibid. 1/3, m. 17.
3 See below, p. 320.
5 E.g. 1313-14; “Et lxvijs. iijd. in expensis Ricardi Foun [senescalli] et Rogeri de Pykering commorancium in partibus Norhampton .... pro hominibus illius patræ procurandis et fretandis pro placito inter Comitem et Episcopum Cestræ et alios dictum placitum contin­gentes” (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.)
7 Ibid. i, 296; ii, 47, 68, 99.
9 E.g. Hugh de Haverbergh witnesses an indenture between the abbot and convent of Sulby and the prior and monks of Kyrkeby Monachorum [Monks Kirby], 1336 (Add. Chart. 22523).
entrusted with the custody of some extra liberty. The appointment of porters and other servants at Leicester castle, and occasionally of bailiffs, fell to his lot. Along with the foresters, clerks and others he usually received the pannage in Leicester forest and at Earl Shilton, Desford and Hinckley. Within certain limits it lay within his power and duty to order the earl's property as he thought best. For instance, Ellis de Stapleton ordered a plot of land called "le Boyshalle" to be enclosed within the castle precincts; John de Hunton farmed a shop in Leicester on condition that certain alterations and repairs were done; and John de Knyghton granted licence to Thomas Corbeir to sell his woods at Braunstone for sixty shillings. But if the steward was thus in a position to issue orders, he himself was in turn constantly receiving them from his lord. Thus in 1322 he had to cause men to be chosen to go to meet earl Thomas at Tutbury; in 1338 he was ordered to have fish caught from the river Soar to be put in the "viner" in Tooley park; in 1373 he received instructions to take sureties from Robert de Drax, formerly bailiff of Warwick, for the payment of his arrears, and to deliver the said bailiwick to him again. The investigation of tenants' complaints made direct to the lord fell to his lot, as when in 1380 he was ordered to receive a letter sent to the duke by William son of Adam de Saxelby, complaining of the damage done to him by the men of the town of Kibworth [Beauchamp], and to do his utmost to give suitable redress to the said William, or as when in 1382 he was ordered to investigate a grievance of the tenants of Earl Shilton and to compel the bailiff there to

1In 1313-14 the custody of the new liberty of the honor of Tutbury in cos. Warwick and Leicester was in the hands of the steward of the honor of Leicester for 33 weeks. The steward received 50s. extra fee for this, but it was not to be paid in future since this new liberty fell within the bailiwick of the steward of Tutbury. The steward of Leicester also received an extra fee of 26s. 8d. for his custody of the liberty of Stapleford from Michaelmas to Easter this year.

2Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 1, 3d.
3Ibid. m. 4d.
4Ibid. m. 4; 1147/20, m. 2.
5Ibid. 1146/9, m. 1.
6Ibid. 1147/20, m. 1.
7D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3111, m. 1.
8Leics. Bar. Rec. i, 328.
9D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 27.
10Gaunt's Reg. 1872-6, ii, 176.
11Ibid. 1379-83, i, 67.
cease causing distress to them.1 And at intervals which were not far apart he was called upon to receive and entertain both the lord himself and personages of his household.2

That a man of rank was usually chosen for this office is therefore not surprising. His position may be judged by noting his emoluments compared with those of the reeve: the steward of Leicester received a yearly fee of £16, with hay, litter and fuel in the manors which he visited,3 with other allowances of provisions for himself, his clerks and his grooms,4 and with an additional fee for further duties.5 He also had a room or house at Leicester castle.6 On the other hand, as already stated, the reeve of a demesne manor received 3s. a year with an occasional allowance of rent and grazing privileges. The careers of the fourteenth-century stewards give a further indication of the importance of the office. The Leicester stewards were usually laymen, but not invariably,7 and were drawn mostly from the knightly class, being themselves considerable landowners, and

1Ibid. i, 214-5.
2Items in the mayors' accounts often refer to these visits. For example, in 1333-4 Henry, son of earl Henry, the king's marshal, William de Blount, and others of the earl's household were entertained (Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 13-14).
3D.L. Knights' Fees, 1/11, fo. 51; D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 32; Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 109. It is to be noted that the fees of stewards on the Lancasterian estates varied in proportion to the extent of the lands for which they were responsible: thus the steward of Hertford was paid only 40s., while the steward of Lancaster received £10, and the steward of Bolingbroke and Sutton £20 p.a.
4Leics. Bor. Rec. passim.
5See above, p. 320, n. 1. He received an extra £4 p.a. for being steward also of Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire (D.L. Knights' Fees, 1/11, fo. 45; D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 32).
6"camera senescalli super magnas portas ab ecclesia beate Marie iuxta castrum vsque cameram coquinorum ibidem" (D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3255).
7Ellis or Elyas de Stapelton (probably Stapleton, co. Leicester), steward from c. 1306 to 1311, was a clerk. He first appears in 1305 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, pp. 355, 405) and probably gained his early training as a household clerk under earl Thomas of Lancaster (Tout, Chapters, ii, 186, n. 3). As such he witnessed a grant in 1307 (Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13, p. 42). He relinquished the stewardship of Leicester in 1311, being succeeded by Richard le Foun (Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 276) He received pardon as one of earl Thomas's adherents in 1313 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1313-17, p. 24) and 1318 (Ibid. 1317-21, p. 235), by which time he was in royal service, for in 1314 he was presented as the king's clerk to the church of Farthinghoe in the diocese of Lincoln (Ibid. 1313-17, p. 181); and in 1321 and 1322 he is referred to as parson of the church of Swaton in the same diocese (Ibid. 1321-4, pp. 28, 32, 202; Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-23, pp. 441, 532). He was one of the executors of the will of earl Thomas (Ibid. 1327-30, pp. 15, 66, 137).
often from families with a tradition for public service. Employment under Lancaster was often a stepping-stone to a judgeship or an administrative office under the crown, and it is quite a common thing to find the steward of Leicester honor serving both his lord and the king at the same time. Thus Henry de Hambury, who was steward in 1327-28 and perhaps during the next two or three years, was one of the most important and busiest royal justices of his day. For thirty years following 1315 innumerable judicial commissions were showered upon him.1 In 1324 he was appointed justice of the pleas following the justice of Ireland,2 and in 1325 became chief justice of the bench at Dublin.3 Soon afterwards he returned to England, acting as judge of the King's Bench from 1328. Foss4 suggests that the cause of his elevation to the bench may have been his connection with earl Thomas, for his adherence to whom he received pardon in 1318,5 but his preoccupation with royal affairs did not sever his connection with the Lancastrian house.

A similar career was that of William de Burgh who acted as the duke's steward of the honor of Leicester at least during the years 1377 to 1382.6 He first appears as a justice of the peace in 1369,7 and was returned as knight of the shire for Leicestershire in 1372.8 From 1376 he was frequently employed as justice of gaol delivery,9 and in 1380 is referred to as the king's sergeant at law.10 In the same year he was appointed to the office of steward of the king's lordship of Oakham in Rutland.11 In Trinity 1383, he is found acting as judge of the Common Pleas and he received knighthood shortly afterwards.12 He practised as justice of the Common Bench from this time onwards13 until August 1387 when, along with his colleagues, he was impeached and condemned to death, the sentence being commuted to banishment for life.14

3Ibid. 1324-7, pp. 111, 197.
4Foss, Biographica Juridica, 324.
6D.L. Min. Acq. 212/3247, m. 1; Gaunt's Reg. 1378-83, i, 214-15.
8Returns of Members, i, 189.
11Ibid. 485.
12Foss, op. cit. 142.
The stewardship, however, occasionally fell to a man who, although devoting much of his time to the business of the crown, remained in Lancastrian service throughout his life. Such was Simon Pakeman. Sprung from the Pakeman family of Kirby Muxloe in Leicestershire, he was probably the Simon Pakeman who proved his age and did homage in 1327. While still young he represented his shire in the parliaments of 1333-4, 1346 and 1347-8, and in 1340 appears as the earl's steward of the honor of Leicester, which office he retained for five or six years. In the meantime, in 1341, he was commissioned as a justice of the peace, and from this date until his death in 1376 not a single year passed without his being employed on commissions of oyer and terminer or other royal business. But these activities on behalf of the crown cannot have prevented his continued service to the Lancastrian house, for on 1 July 1362 he was re-appointed steward of the honor of Leicester in the five midland counties; and ten years later he was granted this office for life as a mark of appreciation for his good service and loyalty. He was again returned as one of the Leicestershire knights in 1364-5, 1366 and 1368. He was discharged from the stewardship in August 1375, at his own request owing to old age and infirmity, but was to remain a life-member of the duke's council and to receive an annual pension of £10 in recognition of his long and loyal service to the Lancastrian house. He died the following year.

Another career, illustrating a more strictly local type, is that of the knight, Thomas Walsh, who was steward of the honor at least from 1392 to 1394 and probably for several years previously. He represented Leicestershire in fifteen parliaments

---

1 For pedigree see Farnham, Leicestershire Medieval Pedigrees, 43.
2 Cal. Fine Rolls, iv, 60; Cal. Inq. vii, no. 94.
3 Returns of Members, i, 102, 141, 143.
4 D.L. Anc. Deeds, 2255; D.L. Great Cowcher, ii, fo. 56v.
5 Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 47, 52, 60, 65.
7 Cal. Close and Pat. Rolls, passim.
8 Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 109.
9 Returns of Members, i, 175, 177, 180.
10 Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 264.
13 William de Burgh, his (?) predecessor as steward, could not possibly have been steward after 1387 (see above, p. 322).
during the years 1370-1 to 1396-7. ¹ He was escheator in the counties of Warwick and Leicester in 1374-5.² He acted as tax collector in Leicestershire in 1373, 1377 and 1384,³ and from 1378 to 1392 was frequently employed as justice of the peace and commissioner of array in the same county.⁴

These biographical details speak for themselves, and similar evidence is available for the careers of most of the other stewards.⁵ Apart from the fact that these officials were usually knights and prominent men in local affairs, they were in a very real sense professional in legal and administrative duties. And in view of the fact that few of them remained in office for more than a few years, it is probably safe to conclude that stewards commonly sought a wider experience than was to be found under one administrative system, and so did not hesitate to serve either other lords or the crown.⁶

(ii) RECEIVER

The official next in importance to the steward was undoubtedly the receiver (receptor), whose duties concerned all financial business at the centre of the honor. He was as much concerned with paying out money as receiving it. On the one hand, he received monies from the local bailiffs, reeves and other officials: thus are shown on his account sums of money under "receipts" which can be traced as "payments" in the accounts of the local officials. He received also the income from the reeveship of Leicester, from the farm of the demesne lands, mills and ovens there, and from any other of his lord's estates for which he might be responsible.⁷ He had also to answer for the

⁴Cal. Pat. Rolls, passim.
⁵Cf. Denholm-Young, op. cit. 70-1.
⁶The receiver's account usually includes income from various places outside the Leicester honor: thus John Hayward was receiver of Higham Ferrers, Huntingdon, Godmanchester, Stapleford and other places in 1381-2 in addition to being receiver of Leicester (D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3246); William Chiselden was receiver of Leicester and Higham Ferrers at a later date (Gaunt's Reg. 1379-88, passim).
collection of money from amercements, feudal aids, and the arrears of officials who had either died or left office in debt. On the other hand, he had to make all authorized expenditure. Thus, under the "outgoings" side of his account appear the wages and expenses of the steward and his servants, of the receiver himself and other officials, together with money paid out as ancient alms, tithe or pensions, and all kinds of working expenses in addition to sums paid to the earl's wardrobe or chamber or to some other local deposit or authorized person as ordered.

The receiver's headquarters were at the castle of Leicester, which acted both as an office and as a treasury or receipt. Unfortunately material does not survive which throws light on the inside working of the receiver's office in any detail. There was certainly a counting table at the castle which the receiver may have used when receiving and paying monies, and there were certain chests there used for storing money. Occasionally pouches were bought or made from canvas for the same purpose. The receiver had a yearly allowance for wax, ink and parchment for the rolls of the honor court and for his own account. It would be from his office that the receiver issued tallies and written receipts for every sum of money he received, which instruments were produced by the local officials at the audit as evidence for the removal of their financial responsibility. There also would be kept all the receipts collected by the receiver for payments

---

1Attached to the receiver's account for 1313-14 is a small membrane containing a list of amercements throughout the honor of Leicester (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/5, m. 22).
2Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, ii, 119.
3Examples are so common as to occur in nearly every account.
4Writs ordering the receiver to pay pensions and fees to specified people occur frequently both in D.L. Misc. and in the printed volumes of John of Gaunt's Register.
5Cf. Gaunt's Reg. 1379-83, i, 33, 169.
6In the Tudor period there were both an auditor's chamber and a receiver's chamber at Leicester castle (Rentals and Surveys, Portf. 10/11, m. 2; D.L. Special Commissions, 279, m. 2), and although no earlier reference to them has yet been found, it is reasonable to suppose their existence even in the fourteenth century.
7See above, p. 306; D.L. Acc. Var. 3/2.
8"tabula computataria".
9Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 1, 3d.
10Ibid. 1147/20, m. 2; D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.
11See Appendix V. From those which remain, it seems that these subsidiary documents were tied together and labelled in bundles for each particular year.
he had made, and all letters or warrants authorizing expenditure in any way.

What part the receiver played in the more domestic side of the establishment at Leicester it is difficult to say, but it is certain that he had to record, if he was not responsible for, purchases of food and other necessities. This is well shown by a schedule, sewn to the accounts of 1313-14, recording the debts incurred by Nicholas de Lomlay, receiver, to tradesmen and others both inside and outside Leicester, in the purchase of fish, meat, pigs, mutton, beer, hay, coal and so on. More often he would merely receive an order to pay for certain purveyances or victuals needed for the lord's household.

Many other duties fell to his lot. The establishment of the Newarke hospital at Leicester in 1331, to which a collegiate church was attached in 1355, greatly added to his tasks. Not only might the receiver be called upon at times to report to the earl concerning the state of the hospital, its chaplains and inmates; he was constantly receiving warrants to make payments to officers connected with it, to pay workmen there, or find money for the fabric, to pay alms for poor men and women who were to be admitted, to find robes for certain persons connected with it, to provide vessels for the same hospital, and to have wood carted there from Leicester forest. Again, it seems that the receiver shared with the steward the general supervision of repairs and alterations to Leicester castle and to the earl's

1 D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 21.
2 Gaunt's Reg. 1379-83, i, 76, 109; ii, 262.
3 For its detailed history see A. H. Thompson, The History of the Hospital and the New College of the Annunciation of St. Mary in the Newarke, Leicester (Leicester, 1937).
4 E.g. On 24 January, 1334, the auditors are authorized to allow 10s. 8d. on the account of William de Bagworth, receiver of Leicester, as expenses incurred during eight days travelling from Leicester to Mottisfont, co. Hants., and back, to report to the earl on the hospital at Leicester, the state of the chaplains and poor people there, etc. (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/33, m. 1.)
5 D.L. Misc. 9/4, m. 7, 24.
6 Ibid. m. 4, 6. Cf. D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 31.
7 Gaunt's Reg. 1379-83, i, 54-5 ii, 301.
8 D.L. Misc. 9/4, m. 12-23.
9 Ibid. m. 5, 9; 9/5, m. 21.
10 Ibid. m. 5, 9; 9/5, m. 21.
11 Ibid. 9/4, m. 11; 9/5, m. 29.
property in the town, for occasionally an order is found author-
izing a certain works to be undertaken by him.1 Like the
steward also he was constantly receiving instructions to perform
a variety of miscellaneous duties which fall quite outside the
strictly financial sphere. Now he is busy making the extent of
a manor,2 or supervising the repair of the mills and ovens at
Leicester;3 now he has to buy suitable oaks for timber for Kenil-
worth castle,4 or see that brushwood cut down in the Frith is
not sold but safely kept.5 On occasion he acts as his lord's
attorney on some special business6 and offers counsel, along with
the steward, to the mayor and community of Leicester.7 Some-
times he receives letters for delivery to named persons8 or writs
from the earl with instructions to hand them over to the sheriff
and to see that due execution of them is done.9 In another instance
he has to order and send "quarte carpenters deux masceons et
deux overers de ferre en le counte de Laicestre pur nous overer
des engines trepgettes et autres tielx choses a nous besoignables
pur cest prochein viage",10 and in another to appoint three or four
"bones vallettes" to accompany two named persons who are to
carry money from Shrewsbury to London, "a cause de peril de
chymyn".11 At one time he is ordered to send to the manor of
Rothwell Haigh "une nostre list palee de blank et de blue, ove les
tapites dyczel, et la sale de meisme la seute", which he will receive
from John Burton, valet of the duke's wardrobe,12 and at another
to look after the duke's wine at Leicester.13

1E.g. Order to William de Bagworth to have a chamber constructed
outside the gate of Leicester castle (D.L. Misc. 9/4, m. 7, 8);
allowance authorized for money expended on the repair of shops in
the Saturday market in Leicester by the receiver (Gaunt's Reg.
1372-6, ii, 315).
2E.g. In the account for 1313-14, a sum of 9s. 6d. is allowed as the expenses
of Nicholas de Lomlay, receiver, for going from Leicester to Sutton
in the Elms and back to make an extent of the manor, by the earl's
warrant (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.).
3The mills seem to have needed frequent attention.
4Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, ii, 183.
5Ibid. 1379-83, i, 212.
6See above, p. 319, n. 4.
7Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 47, 68.
8Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, ii, 283; Ibid. 1379-83, ii, 251.
9E.g. D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 26.
11Ibid. 303.
12Gaunt's Reg. 1379-83, i, 170.
13Ibid. 118.
All these duties, of which examples could be multiplied, involved a high degree of energy and skill. The receivers belonged to a professional class in the strict sense, and although their annual wage of £5,1 with extras for other duties,2 was considerably less than that of the stewards, it placed them, nevertheless, on an important footing. Frequently they were clerks,3 but often laymen belonging to the small landholding class. In the case of the Leicester receivers, they were men of local origin for the most part, like William de Bagworth and John Haywood, though occasionally they had served elsewhere in the same position; for example, Nicholas de Lomlay, who accounted as receiver of Leicester in 1313-14, had previously been the earl’s receiver of the honor of Pontefract.4 Without excluding the possibility of the receivership being used as a stepping-stone to higher service in some form under the crown,5 on the whole the receivers tended to retain their positions longer than the

1D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 32; D.L. Knights’ Fees, 1/11, fos. 45, 51.
2In 1349 the receiver of Leicester received a fee of 66s. 8d. for being receiver also of Higham Ferrers and 33s. 4d. for being receiver of Huntingdon and Godmanchester (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 32).
3William de Bagworth (Bagworth, Leicestershire), for example, who was receiver at least from 1327 to 1334 (D.L. Misc. 9/1, m. 12; 9/4 m. 3), was rector of Claybrook in Leicestershire (Ibid. 9/4 m. 48). Practically nothing is known of his career, but he was alive in 1342, when he is described as “vicar” of Claybrook (Cal. Close Rolls, 1341-3, p. 529). See also the career of William Chiselden, described below, p. 330.
4D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.
5A case in point is the career of Thomas de Chisenhale, who was receiver from at least January, 1337, to October, 1338 (D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 30, 21). In August, 1337, a general pardon was issued to Thomas de Chisenhale for trespasses against the peace of Edward II or of the present king (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1334-8, p. 507). In 1342 a Thomas de Chisenhale was appointed escheator in co. Southampton (Cal. Fine Rolls, v, 263), which office he held for a year; the following year he was sheriff of Southampton (Cal. Close Rolls, 1343-6, pp. 36, 40, 65, 86, 176). At the same time he was employed on various royal commissions (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1343-5, pp. 76, 93, 160, 164). He evidently remained on good terms with the house of Lancaster and maintained friendships in Leicestershire, for in 1344, when he had been outlawed for non-appearance before the justices, touching an indictment relating to his conduct as sub-escheator in co. Bedford in the 7th, 8th, and 9th years of Edward III, he received pardon at the request of Henry of Lancaster, earl of Derby, and on the pledge of William Trussel the elder, of Leicestershire, and others (Ibid. pp. 194, 199). He was still alive in 1351 (Cal. Close Rolls, 1349-54, p. 328), and was probably the Thomas de Chisenhale who received a pension for life in 1357 from Melsham manor, co. Wilts. (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1344-8, p. 839).
stewards, and evidence strongly points to the conclusion that they were very prominent in local affairs.

Two careers may be summarized as illustrations: John Hayward, receiver for twenty-three years (1338-61), and William Chiselden, receiver for at least twenty years (1372-92).

The parentage of the former has not been clearly established, nor has the entry of his admission as a gildsman been found in the records of Leicester borough, although he was a prominent townsman. His name, however, occurs in the tallage roll of 1336 as John le Hayword, "clericus". In 1343 he was one of the founders of the religious gild of Corpus Christi, a fraternity closely connected with the civic body, and in 1349 was one of the twenty persons who founded a chantry of four chaplains in the church of St. Martin, Leicester, for the good estate of the king, earl Henry of Lancaster, Henry of Walton, archdeacon of Richmond, and for the welfare of their own souls. In the same year, with two others he had licence to alienate property in Leicester to the hospital of St. John there. He was mayor of Leicester from 1347 to 1349, and as John "Reveyceur" represented the borough in the March Parliament of 1348. He was probably the John Hayward of the diocese of Lincoln on whom the office of notary was conferred in 1355. Altogether a trusted and competent man of affairs, it was doubtless in recognition of his faithful service to the Lancastrian house that he received a grant of rent to the value of £5 per annum for life charged on the manor of Desford. He died in or shortly after 1361.

---

1See Appendix IV.
2D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 23; D.L. Min Acc. 198/3112, m. 1d.
3Gaunt’s Reg. 1372-6, i, 96; Add. Chart. 21453. It is probable that his tenure of office extended both before and after these dates, but no documentary evidence has yet been found.
5Roll of the Mayors of Leicester, 16.
7Ibid. p. 421.
8Miss Bateson confuses him with John Cook, alias John Waynhouse, in her index to Leics. Bor. Rec. John the Receiver [Hayward] and John Cook both appear in a grant of 1360, so they could not be the same persons (Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 397). Moreover, in John Cook’s account of 1361-2, John Hayward is referred to as “sper receptor Leicestrie” (D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3112, m. 1d.).
9Returns of Members, i, 146.
10Cal. Papal Letters, iii, 582.
11Chancery Inquisition post mortem, Edw. III, file 160 (no. 5).
Of the clerk William Chiselden, nothing is known of his early career. He first appears in 1369 when on 8 August he was presented as priest to the fourth prebend of the Lancastrian foundation of the Newarke college at Leicester. On 2 June, 1372, when already receiver of Leicester honor, he was appointed receiver of the works of the church of the Newarke foundation in the place of John Charnels. In 1374 a William de Chuselden appears as prebendary of the prebend of Holborn in the cathedral church of St. Paul’s, London, and in 1387 a William Chiselden was a prebendary of Tachbrook in Lichfield cathedral. He was a frequent party and witness to conveyances of property in Leicester; occasionally lands in the county were committed to his keeping; and he was evidently sought as an executor, as seen by the will of Robert de Swylyngton. After 6 November, 1379, he combined the receivership of Leicester and elsewhere with that of Higham Ferrers in Northamptonshire, and concerning some of his activities in these capacities the printed volumes of John of Gaunt’s register afford detailed information. His experience in the local receivership apparently stood him in good stead, for in 1388-9 he is found acting as receiver-general of duke John of Lancaster. On 25 November, 1390, he was presented as dean of the Newarke college, which office he held until his death in 1396.

(iii) PORTER

The remaining officer of importance in the ministerial group at the centre of the honor was the porter (janitor) of Leicester castle. His first and obvious duty centred around the keeping of the castle gate, a duty involving all kinds of arrangements to do with the reception, residence or departure of the lord, his retinue and his friends. He was responsible also for guarding

1A. H. Thompson, *Newarke Hospital and College*, 236.
2*Gaunt’s Reg.* 1372-6, ii, 69.
4Ibid. 1385-9, p. 286.
5*Leics. Bor. Rec. passim.*
6*Cal. Fine Rolls*, x, 221.
7*Early Lincoln Wills*, 77.
8*Gaunt’s Reg.* 1379-83, ii, 383.
9*D.L. Min. Acc.* 728/11975. A receipt from him as receiver-general, dated 12 February, 10 Richard II, is to be found in *D.L. Min. Acc.* 725/11819.
the prison of the castle,\(^1\) a task which might sometimes prove arduous as shown by a number of prison incidents. Occasionally a prisoner escaped and had to be sought and recaptured, since the porter was held responsible by the justices in eyre if a prisoner made good his escape;\(^2\) or an attempt at rescue or revenge might be made, as in 1309 when three men entered the gate of the castle, broke the door of the prison and attacked five brothers imprisoned there for a certain trespass by order of the earl, actually killing one of them.\(^3\) Connected with the custody of the prison went the porter’s duties in connection with the castle court. It fell to him to execute the sentences of the court within the town of Leicester, whether by making attachments or collecting fines.\(^1\) The citizens complained in 1322 that in the time of earl Thomas the porters of the castle forcibly made attachments and other executions without a bailiff of the town as had been customary under earl Edmund, and consequently inflicted injuries and hardships upon the town.\(^4\) Sometimes the porter would have to give evidence in particular cases, and he was held responsible with the steward for the chattels of criminals executed in the earl’s court.\(^5\)

But this was not all. Already in the twelfth century there are indications of castle porters rendering accounts,\(^6\) and during the period under consideration it was the porter’s regular duty to render the account for the castle of Leicester every year.\(^7\) He answered for the rents accruing from property in Leicester both in money and kind, for the farm of the mills and the fishery in the river Soar, for the two views of frankpledge of St. Leonard there and small perquisites of the honor court of Leicester, for the chattels of felons and fugitives, for stray cattle and for the produce of the castle garden and curtilage.\(^8\) His accounts further

\(^{1}\)E.g. "Et de xjs. pro vadiis Janitoris custodientis castrum et carcarem et faciendi executionem indictamentorum Curie infra villam Leices-trie, capiendo per diem, jd. ob". (Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1147/20, m. 2).


\(^{3}\)Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 372.


\(^{5}\)E.g. Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 361.


\(^{7}\)This is stated in the rental of 1349 (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 29), and is so in practice.

\(^{8}\)Ibid.
contain details of the wages of workmen engaged in repairing or altering the castle premises, together with the cost of the building materials used; and at the same time they supply interesting snippits of information concerning the cultivation of vines, the feeding of swans and the making of dovecotes at Leicester.

It has not been possible to establish the careers of the castle porters in the national records, a circumstance which, together with their names, suggests that they were usually local men who had probably served in lower capacities at the castle. As individuals they are not important, being definitely of a lower rank than the receivers. Their rate of pay was a 1d. a day, the same wage as the porters of the royal castles in the twelfth century, but whilst the castle and honor were in the king’s hand from 1322 to 1324 they received 1½d. a day. In addition there were certain perquisites and liberties attached to the office, for in 1313 Peter de Leycester granted and quit-claimed to earl Thomas, and failing issue to him, to Henry his brother, the custody of the gate of the castle of Leicester with the corrodies, fees and all liberties and profits belonging to it. What exactly these were has not been discovered, but it is not surprising to find that there were other rewards attached to the office besides money. The keeping of the gate of York castle in the twelfth century was a serjeancy, to which was attached an estate valued at £5 a year, with lands in York itself. From the grant of Peter de Leycester it appears that the porter’s office was granted by the earl himself during the early part of the period; but at any rate during the years 1322 to 1324 the porter was appointed by the steward. There seems to have been no fixed term or duration of office, and changes were probably not very frequent, since it would naturally be of advantage to all concerned to have a man well experienced in the execution of these miscellaneous duties.

1E.g. D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20.
2D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 29.
3English Historical Review, xxxiii, 352.
4Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1147/20, m. 2.
5D.L. Anc. Deeds, 1788-90; D.L. Misc. 1/35, m. 4; D.L. Great Cowcher, ii, fos. 52v-53.
7Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 1, 3d.
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(C) THE COUNCIL

It has already been suggested that over and above both the local and central officials of the honor stood the lord’s council, to which difficult points or grievances relating to the administration might be referred. The existence of private councils in medieval England is a fact already well known. Just like the king, the great magnate, whether layman or ecclesiastic, might be assisted and guided by a body of trained or untrained barons, clerks and lawyers known collectively as his council. The development and functions of the Lancastrian council is therefore an important and interesting subject in itself, and although no detailed treatment of it can be attempted here, since it belongs more strictly to a wider survey of the whole Lancastrian administration, a few points may be noted and its importance in the wider system indicated.

Unfortunately the council does not appear much on the surface of the surviving records. It was obviously in existence throughout the period, but until the second half of the fourteenth century remains an indefinable body of important officials and friends of the earls. Often it is possible to detect a group of officials with all the appearance and powers of a council, and lists of “familiares” can be made from the constant attestation of the earl’s charters; but there is little evidence of the permanent organization which must have existed. References indicating its existence and throwing light upon its functions do appear, however, from time to time. Earl Edmund reformed the procedure of the Leicester portmanmoot in 1277 “par son conseil” and by the assent of the mayor and jurats. Mention of the council (consilium) of the lord earl of Lancaster appears in the mayor of Leicester’s accounts of 1300 and of 1307-8. In 1313-14 the park-keeper of Hinckley is allowed 10s. on his account for


2For example, in Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1317-21, the following attest a grant of 12 May, 1319, to Sir Roger Belers: Robert de Holland, Nicholas and Stephen Segrave, John Bek, knights; William Trussel, John Kynardsby, Michael de Meldon and Ellis de Stapleton, clerks.

3Leic. Bar. Rec. i, 150.

4Ibid. 234, 258.
his wages, but in future he is to receive the wages which others in that position have had " nisi aliud inde ordinatum fuit per consilium".\(^1\) The following year the burgesses of Leicester were allowed certain liberties in the presence of the earl's council.\(^2\) At the end of the account of William de Cloune, bailiff of the reeveship of Leicester in 1332, it is stated that if the earl or his council decide that he owes anything more than the sum given he shall be held responsible.\(^3\) In 1355-6, the bailiff of Northampton accounts for a certain wardship except the dower, which has been assigned " per consilium domini".\(^4\) A relief crossed out in the same bailiff's account for 1361-2 is explained by an insertion on the record: "quia compertum est coram consilio domini quod non debet eo quod de perquisitis".\(^5\)

Under John of Gaunt the council can be seen as a definite and formal body which helps him in the administration of his estates.\(^6\) Under the presidency of the chief of the council (in 1377 Sir John d'Ypres, one of the duke's retinue), and accompanied by the clerk of the council, its members go on progress through the Lancastrian estates, listening to the petitions of aggrieved tenants, settling questions of disputed ownership, respiting demands on a minister in arrears with his accounts—in fact, acting as a final court of appeal to which all causes may be brought. No business seems to have been too great nor too small to come before the council. They advise the duke on the granting of lands and pensions; they authorize expenditure, back up the duke's appointments, recommend estate policy, offer legal advice, and busy themselves with endless miscellaneous business. Yet, as Miss Levett remarks,\(^7\) the jurisdiction and the authority of the council were evidently not undisputed. In one case, some of the duke's tenants have purchased underwood from the council but they petition the duke in person to accept the sale, as they have nothing under seal.\(^8\) On another occasion, John

---

\(^1\)D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 16.  
\(^2\)Leic. Bor. Rec. i, 301.  
\(^3\)D.L. Misc. 10/34, m. 65.  
\(^4\)D.L. Min. Acc. 198/8111, m. 2d.  
\(^5\)bid. 198/8112, m. 1.  
\(^6\)Armitage-Smith, John of Gaunt, 223; Gaunt's Registers, passim.  
\(^7\)Levett, op. cit. 36.  
\(^8\)Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 168-9.
Curson was to have been brought before the council for trespass in the duke's wood but was given a special pardon by the duke.\(^1\)

It is perfectly clear (by the second half of the fourteenth century) that the duke's council was a permanent and regularly constituted body, sharply distinguished even by a chronicler from his "familia", though on one occasion when the "consiliarii ducis Lancastriæ" include the king of Navarre and his brother Giles\(^2\) it seems that only temporary advisers are meant. As far as can be seen the nucleus of the council was formed by the steward with other permanent officials of the household,\(^3\) together with a few knights who were often local stewards or close friends of the duke. There is at least one instance of where a regular councillor (Simon Pakeman) was allowed to relinquish his office (the stewardship of the Leicester honor), but remained a member of the council for life, with a pension.\(^4\) It is still not easy to get any clear idea of its meetings even towards the end of the period, although it has been suggested that there seems to have been some attempt to hold regular meetings at Epiphany, Easter, the feast of St. John the Baptist and Michaelmas.\(^5\)

Along with the chancery,\(^6\) the council must be regarded as a strong factor of uniformity in the Lancastrian possessions, but its importance can only be fully understood as more information concerning its personnel, organization and business is brought to light, especially for the earlier period.

IV

ACCOUNT AND AUDIT

The system of account and audit, which has already been mentioned as binding together the territorial units and ministers of the honor within the wider Lancastrian organization, must now be considered. Information on this subject is forthcoming chiefly from incidental references contained in the ministers' accounts, which are themselves a direct product of the system. In every

\(^1\)Ibid. 279.
\(^2\)Knighton, Chronicon (R.S.), ii, 73. Cf. Levett, op. cit. 36.
\(^3\)Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, xi.
\(^4\)Ibid. 264.
\(^5\)Ibid. 1379-83, i, xlvi (introduction by the late E. C. Lodge).
account or series of accounts the expenses of the auditor or auditors who took the view or heard the account are usually recorded. Often the names of the auditors are given, with the nature of the accounts they heard, the place of audit, and the length of time the audit took. In the case of rolls that have not been engrossed, notes written by the auditor are occasionally found in the margins, while a number of miscellaneous facts concerning the process of the audit can be established from a study of scattered items over a period. In addition, there have survived a number of letters of the earls to their auditors which throw further light on details connected with the whole procedure of account and audit.

(i) VIEW AND AUDIT

It is first necessary to distinguish, so far as the evidence permits, between a “view” and an “audit” of account, both from the point of view of documents and process. As far as the evidence is conclusive, the “view” appears to have been a kind of interim inspection of the financial position of the reeves, bailiffs and receiver taken during the financial year, which ran from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, usually in the spring or early summer. In the final accounts of 1313-14 are included the expenses of Simon de Baldreston and Henry de Leycestre, who

1Mr. Denholm-Young (op. cit. 131 seqq.) has some valuable remarks on this point, based primarily upon thirteenth-century material. Unfortunately, so few “views” have survived relating to the honor of Leicester in the fourteenth century that it is unsafe—indeed impossible—to attempt a detailed comparison with the audit, as does Mr. Denholm-Young.

2Simon de Baldreston was a Lancastrian servant of long standing. In 1303-4 he was steward of Blackburnshire and in 1305 receiver of Lancaster (Vict. Co. Hist. Lancaster, vi, 314; De Lacy Compoiti, 64). He was acting as earl Thomas’s auditor at least as early as 1312-13 (Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 277). He was auditor again the following year (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 16, 20v), and possibly continued in this office until earl Thomas’s fall in 1321-2, when he appears to have entered the service of the crown, being one of the auditors of the accounts of the forfeited Lancastrian estates following 1322 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1321-4, pp. 91, 105, 144, 178; Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-23, pp. 454, 531, 584, 617). In 1312 he was rector of St. Michael’s on Wyresbank in Amounderness hundred, co. Lancaster (Vict. Co. Hist. Lancaster, vi, 264); and there is little doubt that he can be identified with the Simon de Baldreston, parson of Heversham, co. Westmoreland, mentioned in 1322 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1321-4, p. 85) and 1325 (Ibid. 1324-7, p. 92).

3See below, p. 339.
were auditors, for "making views of the accounts of the bailiffs and reeves of the honor of Leicester in the summer of this year;"\textsuperscript{1} and the two earliest surviving "views" cover the periods from 29 September, 1351 to 7 July, 1352, and from 30 September, 1361 to [? 30] March, 1362.\textsuperscript{2} There was no formal rendering of account for audit purposes at the view, since that came after the end of the financial year; but there is every reason to suppose that the view of a bailiff's or reeve's account included a full statement of all income and expenditure from the end of the last financial year up to the time of the view. This for instance, is the impression given by the view of the accounts of the various ministers of the honor in 1360-1. It is essentially a financial statement for that part of the year which has passed with respect to the various manors and bailiwick. The same is true of a view of the receiver of Leicester's account, which embodies a list of the sums of money which he has so far received from the various local units of the honor, together with certain payments already made.

It follows that the view had not the importance of a final reckoning, a point illustrated by the comparative costs of the two processes. For example, whilst the expenses involved in auditing the accounts of the ministers of the midland part of the honor in 1313-14 amounted to £4 13s. 9\textsuperscript{d}.\textsuperscript{3} the cost of viewing the same accounts a few months earlier was only 26s. 8\textsuperscript{d}.\textsuperscript{3} But the view had an importance in relation to the final audit perhaps no less than had the view to the audit at the royal exchequer; and, as Mr. Denholm-Young remarks, it is an interesting speculation whether the lay nobles imitated this system directly from the exchequer, or whether, as seems more likely, they learned to use it from their ecclesiastical neighbours.\textsuperscript{4} Certainly the resultant document, beginning "Visus compoti......" would be produced at the audit at the end of the year both to give information which would help to check the final account,

\textsuperscript{1}D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d. In this connection an interesting point is that when the lands of the honor were in the king's hand in 1322-24, auditors were appointed, and one of the instructions issued to them was that they were to return after the accounts had been audited to hold a "view" of account between Easter and St. John (Cal. Fine Rolls, iii, 268).
\textsuperscript{2}D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3246; 198/3112.
\textsuperscript{3}D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d.
\textsuperscript{4}Denholm-Young, op. cit. 132.
and to testify to payments of money made by local officials at the view.\textsuperscript{1}

(ii) AUDITORS

Fortunately much more is known about the audit, but in order to understand the process clearly something must first be said about the duties and powers of the auditor, and about the type of man employed for this purpose.

The thirteenth-century theorists have much to say on the qualifications and duties of a good auditor. He must be a prudent and faithful man, knowing all the points and details of the accounts and the many items of rents, outlays, returns and stock they must contain. He must "hear the plaints or wrongs of everybody who complains of the steward, reeve or hayward and see that full justice be done to the freemen, villeins and customary tenants and other plaintiffs", and "take inquest on the things which are doubtful", and fine those who have been careless with the lord's property.\textsuperscript{2} Commissions which have survived prove that in actual fact all these things were demanded of an auditor. Although so far no Lancastrian commission appointing any of the auditors who appear in the Leicester accounts during the period under review has been discovered, a good example of such a commission, which throws light on the duties of an auditor, is to be found in Bishop Edington of Winchester's appointment of Robert de Hungerford (who was undoubtedly the same Robert de Hungerford who acted as Lancastrian auditor)\textsuperscript{3} and others to be his auditors in 1347.\textsuperscript{4} They are to audit the accounts of those ministers who ought to render them, making due allowance for authorized expenditure and enforcing the payment of debts. They are empowered to remove unsuitable officers and substitute others, and are enjoined to do everything which they think ought to be done "de consuetudine

\textsuperscript{1}In the accounts of 1313-14, for instance, James Doubel, the keeper of the earl's wardrobe, is said to have received a certain sum of money by an indenture which William le Taillour, sometimes reeve of Earl Shilton, delivered to him "super visum compoti sui anno secundo" (D.L. Min. Ace. 1/8, m. 18). According to Walter of Henley one of the chief objects of the view was to take from the bailiffs [or reeves] whatever money had been collected (Walter of Henley, 82).

\textsuperscript{2}Walter of Henley, 105, 107.

\textsuperscript{3}His career is given below, p. 340.

\textsuperscript{4}See Appendix V.
vel de jure”. There is a striking similarity between this commission and the instructions issued to the auditors—some of whom were old Lancastrian auditors—who were appointed to audit the accounts of the Leicester honor and other Lancastrian estates while they were in the king’s hand from 1322 to 1324. In the light of past account rolls all arrears are to be investigated and charged to the appropriate officials; all allegations of decay or loss are to be inquired into; and the auditors are empowered to do anything else pertaining to the improvement of the lands in question. 1

The auditors were completely distinct from the local as well as the central officials in the Lancastrian system, although it might well be that at some earlier date an auditor had served in the capacity of a local or central official. Thus Robert de Silkeston was one of earl Henry de Lacy’s auditors in 1305 and was also receiver of Bolingbroke. 2 He appears to have been an executor of the same Henry’s will, 3 and on the breakup of the Lacy household became a servant of earl Thomas of Lancaster, being one of the auditors of his accounts in 1313-14. 4 In 1322 he became an auditor in the royal service, 5 and afterwards is spoken of as the king’s clerk. 6 Simon de Baldreston, as we have seen, was receiver of Lancaster prior to his becoming an auditor. 7 Henry de Leycestre, who first appears as a clerk of the king in 1307, 8 and who rendered account in 1313-14 as keeper of earl Thomas’s wardrobe, being then in his fifth year of service, 9 was acting as auditor in 1320-21, 10 and after the fall of the earl acted as royal auditor of the accounts of the Lancastrian forfeited lands. 11

1Cal. Fine Rolls, iii, 266.  
2De Lacy Compoti, 16, 126, 57, 150.  
3Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1313-17, pp. 398, 536.  
4D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 16.  
6In 1324 he was presented by the king to the church of Fishlake, co. York (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1324-7, p. 37). The next year he received a grant of the prebendal church of Bockingfield, Kent (Ibid. 112) and was nominated to the church of Keyingham, co. York (Ibid. 130). In 1326 the king granted him the deannery of Wolverhampton (Ibid. 315).  
7See above, p. 336, n. 2.  
9D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20.  
11Cal. Fine Rolls, iii, 149; Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, 1147/20, passim. He is referred to as parson of the church of Castle Donington, Leicestershire (another of earl Thomas’s possessions) in 1322 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1321-4, p. 84), and from a legal record of 1327 it appears that he was keeper for life of the hospital of St. John there, by grant of Thomas, earl of Lancaster (Coram Rege Roll, 270, Mich. 1 Edw. III, m. 13).
The most striking career of the fourteenth-century Lancastrian auditors is that of Robert de Hungerford, son of Adam de Hungerford of Berkshire, who first appears as a mainpernor in 1306.\(^1\) In 1314 he was appointed keeper of the lands of Alan la Zousche, deceased, in co. Wilts.\(^2\) By December of this same year he was already married, his first wife being a certain Geva,\(^3\) who died in 1335.\(^4\) As a servant of earl Thomas of Lancaster he acted as bailiff of Everley and Collingbourne Ducis, possessions of the honor of Leicester in Wiltshire,\(^5\) and also as bailiff and receiver of the Lancastrian lands in Berkshire and Wiltshire.\(^6\) On earl Thomas’s forfeiture he was appointed royal keeper of his castles and lands in the counties of Middlesex, Wilts, Berks and Southampton,\(^7\) and held the same until they were restored to earl Henry of Lancaster.\(^8\) In 1327 he received a simple protection for one year when going abroad with Henry, earl of Lancaster.\(^9\) From the valor of the Lancastrian estates in 1332 it appears that he was the earl’s supervisor in Hampshire.\(^10\) In 1333-4 he acted as one of the earl’s auditors,\(^11\) and can be traced as such every year until 1338-9.\(^12\) There is every indication that he was a trusted friend and adviser of the earl, who made him one of the executors of his will in 1345.\(^13\)

But like so many of the Lancastrian higher officials Robert de Hungerford did not hesitate to serve both the crown and other lords at the same time. He became a justice of the peace in 1318,\(^14\) and henceforth was regularly employed as such until about 1345. On occasion he also acted as justice of gaol delivery, justice in eyre, collector of taxes and commissioner for all kinds of miscellaneous royal business.\(^15\) As a knight of considerable territorial standing in Hampshire and Wiltshire and as one evidently of a

\(^1\)Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301-7, p. 484.
\(^2\)Cal. Fine Rolls, ii, 199.
\(^3\)Cal. Close Rolls, 1319-18, p. 135.
\(^4\)Cal. Fine Rolls, iv, 457.
\(^6\)D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 13.
\(^7\)Cal. Fine Rolls, iii, 119.
\(^8\)Ibid. 268.
\(^10\)D.L. Knights’ Fees, 1/11, fo. 45.
\(^12\)Ibid. ii, 16, 26, 41, 45; D.L. Min. Acc. 288/4715.
\(^13\)Early Lincoln Wills, 18.
charitable disposition, it is not surprising to find him in the employment of the bishop of Winchester, both as steward of the Winchester estates until 1349, and as auditor in 1347. He died in June, 1352.

The majority of the fourteenth-century Lancastrian auditors, whose names appear in the Leicester accounts, were clerks, and it seems clear that some of them owed their preferments to Lancastrian influence. A few examples may be given in addition to those already cited. Richard Passesmer, who accompanied earl Henry abroad in 1329 and to whom reference is made as auditor on 1334-5, was parson of North Scarle in Lincolnshire, and was presented to the church of Burton Overy, Leicestershire, in 1339. In 1344 he was appointed to survey and reform the priory of Tutbury. His close tie to earl Henry of Lancaster is shown by the fact that he appears as one of the clerks in whose presence Henry made his will, and he was both an executor and the recipient of a bequest. Again, Thomas of Mapelton, auditor at least during the years 1372 to 1375, is referred to as parson of the church of Brampton in Lincolnshire in 1363, which living he still held in 1377, while at the same time he occasionally appears on royal commissions. But the most interesting of all is the noted pluralist, Philip de Melreth (Meldreth, co. Cambridge), who acted as auditor for Henry, duke of Lancaster, at least from 1376 to 1378. In October 1352, he exchanged the church of East Mersea, Essex, for that of Broadwell, Gloucestershire. He was instituted to Westmill (Herts) on 25 October, 1361. At the countess of Pembroke's petition he had provision of an expectative canonry at Lincoln.

1For references to his possessions and alienations see Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1327-37, passim.
2Miss Swift's thesis cited above, p. 64.
3Register de Edyndon, ii, fo. 61.
4Cal. Inq. x., nos. 41, 133; Cal. Fine Rolls, vi, 346.
6Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 16.
8Ibid. 1343-5, p. 329.
9Early Lincoln Wills, 17.
10Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, passim.
12Ibid. 1377-81, p. 41.
13D.L. Acc. Var. 3/1, m. 2; D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3247, m. 3.
15Lincoln Reg. ix, fo. 412d. This and the following references to the unprinted Lincoln registers are taken from Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers, xxxv, 217.
on 27 March, 1363, by virtue of which he must have obtained Marston St. Lawrence prebend in Lincolnshire soon afterwards. He resigned Westmill on obtaining North Luffenham, Rutland, on the death of Roger Northburgh, to which he was instituted on 13 June, 1367. He exchanged North Luffenham and Marston prebend for the precentorship of St. Paul's, of which he had collation on 1 November, 1370. It does not appear when he quitted this dignity. In 1373 he was parson of Bishop Stortford in Hertfordshire. Apart from this "ecclesiastical" aspect of his career he was evidently a clerk with wide administrative experience. In his early career he served the house of Bohun, being one of the attorneys appointed by William de Bohun, earl of Northampton, in 1355, to receive all monies from his estates, to give letters of acquittance and so on. He received a grant of property from the same William in 1359. He was executor of the will of Humphrey Bohun, earl of Hereford, son and heir of William de Bohun, deceased, in 1373, and was auditor of the Welsh estates of his heirs during their minority, by grant of the crown. After this he apparently entered Lancastrian service.

(iii) ACCOUNT AND AUDIT

Armed with instructions and powers such as have been described, the Lancastrian auditors, sometimes singly but usually in pairs, appeared each year to audit the accounts of the various officials responsible for the administration of the Leicester honor. There is no evidence that the auditors travelled from one manor to another or from bailiwick to bailiwick within the central part of the honor in order to hear the accounts. On the other hand, it appears that all the local officials had to appear with their accounts to meet the auditors at Leicester castle. The borough

\[1\text{Cal. Papal Petitions, i, 410.}\]
\[2\text{Lincoln Reg. x, fos. 167d, 290d.}\]
\[3\text{Ibid. fo. 181d.}\]
\[4\text{Cal. Close Rolls, 1369-74, p. 558.}\]
\[5\text{Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1354-8, p. 255.}\]
\[6\text{Ibid., 1358-61, p. 304.}\]
\[7\text{Earl Lincoln Wills, 34; Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1370-4, p. 392.}\]
\[8\text{Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1370-4, p. 496.}\]
\[9\text{Yet, of course, if viewed from the standpoint of the whole of the Lancastrian possessions, the audit was a travelling one. An illustration in point is found in the receiver of Leicester's account for 1399-1400, when the audit moved from Leicester to Higham Ferrers, and from there to Pusenham, Long Buckby, Kenilworth and Castle Donington (D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3248, m. 4).}\]
accounts of Leicester frequently contain items detailing expenses in connection with the auditors' visit, which supplement those on the receiver's account.\(^1\) The auditors seem to have arrived at Leicester usually in December or January, and to have audited all the accounts of the honor lands in Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Warwickshire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland during their visit, which lasted from a week to a fortnight.\(^2\) The very fact that it took so long proves that the business of a general audit cannot have been slight. Apart from all the preliminary arrangements which would have to be made, the actual hearing of the accounts presented by the different ministers must have been both a wearisome and highly complicated task.

The actual conditions of the audit are not known in any detail. There was probably an "auditor's chamber" at Leicester castle as at Higham Ferrers\(^3\), but there is no evidence for any elaborate exchequer organization such as existed at Wolvesey, the administrative centre of the bishop of Winchester's estates. The mention of a counting table in the list of the dead stock at Leicester castle\(^4\) may probably be connected with the audit, although as already suggested, it may have been part of the receiver's office furniture. It may also indicate the use of some system of counters, but since there is no concrete evidence this is purely speculation. Occasionally bags were bought for the rolls and pouches for the money, whilst chests were used for storage purposes.

The anonymous writer of the treatise on husbandry speaks of an oath which all rendering account must take.\(^5\) Such a procedure is naturally not recorded on the account rolls, but it seems fair to assume that all private officials were sworn in after the manner of the agents of the crown.\(^6\) In any case, it is clear that the various ministers appeared in person, or by accredited substitutes, before the auditors. Others present were the steward

---

\(^1\)E.g. In 1313-14, to Simon de Baldreston and his fellows, auditors of the earl's account, Thursday next before Christmas, bread, wine, beer; hens, 1s. 4d. To the same, Tuesday before the Assumption of the Blessed Mary, bread and wine. Similar items occur almost yearly.

\(^2\)E.g. In 1314 they were at Leicester eleven days (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 20d); in 1377 their stay lasted twelve days (Ibid. 212/3247, m. 3).

\(^3\)See above, p. 325, n. 6. Cf. W. J. B. Ker, Higham Ferrers... its Ducal Castle and Park, 112.

\(^4\)Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1148/9, m. 1, 3d.

\(^5\)Walter of Henley, 60.

\(^6\)Denholm - Young, op. cit. 147.
and the receiver of the honor, and in the later fourteenth century often the lord's high steward, together with the auditors' clerks and yeomen and perhaps occasionally others of the lord's household or council, or even the lord himself. The ministers in turn presented their written accounts, which were generally drawn up in a set fashion and written out by a professional clerk, whose writing charges are entered in the account.¹ All the accounts both of the local and central officials of the honor have the following form, although there is room for wide variations within the various sections:

- **Arrears (Arreragia)**
- **Receipts (Recepte)**
- **Total Receipts (Summa Recepte)**
- **Expenses (Expense, occasionally Mise)**
- **Payments or Deliveries (Liberate)**
- **Total Expenses and Deliveries (Summa Expensarum et Liberate)**

**Balance (Quietus est or Et debet...)**

The result appears simple enough, but it is perhaps needless to say that the meaning of an entry is often baffling and elusive by reason of its compression. It must be remembered that these accounts were business documents in the strict sense and were only expected to be understood by the officials concerned. The money account is not always complete as it now appears, for it must be borne in mind that the audit was *viva voce* in part, one consequence being that some of the most interesting details concerning the accounts and their hearing have been irretrievably lost. Moreover, the figures which appear in the receiver's account of the honor do not represent the real wealth of the honor. The cost of the administration of the bailiwicks, the upkeep of the demesne manors, certain authorized annuities, the entertainment of the lord's friends and officials, and many other miscellaneous items were all subtracted before any payments were made to the receiver at Leicester. Hence the sums received by the receiver represent only cash receipts or profits, and give no indication of

¹Two examples may be given: Et vjs. viijd. in stipendio clericis scribentis compotum et parcelas ex convencionem cum seneschallo hoc anno [1355-6] (D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3111, m. 2d); Et soluti pro factura compotorum diuersorum balliorum istius honoris hoc anno [1377-8] et pro pergamo ad eosdem empto, vjs. viijd. (Ibid. 212/3247, m. 1).
the true wealth of the local self-sufficing units which made these profits. A further point is that there is always the possibility of some things going to the lord's household direct without being recorded, whilst items not involving money are apt to be omitted.

As far as the audit is concerned, the auditor first checked the statement of the arrears of the past accountant by reference to the foot of the past year's account. How necessary this was is shown by the fact that it was no unusual occurrence for an official to enter as arrears a sum far less in amount than was usually the case. Then in the light of former returns and a detailed rental or valor specially compiled for this purpose, the auditor proceeded to check on each account the various items of money and kind which should have fallen due as "income" during the past year, and to examine the items accounted for under "expenses" or "deliveries". Any omissions or decreases on the income side were duly noted and an explanation demanded. Thus in 1813-14 the park-keeper of Hinckley, having paid 6s. 9d. for haymaking, explained that he had spent so much by reason of the wet season. In 1323 the keeper of Leicester castle, being unable to give the usual return for the demesne lands and pastures of the castle, explained that there was nobody who wanted to, or even could, farm the said lands and pastures on account of the devastation wrought on the tenants of Leicester by the arrival of the king's army tempore turbationis, a state of affairs proved to be correct by an inquisition held in the presence of the auditors themselves.

During the year 1377-8 the receiver of Leicester was unable to account for any farm of the mill outside the east gate of Leicester, his explanation being that the mill stood ruined and empty and

1It is clear that the auditors carried round with them past account rolls and other relevant documents. When John Lemyng was appointed auditor in 1380, an order was sent to Thomas Hardewyk, lately auditor, to hand over to the said John all the previous accounts and all manner of rolls and other evidences pertaining to the office of auditor (Gaunt's Reg. 1379-83, i, 78).

2See above, p. 302.

3...et tantum pro tempore pluvioso”. This same year the receiver of Heathley also pleaded the same cause “...et tantum propter tempus pluviosum...”) for having spent 18s. 6d. on haymaking in two closes within Leicester forest.

4Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, m. 3d. For further evidence of devastation inflicted by the royal army on Lancastrian property in Leicestershire tempore turbationis, i.e., 1321-2, see my note in Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc. xix, 209-11.
was without tenants. But where omissions or decreases in recorded items could not be satisfactorily explained, the auditors made the necessary adjustments and altered the summa recepcte accordingly.

That the fullest details had to be given is further shown by the occasional presence of a schedule sewn to an account, giving full particulars of an individual item or items referred to by the accountant. No items of expenditure would be allowed to the accounting minister unless they were obviously well founded or authorized by a recognized higher authority. If the auditor himself had not received a letter from his lord authorizing him to allow a certain sum of money on a particular official's account, that official had either to produce a writ from his lord authorizing him to make the expenditure in question or a receipt from the person who had received the money or goods. Not merely this, but every item which was allowed was submitted to the closest scrutiny, and it is common in a roll that has not been engrossed to find an entry in the neat hand of the scribe struck out and a new set of figures entered in the heavy and less practised hand of the auditor. The reeve of Desford claimed on one occasion a sum of £8 8s. 8d. as expenses and deliveries, but as the auditor's correction shows, he had only expended 13s. 4d.; and there are many similar cases. The repetition of these attempts at "profiteering" can partly be explained by the difficulty which the local official—especially the reeve—encountered in collecting the money for which he would be held responsible; when discovered—and it seems they frequently were—they made the official liable to a fine. Thus Geoffrey Boner, reeve of Earl Shilton, was fined 10s. for concealing in his account a sum of 3s. which he had received from the herbage of a garden.

Next, any payments or deliveries of money had to be vouched

---

1D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3247, m. 1.
2A good example is the schedule sewn to the account of 1361-2, giving particulars of the expenditure of a sum of 31s. 7½d. by the reeve of Earl Shilton in repairing the fence of Tooley park (D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3112, m. 2). Some interesting building accounts are contained in the schedules attached to the receiver of Leicester's account for the year 1377-8 (Ibid. 212/3247, m. 4, 5).
3For examples of these documents see Appendix V.
4Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9 m. 2d.
5D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3, m. 16.
for, either by tallies or letters of acquittance produced by the accounting official or by the personal acknowledgment of the receiver. Finally, a balance of the whole account was struck, and with reference to the balance it is necessary to guard against jumping to wrong conclusions from the accountant’s use of technical terms. If, after corrections have been made, he shows an expenditure, including deliveries, less than his receipts, he “owes” so much to his lord. He has had it—it was a receipt—and he has not expended it; he therefore “owes” it and an account of what he has done with it. “Et debet”, therefore, means that his receipts are in excess of the expenditure recorded in his roll, and he has to give an explanation for the sum missing or be held responsible for its payment. That the object of the account was thus to determine the liability of the official in charge and his subordinates, and not to determine profits, is further made clear by the practice of including sums of money delivered to the receiver under the “expenses”, with the cost of working the manor or bailiwick and the extraordinary charges; and in a similar way arrears are included on the income side of the account.

Although, in general, there was a balance to the lord’s credit, it is not unusual to find a sum of money owing by the accounting official. This “debt” should not be taken as an indication simply of the efficiency and honesty of the accountant. Often it is composed of the bad debts of former receivers, bailiffs and reeves, so that even a scrupulously efficient and honest official might have to confess a “debt”. It may, of course, also include money which the accountant is unable to collect from his subordinates; and it is quite usual to find the liability divided between a number of persons. These points tend to emphasize the importance not only of consulting each account in detail, item by item, as opposed to referring merely to the balance, but also of working through a series of rolls, as distinct from a single roll, in order to see the practical aspects of the continuity of the system.

Both wooden tallies and written instruments were used throughout the century. There is some evidence to show that the former were most popular with the local officials of the honor, and that towards the end of the century written instruments, already invariably used by the central Lancastrian treasuries of the wardrobe and the general receipt, were superseding these more primitive devices at the receipt at Leicester.
The varying procedure adopted when the audit established the liability is interesting. Occasionally a debt might be postponed by the auditors if the grounds for its non-payment appeared sound. In 1313-14 the bailiff of Earl Shilton secured the postponement of a debt of 10s. for a specified time by pleading that he could not collect the sum because the amercements of which it consisted were of people living outside (extraneorum) the earl’s liberty. At other times an arrangement might be made for the payment of a debt in instalments. Sometimes an official might have some of his debts respited or remitted altogether by special favour of his lord. Geoffrey Boner, reeve of Earl Shilton in 1313-14, was given respite for the payment of 40s. of his debt which were owed by Alice Husewyve. On 28 March, 1333, earl Henry sent a letter to the auditors acquitting William de Bagworth, the receiver of Leicester and Higham Ferrers, up to Easter, 1333. Another good example of such a letter is one from duke Henry, dated 16 September, 1352, authorizing the auditors of the account of John Hayward, the receiver of Leicester, to allow him £20, being the arrears of the past three years for the farm of Stapleford, for which Henry Moton was responsible.

Normally, however, the final arrearage of one year would be carried over as the first asset in the next year’s account. An official continued liable for his debt after he had left office, and the debt appeared in his successor’s account year after year until it was paid. In 1313-14 Geoffrey Boner, reeve of Earl Shilton, paid £74 17s. 4d. to Nicholas de Lomlay, receiver of Leicester, as income from his manor; but in addition he accounted for 46s. 8½d. paid by William le Taillour, sometime reeve there, for his arrears, and for 49s. 4d. paid by William Yongok, late reeve there, for his arrears. Nor did death clear the debt, for a man’s executors would still be held responsible, as seen from the case in 1313-14 where Robert de Blakebourne, Thomas de Nedham and Richard de Pole, executors of Thomas de Blakebourne, late receiver of

1 *D.L. Min. Acc.* 1/3, m. 17.  
2 *Ibid.* m. 16d. The receiver of Heathley’s debts were to be paid in three yearly instalments at approved terms.  
3 *Ibid.* m. 16.  
4 *D.L. Misc.* 8/4, m. 25.  
5 *Ibid.* 10/34, m. 60.  
6 *D.L. Min. Acc.* 1/3, m. 16.
Leicester, rendered a separate account before the auditors for his debts.\(^1\) It is not surprising, therefore, that the official who left office after having acquitted himself entirely should have sought a chirograph stating his acquittance, as a safeguard against any claims which might arise against him. Such is the extant acquittance of William de Cloune, bailiff of the reeveship of Leicester, which states that he has rendered his final account in 1332, is quit, and has a document to this effect.\(^2\)

The question naturally arises as to what happened when an official refused to pay, or even acknowledge, his debts. Since the earl possessed his own prison at Leicester the answer was no doubt simple: the defaulter would probably be thrown into prison until he agreed to pay or find sureties. Alternatively, the earl might have recourse to the royal action of account for malf easing officials. The earliest instance of this action known dates from 1232; the writ seems to come upon the register late in Henry III’s reign, and much of its efficacy was due to the statutes of 1267 and 1285.\(^3\) These statutes sanctioned and defined a rigorous procedure. If an official remained in debt after rendering account to the lord’s auditors, he might be arrested and kept in the nearest royal prison at his own expense until he made full satisfaction. If he complained that the auditors of his account had not allowed him reasonable expenses he might be delivered to such of his friends as would act as pledges; they were then to have him at the exchequer on an appointed day, when the lord should also appear with the rolls and tallies by which he had rendered account; and the account was then to be rehearsed in the presence of the barons or auditors appointed by them and justice be done. If the official was then found in arrears and was unable to pay, he was again to be committed to prison.

That this procedure was being enforced before the end of the thirteenth century is well illustrated by the examples cited by Mr. Denholm-Young,\(^4\) and that it was fairly common in the fourteenth century is known from the frequency with which notice of such arrests is given on the patent rolls. While it is not possible

---

1Ibid. m. 16d.
2D.L. Misc. 10/34, m. 65.
4Denholm-Young, op. cit. 156 seqq.
without searching the exchequer plea rolls to know whether the earls of Leicester and Lancaster adopted this harsh procedure, there is every reason to suppose they would if occasion demanded.

V

LIBERTIES AND FRANCHISES

Passing reference has frequently been made to the liberties and franchises of the honor, and indeed no survey of the administrative system of the honor would be complete if it ignored them. For not only did they affect both the status of the tenants of the honor and the duties of the honorial officials; they formed the source of a not inconsiderable portion of the lord's income, and as such, items relating to them constantly occur on the account rolls. It is now proposed therefore to give a summary account of the various liberties and franchises which the earls enjoyed in the five midland counties of the honor in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; and it may be said that these in general are typical of the liberties and franchises exercised throughout the whole honor.\(^1\)

What is said is based mainly upon evidence from the *Rotuli Hundredorum* and the *Placita de Quo Warranto*, together with general evidence from the account rolls, illustrating the practical side of these liberties and franchises.

The liberties and franchises claimed and exercised by the earls of Leicester fall roughly into three main categories: jurisdictional, administrative, and fiscal.

The first category has naturally to deal with courts, and involves the complex question of private jurisdiction in medieval England. Private jurisdiction, it has been said, can be divided into three kinds: the baronial, the franchiscal, and the domanial.\(^2\) Although these are little more than theoretical distinctions and simplifications of a very complex subject, they will at least indicate a grouping of the various jurisdictions within the honor of Leicester.

As lord of several manors which he kept in demesne, the earl of Leicester exercised a domanial jurisdiction over the tenants of these manors. Thus "halmote" courts were held at

\(^1\)The evidence for the whole of the honor has been examined for this particular aspect of the administration; and occasionally references are included to lands lying outside the midland counties.

\(^2\)G. B. Adams in *American Historical Review*, xxiii, 696 seqq.
Desford, Earl Shilton and Hinckley manors and were attended by the free and unfree tenants for the regulation of the economic and community life of the manors. Since the general nature of domanial jurisdiction has been described elsewhere, nothing further here need be said, except that the perquisites of the halmote courts form a yearly item of income under each of the demesne manors.

Most of the lands of the honor, however, were held of the earl by vassals, by military or quasi-military tenure. In accordance therefore with the feudal principle that every lord with tenants (barones) enough might hold an honor court, the earl of Leicester is found holding an honor court at the caput of his honor, Leicester. The great age of baronial jurisdiction was the twelfth century, and by the period now under review it is only to be expected that although many of the same forms remained the honor court was far in decline, partly due to the rapid development of the royal judicial system, and partly due to the fact that military tenants were coming more and more to hold directly of the king and thus to escape private jurisdiction. Even for this late period the evidence relating to the honor court is disappointingly fragmentary. That the earl of Leicester's honor court met from three weeks to three weeks is an item which often occurs. It appears from the inquisitions taken on the death of earl Edmund in 1296 that tenants held lands "of the honor" in return for a fixed amount of knight's service or scutage and suit at the honor court. Sometimes scutage was the only service now demanded. It would be interesting to establish whether attendance at court had become a burden attached to various parcels of lands within the honor, but there is not sufficient evidence, although such was probably the case. One important point is quite clear, namely, that before the middle of the fourteenth century a considerable body of tenants, who at an earlier period did their suit in person, were regularly paying fines to be excused from attendance at the honor court. The sums of money collected by the bailiffs from this source appear annually in their accounts. That the court continued to function and to be something more than an empty

---

1Ault, Private Jurisdiction in England, 7-8.
2The first extant document in which they appear is the rental of 1349 (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fos. 32-3 seqq.), and then in the later bailiffs' accounts.
form is proved by the considerable sums of perquisites which appear on all the accounts. Here again details are lacking, in that no concrete illustrations of the business of the court or its working can be given since the court rolls have not survived for this period. Theoretically, as at an earlier period, its business would include all questions relating to tenure, character and amount of service, title to land, boundary lines, the law of inheritance and other questions of a similar nature. It would assess and enforce the military service or its money equivalent owed by the lord to the king; and it might also stand in some sort of relation to the earl’s other courts as a superior court.1 Finally, the lord might use his barons or some of them as an informal council, consulting them about the more important affairs of the honor, although in the case of the earls of Leicester and Lancaster the council appears to have been fulfilling this purpose by the fourteenth century.

Franchiscopal jurisdiction has been described as public jurisdiction in private hands.2 In common with the lords of other liberties the earls of Leicester had from an early period rights of sac and soc, thol and theam and infangthief within their honor3 but by the end of the thirteenth century, the lands of the honor formed a franchise so complete that no officer of the crown had any power to discharge any duty therein, except by the earl’s will or on the receipt of a writ non omittas from the king,4 and no fine imposed on the tenants thereof by the royal justices went to fill the royal coffers.

In all his lands the earl of Leicester claimed to have pleas of “vee de naam” (de namio vetito),5 that is, hearing complaints against litigants who refused to deliver up a distress to the owner when proper security was offered, and the bailiff demanded it.6 The taking of distresses was a particularly dangerous practice from the point of view of royal justice, since it afforded excuses for all kinds of oppressive acts and was an easy means of estab-

---

1 Anlitt, op. cit. 2.
2 Ibid. 3.
3 These appear in king John’s charter of liberties of 1199, which Nichols interpreted as marking the origin or creation of the honor of Leicester (Nichols, Leics. ii, 662).
4 See below, p. 355.
5 Rotuli Hundredorum, i, 44, 237; ii, 6, 7, 11, 225, 227; Placita de Quo War. 46, 320, 458, 550-1, 580, 658, 784.
6 Pollock and Maitland, op. cit. ii, 578.
lishing some sort of feudal jurisdiction. So probably from the
time of Glanvill, and certainly from the beginning of the thir­
teenth century, pleas of "vee de naam" were recognized as being
pleas of the crown, and very few lords had power to entertain
them.

Another general and more common franchise which the earl
claimed and exercised throughout his lands was the view of
frankpledge, with which by the end of the thirteenth century
normally went an inquiry into the articles of the tourn, leading
to presentments. It was, in fact, hundredal jurisdiction. It
appears that a number of vills were grouped together for this
purpose, the view being held twice yearly at one or more places
within each bailiwick. To give examples from the midland part
of the honor alone, in Northampton bailiwick views were held at
Lilbourne, East Haddon and Helmdon, in Warwick bailiwick at
Brinklow, Ilmington and Marston Butlers, in Sileby bailiwick at
Sileby (Leicestershire), Teigh (Rutland), Gunthorpe and Gotham
(Nottinghamshire). Other views were held at Leicester, at
Ilston on the Hill and Mowsley in Carlton Curlieu bailiwick, and
at Desford, Earl Shilton and Hinckley. The perquisites from
these views appear regularly in the accounts rendered by the
bailiffs, together with fixed sums of money from each of the vills
within the bailiwicks. In a few instances the earl had granted
the view of his tenants in a particular vill to another lord. Thus
the abbot of Leicester had the view of his tenants in Lockington
(Leics.) and the Segrave family in Sileby and Thurnby (Leics.);
in 1329 it was stated that although the earl still held views at
Dodford and Welton (Northants.) the profits were received by
others.

Along with the view of frankpledge the earl claimed and
exercised the assize of bread and ale. In theory a royal grant

1Hearnshaw, Leet Jurisdiction, 64-6.
2Miss Neilson (Customary Rents, 168) points out that the original form
of "chevage" (payment to secure exemption from attendance at the
view) became obscured, and appears in some cases as a fixed annual
rent (certus redditus) paid by the vill, no allowance being made for
necessary variations from year to year, and that amercements for
absence were still taken in addition. Both these payments, the fixed
rents and the variable amercements, are to be found in the accounts
of the bailiffs of Leicester honor.
3Rotuli Hundredorum, i, 17, 44, 237, 497; ii, 6, 7, 11, 225, 227, 244; Placita de
Quo War. 46, 458, 581, 659.
was necessary but in practice it was generally taken for granted that the right to punish brewers and bakers for infringing the assize went with the holding of the view. In practice, the holding the assize was more of a fiscal than a judicial privilege,¹ for like many other lords the earl of Leicester occasionally took fines in preference to employing the appropriate judicialia, tumbril and pillory.² In one case, at least, the justices objected that the earl did not possess the recognized judicialia and so was abusing the franchise, but it was pleaded, and confirmed by a jury, that all judicia in these places (Gotham and Gunthorpe, Notts.) had been executed time without mind at Leicester.³

After the jurisdictional liberties come the executive liberties bound up with them: the gallows, which were the outward sign of the right to hang thieves ("infangthief"), which the earl had at Leicester,⁴ Helmdon (Warw.)⁵ and Lilbourne (Northants.),⁶ the gallows at Leicester serving also for thieves taken in Nottinghamshire⁷ and probably Rutland; the prison at Leicester where criminals could be kept till trial; and the pillory and tumbril for the punishment of petty offences in most of the places where the view of frankpledge was held. As Miss Cam points out, the possession of a gaol meant responsibility, parallel to that of the sheriff, for the keeping of prisoners till the justices of gaol delivery came; it also meant the fees and perquisites arising from the custody of the prisoners.⁸ The earl's right to hang criminals was accompanied by the right to take the felon's goods, the value of which appears—often with a detailed statement of the items—in the bailiffs' accounts.

Of all the administrative liberties, however, the most important was the right to execute royal writs and estreats which the earl claimed and exercised throughout his honor.⁹ This meant nothing less than the exclusion of the sheriff and his staff from the earl's lands and the execution of such work as they

---

¹Cam, Hundred and Hundred Rolls, 211.
²Placita de Quo War. 47, 581.
³Ibid. 659.
⁴Rotuli Hundredorum, i, 237.
⁵Placita de Quo War. 247.
⁶Rotuli Hundredorum, ii, 7.
⁷Placita de Quo War. 469.
⁸Cam, op. cit. 213.
⁹Cal. Inquisitions, vii, 64, 65; Rotuli Hundredorum, i, 17, 44, 46, 237, 487; ii, 6, 7, 11, 225, 227; Placita de Quo War. 46, 320, 458, 580, 688.
would normally do by the earl's bailiffs. It was the sheriff's
duty to pass on all royal commands with his own mandate to
execute them, and the bailiffs who received them had, as already
pointed out, to empanel inquests, attach, distrain and so forth.
Only in case the bailiffs were guilty of default and a second writ
came to the sheriff, containing the clause "quod non omittas
propter aliquam libertatem", was he justified in entering the
privileged precinct.

Much more valued, perhaps, were the fiscal liberties exer­
cised within the honor, for on the whole "liberties were valued
less for political than for financial reasons". It was the per­
quisesites and profits of the honor court and the views of frank­
pledge, the fees payable for distraining or for executing writs
that were particularly important from the lord's point of view
since they greatly augmented his revenue from rents and manors.
In addition to such incidental profits the earl claimed throughout
his honor the right to the goods of executed felons and fugitives
and to confiscate waifs and strays; but the income from this
source was uncertain and fluctuating and never large. It is
certain also that the earl received the amercements imposed upon
the men of his liberty by the justices in eyre. Separate lists of
these fines were apparently drawn up for collection by the bailiffs
and appear under the heading "green wax", but from the middle
of the fourteenth century a separate "ballivus libertatis cum
virida cera" was appointed whose primary duty was to collect
these amercements and the other income accruing from the above
mentioned liberties. The record of the appointment of William
de Ledbroke to this office on 14 November, 1372, summarizes his

1See above, p. 311.
2Pollock and Maitland, op. cit. i, 571.
3Cam, op. cit. 215.
4This is one of the privileges specifically mentioned in the royal grant to
earl Thomas in 1307 (Cal. Charter Rolls, iii, 82). It was occasionally
questioned in the quo warranto investigations (Placita de Quo War.
320, 489).
5E.g. In the receiver of Leicester's account of 1313-14 is a receipt of 108s.
5d. from divers amercements of green wax (virida cera) this year, which
are detailed in a schedule sewn to the account (D.L. Min. Acc. 1/3,
m. 20d.; the schedule is m. 22). In the same year another schedule
of fines appears under the receipts of the bailiff of the honor of
Leicester in Buckinghamshire (ibid. m. 28).
6The income from this office is found under a distinct heading in the
accounts of the receiver of Leicester: "Balliva liberatis cum virida
cera".
duties very well: "Johan par la grace etc.... a touz etc.... saluz. Savoir vous faceons que nous avons ordinez et assignez nostre bien ame William de Ledbrok de Leycestre gardien de noz feez et fraunchyses en les countez de Warrewyk, Leycestre, Northamton, del honour de Leycestre et Roteland, et coilliour et receyvour de tout la vert cyre que a nous attient es meismes les counteez, ensemblement et de seiser es noz maines et lever chateux des futifs et des felons et autres forfaitours queconqes a nous appurtenantz, donantz au dit William plein poiar de garder noz ditz fees et fraunchises, coiller et receyver nostre verte cyre, et de seiser et lever chateux des futifs et de felons et autres forfaitours queconques a nous issint regardantz sibien en la ville de Leycestre come en les counteez avantditz...." 1

In addition to the above, the earls and their tenants enjoyed a number of other liberties. All the men of the honor were quit of shire and hundred, but as already shown, the earl's private jurisdiction did the work of the shire and hundred so far as the men of his liberty were concerned. They were quit from pontage, passage, toll, pedage, stallage, cornage, tallage and other gelds; 2 they were free from sheriff's aid, murdrum fine and money for view of frankpledge, which meant that the earl was levying these ancient customary dues for his own use instead of their being levied by the sheriff's servants for the king's use. All these quittances were challenged in the quo warranto pleas no less than the greater privileges. 3 Finally, to all the above sources of revenue may be added the earl's right of chase in Leicester forest, which certainly had an economic as well as a sporting 4 and legal aspect.

The question of the origin of all these liberties and franchises is particularly interesting since it was frequently raised during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Records of quo warranto pleadings reveal both their antiquity and the claims upon which they are based. The various exemptions and quittances enjoyed by the men of the honor are easily explained

---

1 Gaunt's Reg. 1372-6, i, 116.
2 On occasion a tenant of the honor might receive a letter or exemplification reciting his exemption from toll, pontage, pavage, etc. An example is the letter issued on 18 February, 1382, in favour of John Cook of Lilbourne, tenant of the honor of Leicester (Ibid. 1379-83, ii, 371-2).
3 Placita de Quo War. 46, 320, 458, 550, 580, 658.
4 Knighton gives details of a hunting party which duke John held here in 1390 (Knighton, Chronicon, ii, 313).
since they were granted by king John's charter of 1199 and subsequently confirmed on numerous occasions during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The explanation concerning the 

*placita corone* which the earls exercised is not so simple. The royal attorneys argued that these *jura regalia* could not be separated from the crown nor be attached to any honor without specific grant of the king ("*nec alicui honori adjungi nisi per speciale factum domini Regis*"). In reply, the argument which the earl—whether earl Thomas or his successor Henry—invariably fell back upon was that king Henry III granted the honor with all its appurtenances ("*cum omnibus... spectantibus*") to earl Edmund, whose heir he is; and that earl Simon de Montfort, who held the honor before its forfeiture and regrant to Edmund, claimed and exercised pleas of "*vee de naam*", return of writs, assize of bread and ale, and so forth, from time out of mind, a claim invariably supported by the jury which was called to give evidence; ¹ whilst in some of the later cases the grant of 1307 to earl Thomas, which indeed made specific mention of these franchises claimed, ² was also produced. ³ It looks, therefore, as though the negative grants embodied in John's charter were assumed to create positive rights to correspond; and that although no *expressa mentio* or specific grant of these regalian rights to the earls of Leicester was ever made till 1307, they had been exercising them throughout the thirteenth century. And when summoned like other lords, great and small, to show by what warrant they exercised these rights, they vindicated them successfully as being among the "appurtenances" of the honor from time immemorial.

But if the king recognized these privileges, he demanded that in return the work of government should be well done. The jurors of 1274 were asked whether the liberties granted by the king had impeded common justice, and if they had been exer-

---

¹ *Placita de Quo War.* 47, 320, 458-9, 580-1, 658-9.

² Grant to Thomas, earl of Lancaster, the king's nephew, that he and the lawful heirs of his body shall have the return of all writs and all the pleas of withernaam in their lands and fees; and that they shall have all the fines and amercements of their men and tenants, wherever they are amerced, or make fine in the king's court, and they shall have all the chattels of their own men and tenants, being felons, fugitives and condemned, 1 May, 1307, Lanercost (*Cal. Charter Rolls*, iii, 82). Cf. the grant of similar liberties in 1381 (Hardy, *Charters of the Duchy of Lancaster*, 12).

³ *Placita de Quo War.* 320, 458-9.
cised in accordance with the terms of the grant, and further, if lords of liberties had impeded the execution of the king's commands.¹ To these questions it was complained in Leicestershire that the earl's bailiffs and those of other lords had been amercing townships when all who in the tithing had not appeared at the view;² and in Nottinghamshire that the earl's bailiffs had been obstructing the servants of the crown in performing their duties, and they themselves had not been executing royal mandates.³ Moreover, inquiry was made in the quo warranto proceedings concerning not only the earl's right to exercise certain liberties, but also his use of them. The juries were frequently asked if the view of frankpledge was exercised as it ought to be, and whether the earl possessed the appropriate judicialia; and in one instance at least the view was taken into the king's hand for abuse, and the earl had to pay a fine before he recovered it.⁴

Step by step the crown was thus asserting its authority, pressing home the doctrine that liberties entailed responsibilities. However powerful the earls of Leicester and Lancaster may have appeared within their own lands, it is wrong to conceive of their exercising an independent and isolated authority; at every point their franchiscal jurisdiction and their administrative and fiscal liberties touched the interests and the administration of the crown.

¹Cam, op. cit. 217.
²Rotuli Hundredorum, i, 239.
³ibid. ii, 28.
⁴Placita de Quo War. 47.
CONCLUSION

The sources which have been used for this administrative sketch could well have been used for other purposes. In particular, the strictly economic and social side of the ministers’ accounts, or even their topographical aspect might have been more fully developed; but attention has here been focussed chiefly on administration, its problems and its agents. The picture which has emerged is no argument from design, but has been built up from the actual records of the working of the administration in practice. It can be seen that the system whereby the lands of the honor were organized and worked formed a unity out of a diversity of local units; and whilst there was obviously some room for local autonomy there was undeniably a high degree of centralization and central control. Although there is every indication that centralizing tendencies increased during the later fourteenth century, the system in all its essentials is clearly found in existence at the beginning of the century, and it is to be regretted that material does not exist to throw light on the earlier formative period.

The object of this sketch will have been achieved if something has been shown of the variety and nature of the tasks involved in the administration of a large group of manors and lands such as was the honor of Leicester. It will be evident that in the matter of administration the earls of Lancaster and Leicester had to deal with problems similar to those of the crown; in fact, their territorial possessions, of which the honor of Leicester formed but one of several, may fairly be regarded as a kingdom in microcosm. If an approach to the subject had been made from the central as distinct from the local standpoint, an elaborate household organization,¹ no less interesting than that of the royal household, would have emerged, co-ordinating the territorial and personal elements of the various honors and possessions. The more enlightening and indeed more logical approach, however, is to start at the bottom of the system, as it were, at the territorial local units, and to work to the top, which is the household itself. This latter can only be fully investigated and under-

stood when further local territorial and administrative research has been done. Just as the governmental machine of the crown cannot be understood without reference to the sheriff and the shire, so cannot the Lancastrian household organization be understood without reference to the local stewards and receivers and the honors and lands for which they were responsible.

But if the duties and problems involved in private administration have been indicated, a glimpse, at any rate, has been given of the elaborate and efficient working of the system which coped with those problems and of the officials who performed those duties. Not the least striking feature is the system of account with its writs, tallies and receipts—themselves interesting to the student of diplomatic—with its audit and amazingly business-like procedure, together with the presence of skilled officials who were willing and able to serve a private lord as well as the crown. Researchers on kindred subjects have noted the readiness of the class of men who acted as stewards and auditors to pass from private to public administration, and the comparative ease with which they were able to do so; and it has now been found that it was not only uncommon, but in fact quite usual, for the Leicester stewards and the Lancastrian auditors to be serving the crown, and occasionally other lords, at one and the same time. It seems that the historian of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries must be far more ready to admit than he has done generally in the past the existence of recognized professional families, which supplied the official "land agent" class of men both for the crown and its greater subjects. It was by no accident or special grace that Edward II employed as auditors and commissioners for the contrariants' lands such men as Henry de Leycestre, Robert de Silkeston, Simon de Baldreston and Robert de Hungerford, who had been important officials of the executed earl Thomas. They were professional men in the strict sense of the word, and belonged to the class of men who were alone capable of performing such duties; it mattered little to them whether they were working for the crown or for a lesser lord. The more advanced our knowledge of private administration becomes, the more irretrievably does the long supposed antagonism between private and public administration disappear.
APPENDICES

I

THE EARLS OF LEICESTER AND LANCASTER

Edmund, 2nd surviving = (1) Aveline, daughter and son of Henry III, earl of Leicester, Derby and Lancaster, d. 1296
   heir of William, earl of Albemarle, d. 1273
   (no issue)
(2) Blanche, daughter of Robert, count of Artois, d. 1302

Thomas, earl of Lancaster, Derby, Leicester, Lincoln and Salisbury, d. 1322 = Alice, daughter and heir of Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln and Salisbury, d. 1348
   (no issue)

Henry, earl of Lancaster, and Leicester, d. 1345 = Maud, daughter and heir of Sir Patrick Chaworth

Henry, duke of Lancaster, = Isabel, daughter of Henry, lord Beaumont
    earl of Leicester, Derby and Lincoln, d. 1361

Maud, d. 1362 = (1) Ralph, son and heir of Ralph, earl of Stafford, d. 1348
   (no issue)
(2) William, count of Hainault, Holland, Zeeland, and Friesland, duke of Bavaria

Blanche, d. 1369 = John of Gaunt, 3rd surviving son of king Edward III, earl of Richmond, Leicester, Derby and Lincoln, duke of Lancaster; also king of Castile and Leon, duke of Aquitaine, d. 1399

Henry, duke of Lancaster, earl of Leicester, etc. Ascended the throne as king Henry IV, 30 September, 1399
II

THE MIDLAND BAILIWICKS OF THE HONOR OF LEICESTER IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The following bailiwick groupings are based on a number of sources, the most important being the extant bailiffs' accounts throughout the century, the returns for the feudal aid of 1330, the inquisitions taken after the deaths of earl Edmund, earl Thomas and duke Henry, and the feodary of 1344.

Carlton Curlieu bailiwick

Ashby Magna
Bitteswell
Carlton Curlieu
Catthorpe
Cranoe
East Langton
Glooston
Illston on the Hill
Knaptoft
Laughton
Mowsley
Noseley
Shangton and Hardwick
Smeeton and Westerby
South Kilworth
Stockerston
Stonton Wyville
Theddington
Thorpe Langton
Walton
West Langton
Wigston Magna
Willoughby Waterless

Desford bailiwick

Bagworth
Cadeby
Desford
Kirby Muxloe
Kirkby Mallory
Osbaston
Peckleton
Ravenstone
Stapleton
Thornton

Earl Shilton bailiwick

Blaby
Broughton Astley
Countesthorpe
Croft

1Feudal Aids, vi, 560 seqq.
2D.L. Knights' Fees, 1/7.
3Formerly a small distinct manor belonging to the lords of Shangton, Hardwick has now become absorbed in Shangton.
4Now Smeeton Westerby. At this time Smeeton and Westerby were considered as two distinct vills included in the same manor.
Earl Shilton
Enderby
Frowlesworth
Normanton Turville
Glenfield bailiwick
Bromkinsthorpe
Hinckley bailiwick
Atterton
Higham on the Hill
Hinckley ¹
Shenton
Stoke Golding
Sileby bailiwick (occasionally called Belgrave bailiwick)
Belgrave
Birstall
Bushby
Burton on the Wolds
Cotes
Edwinston (co. Notts.)
Evington
Gotham (co. Notts.)
Gunthorpe (co. Notts.)
Hathern
Houghton on the Hill
Humberstone
Ingarsby
Keyham
Keyworth (co. Notts.)
Lockington
Northampton bailiwick
Adstone (in Canons Ashby)
Ashby St. Ledgers
Astrop
Byfield
Catesby
Sapcote
Thorpe Prime
Thurlaston
Whetstone
Glenfield
Upton
Wellsborough
Wilnecote (in Tamworth, co Warw.)
Witherley
Long Whatton
Lowdham (co. Notts.)
Normanton upon Soar (co. Notts.)
Prestwold
Saxelby
Shoby
Sileby
Sutton Bonnington (co. Notts.)
Teigh (co. Rutland)
Thorpe Acre
Thurcaston
Thurnby
Walton on the Wolds
Wanlip
Wymeswold
Chapel Brampton
Charlton (in King’s Sutton and Newbottle)
Charwelton

¹Hinckley was formerly divided into two divisions or liberties, called the Borough and the Bond. These are treated separately in the bailiffs’ accounts.
Church Brampton
Claycoton
Cosgrove
Croughton
Dodford
East Haddon
Evenley
Eydon
Farthingstone
Great Brington
Great Purston
Greatworth
Helmdon
Holdenby
King's Sutton
Kislingbury
Lilbourne

Little Brington
Long Buckby
Marston Trussell
Newbold (in Catesby)
Old Stratford
Preston Capes
Puxley (in Passenham)
Ravensthorpe
Staverton
Syresham
Thorby
Thorpe Lubbenham
Tiffeld
Welton
West Haddon

Warwick bailiwick

Bishops Tachbrook
Brinklow
Essenhall (in Monks Kirby)
Eatington
Fenny Compton
Fillongley
Foxcote (in Ilmington)
Halford
Harborough
Harbury
Hunningham
Ilmington
Lapworth

Luddington (in Old Stratford)
Marston Butlers
Moreton Morrell
Newbold Revel
Oversley (in Arrow)
Oxhill
Pailton (in Monks Kirby)
Pinley (in Claverdon)
Princethorpe
Radway
Stretton under Fosse
Wappenbury
Woodcote (in Leek Wootton)
III

STEWARDS OF THE HONOR DURING THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

These names and dates have been established from a variety of sources. References are only given to the earliest and latest dates at which each official appears as certainly holding the particular office. Where the discovery of additional details from other sources may warrant an alteration of any date given, thus extending the official’s tenure of office either backwards or forwards, an asterisk * has been appended.

Richard de Coleshill\textsuperscript{1} \textit{circa} 1300*

Elias or Ellis de Stapelton\textsuperscript{2}

Richard le Foun\textsuperscript{3} 1311 to 1322

Geoffrey de Skeftynyngton

John de Hunton \textit{1322 to 1324}\textsuperscript{4}

Roger de Belegrave

Robert de Gaddesby\textsuperscript{5} 1326* to 1327

Henry de Hambury\textsuperscript{6} 1327 to 1328*

Hugh de Haverbergh\textsuperscript{7} 1332* to 1336

Robert Fouch alias 1336 to 1338*

Foucher\textsuperscript{8}

Simon Pakeman\textsuperscript{9} 1340* to 1346

John de Frelond (Junior)\textsuperscript{10} 1346 to 1352

John de Knighton\textsuperscript{11} 1353 to 1360

Robert de Ernesby\textsuperscript{12} \textit{circa} 1361

\textsuperscript{1}Add. Chart. 21622 (undated), but appears in the mayor of Leicester’s account for 1300 (Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 233).

\textsuperscript{2}Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 245, 276.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid. i, 276, 338. For his death see the Close Roll of 8 August, 1322 (Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-23, p. 589).

\textsuperscript{4}The period of forfeiture, during which the stewards were appointed by the crown (Min. Acc. (Gen. Ser.) 1146/9, 1147/20).

\textsuperscript{5}Leics. Bor. Rec. i, 353-4. For notes on his career see Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc. xx, 82, n. 23.

\textsuperscript{6}Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 8.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid. ii, 11-12; Add. Chart. 21630, 22523.

\textsuperscript{8}Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 27; D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 27.

\textsuperscript{9}Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 47, 65.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid. ii, 68, 79-80, Also Steward of Higham Ferrers (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/17, fo. 32).

\textsuperscript{11}Leics. Bor. Rec. ii, 91, 113.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid. ii, 116. He died between 15 December, 1361 and 10 February, 1362 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1361-4, pp. 66, 205).
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Simon Pakeman  1  1362 to 1375
William de Burgh  2  1377* to 1382*
Thomas Walsh  3  1392* to 1394*
John Holt  4  circa 1395*
Thomas de Rempston  5  1399* to 1400*

IV

RECEIVERS OF THE HONOR DURING THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The same procedure has been followed as in Appendix III.

Thomas de Blakebourne  6  1312* to 1313
Nicholas de Lomlay  7  1313 to 1314*
William de Oterhampton  9
William Davy  10  1322 to 1324*
Roger de Belegrave  11
William de Bagworth  12  1327* to 1334*
Thomas de Chisenhale  13  1337* to 1338
John Hayward  14  1338 to 1361
John Cook  15  1361 to 1362*
William de Chiselden  16  1372* to 1393*
Simon Bache  17  1399* to 1400*

1 Appointed on 1 July, 1362 (Gaunt’s Reg. 1372-6, i, 109); resigned office on 17 August, 1375 (Ibid. i, 264).
2 D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3247, m. 1; Gaunt’s Reg. 1379-83, i, 214-15. He could not have been steward after August, 1387 (see above, p. 322).
4 D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3246, m. 4. He was steward at Higham Ferrers and elsewhere in 1380 (Gaunt’s Reg. 1379-83, i, 98, 128).
5 D.L. Min. Acc. 212/3248, m. 4.
6 Ibid. 1/3, m. 16d.
7 Ibid. m. 16-20.
8 The period of forfeiture, during which the receivers were appointed by the crown (Min. Acc. (Ger. Ser.) 1146/9, 1147/20).
9 For notes on his career see Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc. xix, 206.
10 For notes on his career see Ibid. xx, 86, n. 25.
11 For notes on his career see Ibid. xx, 103, n. 36.
12 D.L. Misc. 9/1, m. 12; 9/4, m. 3.
13 Ibid. 9/5, m. 30, 21.
14 Ibid. 9/5, m. 23; D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3112, m. 1d.
15 D.L. Min. Acc. 198/3112.
16 Gaunt’s Reg. 1372-6, i, 96; D.L. Acc. Var. 3/2, fos. 7, 17, 17v, 20v.
17 D.L. Acc. Var. 212/3248.
**Commission of the bishop of Winchester appointing Robert de Hungerford and three others to be auditors\(^1\)**

Willelmus etc. discretis viris dominis Roberto de Hungerford' militi Johanni Payn de South Waltham' et Ade de Kynefare de North Waltham' ecclesiarum nostrarum dictarum Rectoribus et Willelmo de Overton' salutem graciam et benedictam: vos ad audiendum compotos seu ratiocinia prepositorum et aliorum ministrorum nostrorum quoruncunque qui nobis ad ratiocinia reddenda tenetur et eisdem allocaciones debitas faciendas, arreragia que nobis debita levanda et ipsos distringendos eosdemque si pro nostra utilitate nobis expediens videatur a suis officiis amovendos et eorum loco alios nobis magis ydoneos subrogandos, de omnia alia et singula facienda videretis de consuetudine vel de iure vobis quattuor seu tribus vestrum coniunctim vices nostras donee ea duxerimus revertenda data apud Suthwerk' .vj. die mensis Octobr' anno domini supradicto [1347]. (Register de Edyndon' ii, fo. 61).

**Specimen warrants sent to the officials of the honor and to the auditors of their accounts**

Henri Counte de Lancastre et de Leicestre, Seneschal Dengle-terre a sire William de Baggeworth notre recevior de Leicestre salutz. Nous vous mandoms qe vous facez faire la chambre outre la porte de notre Chastel de Leicestre sicom nous le vous avouns devisez. Et voloms qe les resonables custages qe vous y metirez soient allowe sur votre acompte par garaut de ceste lettre etc. Higham Ferrers, 22 May, 6 Edward III [1332]. (D.L. Misc. 9/4, m. 7).

Henri Counte de Lancastre et de Leicestre Seneschal Dengle-terre a Thomas de Chisenhall notre Recevior de Leicestre salutz. Nous vous envoioms qatre briefs del Eschekere de vnseignes que nous couchent et vne remembrance dedeinz enclose, par la quelle vous poiez savoir cee qe les ditz briefs

---

\(^1\)I am indebted to Miss E. Swift for this transcript.
amontent et vous mandoms qe vous facez livered les ditz briefs au vicomte etc. Kenilworth, 30 December [1338]. (D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 26).

Henri Counte de Lancastre et de Leicestre Seneschal Dengle-terre a Robert Fouch notre Seneschal de Leicestre et Thomas de Chisenale notre Recevior etc. Nous vous mandoms qe vous faccez pescher en lewe de Sore et le pessheur qe vous poez prendre faccez mettre en notre viner dedeinz le park de Tolowe etc. 1 May, 12 Edward III [1338]. (D.L. Misc. 9/5, m. 27).

Thomas Counte de Lancastre et Leycestre, Seneschal dengle-terre, as auditors del aconte Thomas le Chambrelein et Willelme le Palmer, vendors de nostre boys de Leycestre salutz. Aloez au distz vendors sur lour prochein aconte xvii. xvis. iid. qa. a paier a Henri Dowel por fein, aueine et feues de lui achatez por les despenses de notre hostel en tour le mie quaresme lan vnzime. Et lxviis. ixd. ob. a paier a meisme celui, por ceruoise de lui achate meisme le heure. Et xviid. por vn veel de meisme celui achate. La somme des parceles susescriptes xixli. vs. vd. ob. qa. Chargeant de meisme la somme Henri de Leycestre nostre Clerke. Kenilworth, 5 May, 11 Edward II [1318]. (Leics. Ear. Rec. i, 318).


Henri Duc de Lancastre Counte de Derby Leycestre et Nicole Seneschal Dengleterre as Auditours del acompte Johan Kyng notre provost de Shulton' salutz. Allowez au dit Johan sur son acompte vint set soudz dargent queux il ad paye ad Execu- tours Johan de Barewelle iadys notre provost illoeques etc. Leicester, 17 September, 26 Edward III [1852]. (D.L. Misc. 9/7, m. 2).
Specimen letters of acquittance

Pateat universis per presentes me Henricum de Ferraris militem recepisses a venerabili viro domino meo domino Henrico Comite Lancastrie per manus domini Willelmi de Bageworth Receptoris sui de honore Leycestrie sexaginta sex solidos et octo denarios argentii de annua firma michi per eundem dominum meum concessa ad terminum vite mee de termino Pasche ultimo preterito. De quibus quidam sexaginta sex solidis et octo denariis argenti factores me plene esse pacatum per presentes. In cuius rei testimonium presenti littere acquitancie sigillum meum apposui. Datum apud Leycestriam die Martis in festo apostolorum Petri et Pauli anno regni Regis Edwardi tercij post conquestum septimo [1333]. (D.L. Misc. 9/4, m. 36).

Pateat universis per presentes me Ricardum le Cartere recepisses de nobili viro domino Henrico Duce Lancastrie per manus Johannis Kyng preposito de Shulton’ duo quarteria frumenti in quibus idem Dux michi tenebatur de termino Sancti Michaelis anno regni regis Edwardi terciij post conquestum xxvj°, de quibus vero duobus quarteriis fatores me esse pacatum et predictum Ducem quietum per presentes quibus sigillum meum apposui. Datum apud Shulton’ die Lune proximo post festum sancti Dionisij anno supradicto [1352]. (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/18, m. 3).

Pateat universis per presentes me Willelum de Stillynton’ recepisses de Ricardio Page preposito de Hinkelee viginti solidos argentii pro feodo meo de terminis Pasche et Michaelis quos habiti ex dono Henrici comitis Lancastrie ad terminum vite mee. De quibus vero viginti solidis me plenarie esse pacatum et dictum Ricardum per presentes inde fore quietum. In cuius rei testimonium presentibus sigillum meum apposui, datum Hincklee die Jovij proximo post Sancti Michaelis anno regni Regis Edwardi terciij post conquestum vicesimo sexto [1352]. (D.L. Acc. Var. 32/18, m. 7).
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