INTRODUCTION

A history of the politics of the reign of a medieval king that is told without the nobility at the heart would be, if not quite *Hamlet* without the prince, then the History Plays without the nobles. In some of these, it is not always easy to tell which character is which and what is the motivation of each. Without them, however, little would happen and less would make sense. A king's relations with his nobility, and particularly his earls, who were the greatest nobles in the kingdom, did more to shape his reign than perhaps anything else, as is clear from Shakespeare's dramas. As T.F. Tout put it, '[e]ven in the hands of a dull and commonplace person – provided that he were but brave and strenuous – the dignity of an earl was so great that it could not but exercise immense weight'.[1] Edward II's failure to meet the aspirations of his nobility fatally hampered his kingship. The clash between Richard II's view of kingship and that of his nobles blighted his reign and eventually brought him down. Henry III's personality never inspired confidence among his nobles and eventually convinced them that the kingdom would be better off under their stewardship. It was the breakdown in relations between King John and his nobles that led to Magna Carta. Conversely, the military and domestic successes of Edward III and Henry V can be attributed in no small part to their ability to carry their nobles with them and to put them to work in the interests of the crown.

It was K.B. McFarlane who first recognised that in the relationship of nobles and crown, so central to medieval politics, the interests of the crown and the nobles were not naturally at odds with each other and that quarrels between kings and nobles were not the product of an unending struggle between natural enemies, but rather specific failures

---

[1] T.F. Tout, 'The Earldoms under Edward I', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2nd Series 8 (1894), 131.

of kingship by monarchs such as Edward II, Richard II and Henry VI.[2] Since McFarlane, historians have produced a plethora of monographs on individual nobles and on the nobility more broadly, starting in the early 1970s with the political biographies of Thomas of Lancaster and Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke, by John Maddicott and Seymour Phillips respectively.[3]

Until very recently, however, the nobles of Edward I's reign have remained largely free of historical inquiry, in large part because of McFarlane's own brief treatment of the subject. The first professional work on Edward I's earls was done by Tout in 1894 in an article that was as much concerned with the location of the earls' estates as with their political relations with the crown.[4] It did, however, argue that Edward had a very definite policy towards the earldoms, which was 'wherever he could to absorb them gradually into the sphere of the royal influence'.[5] Tout saw this as a mistake and a failure. Indeed, he went so far as to state plainly that, '[t]he family settlement of Edward I explains the reign of Edward II'.[6]

The most influential work on Edward I's earls remains McFarlane's 1965 article, which tackled Tout's thesis that Edward had a clear political policy towards the earldoms.[7] McFarlane rejected this, arguing

---

[2] K.B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 120–1.

[3] Monographs of individual noblemen or noble families include: J.R. Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307–1322: a Study in the Reign of Edward II* (Oxford University Press, 1970); J.R.S. Phillips, *Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, 1307–1324: Baronial Politics in the Reign of Edward II* (Oxford University Press, 1972); C. Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394–1521* (Cambridge University Press, 1978); D. Crouch, *The Beaumont Twins: the Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 1986); R. Horrox, *Richard III: a Study in Service* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), chapter 1; D. Crouch, *William Marshal: Court, Career and Chivalry in the Angevin Empire, c.1147–1219* (Harlow: Longfield Press, 1990); S.K. Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity, 1361–1399* (Oxford University Press, 1990); J.R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge University Press, 1994); M. Morris, *The Bigod Earls of Norfolk in the Thirteenth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Press, 2005); J. Ross, *John de Vere, Thirteenth Earl of Oxford (1442–1513): 'The Foremost Man of the Kingdom'* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Press, 2011). More general books on the nobility include G.A. Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge University Press, 1957); A. Tuck, *Crown and Nobility, 1272–1461: Political Conflict in Late Medieval England* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Press, 1985); C. Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: the Fourteenth-Century Political Community* (London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987); J.S. Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage: Royal Patronage, Social Mobility and Political Control in Fourteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Press, 2004); D. Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France, 900–1300* (Harlow: Longfield Press, 2005); R.R. Davies, *Lords and Lordship in the British Isles in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. B. Smith (Oxford University Press, 2009); D. Crouch, *The English Aristocracy, 1070–1272: a Social Transformation* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2011).

[4] Tout, 'Earldoms'.

[5] Ibid., 140.

[6] Ibid., 154–5.

[7] McFarlane, *Nobility*, 248–67.

Introduction

that, although the aggrandisement of his kin was a conscious policy on Edward's part, it was not a political policy.

However, Edward's pursuit of such a policy resulted in behaviour that did not accord with McFarlane's understanding that the essence of successful late medieval kingship was 'unite and rule', of co-operation between crown and nobles.[8] He confessed that he 'found it difficult to account for what happened to a number of comital families during his reign on the assumption that the king's intentions were honourable'.[9] In his Ford Lectures of 1953 McFarlane had placed Edward I with Edward III and Henry V as the most authentic examples of co-operation between the king and his greatest subjects, but a dozen years later he summed up Edward's dealings with his earls in unflattering terms: the king, he wrote, 'preferred masterfulness to the arts of political management. In that sense he belonged less to the future than to the past'.[10] Closer examination of his behaviour convinced McFarlane that Edward was not behaving like a late medieval monarch ought to and he therefore pushed Edward out of the late middle ages.

While McFarlane damned Edward I for his domination of his magnates, it was this very quality that had earned him the praise of earlier historians. From Fabian Phillips in the seventeenth century, through David Hume in the eighteenth and culminating with Bishop Stubbs at the end of the nineteenth century, Edward I was, in Stubbs' words, 'the necessary check on … an aggressive baronage, the hope and support of a rising people'.[11] The last major treatment of Edward I before McFarlane was Sir Maurice Powicke's and he, unlike his Whiggish predecessors or his McFarlaneite successors, presented a generally positive view of Edward I's relations with his earls.[12] He saw them essentially as 'one large family', held together by a common interest and a common outlook.[13] It is McFarlane's interpretation rather than Powicke's that has gained most traction in the last fifty years of scholarship on the reign, and his view of the relations between king and earls has helped to shape perceptions of Edward's kingship more generally: McFarlane's acerbity has clouded the king's historical reputation.

---

[8] Ibid., 121.
[9] Ibid., 249.
[10] Ibid., 267.
[11] W. Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England*, 4th edn, 3 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1906), II, 306; G. Templeman, 'Edward I and the Historians', *Cambridge Historical Journal* 10 (1950), 16–35.
[12] F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward: the Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947).
[13] Ibid., II, 711.

Nobility and Kingship in Medieval England

In Rees Davies' work on the Welsh March, McFarlane's Edward I is on display in full Technicolor, imposing his will upon the Marcher lords in such a way as to build up dangerous resentment.[14] E.B. Fryde also saw Edward's relations with his magnates in terms of confrontation and domination.[15] Michael Prestwich, the leading historian of Edward I of the past forty years, has no doubt that Edward was a 'formidable king' and his reign 'a great one', and yet he too sees defects in Edward's relations with his greatest subjects.[16] Again, the picture is one of confrontation. Some of Edward's policies were 'designed more with the intention of asserting his authority over the magnates than of winning their co-operation'; his attitude was 'one of aggressiveness which might be modified if he needed support for his wars'.[17] Prestwich sums up Edward I's relations with his magnates in McFarlaneite terms, stating that the king 'did not possess the sympathy with his aristocracy that was to be displayed by his grandson, Edward III'.[18]

Given this historiographic consensus, based as it is on the work of the man who founded the modern study of crown–noble relations in the English middle ages, it may be asked why a new book on the earls under Edward I is needed. The answer is that relatively little is known about them, their individual relations with each other and with the king, and therefore a full understanding of the politics of Edward I's reign is impossible. The earls occupy only walk-on parts in the two major biographies of Edward in the past twenty years, those by Michael Prestwich and Marc Morris.[19] Morris' earlier book on the earls of Norfolk does provide a vivid picture of the career of a single earl in Edward I's reign, but only one, while Caroline Burt's article on the earls of Warwick focuses on their local networks of power rather than on national politics.[20] A full-scale treatment of Edward I's relations with his earls will help to provide a proper picture of politics in his reign. A thorough engagement with McFarlane's vision of Edward will thus be necessary for a clearer picture to emerge.

---

[14] R.R. Davies, *Lordship and Society in the March of Wales, 1282–1400* (Oxford University Press, 1978), 254–67.

[15] E.B. Fryde, 'Magnate Debts to Edward I and Edward III: a Study of Common Problems and Contrasting Royal Reactions to Them', *The National Library of Wales Journal* 27 (1992), 249–88.

[16] M.C. Prestwich, *Edward I*, 2nd edn (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1997), 567.

[17] M.C. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London: Rowman & Littlefield Press, 1972), 225, 235.

[18] Ibid., 245.

[19] Prestwich, *Edward I*; Morris, *GTK*.

[20] Morris, *Bigod Earls*; C. Burt, 'A "Bastard Feudal" Affinity in the Making? The Followings of William and Guy de Beauchamp, Earls of Warwick, 1268–1315', *Midlands History* 34 (2009), 156–80.

Introduction

A comprehensive understanding of Edward's kingship, which can only be achieved once his relationship with the nobility is fully chronicled, will provide historians with a better idea of the place of the reign of Edward I in English history and historiography, and in particular the question of whether Edward was the last of the Angevins or the first late medieval king. Historians have been rightly cautious about giving a simplistic answer to this question since Tout muddied the clear water of Stubbs who had regarded Edward, in Tout's words, as laying 'the foundations of the English constitution and of the English nation, such as we have known them in subsequent ages … and saved us from the danger both of a small aristocratic oligarchy and of the infinitely extended privileged noblesse of most continental countries'. Tout happily accepted this but suggested that 'it is quite as true to regard the work of the most conservative of our great reforming kings as summing up the tendencies of preceding generations'. To contemporaries, he argued, 'ignorant of the future, his reign seemed rather the end of the old than the beginning of the new'.[21] As has been noted, McFarlane's Ford Lectures on the English Nobility began their subject in 1290, and in them Edward I was very much part of late medieval kingship but subsequently very definitely cast out from the late middle ages.[22]

Late medievalists since McFarlane have remained uncertain about the proper place of Edward I's reign in their work. Textbooks on the late middle ages variously begin in 1272, 1290 and 1307.[23] Nor is this uncertainty restricted to late medievalists. Michael Clanchy's textbook on England after the Conquest has gone through three editions.[24] In the first edition, Edward I is excluded; the book finishes in 1272. In the second, an epilogue on Edward I is included. The most recent edition, however, incorporates Edward into the main body of the book, ending firmly in 1307. David Carpenter, on the other hand, in his chapter on the thirteenth-century kings of England in the *New Cambridge Medieval History*, has restated a more traditional picture of Edward's achievements in 'laying the foundations for late-medieval monarchy', in particular through the development of parliament.[25] By illuminating not only Edward I's kingship, but also the political lives of his earls, it is hoped that this book will

[21] Tout, 'Earldoms', 130.

[22] See above, 3.

[23] See, for instance, M.H. Keen, *England in the Later Middle Ages: a Political History* (London: Methuen Press, 1973); Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*.

[24] M.T. Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers, 1066–1272: Foreign Lordship and National Identity* (Oxford University Press, 1983); *England and Its Rulers, 1066–1272*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, 1998); *England and Its Rulers, 1066–1307*, 3rd edn (Oxford University Press, 2006).

[25] D.A. Carpenter, 'The Plantagenet Kings', in D. Abulafia (ed.), *New Cambridge Medieval History, c.1198–1300*, vol. v (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 343.

bring some clarity to a question that goes beyond attributing simple and artificial labels to certain periods, to the heart of understanding how the English constitution developed in the two centuries after Magna Carta.

This uncertainty about Edward I's position poses problems for the historian who approaches his reign, but it also offers an opportunity to engage with the history of the thirteenth century from the perspective of the detailed and sophisticated historiography of the late middle ages that has been produced since McFarlane. Although some thirteenth-century historians, as will be discussed in detail, have engaged with late medieval historiographical ideas such as 'bastard feudalism', this has not always been done with any great familiarity with more recent developments in late medieval historiography. In part this is because, with a few notable exceptions such as Michael Prestwich and Peter Coss, few thirteenth-century historians venture into the fourteenth century in their own research and thus something of a barrier has arisen between work on the thirteenth century and that focusing on the subsequent two centuries. The aim of this book is to help break down that barrier and to examine Edward with a full knowledge of the historiography of what came later as well as looking backwards to the reign of Henry III. Edward I's reign thus offers the opportunity to act as a bridge between the historiography of both the high and the late middle ages and, hopefully, has something to offer students of both periods.

At the start of this book, then, it is worth considering where English kingship stood at the opening of Edward I's reign and the challenges that he faced. In older European historiography the thirteenth century was seen as the culmination of the middle ages, the high point of medieval culture, from which it slowly decayed into the corruption, violence and stagnation of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries before rising again to something even greater with the Renaissance and Reformation.[26] Such a view is no longer current among most historians, who recognise both the vitality and creativity of the later middle ages and the incompleteness and inconsistencies of thirteenth-century achievements. The thirteenth century was a transitional and transformative period in the history of English kingship, falling as it did between the sprawling, restless rule of the Angevins and the national monarchy of Edward III.[27] It took the kings of England a long time to accept the reality of the end of the Angevin empire. The legacy of Henry II's accumulation of French titles continued

---

[26] See J.L. Watts, *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300–1500* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 43–8, for a discussion of historiographical trends in the history of thirteenth-century Europe.

[27] R. Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings: 1075–1225* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000); M.C. Prestwich, *Plantagenet England, 1225–1360* (Oxford University Press, 2005).

Introduction

to affect the history of England and its monarchy fundamentally for the remainder of the middle ages and beyond. In Henry III's reign, moreover, English kingship was still reeling from the twin shocks at the beginning of the century of military disaster in France and humiliation in England. The effects of Magna Carta profoundly hampered the kingship of Henry III throughout his long reign. Royal government and law continued to grow, for the charter was never aimed at restricting them, only controlling their abuse by the king, and the crown was doing considerably more by 1272 than it had been doing in 1216. It is important, however, not to mistake governmental aspirations and mechanisms for power, and there can be no doubt that Henry III was a much weaker king than any of his Angevin predecessors. This was as much to do with the structural position of the monarchy as with the obvious personal inadequacies of Henry himself. Magna Carta had severely curtailed two highly profitable financial tools available to the Angevins: the manipulation of royal feudal rights and the selling of justice. William Ralegh's financial reforms between 1236 and 1239 stabilised the crown's finances after the largely hand-to-mouth experience of the minority but these finances could not survive Henry's determination to recover Poitou, let alone the rest of the Angevin possessions.[28] In other words, the English crown under Henry III was solvent only if it decided to keep out of European politics, an idea wholly alien to his dynasty. Henry's madcap plans in the 1250s for challenging the dominance of the Capetians forced him back on increasingly intense exploitation of his inadequate resources, which culminated in financial and political collapse in 1258. The power, authority and prestige of the monarchy was further debased during the years of Reform and Rebellion, reaching their nadir between the battles of Lewes and Evesham, when the king's heir was imprisoned and denuded of his inheritance and Henry himself was dragged around the country as little more than a miserable cipher, rubber-stamping the decisions of his bitterest enemy.[29]

Simon de Montfort's defeat and death at Evesham, while it solved Henry and Lord Edward's immediate problem, could not by itself solve the endemic problems that had afflicted the monarchy during Henry's reign nor fully eradicate the stain of the humiliations of 1258–65. Some progress was made between Evesham and Henry III's death but the principal challenges facing Edward when he returned from crusade as king in 1274 were the restoration of royal authority and to find a way to make

---

[28] R.C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy, and Royal Finance under Henry III, 1216–1245* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
[29] See Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, chapter 8.

7

Magna Carta work politically and financially for the king and for the community of the realm. For too long under his father the interests of the king and the community of the realm had seemed to be in conflict; it was Edward's task to bring them into harmony.

Illuminating the nature of Edward I's kingship and the way he rose to these challenges thus forms one part of this book and its title, and Part I deals largely with this, but the other part of the book concerns the earls themselves and the key questions of nobility and noble power in the late thirteenth century, and this forms the focus of Part II. For the nobility, too, the thirteenth century was one of transition and they too faced significant challenges at the opening of Edward I's reign. They had begun the century under the tyranny of King John and had risen up in 1215 to force the king to abide by his own law.[30] Following Richard Marshal's rebellion and the Upavon judgment of 1234, the author of *Bracton* penned these famous words:

No one may pass upon the king's act (or his charter) so as to nullify it, but one must say that the king had committed an *injuria*, and thus charge him with amending it, lest he (and the justices) fall into the judgment of the living God because of it. The king has a superior, namely, God. Also the law by which he is made king. Also his *curia*, namely, the earls and barons, because if he is without a bridle, that is without the law, they ought to put the bridle on him (that is why the earls are called 'partners', so to speak of the king; he who has a partner has a master).[31]

In this most establishment of texts, the earls specifically, and the nobility in general, were given an injunction to restrain the king, were he to act beyond the law. This was something they were very willing to do at various points in Henry III's reign and most obviously, of course, in 1258, when, in response to Henry's denial of justice to one of their number, a group of nobles took *Bracton*'s words to heart and resolved to bridle the king on an enduring basis.[32] In their hubris, they believed that, with the adequate safeguard of a broad-based council, they could order England better than the king: the terrible violence of 1263–5, the worst England had seen since Stephen's reign, proved their safeguards worthless and shattered the nobility's mid-century confidence. They had seemingly forgotten that *Bracton*'s famous passage continued: 'When even they [the

---

[30] J.C. Holt, *Magna Carta,* 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[31] *Bracton De Legibus Et Consuetudinibus Angliæ*, ed. and trans. S.E. Thorne, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), II, 110; D.A. Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon Press, 1996), 40–1.

[32] Carpenter, *Reign of Henry III*, 192–3.

Introduction

earls and barons], like the king, are without bridle, then will the subjects
cry out and say "Lord Jesus, bind fast their jaws in rein and bridle."'[33]

The years of Reform and Rebellion also demonstrated to the nobil-
ity the rising power and influence of the gentry, whose grievances were
directed as much at the abuses of the nobility as at those of the crown.[34]
Thus for the nobility the final third of the thirteenth century threatened
the possibility that their power would be squeezed by the combination
of the rising ambition of the gentry and the determination of the crown
to reassert its authority. How they handled these challenges will be an
important theme of this book.

Again, as with kingship, the influence of McFarlane on the history of
the nobility is inescapable, as he did so much to establish the thriving his-
toriography of the nobility and gentry of late medieval England. There
is no consensus among late medievalists about McFarlane's legacy, but it
has produced a rich and sophisticated corpus of writings.[35] By contrast,
work on the thirteenth-century nobility is less abundant and much of
it has been of a general nature rather than the detailed investigation of
individual nobles, families or regions that characterises so much of the
work on the fifteenth century.[36] That is neither to underestimate the
value that these broad studies of the nobility possess, nor to forget that
some important detailed work has been done by Michael Altschul, Peter
Coss, Marc Morris, David Crouch and John Maddicott among others,
but work on the thirteenth-century nobility thus far lacks the depth and
range of that on their fifteenth-century counterparts.[37]

A compromise has been chosen between range and depth. Studies
of individual nobles offer unparalleled depth and give the historian a
firmer grasp of the individual motivations, interests and situation of his

---

[33] *Bracton*, II, 110.

[34] See, for instance, D.A. Carpenter, 'The Second Century of English Feudalism', *Past and Present* 168
(2000), 41–3, for gentry grievances against magnates over suit of court.

[35] For evidence of McFarlane's disputed legacy, see, for instance, R.H. Britnell and A.J. Pollard (eds.),
The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society (Stroud and New York: Sutton and
St Martin's Press, 1995). For the corpus of literature influenced by McFarlane, see note 3 above.

[36] See, for instance, P.R. Coss, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present* 125 (1989), 27–64; P.R.
Coss, D. Crouch and D.A. Carpenter, 'Debate: Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present* 131
(1991), 165–203; Crouch, *Birth of Nobility*; Crouch, *English Aristocracy*.

[37] M. Altschul, *A Baronial Family in Medieval England: the Clares, 1217–1314* (Baltimore, MD: Johns
Hopkins University Press, 1965); G.G. Simpson, 'The *Familia* of Roger de Quincy, Earl of
Winchester and Constable of Scotland', in K.J. Stringer (ed.), *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval
Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1985); P.R. Coss, *Lordship, Knighthood and Locality: a
Study in England Society, c.1180–c.1280* (Cambridge University Press, 1991); H.W. Ridgeway, 'William
de Valence and His *Familiares*, 1247–1272', *Historical Research* 65 (1992), 239–57; Maddicott, *Simon
de Montfort*; D. Crouch, 'The Local Influence of the Earls of Warwick, 1088–1241: a Study in
Decline and Resourcefulness', *Midland History* 21 (1996), 1–22; Morris, *Bigod Earls*; Burt, 'A
"Bastard Feudal" Affinity in the Making?'.

or her chosen noble than is possible in a more general work, but there are obvious dangers. As Christine Carpenter has put it: 'If all politics is seen in terms of individual protagonists, each driven by his own inner daemon, we can come to no other conclusion than that politics were exclusively personal and, regardless of what ideological front might be put up to justify political action, each was out for what he could get.'[38] This is not always the case; John Maddicott has skilfully described Simon de Montfort's peculiar blend of high idealism and low self-interest.[39] A delicate balance, therefore, needs to be struck to ensure that enough is known about individual noblemen to understand their unique circum-stances, while acknowledging that each nobleman was part of a broader group of people who shared common assumptions, activities and inter-ests, politically, socially and economically.

With this in mind, a small group of nobles has been chosen for this book. Choosing the earls as a distinct group to study is certainly unrep-resentative of the nobility as a whole. The earls were much richer, more prestigious and fundamentally more powerful people than the average nobleman. Sidney Painter calculated the median baronial income in the late thirteenth century of twenty-seven barons (including six earls) as £339. In comparison, most earls had incomes in excess of £2,000 a year.[40] They were the billionaires compared to the mere millionaires of the rest of the nobility. Today it is fruitless to learn about the ways of the rich by looking at the lives of the super-rich, but this is not so in the middle ages. This was a much smaller and more tightly knit society and, though they were richer and more influential than the majority of the nobility, the earls shared the common heritage and outlook of the nobil-ity as a whole.

That said, one also has to acknowledge that there were great differ-ences in wealth and influence among the earls themselves and it could be questioned whether it is helpful to treat the earls corporately, if indeed there was such a thing as a shared comital experience. Such questions are valid and important but there is enough evidence to suggest that earls were a definable grouping within the nobility and were recog-nised as such by themselves and others. They were addressed separately by the royal government, thought of separately by lawyers and thinkers and regarded themselves as something special within English society. It is,

---

[38] M.C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: a Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401–1499* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 6.

[39] Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*. By contrast, see J.L. Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), for what a group approach towards the nobility can achieve.

[40] S. Painter, *Studies in the History of the English Feudal Barony* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1943), 173.